


~~By~~ / DIC



22101176981

59574

A DICTIONARY
OF
CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY,
LITERATURE, SECTS AND DOCTRINES;

BEING
A CONTINUATION OF 'THE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.'

EDITED BY
WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D.,
AND
HENRY WACE, M.A.,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON;
CHAPLAIN OF LINCOLN'S INN.



VOLUME I.

A—D.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1877.

The right of Translation is reserved.

BY / DIE

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.



W	WELLBOME
LIBRARY	
General	Collection
M	
7942	

LIST OF WRITERS

IN THE DICTIONARIES OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY
AND ANTIQUITIES.

INITIALS.

NAMES.

- H. T. A. Rev. HENRY THOMAS ARMFIELD, M.A., F.S.A.,
Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Salisbury.
- F. A. Rev. FREDERICK ARNOLD, B.A.,
Formerly of Christ Church, Oxford.
- C. B. Rev. CHURCHILL BABINGTON, B.D., F.L.S.,
Disney Professor of Archaeology in the University of
Cambridge; Rector of Cockfield, Suffolk; formerly
Fellow of St. John's College.
- H. B—Y. Rev. HENRY BAILEY, D.D.,
Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and
Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral; formerly
Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
- J. B—Y. Rev. JAMES BARMBY, B.D.,
Vicar of Pittington; formerly Fellow of Magdalen College,
Oxford, and Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall,
Durham.
- A. B. Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D.,
Principal of King's College, London, and Canon of
Worcester.
- E. W. B. Rev. EDWARD WHITE BENSON, D.D.,
Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral; formerly Fellow of
Trinity College, Cambridge, and Master of Wellington
College.
- E. B. B. EDWARD BICKERSTETH BIRKS, M.A.,
Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- C. W. B. Rev. CHARLES WILLIAM BOASE, M.A.,
Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
- H. B. HENRY BRADSHAW, M.A.,
(in *Dict. Biog.*) Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Librarian of the
University of Cambridge.
- W. B. Rev. WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.,
Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Regius Professor of
Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford.
- H. B. The late Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A.,
(in *Dict. Ant.*) Vicar of Pevensey, and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.
- I. B. ISAMBARD BRUNEL, D.C.L.,
Of Lincoln's Inn; Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely.
- J. B. JAMES BRYCE, D.C.L.,
Of Lincoln's Inn; Regius Professor of Civil Law in the
University of Oxford.

LIST OF WRITERS.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
T. R. B.	THOMAS RYBURN BUCHANAN, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
D. B.	Rev. DANIEL BUTLER, M.A., Rector of Thwing, Yorkshire.
J. M. C.	Rev. JOHN MOORE CAPES, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford.
J. G. C.	Rev. JOHN GIBSON CAZENOVE, D.D., F.R.S.E., Diocesan Chaplain, Edinburgh; formerly Provost of Cumbrae College, N.B.
C.	Rev. SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, and Chaplain of Dulwich College; formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
E. B. C.	EDWARD BYLES COWELL, M.A., Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Cambridge, Fellow of Corpus Christi College.
M. B. C.	Rev. MAURICE BYLES COWELL, M.A., Vicar of Ash-Bocking.
J. Ll. D.	Rev. JOHN LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A., Rector of Christchurch, St. Marylebone; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. D.	Rev. CECIL DEEDES, M.A., Secretary to the Central African Mission; formerly Chaplain of Christchurch, Oxford, and Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford.
W. P. D.	Rev. WILLIAM PURDIE DICKSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow.
S. J. E.	Rev. SAMUEL JOHN EALES, M.A., Principal of St. Boniface, Warminster; formerly Head Master of the Grammar School, Halstead, Essex.
J. E.	Rev. JOHN ELLERTON, M.A., Rector of Barnes, Surrey.
C. J. E.	Rev. C. J. ELLIOTT, M.A., Vicar of Winkfield, Windsor; formerly Crosse and Tyrwhitt Scholar in the University of Cambridge.
E. S. Ff.	Rev. EDMUND SALUSBURY FFOULKES, Rector of Wigginton; Examiner in the Honour School of Theology, Select Preacher, and formerly Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford.
A. P. F.	The late Right Rev. ALEXANDER PENROSE FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin.
W. H. F.	Hon. and Rev. WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Marylebone, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; formerly Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
J. M. F.	Rev. JOHN MEE FULLER, M.A., Vicar of Bexley; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

LIST OF WRITERS.

v

INITIALS.	NAMES.
J. G.	Rev. JAMES GAMMACK, M.A., The Parsonage, Drumlithie, Fordoun, N.B.
R. G.	Rev. RICHARD GIBBINGS, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.
C. D. G.	Rev. CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D., Binfield, Bracknell, Berks.
W. F. G.	The late Rev. WILLIAM FREDERICK GREENFIELD, M.A., Master of the Lower School, Dulwich College.
A. W. H.	The late Rev. ARTHUR WEST HADDAN, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath; Hon. Canon of Worcester; sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
E. H.	Rev. EDWIN HATCH, M.A., Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford.
E. C. H.	Rev. EDWARDS COMERFORD HAWKINS, M.A., Head Master of St. John's Foundation School, Leatherhead.
L. H.	Rev. LEWIS HENSLEY, M.A., Vicar of Hitchin, Herts; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. H.	Rev. CHARLES HOLE, B.A., Camberwell; formerly Rector of Loxbear.
H. S. H.	Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Senior Student and Tutor of Christchurch, Oxford.
H.	Rev. FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, D.D., Fellow and Divinity Lecturer of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester.
H. J. H.	Rev. HENRY JOHN HOTHAM, M.A., Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.
J. H.	JOHN HULLAH, LL.D., Honorary Fellow of King's College, London.
W. J.	Rev. WILLIAM JACKSON, M.A., F.S.A., F.R.A.S., Formerly Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer for 1875.
G. A. J.	Rev. GEORGE ANDREW JACOB, D.D., Formerly Head Master of Christ's Hospital, London.
D. R. J.	Rev. DAVID RICE JONES, Oxford.
W. J. J.	Rev. WILLIAM JAMES JOSLING, M.A., Rector of Moulton, Suffolk; formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
L.	Rev. JOSEPH BARBER LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's; Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; Honorary Fellow of Trinity College.
R. A. L.	RICHARD ADELBERT LIPSUS, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Jena.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
J. M. L.	JOHN MALCOM LUDLOW, Of Lincoln's Inn.
J. R. L.	Rev. JOHN ROBERT LUNN, B.D., Vicar of Marton-cum-Grafton, Yorkshire; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
J. H. L.	Rev JOSEPH HIRST LUPTON, M.A., Surmaster of St. Paul's School; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
G. F. M.	Rev. GEORGE FREDERICK MACLEAR, D.D., Head Master of King's College School, London.
S. M.	The late Rev. SPENCER MANSEL, M.A., Vicar of Trumpington; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
W. B. M.	The late Rev. WHARTON B. MARRIOTT, M.A., Formerly of Eton College, and sometime Fellow of Exeter College.
G. M.	Rev. GEORGE MEAD, M.A., Formerly Chaplain to the Forces, Dublin.
F. M.	Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Rector of Blickling, Norfolk; Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral; Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
W. M.	Rev. WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen.
G. H. M.	Rev. GEORGE HERBERT MOBERLY, M.A., Rector of Duntresbourne Rous, near Cirencester; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury; formerly Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
T. D. C. M.	Rev. THOMAS DANIEL COX MORSE, Rector of Drayton, Nuneaton.
H. C. G. M.	Rev. HANDLEY CARR GLYN MOULE, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
J. R. M.	JOHN RICKARDS MOZLEY, M.A., Formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
J. B. M.	J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
A. N.	ALEXANDER NESBITT, F.S.A., Oldlands, Uckfield.
P. O.	Rev. PHIPPS ONSLOW, B.A., Rector of Upper Sapey, Herefordshire.
G. W. P.	Rev. GREGORY WALTON PENNETHORNE, M.A., Vicar of Ferring, Sussex, and Rural Dean; formerly Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Chichester.
W. G. F. P.	WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, D.C.L., Of the Middle Temple; Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln; formerly Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
H. W. P.	Rev. HENRY WRIGHT PHILLOTT, M.A., Rector of Staunton-on-Wye; Praelector of Hereford Cathedral; formerly Student of Christ Church and Master in Charterhouse School.
E. H. P. (sometimes P.)	Rev. EDWARD HAYES PLUMPTRE, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College, London; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral; Vicar of Bickley; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
DE PRESSENSÉ.	Rev. E. DE PRESSENSÉ, Of Paris.
J. R.	Rev. JAMES RAINE, M.A., Canon of York; formerly Fellow of the University of Durham.
W. R.	Very Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., Dean of Armagh.
G. S.	Rev. GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin.
P. S.	Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., Bible House, New York.
F. H. S.	Rev. FREDERICK HENRY SCRIVENER, M.A., LL.D., Rector of Hendon, Middlesex.
W. E. S.	Rev. WILLIAM EDWARD SCUDAMORE, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
J. S.	Rev. JOHN SHARPE, M.A., Rector of Gissing, Norfolk; formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
B. S.	BENJAMIN SHAW, M.A., Of Lincoln's Inn; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
W. M. S.	Rev. WILLIAM MACDONALD SINCLAIR, M.A., Assistant Minister of Quebec Chapel; formerly Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford.
R. S.	Rev. ROBERT SINKER, M.A., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge.
I. G. S.	Rev. ISAAC GREGORY SMITH, M.A., Vicar of Great Malvern; Prebendary of Hereford Cathed- ral; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer for 1873.
A. P. S.	Very Rev. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster.
W. S.	Rev. WILLIAM STEWART, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow.
J. S—T.	JOHN STUART, LL.D., Of the General Register House, Edinburgh.

INITIALS.

NAMES.

- S. Rev. WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A.,
Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of
Oxford; Fellow of Oriel College.
- C. A. S. Rev. CHARLES ANTHONY SWAINSON, D.D.,
Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of
Cambridge; Canon of Chichester Cathedral; formerly
Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
- H. B. S. Rev. HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, B.D.,
Fellow and Divinity Lecturer of Gonville and Caius
College, Cambridge.
- E. S. T. Rev. EDWARD STUART TALBOT, M.A.,
Warden of Keble College, Oxford.
- R. ST. J. T. Rev. RICHARD ST. JOHN TYRWHITT, M.A.,
Formerly Student and Rhetoric Reader of Christchurch,
Oxford.
- E. V. Rev. EDMUND VENABLES, M.A.,
Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Lincoln Cathedral;
Chaplain to the Bishop of London.
- H. W. Rev. HENRY WACE, M.A.,
Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Ecclesiastical
History in King's College, London.
- B. F. W.
or W. Rev. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D.,
Canon of Peterborough; Regius Professor of Divinity in
the University of Cambridge; formerly Fellow of
Trinity College.
- G. W. Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D.,
Vicar of Ringwood; Hon. Canon of Winchester; formerly
Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
- C. W. Rev. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A.,
Fellow of Peterhouse, and formerly Scholar of Trinity
College, Cambridge.
- J. W. Rev. JOHN WORDSWORTH, M.A.,
Prebendary of Lincoln; Examining Chaplain to the
Bishop of Lincoln; formerly Fellow of Brasenose
College, Oxford.
- W. A. W. WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.,
Trinity College, Cambridge.
- E. M. Y. Rev. EDWARD MALLET YOUNG, M.A.,
Assistant Master in Harrow School; Fellow of Trinity
College, Cambridge.
- H. W. Y. Rev. HENRY WILLIAM YULE, B.C.L., M.A.,
Rector of Shipton-on-Cherwell and Vicar of Hampton Gay.

PREFACE.

THIS WORK is designed to furnish, in the form of a Biographical Dictionary, a complete collection of materials for the History of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne, in every branch of this great subject except that of Christian Antiquities. Those Antiquities have been treated in a separate Work,* and the two Dictionaries are to be regarded as forming parts of one comprehensive Cyclopaedia of Ecclesiastical History for the first eight centuries of the Christian Era. The present Work, like its companion, commences at the period at which the Dictionary of the Bible leaves off, and forms a continuation of it; and it ceases at the age of Charlemagne, because the reign of that monarch forms a recognised link between ancient and modern times. The Biography and Literature of the Ages that followed, no less than their Institutions, Arts, and Customs, afford abundant matter for a separate book.

It is the object of this Dictionary, speaking generally, to supply an adequate account, based upon original authorities, of all persons connected with the History of the Church within the period treated concerning whom anything is known, of the Literature connected with them, and of the controversies respecting Doctrine or Discipline in which they were engaged. From the Articles on Doctrine we have carefully excluded subjects of controversy which arose at a later date than the period with which the Dictionary deals; so that doctrinal terms which became matter of dispute only in the Middle Ages, or at the Reformation, are not discussed in these pages. Our object has been to treat these subjects from a purely historical point of view, and simply to give an impartial account of what was believed, thought, and done in the early ages

* *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, being a continuation of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by William Smith, D.C.L., LL.D., and Samuel Cheetham, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London; vol. i. London: John Murray. 1875.

of Christianity, without entering upon the disputable conclusions drawn from these facts by various schools or parties. Though it would be too much to hope that these principles have been applied with uniform strictness, we can at least assert that throughout the composition and revision of the Work they have been diligently kept in view.

It will readily be understood with respect to an undertaking of this comprehensive nature, dealing with extremely varied and often very obscure periods of Church history, that experience alone could determine the precise limits within which it should be confined and the best method of conducting it. At one time the intention was entertained of exhibiting a complete Onomasticon of the Christian world for the first eight centuries; but it was found that to aim at such an ideal would delay the Work indefinitely. We therefore found it desirable to adopt another standard which, without falling very far short of the former, would render the Dictionary complete for all practical purposes. The labours of great foreign scholars since the Reformation, particularly of Baronius, of Tillemont, of Ceillier, and of more recent French and German authors, have brought together nearly all the primary materials for the general Church history of our period; and similarly grand collections have been made for the Church history of particular nations. It was thought that if these labours were taken as our starting-point, and if an effort were made to ensure that all the materials afforded in these voluminous collections were verified, utilised, and brought within practicable compass, we should at least have carried the work done by our predecessors an important step forward, and should have placed within the reach of general readers whatever is essential to the study of Church history. In the execution of this plan the authorities have been investigated afresh, with the aid of the light thrown upon them by modern learning, and care has been taken that our accounts should, as far as possible, be derived immediately from the original sources. Particular attention has of course been paid to the chief Fathers of the Church, and they have been made the subject of special studies by some of our principal contributors. All persons mentioned in their works have been noticed, whether Christians or not, and accordingly Roman Emperors and pagan writers have been admitted in our pages, so far as they influenced the external fortunes or the thought of the Church.

We think, therefore, it may justly be claimed for this Work that, with the aid of great scholars of former times as well as of our own, it presents to the public a more complete collection of

materials for the Ecclesiastical History of the important period with which it deals than has hitherto been produced either in England or abroad; and we venture to hope that, with the companion Work on Antiquities, it may vindicate for English scholarship a higher place in this field of learning than has hitherto been attained. At the same time it will be understood from what has been said that, as the plan of the Dictionary was only gradually formed, some inequality will be found in the treatment of the subject in the present volume, especially in the earlier part. In consequence, moreover, of the unavoidably long period over which the preparation of the volume has extended, some of the earlier articles may need to be supplemented with information which has been brought to light since they were printed. All such defects will be remedied in a Supplement, to be published at the conclusion of the Work, which will also afford an opportunity for correcting those errors or errata which, in a first edition, will be admitted to be unavoidable.

It should further be explained that special attention has been paid to the Church History of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and in this department of the Work the same plan has in substance been followed. The great historical collection known as the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy's *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relative to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, and the important volumes by Professor Stubbs and the late Mr. Haddan entitled *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland* have been diligently consulted, and authorities quoted by them have been, as far as possible, minutely examined. A scale has been allowed for the treatment of names in this portion of the Work which would have been, perhaps, impracticable in respect to other countries. Without including, as would have been necessary in a complete Onomasticon, all the names which might be collected from the signatures to charters and other public documents, we have endeavoured to notice every person bearing an ecclesiastical designation or office, and every person of royal rank, as it is impossible in these early ages to separate ecclesiastical from political history. Dugdale's *Monasticon* and similar works have, for this purpose, been carefully examined. The Church History of Scotland and Ireland was entrusted to the late Bishop of Brechin, and since his death has, in the main, been committed to the clergyman by whom, under the Bishop's superintendence, the actual work had previously been executed.

It would not have been convenient for the reader, even if it had been practicable, to apply rigidly a uniform principle to the spelling

of proper names. Where an abbreviated or modified orthography has become naturalised in English, we have usually retained it in the heading of an article ; taking care, however, to give the more correct form, and a cross reference when necessary. Contributors have been left to name the editions from which they quote ; but as a rule, when nothing is said to the contrary, the Fathers are quoted according to the standard pagination, which is marked in large figures in the text of Migne's edition. It may also be as well to mention that Ceillier is generally referred to in the very useful edition published in Paris between 1858 and 1869.

When the plan of this Christian Cyclopaedia was formed, the editorship of the portion comprised in these volumes was placed in the hands of Professors Lightfoot and Westcott, under the general superintendence of Dr. William Smith, and the Work owes much to the labour which was at first bestowed upon it by those two distinguished scholars. The pressure of other engagements compelled them before long to relinquish this task, but their subsequent co-operation and advice, so far as their time has allowed them to afford it, claims the best thanks of the present Editors. On their retirement, Dr. William Smith assumed the editorship as far as the end of the articles in B ; but from the commencement of the articles in C Professor Wace has acted as Editor, with the advice and assistance of Dr. Smith.

In conclusion, while gratefully acknowledging the hearty co-operation of all their contributors, without which the production of any such work would have been impossible, the Editors are bound to express their special obligations in two instances. Their first acknowledgments are due to Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, who, in addition to contributing many important articles, had the generosity to volunteer at the last moment to read through the latter and the larger part of the proof sheets ; and the Editors cannot sufficiently express their sense of the advantage the Work has derived from his learned supervision. Their other acknowledgments must be tendered to the Rev. Charles Hole, the author of a *Brief Biographical Dictionary*, well known to historical students. The completeness with which, as the Editors hope, English Ecclesiastical History has been treated in this volume is in great measure due to the accurate labours of Mr. Hole. They have also to thank him for invaluable assistance in revising the proofs, and in making those supplementary investigations by which alone a Dictionary of this kind can be rendered trustworthy.

A

DICTIONARY

OF

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY,

LITERATURE, SECTS, AND DOCTRINES.

A

ABBANUS

ABBANUS (St.), of Cill-Abbain, in Uimíreadhaigh (co. Meath), and of Magh-Arnuidhe in Uí-Ceinseallaigh (co. Wexford), Irish abbats, in the 5th and 6th centuries. The editor of the life in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Bruxellis, 1867, folio) unravels the confusion which has hitherto existed on the subject, by discriminating between two saints of the same name, both of the royal family of Leinster. The earlier must be St. Abban of Cill-Abbain, originally named Blath, son of the sister of St. Ibar the contemporary of St. Patrick in the 5th century, and commemorated in the Calendars on the 16th of March. Of him nothing certain is known. The later one is then St. Abban of Magh-Arnuidhe, son of the sister of St. Coemgen, in the 6th century, and commemorated on the 27th of October. Two Latin and two Irish lives have been preserved, but all based upon one professing to have been written by a great-grandson of one whom St. Abban had baptized. Twenty monasteries are mentioned as having been founded by the saint, almost all in the southern half of Ireland.

(O'Clery, *Martyrol. Dungall.*, ed. Todd and Reeves; Colgan, *Acta SS. Hiberniæ*; *Acta SS. Octobris*, tom. xii. p. 270.) [H. B.]

ABDA, or **ABDAS**, bishop of SUSA (Theophanes, *Chronogr.* sub an. 406), called by Socrates (vii. 8) bishop of Persia. He is said to have assisted Maruthas in driving a demon out of the son of Isdegerdes or Yezdegerd, king of Persia. Theodoret (v. 39) relates that his zeal led him to destroy a fire-temple, which roused a persecution against the Christians, to which he himself fell a victim. Assemani saw a splendid MS. of the Acts of Abdas in the Syrian monastery at Scete, while he was making a tour of the Nitrian desert (*B. O.* i. 176, 177, 181; iii. 19). In another passage (ii. 401) he calls him Abda, bishop of the Huzitæ. In Socrates (vii. 8) his name is corrupted into 'Ανδᾶ, and Epiphanius Scholasticus calls him 'Αβλαδῆτης. [W. A. W.]

ABDIAS. Under the name of Abdias, whom the legend makes first bishop of Babylon, a collection of apocryphal Acts of Apostles, written in Latin and bearing the general title *Historia Certaminis Apostolici* or *Historiæ Apostolicæ*, has

ABDIAS

come down to us. It is distributed into ten books, and comprises the Acts of the Apostles Peter, Paul, Andrew, James the son of Zebedee, John, James the son of Alphaeus, Simon and Jude, Matthew, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Philip. The work is introduced by a preface which pretends to have been written by the historian Africanus, i.e. the celebrated chronographer Julius Africanus, who was contemporary with Origen. The 'Acts' which follow are alleged to have been originally written in Hebrew by Abdias, a companion of the two Apostles St. Simon and St. Jude, and first bishop of Babylon, to have been translated by his disciple Eutropius into Greek, and to have been thence rendered into Latin by Africanus, and distributed by him into ten books, so that each Apostle had a book to himself. This order is actually observed in the work before us, with the exception only of the sixth book, which, besides the Acts of James the Just, contains those also of his alleged step-brothers, St. Simon and St. Jude. The authorship of these last is however attributed not to Abdias himself, but to another disciple of the two apostles, who is called Craton (*Hist. Apostol.* vi. 20), and from whose work, which is also said to have consisted of ten books, and to have been translated into Latin by Africanus, an extract is inserted here. The conjecture of former critics that at vi. 20 we must still read Abdias and not Craton, or that the whole work before us may have circulated sometimes under the one name and sometimes under the other, is erroneous. Abdias indeed is mentioned in the same connection in which the work of Craton is referred to, but in such a way as to exclude the possibility of his being regarded as the author of that work. According to this apocryphal writer's statement, the two Apostles Simon and Jude, after ordaining Abdias bishop of Babylon, take their journey into Persia, and for the space of thirteen years traverse the twelve provinces of that country. In order therefore to be able to appeal to the testimony of an eye-witness as to the later history of the two Apostles, he purposely refers not to Abdias, who is supposed to be left behind in Babylon, but to another of their disciples and companions, Craton, as his autho-

city. This alone is a sufficient hint that the statement in the preface attributing the whole work to Abdias as its author is a fiction. The other statement likewise, that Africanus was the translator, is contradicted by the author's own language in the sixth book. For he there distinguishes himself from the imaginary Africanus, whom he now designates as the author of a much more extended work concerning the two Apostles Simon and Jude, of which he only gives certain extracts. The reference of these histories of the Apostles to the oldest possible and contemporary witnesses is after all a somewhat rude attempt at deception. Africanus wrote of course in Greek, not in Latin; but this author had evidently the works of Jerome and Rufinus before him. He makes a series of Scriptural quotations from the text of the Latin Vulgate, and inserts long extracts from the Church History of Rufinus, as well as from his Latin version of the Clementine Recognitions. The names of Abdias of Babylon and of Craton are inventions of some predecessor of the present writer. The latter must undoubtedly have been referred to as an eye-witness and original authority in the earlier Acts of St. Simon and St. Jude, from which large extracts are incorporated in the sixth book of the *Historiae Apostolicae*. His name meets us yet again in a fragment of the Acts of the Apostle Bartholomew, for which we are indebted to Stephen Praetorius. There likewise Craton is designated as a disciple of St. Simon and St. Jude. Compare the *Fragmenta Apostolorum* in the Appendix to Praetorius' edition (in German and Latin) of the Apocryphal Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans, Hamburg, 1595. These *Fragmenta* are reprinted in Fabricius *Cod. Apocryph. N. Test.* ii. 931. The name of Abdias too belongs undoubtedly to the original source of the narrative in the sixth book of the *Historiae Apostolicae*. It is probably derived originally from the legend of Thaddaeus, referred to by Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13), in which a certain Abdos, son of Abdu, is spoken of as having been healed of a disease in the feet by the Apostle. (Compare also the *Doctrina Addaei* in Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, London, 1864, pp. 7, 13, where the same person is called Abdu, son of Abdu.) At any rate, this name appears in the Latin version of Eusebius by Rufinus (of which diligent use is made by our author) in the more familiar form of Abdias, by which the LXX represents the Hebrew Obadiah (עֲבַדְיָה). With this has been combined a statement of Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 39) and of Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 8), according to which a Persian temple of the sun is said to have been destroyed by a bishop named Abda—a story which may at any rate remind us of the destruction of the temple of the Sun and Moon in the Persian city Suanir related by our author (*Hist. Apost.* vi. 21–23), but by him attributed to a miraculous interposition at the martyrdom of the Apostles Simon and Jude. Moreover, the name Abda is not identical with Abdias. And however that may be, there is certainly no trace in the whole of ecclesiastical antiquity of the existence of such a work as these Acts or Histories of the Apostles by an author so named. The first signs of an acquaintance with it meet us in Venantius Fortunatus (†609), who, in a poem in praise of virginity (*Op. Miscell.* viii. 5,

comp. 6), alludes to a series of legends concerning the Apostles which can be referred to no other than this pseudo-Abdias. The passage is as follows:—

“Nobilis Andream mittit Achaia suum
Praecipuum meritis Ephesus veneranda Joannem
Dirigit et Jacobos terra beata sacros
Laeta suis votis Hierapolis alma Philippum
Producens Thomam munus Edessa pium
Inde triumphantem fert India Bartholomaeum
Matthaeum eximium Naddaver alta virum
Hinc Simonem et Judam lumen Persida gemellum
Laeta relaxato mittit ad astra sinu.”

If to the Apostles here designated we add the names of Peter and Paul, mentioned in the verses immediately preceding, we shall have all the twelve Apostles together, of whom the *Historiae* of Abdias treat, which, taking the variations in the Catalogues of the Apostles into account, can hardly be regarded as accidental. A still greater weight in the scale must be attached to the agreement as to the localities in which the Apostles are said to have suffered martyrdom. On this subject there is no uniform tradition, except in reference to St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John, and St. Philip. With regard to all the rest the legends and martyrologies differ widely. Venantius Fortunatus however follows throughout the tradition as exhibited by Abdias. They both, for instance, place the tomb of St. Bartholomew in India; while Gregory of Tours (573–595), and with him the Greek Acts of Bartholomew (Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, p. 259) are already acquainted with the legend that the isle of Lipari, near Sicily, possesses his bones. So also Venantius, like Abdias (vi. 20–23), knows of the martyrdom of Simon and Jude in Persia, the translation of the bones of St. Thomas from India to Edessa (Abdias ix. 25), and the city of Naddaver in Ethiopia, as the place of St. Matthew's martyrdom (Abdias vii. 1 sq.). This Naddaver is nowhere mentioned by writers of the first six centuries, but only in later Martyrologies. (Compare the *Acta St. Matthaei* in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Septemb. t. vi. p. 220 sq., a production based on this of Abdias.) It is however again mentioned by Fortunatus in the next following poem (viii. 7):—

“Quos Patra, quos Ephesus, Naddaver arce tenet;”

where Patra involves a reference to St. Andrew (comp. Abdias, iii. 35 sqq.), Ephesus to St. John, and Naddaver to St. Matthew. Subsequently to Venantius Fortunatus various authors exhibit acquaintance with the Apostolic Histories of Abdias; e.g. Bede (†735), who refers to them as “historiae in quibus passiones Apostolorum continentur,” and rejects them as Apocryphal (*Retract. in Acta Apost.* cap. i; comp. Fabricius ii. pp. 629 sq., 639); and Aldhelm (*Ep. ad Geruntium regem*, in the epistles of Bonifacius; comp. Fabricius iii. p. 602), who refers to the plots of Simon Magus against St. Peter as related in the “*Certamen Apostolorum*” (i.e. Abdias, lib. i. and ii.), and in the ten books of Clemens (i.e. the Clementine Recognitions). In accordance with these references, and taking into account on the one hand the acquaintance with this work betrayed by Fortunatus, and on the other its author's ignorance of the translation to the island of Lipari of the bones of St. Bartholomew, we cannot fix on a later date for its com-

position than the second half of the 6th century. But neither can we assign it an earlier date, as Gutschmid has proved (*Die Königsnamen in den apocryph. Apostelgeschichten*; *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, xix. p. 387 sq.). The story told by Abdias in the *Acta Matthaei* of a king of Ethiopia named Beor, who in his lifetime constituted one son commander of his army and made the other king, and who lived till the day of his death in peace with the Romans and Persians (Abdias, vii. 15) has a real historical basis in the history of the Abyssinian King Elesbaas to which Fabricius refers (*Cod. Apocr. N. T.* ii. p. 653) in illustration of the epithet *rex Christianissimus* applied to Aeglippos (vii. 8). Elesbaas subjugated in the year 524 the kingdom of the Sabaeans and from that time the Abyssinians were involved in the contests between the Romans and Persians. These *Acta Matthaei* therefore, incorporated in the work of Abdias, must have been written subsequently to the year 524.

The place where is not so easy to determine as the time when these histories of Abdias were written. One thing only is certain, that they originated in the West, and that Latin is the language in which they were written. This is evident from the use made of the Latin Vulgate, and of Eusebius and the Clementine Recognitions in the translations of Rufinus as well as of various other Latin recensions of Greek *Acta*. The proof is less cogent which may be drawn from plays on words such as *non everti sed converti eum* (viii. 8) and *impetrabam non imperabam* (ix. 21), the former at any rate being a mere imitation of a similar Greek paronomasia. The Greek originals however are probably only mediately made use of.

The collection as it here lies before us as a whole seems to have been made with no other object than that of gratifying a pious curiosity, and not intended to subserve any such local interests as have given rise to so many legends of the Saints. The *Acta Matthaei*, written in the last years of the 10th century and in the monastery of St. Eucharius at Trèves, though formerly attached, in early printed editions, to this collection of Abdias (first of all by Wolfgang Lazius, Basle, 1551), could not, as the date of its composition shows, have formed originally any part of it. Our collection appears to have been composed in some Frankish monastery in which a learned contemporary of Gregory of Tours seems to have put together what he could collect of older and more recent narrations of the deeds and fates of the different Apostles, and to have sought to enhance the credibility of his compilation by attaching to it the names of Abdias as a disciple of Apostles and of the celebrated chronographer Africanus. The first traces of its existence certainly meet us in the Frankish kingdom, and that soon after the time of its composition; and as the monastic institutions of that kingdom were in the 10th century the seat of great literary activity, the above conjecture in default of more certain information appears the most probable.

For the text of Abdias we are still dependent on the old printed editions, among which that of Fabricius (*Cod. Apocr. N. T.* ii. pp. 402-742), if not the most correct, is the most accessible. (For a list of older editions, see Fabricius p. 400 sq.)

But little further assistance is afforded by the parallel texts of single books as printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*. From a manuscript described in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May t. i. p. 7, and June t. v. p. 399), and also by Fabricius (p. 401) and Thilo (*Acta Petri et Pauli*, fasc. 1, Halle 1837, p. 28), which formerly belonged to the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Weissenburg, and afterwards to a Baron Blum, Imperial Councillor of Appeals, from whose possession it passed first to Helmstädt, and then to Wolfenbüttel (Guelpherby. A. in Thilo), it is evident that these "histories" of Abdias received additions from older documents and from other sources. In this manuscript they bear the title *Melito Episcopus de Virtutibus Apostolorum*, followed by the *Epistola Encyclica*, elsewhere prefixed to the *Passio Johannis* (an apocryphal work, also circulated under the name of *Melito*; Fabricius iii. p. 604 sq.). To the *Virtutes Pauli* is immediately attached in this MS. the *Passio Petri et Pauli* of the pseudo-Marcellus, from which a passage has found its way into our present text of Abdias, though wanting in many MSS. Single books were frequently copied separately, undergoing here and there alterations in the process and receiving separate inscriptions.

The pseudo-Abdias himself indicates as the sources whence he drew his information, besides the New Testament, certain older documents concerning the martyrdoms of single Apostles (*Praefatio Operi Praefixa*: "nam de multis quae hac de re a veteribus scripta sunt nihil ad nos praeter ipsorum passionum monumenta venerunt"). Among these he makes special mention "of a certain book" in which the journey of St. Thomas into India and his deeds there are described (ix. 1). The reference is evidently to the *Acta Thomae* which still exist in a fragmentary shape in the original Greek, and were in the hands of our author in a more complete form than now in ours. From these he extracts largely, omitting what appeared to him superfluous (*supervacaneis omissis*); the allusion being probably to the speeches and hymns which, from their Gnostic colouring, were not fitted to edify the Church (*ecclesiam roborare*). He also elsewhere several times expressly declares that he is only making extracts from more copious sources of information; e.g. in the passage already referred to (vi. 20), where he assures us that he has selected only a little from the writing of the alleged disciple of the Apostles, Craton, concerning the Acts of St. Simon and St. Jude, translated, as he pretends, by Africanus. Again a similar statement meets us in the Acts of St. Matthew (vii. 8), which in the source from whence pseudo-Abdias drew his information may have been already connected in a loose or merely accidental way with those of St. Simon and St. Jude. In other places too, where he does not expressly say so, he is simply making extracts from his authorities, and these often so abridged as to be nearly unintelligible, while elsewhere he gives long connected passages. A great part of the writings thus employed are still in existence; the existence of others can with some degree of certainty be inferred. The value of his compilation for us consists in this, that he had before him a large number of works now lost, if not in the original, yet in a Latin version; and that of

others he had better texts than we at present possess.

The authorities thus made use of, so far as we can still ascertain them, are the following:—(1) St. Jerome's Latin version of the New Testament (the Vulgate). (2) Rufinus' Latin version of the *Church History* of Eusebius (Abdias v. 3, vi. 4–6). (3) The Latin version of the *Clementine Recognitions* (Abdias i. 7–14, vi. 2, 3), and that of the *Epistola Clementis ad Jacobum* (Abdias i. 15), by Rufinus. (4) St. Jerome's book *de Viris Illust.* (Abdias vi. 1). (5) Pseudo-Hegesippus *De Excidio Hierosolymae* or the Latin paraphrase of Josephus' work on the Jewish war (Abdias i. 16–20). (6) Pseudo-Marcellus *De Passione Petri et Pauli*; i.e. a Latin version of the *Πράξεις Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου* (Abdias ii. 7), published by Thilo (*Acta Petri et Pauli*, Halle, 1837, 1838) and Tischendorf (*Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 1 sq.), together with a passage inserted in the section taken from pseudo-Hegesippus, and found in our printed texts of Abdias (i. 17, 18) though wanting in that given in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Jun. tom. v. p. 424 sq.). (7) The Latin version of pseudo-Linus *De Passione Petri et Pauli* (*Bibl. Patr. Maxima* ii. p. 67 sq.), being a Catholic adaptation of Gnostic Acts of St. Paul and St. Peter (Abdias i. 20, ii. 8). (8) A Catholic adaptation of the Gnostic *περίοδοι* and the *μαρτύριον Ἀνδρέου*, likewise in Latin (Abdias iii. 2–42). The text of the *περίοδοι*, which describe the journeys of St. Andrew from Pontus to Greece (Philastrius *Hæc.* 88), is now only known to us through Abdias (with exception of the history of St. Andrew's doings among the Anthropophagi referred to in Abdias iii. 2, 3, which we possess now in its original form in the Gnostic *πράξεις Ἀνδρέου καὶ Μαθαίου* in Tischendorf's *Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 132 sq.). The text of the *μαρτύριον* from cap. 35 onwards is more complete than that contained in the *Epist. Presbyterorum et Diaconorum Achaiae* (Latin version in Surius *Vit. Sanct.* for 30 November, Greek text in Tischendorf *Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 105 sq.). (9) A Latin version of the *περίοδοι Ἰωάννου*, which also was originally a Gnostic work but has undergone a Catholic revision. On it are based both the Latin *Prochorus* (*Bibl. Patr. Maxima*, t. ii. p. 40 sq.) and the Latin *Mellitus de Passione Johannis* (Fabricius *Cod. Apocr.* iii. p. 604 sq.). See Abdias v. 2 and 4–23: c. 2 stands in connection with the pseudo-Prochorus, cc. 4–23 with the pseudo-Mellitus. In both cases Abdias represents a text nearer the original form. Our Greek text of the *πράξεις Ἰωάννου* (in Tischendorf's *Acta Apost.* p. 266 sq.) is fragmentary, and at any rate not quite true to the original form, but agrees better with Abdias than with pseudo-Mellitus; the former indeed has here and there preserved the original form more faithfully still. (10) A Latin version of the Gnostic *Acta Thomae* (Abdias ix. 2–25). A great part of this work is now known to us through pseudo-Abdias only (ix. 8–15), who also has preserved the concluding part, the *Martyrium Thomae*, in at least a much more complete form than the Greek *τελείωσις Θωμᾶ*, first printed by Tischendorf (*Act. Ap. Apocr.* p. 235; comp. Abdias, ix. 16–25). The first portion preserved to us in the original Greek (*Acta Thomae*, ed. Thilo, Halle, 1823; Tischendorf *Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 190 sq.) is given by Abdias in a very abridged form,

and purified as much as possible from the old Gnostic elements. (11) A Latin text of pseudo-Craton *De Vita et Martyrio Simonis et Judae* (Abdias vi. 7–23); and (12) The *Acta Matthaei*, intimately connected in their origin with the above, and dating from the second quarter of the 6th century (Abdias.vii.). (13) A Latin version of the Nestorian *πράξεις Βαρθολομαίου* (Abdias viii.) nearer to the original form than the Greek text in Tischendorf (l. c. p. 243 sq.) which is the result of a careful revision by a Catholic. (14) *Acta Jacobi Majoris* (Abdias iv. 2–9), a Catholic work, of which, with the exception of one passage quoted in the *Hypotyposes* of Clemens Alexandrinus (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 9), no other trace is to be found. (15) *Acta Philippi*, also not met with elsewhere (Abdias x. 2–4); a part of this work however appears to have been derived from the Gnostic *περίοδοι Φιλίππου*.

The object which pseudo-Abdias seems to have kept mainly in view in the compilation of his work, and the use made of his authorities, was neither on the one hand to reproduce them with fidelity nor on the other to subvert any purposes of dogmatic instruction, but simply to give as complete a collection as possible of the histories of the Apostles, their Acts and Martyrdoms, and more especially their miracles. Narratives which seemed to be of doubtful utility or to extend to too great length are abridged without scruple. Anything which might give offence from a dogmatic point of view is carefully removed or revised in a Catholic sense. The fiction that the whole work proceeds from an eyewitness is partly maintained by pseudo-Abdias' custom of preserving the first person wherever he finds it used by his authorities (compare ii. 3 sq., iii. 42, v. 23, ix. 18). [R. A. L.]

ABDON (ABDUS) and SENNEN (SENNES), SS., two Persian princes martyred at Rome under Decius, of whom an account is given in the *Dict. of Christ. Ant.*, p. 8.

ABEL, St., of Imleach-fiach (now Emlagh, co. Meath), an Irish abbat, is recorded to have died in 742. (*Annals of the Four Masters*, ed. O'Donovan.) [H. B.]

ABELONII, the name of an obscure local sect occupying the country villages round Hippo, in N. Africa, in and before the time of Augustine (*De Hæc.* 87). When he wrote, about 428, it was confined to a single hamlet, of which it held exclusive possession. Elsewhere its adherents had "become Catholics." The members of the Abelonian community were all obliged to be married, but also to live in virgin wedlock. Each couple adopted a boy and a girl, and filled up the number whenever one died. Upon the decease of either adoptive parent the children gave their services to the survivor for his or her lifetime, and then succeeded to the property and adopted a fresh couple. There was no difficulty in keeping up the supply of adoptive children, as the prospect of an inheritance tempted poor neighbours to surrender their offspring. Unfortunately we do not learn whether these practices were combined with any peculiar doctrines.

Augustine refers the termination of *Abelonii* to a Punic inflexion. Some, he says, derived the name from Abel, 'so that we might call' the members of the sect 'Abeliani or Abeloitæ.' [H.]

ABERCICIUS (Ἀβέρκιος, Ἀουέρκιος, Ἀβίρκιος, etc.), the reputed successor of Papias as bishop of Hierapolis, c. 160, is recorded to have been born of reputable Christian parentage, to have suffered from the persecutions of M. Aurelius and Verus, and to have died a natural death in their joint reign. The memoir of the anonymous author on the origin of the Montanist heresy given by Eusebius (*H. E.* lib. v. c. 16) is addressed to a certain Ἀουίρκιος Μάρκελλος, who may be probably identified with the bishop of Hierapolis. He is mentioned by Nicephorus (*H. E.* iv. 23), simply as Ἀβέρκιος τις. In the Greek *Menologies*, Oct. 22, we find a notice of τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἰσαποστόλου Ἀβερκίου ἐπισκόπου Ἱεραπόλεως, τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ. Halloix (*Vitae P.P. Orient.*, vol. ii.) has given a life of Abercius drawn from Symeon Metaphrastes and the *Menologies*, full of untrustworthy tales. The most noticeable of these is the exorcism by Abercius of an evil spirit with which Lucilla, the daughter of Marcus Aurelius, then betrothed to Verus, was possessed. M. Aurelius, in gratitude for his daughter's cure, is said to have made an annual largess of 3000 modii of corn to the poor of Hierapolis, and to have erected baths over some hot springs that had recently burst forth. Abercius is reported to have been the author of a *Book of Discipline* for the use of his clergy, and of a letter to M. Aurelius, a copy of which latter was once in the hands of the historian Baronius, who speaks of its loss with great regret (Baron. *Ann. Eccl.*, A.D. 163, no. xi. xv.). See *Act. SS. Boll.* Oct. 22. [E. V.]

ABGAR, the name of several kings of Edessa, who reigned, according to the chronology of the Chronicle of that city, at various periods, ranging from B.C. 99 to A.D. 217. The etymology and origin of this word are doubtful; derivations have been sought for it in Armenian, Syriac, and Arabic. In the Armenian history of Moses of Chorene (p. 165, ed. Whiston) it is explained as a corruption of *Avagair*, a word compounded of *avag* and *air*, which is said to signify *vir primarius* or *insignis*. The Greeks and Syrians, being unable to pronounce this, corrupted it to *abgar*. Bar Ali, in his Lexicon, quoted by Bernstein (*Lex. Syr.*) and Dr. Payne Smith (*Thes. Syr.*), says the name is Armenian and signifies "lame." His testimony is of value, though the explanation he gives may be incorrect, because it shows that he did not trace it to an Arabic or Syriac root. In Syriac the word ܐܒܓܪ, or ܐܒܓܪ, has unquestionably the meaning of "lame," or rather, as Lagarde (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 6) says, "crippled"; but in this sense it has been borrowed from the Persian, افگار, *afgâr*, or فگار, *fgâr*, which has the same meaning. It occurs in the commentary of Ephrem Syrus on 2 Sam. xix. 24, with reference to Mephibosheth; and Assemani (*B. O.* iii. 232) gives the surname of John V. Patriarch of the Nestorians as *Bar Abgore*, which he renders "filius claudi," or rather, as he gives it elsewhere (ii. 440), "claudorum." In another passage (i. 261, note) he says, "*Abgar* autem Syriace *claudum* sonat," and maintains that it was an appellation of the kings of Edessa, as Caesar among the Romans, Pharaoh and Ptolemy in Egypt, and Antiochus

in Syria. Whatever be the true etymology of the proper name Abgar, there can be no doubt that the word so much like it in Syriac, *abgor* or *abgoro*, is of foreign, probably Persian, origin. The forms, both Latin and Greek, in which the name appears are various. The coins have uniformly Ἀβγαρος. In Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13) the MSS. vary between Ἀβγαρος and Ἀβγαρος. The former of these is found in Suidas (*s. v.* ἀβγήσονται), the latter in the same author (*s. v.* Ἀνθεμοῦς). Appian (*De Bello Parth.* p. 140) has Ἀκβαρος, and Herodian (iii. 9), Procopius (*De Bello Pers.* ii. 12), Dion Cassius (xl. 20, &c.), Suidas (*s. v.* Ἀβγαρος, φυλάρχης, ἐλλόβια, ἱκέτευμα, ὠνήτῃ), Nicephorus (ii. 13), and Cedrenus (*Hist. Comp.* p. 175) have Ἀβγαρος, a form which somewhat favours the Armenian origin of the word given above. In Latin we find *Abcarus* (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 12; Aelius Spartianus, *Vit. Severi*, c. 18; Julius Capitolinus, *Vit. Ant. P.* c. 9), and in Aurelius Victor (*De Caesar.* xx. 14) *Agarrus*. Clemens Galanus (*Hist. Arm.* c. 1) uses both *Abgarus* and *Abagarus*, and some MSS. of Tacitus, quoted by Rupert, exhibit the variations *Abbarus*, *Aebarus*, *Abazus*, and *Acharus*. The forms Ἀβγαρος, or Ἀκβαρος, and *Abcarus*, have suggested the identification of the name Abgar with the Arabic *Abbar*, which is derived from a root signifying "to be great"; and this derivation is favoured by Valesius, in his notes to Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13), in spite of the reading of the best MS. and the unanimous testimony of the coins. In addition to those which have been already quoted, we find, in the notes of Pontacus to his edition of Jerome's Chronicle of Eusebius, the forms *Aggarus*, *Abacarus*, and *Abcarus*, while in the Armenian Version of the same Chronicle (ed. Aucher, i. 164), there is yet another variety, *Apharivos*. The proper name *Aphar* still exists among the Armenians. There can be little doubt therefore, that the preponderance of evidence is greatly in favour of the form Abgar.

Of the ten kings of Edessa who, according to the Chronicle of Dionysius of Telmahar (Assem. *B. O.* i. 417, &c.), bore the name of Abgar, we have only to do with the last six. Before enumerating them it will be as well to call attention to the fact that the chronology of Dionysius, as has been shown by Gutschmid (*Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, in the *Rhein. Mus.* N.F. xix. 171), is faulty, and that his early dates are wrong by four years. The years of the last king, Ma'n IX., are to be reckoned to his death, and not to the capture of Edessa by Caracalla; so that the dates of the last eight kings must be put forward about 21 years. In addition to this, there is a gap of 17 years between Abgar VI. bar Ma'n and Abgar VII. bar Izat, during which period (A.D. 91-108) Edessa was held by the Parthians.

The first king of the name was Abgar Phika, "the dumb," who reigned with Bacro two years and 4 months, and by himself 23 years and 5 months, in all 25 years and 9 months (B.C. 93-67). His son Abgar reigned 15 years (B.C. 67-52), and is mentioned by Dion Cassius (xl. 20, Ἀβγαρος ὁ Ὀρρόνηρος or Ὀσσηνήρος) as having made a treaty with the Romans in the time of Pompey. He is the same who treacherously deceived Crassus in his expedition against the Parthians (B.C. 53), and is called by Appian (*De Bell. Parth.* p. 140), φυλάρχος τῶν Ἀράβων.

In Plutarch (*Cras.* 21) his name is written Ἀπίδωρς. The eleventh and twelfth kings of Edessa bore the same name, according to Dionysius (*Assem. B. O. i.* 419), but nothing is recorded of them except that the latter was surnamed Sumoko, "the red." We now come to the one with whom the name is most conspicuously associated, the fifteenth king, Abgar surnamed Ucomo, "the black," who reigned, according to the chronology of Dionysius of Telmahar, from A.D. 9 to A.D. 46; but, according to the rectification of Gutschmid, from A.D. 13 to A.D. 50. Moses of Chorene (in Bayer, *Hist. Osrh.* p. 97) traces his descent from the Parthian king Arsaces. Procopius has a story (*Bell. Pers.* ii. 12) of the romantic attachment which he excited in Augustus when on a visit to Rome, and of the device he was obliged to employ before the emperor would allow him to return to Edessa. The narrative of Eusebius (see Cureton's *Anc. Syr. Documents*), though professedly derived from no less an authority than the archives of Edessa, is in all probability equally apocryphal. He tells (*H. E.* i. 13) how Abgar, suffering from an incurable disease, heard of the fame of Christ's miracles, and wrote the famous letter entreating him to leave the unworthy Jews and to take up his abode with him. The reply of Christ promised that after his ascension one of his disciples should be sent to heal his disease, and to give life to him and his. Accordingly Thomas, one of the twelve, sent Thaddeus, one of the seventy, who came and dwelt with Tobias, the son of Tobias. The fame of his miracles soon reached the ears of Abgar, who recognised in him the promised messenger. He sent for Tobias, and commanded him to bring before him his distinguished guest. On the following day Thaddeus was ushered into the presence of the king, who was surrounded by the nobles of his court. As soon as he entered, a mysterious halo about the apostle's face was visible to Abgar alone, and the king, to the astonishment of all who stood by, bowed down before Thaddeus. The healing of Abgar, and of Abdu ben Abdu, a martyr to the gout, followed as a matter of course, as well as the preaching of Christianity by Thaddeus. In the later form of the legend, as recorded by Nicephorus (*H. E.* ii. 7), Abdu ben Abdu becomes Audu, the son of Abgar. In Procopius (*Bell. Pers.* ii. 12), there is a still further confusion, and the gout of Abdu is transferred to Abgar. By the time the story reached Cedrenus it had become embellished with incidents still more marvellous. In his *Historiæ Compendium* (p. 176) it is related that Abgar suffered from a complication of maladies, gout of long standing, and the black leprosy, by the latter of which he was so disfigured that he rarely allowed any one to see him. On receiving Christ's letter, sealed with the seven mysterious Hebrew characters which signified Θεοῦ θεατὴν θαῦμα θεῖον, Abgar fell on his face before it and was straightway made whole. A slight trace of the leprosy alone remained in his face, and this was removed by the waters of baptism, which he received at the hands of the Apostle Thaddeus. In Cedrenus, too, we find the most elaborate story of the picture of the Saviour, and of its various fortunes till it was transferred to Byzantium. Ananias, the swift courier who carried the letter of Abgar, was also a painter, and endeavoured to

take the portrait of Christ, but was dazzled by the great splendour of His countenance. Whereupon our Lord, having washed His face, dried it upon a linen cloth, on which was miraculously impressed the image of His features. The cloth was taken to Edessa by Ananias, and was placed by Abgar in a niche over the city gate, where formerly had stood the image of a Grecian god. It was treated with reverence till the time of his grandson, who relapsed into idolatry and announced his design of removing the sacred picture. The bishop, to prevent the sacrilege, placed a lamp in front of the picture, and covered up the niche with a tile so that nothing could be seen. Five centuries afterwards, when the Persians had been repulsed from the city through the influence of the divine picture, it was discovered with the lamp still burning before it; and, wonderful to relate, by some strange photography a duplicate of the face had been transferred to the tile which concealed it. Cedrenus then follows the fortunes of the picture to Byzantium. A more detailed, but equally veracious, account of the share which it had in the repulse of the Persians under Chosroes will be found in Evagrius (iv. 27). It has been necessary to notice the mass of ecclesiastical fiction which has grown up round the name of Abgar, though it is beside the purpose of the present article to discuss the genuineness of the famous letter, which will be treated of elsewhere. [THADDEUS.] The Syriac version of the story given in Cureton's *Anc. Syr. Documents* is obviously an elaborate expansion of Eusebius. In all probability the only fact in connection with Abgar which has come down to us is to be found in the pages of Tacitus (*Ann.* xii. 12-14), where he appears in a not very creditable light, first seducing the young Parthian king, Meherdates, to waste precious days in luxurious indulgence at Edessa, and then treacherously abandoning him on the battle field (A.D. 49). The chronology of Dionysius would transfer the odium of this conduct to his son, described by Procopius as a monster of iniquity, who, fearing the vengeance of the Romans, joined himself to Persia. But Gutschmid's correction fixes the stigma upon Abgar.

In addition to the other utterly untrustworthy narratives of Abgar, we have one by Moses of Chorene which introduces new elements of fiction. In his Armenian history he tells us how Abgar was king of Armenia, which in the second year of his reign became tributary to the Romans. He quarrelled with Herod, and defeated the army which was sent out against him. On the accession of Tiberius, Abgar prepared to throw off his allegiance, and built the city of Edessa on the Euphrates. He established Ardaches on the throne of Persia and assisted Aretas in his struggle with Herod the Tetrarch. During his campaign in Persia he had contracted an acute disease, on account of which when he had heard of the miracles of Christ he wrote his famous letter. The Empress Helena, in this mass of fiction, is made the wife of Abgar, who survived him and went to Jerusalem in the time of Claudius, during the famine which Agabus had predicted. For all this, and much more, see Cureton's *Anc. Syriac Documents*.

Abgar VI. bar Ma'nû, according to Dionysius, reigned for 20 years (A.D. 65-85), which Gutschmid reckons from A.D. 69-89. It must be

this king who, in the Chronicle of Edessa, is related to have built himself a mausoleum (A. Sel. 400, A.D. 88), and not his successor as Assemani says (*B. O. i.* 421). The dynasty now seems to have changed, and the next king, Abgar VII. bar İzat, who purchased the kingdom from the Parthians (*Suidas, s. v. ὠνητή*) and reigned A.D. 108–115, was of the royal race of Adiabene. It was this Abgar, in all probability, who behaved with such caution when Trajan made his expedition to the East. According to Dio Cassius (lxviii. 18, 21), he did not go in person to meet the Emperor at Antioch, but sent him gifts and friendly messages. He was afraid of Trajan on the one hand and of the Parthians on the other, and therefore deferred his meeting with Trajan till he came to Edessa, where he entertained him at a banquet, at which he introduced his son Arbandes dancing some of his native dances. *Suidas (s. v. Ἐδεσσα)* says that Abgar went out to meet Trajan as he approached the city, taking with him 250 horses, 250 coats of mail, and 60,000 javelins; but Trajan would only accept three coats of mail, and begged him to keep the rest. The emperor was greatly taken with the young Arbandes. In consequence of the discrepancy in the chronology, Assemani is driven to suppose that this Abgar of Trajan's time was his brother, Ma'nū bar İzat, and that his son Ma'nū is the Abgar of the time of Antoninus Pius, who is mentioned by Julius Capitolinus. It appears from Xiphilinus (*Exc. ex Dion. Cass. lxxviii. 30*), that Abgar at a subsequent period revolted from Trajan, who sent against him his general Lusius, who stormed Edessa and burnt it to the ground. The Acts of Sharbil, printed in Cureton's *Anc. Syr. Documents*, are referred to this reign.

The Abgar of the time of Antoninus Pius (Julius Capit. *Vit. Ant. P. c. 9*) must be Ma'nū bar Ma'nū, as Assemani suggests. Of him Dionysius relates, that after reigning 23 years he went over to the Romans, his throne was occupied by Vāl bar Sahrū for two years, and that then he was restored and reigned 12 years longer. To him Bayer attributes the story told by Procopius of Abgar Ucomo and Augustus. His son, Abgar VIII. bar Ma'nū, who reigned from A.D. 176 to 213, is the "Persarum rex" of that name who, according to Aelius Spartianus (*Vit. Sev. c. 18*), was conquered by Severus. Aurelius Victor (*De Caesaribus, xx. 14*) calls him *Agarrus*. According to Dio Cassius (ap. Xiphil. lxxv. 1) the Osrhoeni had revolted and besieged Nisibis, but were defeated by Severus. It is difficult to ascertain what was the exact nature of the relation between Severus and Abgar. Herodian (iii. 9 § 4) describes him as a king of the Osrhoeni who took refuge with Severus, brought a large number of archers to his assistance, and left his children with him as pledges of his fidelity. He was a Christian (Julius Africanus quoted by Georgius Syncellus A.D. 215), and we learn from Epiphanius (*Haeres. lvi.*) that Bardesanes was on intimate terms with him. Bardesanes himself (Euseb. *Praep. Ev. v. 10*) says that Abgar made a law forbidding any one to mutilate himself in honour of Cybele on pain of having his hands cut off. He appears, so far as may be gathered from an allusion in Dio Cassius (ap. Xiphil. lxxix. 16), to have gone to Rome, and to have had a brilliant reception given him by Severus. Although in the Chronicle of

Dionysius he is distinguished from Abgar Severus, they are in all probability the same person. He seems to have associated with himself in the kingdom his son Ma'nū during the last year and seven months of his reign. Under him was held the council at Osrhoene of 18 bishops to decide the Easter Controversy (Grabe, *Spicilegium, i. 316*). Valesius believed him to have been the same who reigned at Edessa in the time of Caracalla (note in Dion. Cocc. p. 747). Dio Cassius relates (ap. Xiphil. lxxvii. 12) that he reigned cruelly, and was entrapped by Caracalla, who put him in chains and took possession of Osrhoene. It was during his reign that the great flood happened at Edessa, which is described in the chronicle of the city under the year A.D. 202 (*Assem. B. O. i. 390*). Returning to the Chronicle of Dionysius, we find that Abgar Severus was succeeded by his son Ma'nū, who reigned 26 years. If this be correct, it would bring the date of the last Abgar bar Ma'nū, whom Gutschmid ignores, within the period of Gordianus III. (A.D. 238–242). The name of Abgar occurs on a coin of that emperor, which is supposed to have been struck to commemorate some victory over the Parthians (Occo, *Num. Imp. Rom. p. 437*). [W. A. W.]

ABGAR, LETTER OF. [THADDEUS.]

ABIBAS (written also Abibus). According to the story, the second and favourite son of Gamaliel, who in youth was a companion of his father's pupil, Saul of Tarsus, and afterwards was baptized by St. Peter and St. John. One Lucianus (A.D. 415) saw a vision of Gamaliel, who revealed where the body of his son, with other saints, was laid. From his letter, giving an account of his vision, we learn about this Abibas; Lucian. *de Steph. § 3 sq.* in August. *Op. vii. app. p. 7 sq.* Comp. Phot. *Bibl. 171*. [L.]

ABILIUS, (St.) (Ἀβίλιος), the second bishop of Alexandria (after St. Mark), 86–96 A.D. According to one tradition he was ordained presbyter, together with his successor Cerdon, by St. Mark himself: according to another he was appointed bishop by St. Luke (*Const. Ap. vii. 46*). The name is variously written Αἰμίλιος, Ἀμέλιος, Melias, &c., and perhaps represents the Latin *Avilius* (Vales, on Euseb. *H. E. iii. 44*). The first bishop Annianus, also bore a Roman name. Euseb. *H. E. iii. 14, 21*; Hieron. *Chron. p. 600*; Tillemont ii. 44, &c. Abilius is commemorated on Feb. 22 (cf. *Chron. Orient. p. 90*, ed. 1685; Melianus). [W.]

ABLABIUS (Ἀβλάβιος), often written Ablavius in Latin, a somewhat famous prefect of the praetorium, A.D. 326–337, under Constantine and Constantius. He was deposed and put to death by the latter (Tillemont *Hist. des Emp. iv. 218 sq. 313*). In 314 Constantine writes to one Ablabius, who holds some command in Africa and is apparently a Christian, summoning the disputants in the Donatist controversy to a council at Arles: August. *Op. ix. app. p. 21*, Labb. *Conc. i. 1421*. This is supposed to be the Ablabius in question, afterwards prefect of the praetorium (Tillemont *Mém. Eccl. vi. p. 46*). See also the edict *de episcopali iudicio*, professing to be addressed to him by Constantine, Cod. Theod. vi. P. i. p. 339 ed. Gothofred., with his notes, and the index vi. ii. p. 35, s. v. Ablavius. [L.]

ABRAHAM, APOCALYPSE OF, a book "full of all manner of wickedness," was current among the Sethian Ophites (Epiph. *Haer.* 286 C.). It is probably the apocryphal work under Abraham's name condemned by Nicephorus (Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kanons* 121, 145): the length is rather over that assigned to Canticles. A Greek *Testament of Abraham* extant in MS. at Vienna (Fabricius, *Cod. Ps. V. T.* 417 f.) appears to be of much later date. [H.]

ABRAHAM, written also Abraam, Abbraam, Abraames, Abramaeus, Abramias, Abramius, etc.

(1). Bishop of SELEUCIA, patriarch, and kinsman of James, the brother of our Lord; of whom it is said that he quieted a persecution raised against the Christians by the king of Persia, by casting a devil out of the king's son. He died, according to Amru, A.D. 152, but this is probably an error (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 395; iii. 612). A poem, quoted by Assemani, in which the names of the patriarchs of the East are enumerated, calls him Abraham of Cascar or Cashear (*Ib.* ii. 389), and places him third in the list. According to another account, he died in the 22nd year of his episcopate, A.D. 120 (*Ib.* iii. 612), and was buried at Seleucia. [W. A. W.]

(2) (Cyrensis), written Abraames, a Syrian hermit of the 4th century, afterwards bishop of CARRHAE (Haran), in Mesopotamia (Theodt. *Philoth.* c. 17). From his cell in the desert of Chalcidice, near Antioch (Theodt. *Hist.* iv. 28, Nicephor. *Hist.* xi. 41), he went disguised as a pedlar to convert the inhabitants of Lebanon; and, though opposed and persecuted at first, succeeded eventually in his purpose. At the end of three years, having persuaded the people to build themselves a church, he retired to his cell, but was subsequently prevailed upon, most unwillingly, to become Bishop of Carrahae. Even then he persevered in the same austere mode of life, so that, for a time, he lost the use of his limbs through his excessive fasting. His fare was only vegetables; he abstained even from bread and water; but, though so severe to himself, he was hospitable to strangers. He was held in great reverence by the emperor and his family (Theodt. *Philoth.* c. 17). Perhaps this is the Abraames, of whom it is recorded that his retirement from the world was so complete, that he continued, for some time after the Council of Nicaea, to keep Easter after the old reckoning, in ignorance of the decree which had been made (Theodt. *Philoth.* c. 3). See *Act. SS. Boll.* Feb. 14. [I. G. S.]

(3) Bishop of BATNAE, in Osrhoene near the Euphrates, was a correspondent of St. Basil, who addressed a letter to him (cir. A.D. 373) while he was living in the house of Saturninus the Comes of Antioch (Basil. *Ep.* 132 [315]). Various rumours had been spread as to his whereabouts, some saying that he was at Samosata, others in the country. Tillemont (vi. 578) conjectures that he was hiding from the Arian persecutions. His name appears with those of Meletius, Eusebius, Basil, and others in the letter which the bishops of the East addressed to those of Italy and Gaul, A.D. 372 (Basil. *Ep.* 92 [69]). He was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Labb. *Conc.* ii. 955). [W. A. W.]

(4) St. (4th century), was one of the most famous among the disciples of Ephrem Syrus (Soz. *Hist.* iii. 16, and Niceph. *Hist.* ix. 16). By

his parents, who were wealthy inhabitants of Edessa, he was induced, against his will, to marry, but deserted his bride on the wedding-day, and was found, after three weeks, in a cell two miles from the city. After the death of his parents, twelve years afterwards, he entrusted all his property to a friend, for the poor, devoting himself to the life of an anchorite. Subsequently, against his own wishes, he was ordained priest, and sent by the bishop as a missionary to a neighbouring village of idolaters. There he destroyed the idols with his own hands, and, chiefly through the extraordinary patience with which he bore their persecution, effected the conversion of the inhabitants. After building a church for them, he deserted his flock as he had deserted his wife, and retired to his cell, to their great sorrow. During the fifty years of his seclusion he never tasted even bread, living entirely on vegetables, never changed his hair-shirt, never washed face nor hands, and yet is said to have been hale and vigorous to the last. It is recorded of him, as of other solitaries, that he experienced peculiar temptations of Satan. He was always bewailing his own faults, but gentle and tolerant to others (S. Ephr. Syr. *Acta S. Abr.*). When his niece had been seduced from him by a profligate monk, he sought her in vain for two years, and, at last, having disguised himself as a soldier, found and reclaimed her from her abandoned life. He is commemorated by the Greek Church on the 29th of October; by the Latin Church on the 16th of March. [I. G. S.]

(5) Nestorian Bishop of BETH-RABAN in Media, cir. A.D. 489 (Assem. *B. O.* i. 204, 352). He studied sacred literature in the school at Edessa, but was expelled. Amru calls him a disciple of Narses, and says that he flourished under the Emperor Justin the Younger, A.D. 565-578, (Assem. *B. O.* iii. 71). He was head of the monastery of Beth-Raban (*Ib.* 185, 255, 468, 476), and wrote commentaries on the Books of Joshua, Judges, Kings, Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah, the twelve minor prophets, Daniel, and Solomon's Song, besides various poems (*Ib.* 71). Sabarjesu, surnamed Rustam, wrote his life (*Ib.* 455, 468). He is apparently the same with Abraham the disciple of Narses, who was contemporary with Abraham of Cascar (*Ib.* iii. 155). [W. A. W.]

(6) Of Cascar, called *the Great* (Assem. *B. O.* iii. 154, 467), a famous Archimandrite, who flourished (cir. A.D. 502) under Babaeus, bishop of Seleucia, the patriarch of the Nestorians (ii. 408). According to Amru, whose account Assemani quotes (*B. O.* iii. 155, 431), he studied at Nisibis in company with another Abraham the disciple of Narses. He afterwards removed to Hirta, where he converted the inhabitants from idolatry, and thence to Jerusalem, Egypt, and Mount Sinai, where he received the benediction of the monks. The life of him, written by John and Rustam, which is quoted by Thomas of Marga (*B. O.* iii. 93), tells us that he retired into the desert of Scete, and adopted there the monastic dress; that he afterwards by divine command came and dwelt in a retired cave on Mount Izla, near Nisibis, and thence spread monastic discipline among the Nestorians. He established the monastic dress and the tonsure, and so acquired the title of father of the Assyrian monks (*B. O.* iii. 147, 155). He died in Haza or Adiabene, and his body was taken to Cascar (*Ib.* 633).

t was afterwards thrown into the Tigris by command of the Caliph Motawakel (*Ib.* 510). Besides the life of him already mentioned, there is another by Thomas of Marga, and a work by Babaeus the Archimandrite upon Abraham of Nisibis, is supposed by Assemani to refer to Abraham of Jascar (*Ib.* 97). He wrote letters, expositions, a commentary on the whole of the Dialectics of Aristotle (*Ib.* 154), and drew up rules for the government of the monks (*Ib.* 342, 351). Theodoros, bishop of Maru, speaks of him with praise in a poem (*Ib.* 147). Two miracles are attributed to him; one that he raised from the dead the daughter of a citizen of Nisibis, the other that he drove away a flight of locusts with holy water (*Ib.* 155).

[W. A. W.]

ABRANUS (St.), an Irish missionary, one of the brothers of St. Tressanus who went as missionaries from Ireland to Reims, at the beginning of the 6th century. (Colgan, *Acta SS. Hiberniae*, p. 275.)

[H. B.]

ABRASAX (Ἀβραξάξ, Ἀβραξάς). I. In the Basilidian system described by Irenaeus (101 f.) "the unbegotten Father" is the progenitor of a series of powers, the last of whom create "the first heaven." They in turn originate a second series, who create a second heaven. The process continues in like manner till 365 heavens are in existence, the angels of the last or visible heaven being the authors of our world. "The ruler" [*principem*, i. e. probably τὸν ἀρχοντα] of the 365 heavens "is Abraxas, and for this reason he contains within himself 365 numbers." Substantially the same account is given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 69, 73 f.), who appears to follow partly Irenaeus, partly the lost Compendium of Hippolytus (R. A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik d. Epiphanius* 99 f.). He designates Abrasax more distinctly as "the power above all, and First Principle," "the cause and first archetype" of all things; and mentions that the Basilidians referred to 365 as the number of parts (μέλη) in the human body, as well as of days in the year. The author of the appendix to Tertullian *De Praescr. Haer.* (c. 4), who likewise follows Hippolytus's Compendium (Lipsius 33 f. &c.), adds some further particulars; that 'Abraxas' gave birth to Mind (νοῦς), the first in the series of primary powers enumerated likewise by Irenaeus and Epiphanius; that the world, as well as the 365 heavens, was created in honour of 'Abraxas;' and that Christ was sent not by the Maker of the world but by 'Abraxas.' More on the doctrines here referred to will be found under BASILIDES.

Thus far we are dealing with authorities who shew no acquaintance with the doctrines of Basilides himself [BASILIDES]. The name occurs however in the *Refutation of all Heresies* (vii. 26) by Hippolytus, who appears in these chapters to have followed the *Exegetica* of Basilides. After describing the manifestation of the Gospel in the Ogdoad and Hebdomad, he adds that the Basilidians have a long account of the innumerable creations and powers in the several 'stages' of the upper world (διαστήματα), in which they speak of 365 heavens and say that "their great archon" is Abrasax, because his name contains the number 365, the number of the days in the year (the passage is corrupt, but thus much is clear); i. e. the sum of the numbers denoted by

the Greek letters in ΑΒΡΑΣΑΞ is 365. The whole passage is a parenthesis interrupting a long sentence; and the plural form of the references (κατ' αὐτοὺς twice, φάσκουσι) seems to indicate a doctrine of Basilidians rather than of Basilides, though the usage of Hippolytus is not consistent enough in this respect to be quite decisive. Hence Uhlhorn (*Das Basilid. System*, 26, 65 f.) infers that Abrasax is foreign to the original system of Basilides. On the other hand it might be urged that the occurrence of words characteristic of Basilides ('stage,' 'great archon') implies the *Exegetica* to have been Hippolytus's authority throughout; and the contents of the parenthesis might be taken as explanatory of "all things in the Hebdomad." Yet it is very difficult to bring the representation here given into intelligible connexion with the proper scheme of Basilides, either as forming a part of it or as coextensive with the whole; and the name itself does not harmonize with the rest of his terms. Its introduction is therefore probably due to the eclecticism of disciples; and the intermixture of language in the passage of Hippolytus may be supposed to arise from an attempt to combine and adjust information from two sources. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 90 f.) states that the Phibionite 'Gnostici' (Ophites) recognised 365 archons; but he connects no mystic name with the number.

Nothing can be built on the vague allusions of Jerome, according to whom 'Abraxas' meant for Basilides "the greatest God" (*De vir. ill.* 21), "the highest God" (*Dial. adv. Lucif.* 23), "the Almighty God" (*Comm. in Amos* iii. 9), and "the Lord the Creator" (*Comm. in Nah.* i. 11). The notices in Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 4), Augustine (*Haer.* 4), and 'Praedestinatius' (i. 3), have no independent value.

II. A vast number of engraved stones are in existence, to which the name 'Abraxas-gems' has long been given. The subjects are mythological, and chiefly grotesque, with various inscriptions, in which ΑΒΡΑΣΑΞ often occurs, alone or with other words. Sometimes the whole space is taken up with the inscription. In certain obscure magical writings of Egyptian origin Ἀβραξάς or Ἀβραράξ is found associated with other names which frequently accompany it on gems (Reuvens, *Lett. à M. Letronne s. l. Pap. bilingues*, etc., Leyden, 1830). The meaning of the legends is seldom intelligible: but some of the gems are amulets; and the same may be the case with nearly all. In a great majority of instances the name *Abrasax* is associated with a singular composite figure, having the head of a cock or hawk, the arms of a man (bearing, the one a whip or more rarely a dagger, and the other a small round shield), and the breast of a man in a cuirass, from below which diverge two serpentine legs. The name ΙΑΩ, to which ΣΑΒΑΩΘ is sometimes added, is found with this figure even more frequently than ΑΒΡΑΣΑΞ, and they are often combined.

In the absence of other evidence to shew the origin of these curious relics of antiquity the occurrence of a name known as Basilidian on patristic authority has not unnaturally been taken as a sufficient mark of origin, and the early collectors and critics assumed this whole group to be the work of Gnostics. During the last two centuries attempts have been made to sift away

successively those gems which had no claim to be considered in any sense Gnostic, or specially Basilidian, or connected with *Abrasax*; but with little success. Passerio (*Thes. Gemm. Astrif.*, Flor. 1750, cited by Matter in Herzog *R.E.* i. 79) and Beausobre (*Manich.* ii. 50-69) on the other hand questioned the whole theory; and though their scepticism has met with little favour, it appears to be well founded. While it would be rash to assert positively that no existing gems were the work of Gnostics, there is no valid reason for attributing any of them to such an origin. The Basilidians of the second century are said to have "made use of magic [inferior MSS. substitute "images"] and incantations and invocations and all other curious arts" (*Iren.* 102: cf. *Epiph. Haer.* 69 D; *Philastr. Haer.* 32); and incantations by mystic names are noticed by Jerome as characteristic of the hybrid Gnosticism planted in Spain in the fourth century (*Ep.* lxxv. 3; cxx. 10; on *Is.* lxiv. 4). It is therefore not unlikely that some Gnostics were addicted to the use of amulets, though the confident assertions of modern writers to this effect rest on no authority. Beausobre properly calls attention to the significant silence of Clement in the two passages in which he instructs the Christians of Alexandria on the right use of rings and gems, and the figures which may legitimately be engraved on them (*Paed.* 241 ff.; 287 ff.). But no attempt to identify the figures on existing gems with the personages of Gnostic mythology has had any success, and *Abrasax* is the only Gnostic term found in the accompanying legends which is not known to belong to other religions or mythologies. The present state of the evidence therefore suggests, not that the gems inscribed with *Abrasax* are of Basilidian origin, but that their engravers and the Basilidians received the mystic name from a common source now unknown. If this be true, the whole family of 'Abraxas-gems' has probably no connexion with Gnosticism or any form of Christianity, and belongs rather to the mixed superstitions which throve rankly on the shores of the Mediterranean during the decay of Paganism. Some parts at least of the figure above mentioned are solar symbols (cf. Kopp, *Palaeogr. Crit.* iv. 132 ff.; Bellermann, 53 ff.: but only a fraction of the evidence collected by these writers is pertinent and trustworthy); and the Basilidian Abrasax is manifestly connected with the sun.

Hyginus (*Fab.* 183) gives Abrax Aslo Therbeo as names of horses of the sun mentioned by 'Homerus.' The passage is miserably corrupt: but it may not be accidental that the first three syllables make *Abraxas*.

The literature of the subject is extensive, but of little value except for the figures. The leading treatises are L'Heureux's [*Macarii*] *Abraxas seu Apistopistus*, edited by Chiffet, Antwerp, 1657; vol. ii. part ii. of Montfaucon's *Antiquité Expliquée*; Passerio (*ut sup.*); Jablonski, *De Nominis Abraxas . . . significatione*, in *Opusc.* iv. 80 ff. Leyd. 1813; Bellermann, *Ueber d. Gemmen d. Alten m. d. Abraxasbilde*, Berlin, 1817-9; Matter, *Hist. Crit. du Gnosticisme*, Paris, 1828; C. W. King, *The Gnostics and their Remains*, London, 1864.

III. The proper form of the name is evidently *Abrasax*, as with the Greek writers, Hippolytus,

Epiphanius, Didymus (*De Trin.* iii. 42), and Theodoret; also Augustine and 'Praedestinatus'; and in nearly all the legends on gems. By a probably euphonic inversion the translator of Irenaeus and the other Latin authors have *Abraxas*, which is found in the magical papyri, and even, though most sparingly, on engraved stones.

The attempts to discover a derivation for the name, Greek, Hebrew, Coptic, or other, have not been successful; and Basnage and Jablonski may be right in maintaining its purely artificial character. Yet we may with better reason suppose that it came originally from a foreign mythology, and that the accident of its numerical value in Greek merely caused it to be singled out at Alexandria for religious use. It is worth notice that ΜΕΙΘΡΑΣ and ΝΕΙΛΟΣ have the same value. The Egyptian author of the book *De Mysteriori* in reply to Porphyry (vii. 4) admits a preference of 'barbarous' to vernacular names (τῶν ἑκδοσφ οἰκείων) in sacred things, urging a peculiar sanctity in the languages of certain nations, as the Egyptians and 'Assyrians'; and Origen (*Contra Cels.* i. 24) refers to the 'potent names' used by Egyptian sages, Persian Magi, and Indian Brahmins, signifying deities in the several languages.

If a fresh conjecture may be hazarded, two widely spread Shemitic roots offer a probable etymology. *Ab-razach* probably, *ab-zarach* certainly, denotes 'the father of effulgence,' a name appropriate to a solar deity. יָרַח, יָרֵחַ, and צָרַח are cognate roots, expressing the twin conceptions of a loud cry and the breaking forth of light. Movers (*Phoen.* i. 229) shews that *Serach* was apparently a Phoenician name of Adonis, whose worship was connected with the seasons of the year (cf. Macrobi. *Sat.* i. 21, "Adonis quoque solem esse non dubitabitur inspecta religione Assyriorum, apud quos Veneris †Architidis† et Adonis maxima olim veneratio viguit, quam nunc Phoenices tenent"), and who had much in common with 'Jao' (*ib.* 542 ff.); and he mentions *al-sarakh*, "the rising and blazing sun," as "an idol of the old Arabians, according to the *Camus*." Chwolsohn (*SSabier*, ii. 281) observes that the root *zarach*, 'to shine,' occurs often as a proper name among the most different Shemitic races, as the Jews, Edomites, Ethiopians, and Babylonians. We may add the Assyrian deity Assarach and the problematical Nisroch of 2 Kings xix. 37, Is. xxxvii. 38, who loses the initial N in the better MSS. of the LXX, and, what is yet more to the point, becomes Ἀρσάκης in Josephus (*Ant.* x. i. 5). Nor is the Persian extraction of Arsaces so certain as to preclude the suspicion that his name may have the same origin. Notwithstanding the rarity of the forms in which the *r* precedes the *s*, this various evidence shews how easily *Abrasax* may come from the name of a Shemitic god representing the sun, though the locality cannot at present be determined. [H.]

ABRASAXS. [ABRASAX.]

ABRES, Bishop of Seleucia and patriarch, was ordained at Antioch. He was a pupil of Mares and succeeded him. Bar Hebraeus relates that he was descended from Joseph the carpenter, the father of James and Josés. Amru says that Abres was not ordained at Antioch but at Jerusalem by St. Simeon, the successor

of St. James the Great (Assem. B. O. ii. 395; iii. 611, 612). [W. A. W.]

ABRUNCULUS, APRUNCULUS, St., 24th Bishop of Treves, mentioned by Gregory of Tours. His death is placed in 557. Commemorated on April 22. He was buried in the Church of St. Paulinus. His relics were transferred to the Monastery of Sprinkirsbach. *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 380; *Act. SS. Boll.* April, iii. 30. St. Apponculus, bishop of Treves and confessor, is probably the same. [C. D.]

ABSTINENTES. So Philastrius (*Haer.* 84) calls a sect in Gaul, Spain, and Aquitania, evidently meaning the Priscillianists (cf. Aug. *Haer.* 70). [H.]

ABUNDIUS, fourth Bishop of Como, 450–469, a native of Thessalonica. He was present at the Council of Constantinople, 450 (Labbe, ed. Coleti, iv. 751); and took an active part against the Eutychian heresy at the Council of Chalcedon, where he represented Pope Leo. He was afterwards present at a Council of Milan, 452, held to refute the same heresy (Ughelli, *I. S. v.* 259, Leo M. *Ep.* 97). The authorship of the *Te Deum* is ascribed in some MSS. to him (Tillemont, *M. E.* xiii. 962). [W.]

ABURGIOUS (Ἀβούργιος), an old friend and fellow countryman of St. Basil (*Ep.* 33, 75, 147, 178, 196, 304). He was a person of high station and great influence (see esp. *Ep.* 196), and Basil more than once invoked his aid on behalf of friends in trouble (*Ep.* 75, 147, 178). On one occasion he appeals to him to assist his brother Gregory the bishop (*Ep.* 33). This is thought to be his friend Gregory Nazianzen and not his actual brother Gregory Nyssen (Garnier, *Vit. Bas. Op.* iii. p. lxxix). One of these letters to Aburgius (*Ep.* 196), sent when the writer considers himself on the point of death, is included also among the letters of Greg. Naz. (*Ep.* 241, where the name is read Ἀβουργίφ), and perhaps ought not to be assigned to Basil. [L.]

ACACIUS (Ἀκάκιος), also written ACATIUS and ACHATIUS in Latin.

(1) A bishop (said to be of Antioch in Phrygia) and confessor according to his *Acta* (Ruinar, 138–142), but martyr according to the martyrologies (*Menaee* March 31, Rab. Maur. March 31, &c.), also called *Agathosangelus* or *Agathangelus*, under Decius, A.D. 250; sometimes confounded with Acacius, Bishop of Melitene in Armenia in the 5th century: see Tillemont *M. E.* iii. p. 357. [A. W. H.]

(2) Bishop of CAESAREA, from a personal defect known as δ μονόφθαλμος, the pupil and biographer of Eusebius, the Church historian. He succeeded his master as bishop, A.D. 340 (*Soer. H. E.* ii. 4; *Soz. H. E.* iii. 2). He is chiefly known to us as the bitter and uncompromising adversary of Cyril of Jerusalem, and as the leader of the intriguing band of ambitious prelates with whom truth was secondary to power, of whom Eusebius of Nicomedia was the most complete type. The events of his life show Acacius to have been a man of great intellectual ability and little honesty, ready in action, eloquent in speech, subtle in argument, and unscrupulous as to the means by which he secured his ends; with no deep convictions on the great subjects of controversy, concealing his real views

with skilfully chosen ambiguity of language, and adroitly changing them when it was to his advantage to do so. After the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, c. 342, he became the head of the courtly Arian party, and is thought by some to be the person styled by Greg. Naz. (*Orat.* xxi. 21) “the tongue of the Arians,” George of Cappadocia being “the hand.” His dispute with Cyril had its origin in a question of precedence. He assisted Patrophilus and the other bishops of his province in consecrating Cyril, A.D. 351, and in accordance with the 7th Nicene Canon he claimed a right of priority for the metropolitanical see of Caesarea over that of Jerusalem. This Cyril refused to yield. Animosity having thus arisen, the breach was widened by mutual accusations of unsoundness in the faith. Acacius, being supported by the Palestinian bishops, deposed Cyril on frivolous grounds, and expelled him from Jerusalem, A.D. 358. The next year, A.D. 359, at the Council of Seleucia, Cyril successfully appealed against the sentence and was restored to his see; but at the Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 360, the influence of Acacius with Constantius enabled him again to procure the deposition of his adversary, who was sent into exile until the death of the Emperor [CYRIL OF JERUSALEM]. (*Soz.* iv. 25; Theodt. ii. 26.)

Acacius took a prominent part in the theological controversies of the period, alternately deposing and being deposed by his adversaries. He attended the council of Antioch, A.D. 341 (*Soz.* iii. 5), when in the presence of the emperor Constantius “the Golden Basilica” was dedicated by a band of 90 bishops, and subscribed the ambiguous creeds then drawn up from which the term Homocousion and all mention of “Substance” were carefully excluded. With other bishops of the Eusebian party he was deposed at the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347. They refused to submit to the sentence, and withdrew to Philippopolis, where they held a council of their own, and revenged themselves by anathematizing and deposing their deponents, including Pope Julius and Hosius of Cordova (Theodt. ii. 26; *Soz.* ii. 16; *Soz.* iii. 14; Labb. *Conc.* ii. 625–699). According to Jerome (*Vir. Ill.* 98), his influence with the emperor Constantius was considerable enough to nominate Felix (the Antipope) to the see of Rome at the fall of Liberius, A.D. 357. Acacius took a leading place among the intriguing prelates, who succeeded in splitting into two the Oecumenical Council which Constantius had proposed to summon, and thus nullifying its authority. While the Western bishops were assembling at Rimini, A.D. 359, he and his brethren of the East gathered at Seleucia, where he headed a turbulent party, called after him Acacians [SELEUCIA, SYNOD of.]. After the majority of the assembled prelates had confirmed the semi-Arian creed of Antioch (“Creed of the Dedication”), Acacius brought forward a confession (preserved by Athanasius *de Synod.* § 29; *Soer.* ii. 40; *Soz.* iv. 22) rejecting the terms Homocousion and Homoiousion “as alien from Scripture,” and anathematizing the term “Anomoeon,” but distinctly confessing the “likeness” of the Son to the Father. This formula the semi-Arian majority rejected, and becoming exasperated by the disingenuousness of Acacius, who interpreted the “likeness of the Son to the Father” as “likeness in will alone,” *δμοιον*

κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν μόνον, and refused to be judged by his own published writings (Socr. and Soz. l. c.), they proceeded to depose him and his adherents. Acacius and the other deposed prelates flew to Constantinople, and without delay laid their complaints before the Emperor. The adroit Acacius soon gained the ear of the weak Constantius, and finding that the favour he had shown to the bold blasphemies of Aetius had to some degree compromised him with his royal patron, he had no scruple in throwing over his former friend, anathematizing his doctrines, and acquiescing in his degradation and banishment. A new council was speedily called at Constantinople, of which Acacius was the soul. The proceedings were arranged by his skill, while the numerous letters and documents it sent forth were the product of his facile pen (Philostorg. iv. 12). It was mainly through his intrigues that the Council was brought to accept the Confession of Rimini, and that this heretical formula was enforced on the acceptance of the Church, when, in Jerome's strong words, "the whole world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian" (*Dial. adv. Luc.* 19). To complete their triumph, he and Eudoxius of Antioch, then Bishop of Constantinople, put forth all their influence to bring the edicts of the Nicene Council, and all mention of the Homoeousion, into disuse and oblivion (Soz. iv. 26). On his return to the East in 361, Acacius and his party sought to fortify themselves by the consecration of new bishops to the vacant sees. Among these Meletius was nominated to the see of Antioch, in the hope that, as he had not hitherto declared any very decided opinions on the great point of controversy, gratitude for his elevation would lead him openly to advocate these doctrines. In this they were mistaken, and Acacius revenged himself for the error by the usual course of deposition and banishment (Socr. ii. 44; Soz. ii. 26; Theodt. ii. 27). [MELETIUS]. In spite of his publicly declared opposition to the Nicene doctrines, when the imperial throne, which had been occupied by the semi-Arian Constantius, was filled by the orthodox Jovian, Acacius with his friends found it convenient to change their views; and when the emperor was residing at Antioch in 363, they voluntarily accepted the Nicene Symbol, and handed in a document expressing their adherence to it; "thus," as the philosopher Themistius sarcastically observed, "evidencing that they worshipped the purple and not the Deity" (Socr. iii. 25). On the accession of the Arian Valens, in 364, if Socrates does not do him injustice, Acacius once more went over to the more powerful side, and made common cause with the Arian Eudoxius (Socr. iv. 2). But he found no favour with the Council of Macedonian bishops that met at Lampsacus, and his deposition at Seleucia was confirmed. This is the last time history mentions him. According to Baronius, three years after this Acacius was removed by death beyond the possibility of further change, A.D. 366.

Acacius was a patron of literature as well as a copious writer. He enriched with parchments the library at Caesarea founded by Pamphilus (Hieron. *Ep. ad Marcellam*, 141). He wrote copiously on Ecclesiastes, and 6 books of *σύμμικτα ζητήματα*, besides many various treatises; a considerable fragment of his *Ἀντιλογία* against Marcellus of Ancyra is preserved by Epiphanius,

Haer. 72, 6-9. His life of his master Eusebius has unhappily perished. See Fabricius *B. G.* vii. p. 336; ix. p. 254, 256 (ed. Harless), Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* vi. (*passim*). [E. V.]

(3) A presbyter of Beroea, who visits St. Basil about A.D. 375, bringing a favourable report of the monastic life there, Basil. *Ep.* 220. Basil writes to him and others (among whom the name Paulus occurs) condoling with them on the loss of their monastery, which had been burnt by the heretics, *Ep.* 256. This is doubtless the same Acacius who, in conjunction with Paulus, writes to Epiphanius urging him to compose a work on heresies; for the two are described as presbyters and archimandrites of monasteries in the regions of Chalcis and Beroea in Coele Syria. The letter is prefixed to the *Panarium*, which was the response to this appeal, Epiphani. *Op.* i. p. 3; see Tillemont x. p. 805. He is probably the same with the next (4). [L.]

(4) Bishop of BEROEA, in Syria, c. A.D. 379-436. He was apparently a Syrian by birth, and in his early youth adopted the ascetic life, and entered the monastery of Gindarus, near Antioch, then governed by Asterius (Theodt. *Vit. Patr.* c. 2). Unless he may be identified with the last mentioned Acacius (as seems highly probable), not much is known of this period of his life. He appears, however, to have been prominent as a champion of the Orthodox faith against the Arians, from whom he suffered (Baluz. *Nov. Collect. Conc.* p. 746), and it is especially mentioned of him that he did great service in bringing the hermit, Julianus Sabbas, from his retirement to Antioch to confront the members of this party who had falsely claimed his support (Theodt. *Vit. Patr.* 2, *H. E.* iv. 24). We find him in Rome, probably as a deputy from the Churches of Syria, when the Apollinarian Heresy was treated before Pope Damasus (Baluz. *Concil.* 763). After the return of Eusebius of Samosata from exile, A.D. 378, he was consecrated to the see of Beroea (the modern Aleppo) by that prelate (Theodt. *H. E.* v. 4). As bishop he did not relax the strictness of his asceticism, and like Ambrose (August. *Confess.* vi. 3) throwing the doors of his house open to every comer he invited all the world to witness the purity and simplicity of his life (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 28). He attended the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Theodt. v. 8). The same year, on the death of Meletius, he took a leading part in the ill-advised consecration of Flavian to the bishopric of Antioch [FLAVIANUS]. This was in direct violation of the compact between Paulinus and Meletius, and, as perpetuating the unhappy Eustathian schism, was looked upon with well-grounded displeasure both in East and West; and Acacius and those who acted with him were cut off from communion with the Church of Rome (Soz. vii. 11). The death of Paulinus in 388, followed speedily by that of Evagrius, whom the dying bishop had weakly appointed as his successor, removed the chief obstacle to reconciliation. The Council of Capua, at the close of 391 or 392, received Acacius again into communion, together with the prelates of Flavian's party (Ambros. *Ep.* 9; Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1072). The admission of Flavian himself caused more difficulty. Acacius, who, though 76 years old, had been deputed with Isidore of Alexandria to convey to Pope

Siricius, in 398, the intelligence of Chrysostom's election to the see of Constantinople, received earnest injunctions from that prelate to do all he could to remove the prejudice from the Pope's mind. His advocacy was strengthened by the long white hair that marked his venerable age, and the reverent mildness of his aspect. He fully succeeded in his object, and returned to Syria bearing letters of communion not only from Rome, but also from Theophilus and the Egyptian bishops. The whole merit of the success was not unjustly ascribed by the bishops of the East to "their father" Acacius (Soz. vi. 9; Soz. viii. 3; Theodt. v. 23; Labbe, *Conc.* iii. p. 391; Pallad. p. 39).

The beginning of the 5th century saw Acacius one of the most implacable of the enemies of Chrysostom. Palladius traces the animosity to his discontent at the insufficient hospitality he had received when Chrysostom's guest at Constantinople in 401 or 402, and quotes an undignified threat that he "would cook a dish for him" (ἐγὼ αὐτῷ ἄρτυμα χύτρω). Referring the reader to the article JOHN CHRYSOSTOM for the details, it will be enough here to say that Acacius took part in the infamous "Synod of the Oak," A.D. 403, where he was one of the four bishops specially excepted against by Chrysostom as men from whom no impartial sentence could be expected; and that he again took the lead in the Synod of 404, after Chrysostom's return from exile, and joined Antiochus, Bishop of Ptolemais, in urging the gentle and hesitating Arcadius to depose him, taking all the apprehended consequences of his deposition on their own heads, ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἡμῶν ἢ τοῦ Ἰωάννου καθάρσεις (Pallad. p. 82). He added acts of open violence to his urgency with the timid emperor, until he had gained his end in the final expulsion of the saint, June 20, A.D. 404. Nor was his hostility even now satiated. The character of Chrysostom stood high in the West as well as in the East. Pope Innocent might take another view of the dispute. Acacius therefore sent to Rome one Patronus, a deformed dwarf, whose provincial dialect was hardly intelligible, with letters in his own name and that of his adherents, accusing Chrysostom of being the author of the conflagration of his own church. The Pope treated the accusation with deserved contempt, and Acacius was a second time suspended from communion with Rome (Pallad. p. 35). An additional ground of displeasure had been given, A.D. 404, by his clandestine and hurried ordination of Porphyrius as Bishop of Antioch, in direct opposition to the wishes of the diocese (Pallad. 145; Soz. viii. 24). Acacius did not regain communion with the West till 414, and then chiefly through the influence of the excellent Alexander of Antioch, who had healed the long-lasting Eustathian sore, and sought to restore peace fully to the Church by placing Chrysostom's name on the diptychs. The letter sent to the Pope by Acacius, together with those of Alexander, was received with haughty condescension, and an answer was returned readmitting the aged prelate on his complying with certain conditions (*Conc.* ii. 1266-8). His communion with Alexander was fully restored, and we find the two prelates uniting in ordaining Diogenes, a "bigamus" (Theodt. *Ép.* 110). Acacius' enmity to Chrysostom's memory seems however to have been unquenched; and on the succession

of Theodotus of Antioch, A.D. 421, he took the opportunity of writing to Atticus of Constantinople to apologise for the new bishop's having, in defiance of his better judgment, yielded to popular clamour, and placed Chrysostom's name on the diptychs (Theodt. v. 34; Nicephorus, xiv. 26, 27). On the rise of the Nestorian controversy Acacius endeavoured to act the part of a peacemaker, for which his venerable age of more than 100 years, and the popular reverence which had gained for him the title of "the father and master of all bishops" well qualified him. With the view of healing the breach between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius, he wrote a reply to a violent letter of the former (A.D. 430), beseeching him not to disturb the peace of the Church for a word, and seeking to put his adversary's views in the most favourable light. When his pacific measures failed, and the differences had risen to a height which could only be settled by a general council, his advanced age prevented his taking any personal part in that summoned at Ephesus, A.D. 431, but he entrusted his proxy to Paul of Emesa, and it is not improbable that the Eastern bishops received a hint from him to meet Cyril with his own weapons and indict him of Apollinarianism. The influence of the aged Acacius was powerful at Court. Theodosius commissioned Count John to lay before the Council a letter Acacius had addressed to him counselling peace, as the model they should follow in their deliberations; and after the powerlessness of his advice had been proved by the unhappy schism between Cyril and the East, the Emperor wrote to him in most reverential terms beseeching him to give his endeavours and prayers for the restoration of unity to the distracted Church. His influence was also appealed to by Pope Sixtus III. for the same object (Baluz. *Conc.* pp. 721, 754, 757; Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 1087).

Acacius was strongly prejudiced against Cyril, and disapproved of his anathemas of Nestorius, which, as we have seen, appeared to him to savour of Apollinarianism. He therefore received with satisfaction the intelligence of the deposition of Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus, sent him by John of Antioch and his other friends in the Council (Baluz. *Conc.* 714), who, on the close of the Synod, visited him at Beroea, with a particular account of all that passed at Ephesus and Chalcedon. What he heard confirmed him in his view of Cyril's heresy. But the old man was weary of controversy, of the uselessness of which he had seen too many proofs in his long life, and Acacius spent his last days in the congenial task of promoting peace between the rival parties. He took part in the Synod held at the Emperor's instance in his own city of Beroea, A.D. 432, by John of Antioch, and did all in his power, both by personal influence and by letters to Cyril and to the Roman Bishop Celestinus, to put an end to the feud. His first endeavours proved unsuccessful, in consequence of the unreasonable demands made of Cyril. But, as detailed in the article CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, he ultimately succeeded in establishing friendly communion between John and Cyril. He saw the peace of the Church re-established, and died, full of days, and honoured of all men, at the reputed age of more than 110 years, A.D. 436.

Three letters are still extant out of the large

number that he wrote, especially on the Nestorian controversy; two to Alexander of Hierapolis, Baluzius, *Nov. Collect. Concil.* cap. xli. p. 746, c. lv. p. 757; and one to Cyril, Ib. c. xvii. p. 440, Labbe, *Conc.* vol. iii. p. 382 (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 417; Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* vol. xiv.; Baronius, *Ann. Eccl.*). [E. V.]

(5) Bishop of AMIDA, c. A.D. 420, chiefly famous for having induced his clergy to sell the gold and silver vessels belonging to the church in order to feed and ransom several thousands of Persian captives, who had been taken by the Romans (Socr. vii. 21; Niceph. xiv. 22; Assem. B. O. i. p. 195 sq., iii. p. 365, 371 sq., 374). "His name might have dignified the saintly calendar," says Gibbon, c. xxxii. He left some *Letters*, on which Mares the Persian wrote commentaries; Ebedjesu in Assem. B. O. iii. p. 51, 172. [L.]

(6) Bishop of MELITENE in Armenia Secunda, c. A.D. 431. In earlier life a reader in the Church at Melitene, he gained the good opinion of the Bishop Otreus by the sanctity of his life, and was entrusted by him with the education of St. Euthymius; *Act. SS.* Jan. 20. Succeeding to the see, he became famous by his steadfast opposition to Nestorius, with whom he had lived on intimate terms (σφόδρα ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους ἡγάπησα are his own words, Labb. *Conc.* iii. 498), and whom he had tried in vain to reclaim to more orthodox opinions. At the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, he took an active and prominent part. Several short speeches are reported (see the indices to Labb. and Baluz. *Conc.*) besides a homily there delivered by him (Labb. *Conc.* iii. 983). After the condemnation of Nestorius, when Cyril concluded his concordat with the Oriental bishops [CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA], Acacius wrote to remonstrate with him on the step (Baluz. *Conc.* 785). Altogether his antagonism to Nestorian teaching was not only persistent but intemperate, and his zeal more than once betrayed him into great extravagances of language. On one occasion he had to defend himself before Theodosius against the charge of maintaining that the Deity is passible—a blasphemy at which the emperor shook out his robe and fell back in horror (Baluz. 723); and again in an extant letter to Cyril he expresses himself in a manner strongly savouring of Monophysitism (Baluz. 786). The date of his death is uncertain, but he was still living when the feuds broke out about Theodore of Mopsuestia; for we find him (c. A.D. 437), in conjunction with Rabulas [RABULAS], exerting himself actively in condemnation of this great man's writings: *Liberat. Brev.* 10 (Gall. *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* xii. p. 134). In his own church he was held in high honour. Not long after his death the bishops of his province designate him "the great Acacius our father and doctor" (Labb. *Conc.* iv. 950); and in some Greek Menaea he is commemorated as a thaumaturge on April 17 (see *Act. SS.* March 31, but there is some confusion with an earlier Acacius (1)). See Tillemont *Hist. Eccl.* xiv. p. 294 sq., 385, 453, 475, 567, 628. [L.]

(7) PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 471–489. Acacius was originally at the head of an orphanage at Constantinople, which he administered with conspicuous success (Suidas, s. v. Ἀκάκιος). His abilities attracted the notice of the Emperor Leo, over whom he obtained great

influence by the arts of an accomplished courtier (Suidas, l. c.). On the death of Gennadius (471) he was chosen Bishop of Constantinople, and soon found himself involved in controversies, which lasted throughout his patriarchate, and ended in a schism of thirty-five years' duration between the Churches of the East and West. On the one side he laboured to restore unity to Eastern Christendom, which was distracted by the varieties of opinion to which the Eutychian debates had given rise; and on the other to aggrandize the authority of his see by asserting its independence of Rome, and extending its influence over Alexandria and Antioch. In both respects he appears to have acted more in the spirit of a statesman than of a theologian; and in this relation the personal traits of liberality, courtliness, and ostentation, noticed by Suidas (l. c.), are not without importance.

The first important measures of Acacius carried with them enthusiastic popular support, and earned for him the praise of Pope Simplicius. In conjunction with a Stylite monk, Daniel, he placed himself at the head of the opposition to the Emperor Basiliscus, who, after usurping the empire of the East, had issued an encyclic letter in condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, and taken Timotheus Aelurus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, under his protection, A.D. 476. The resistance was completely successful. Basiliscus publicly retracted his letter; the Asiatic bishops who had subscribed it, professed that their names were given under compulsion, and the Monophysites, who had been intruded into various sees, were expelled. In the mean time Zeno, the fugitive emperor, reclaimed the throne which he had lost; and Basiliscus after abject and vain concessions to the ecclesiastical power, was given up to him (as it is said) by Acacius, after he had taken sanctuary in his church, A.D. 477 (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 4 ff; Theodor. *Lect.* i. 30 ff; Theophan. *Chron.* pp. 104, ff; Procop. *B. V.* i. 7, p. 195). At this period the relations between Zeno, Acacius, and Simplicius, appear to have been amicable, if not cordial. They were agreed on the necessity of taking vigorous measures to affirm the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and for a time acted in concert (Simplic. *Epp.* 5, 6). Before long a serious difference arose, when Acacius, in 479, consecrated a Bishop of Antioch (Theophan. *Chron.* p. 110), and thus exceeded the proper limits of his jurisdiction. However, Simplicius admitted the appointment on the plea of necessity, while he protested against the precedent (Simplic. *Epp.* 14, 15). Three years later (482), on the death of the patriarch of Alexandria, the appointment of his successor gave occasion to a graver dispute. The Monophysites chose Petrus Mongus as patriarch, who had already been conspicuous among them; on the other side the Catholics put forward Johannes Talaia. Both aspirants lay open to grave objections. Mongus was, or at least had been, unorthodox; Talaia was bound by a solemn promise to the emperor not to seek or (as it appears) accept the patriarchate (*Liberat.* c. 17; Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 12). Talaia at once sought and obtained the support of Simplicius, and slighted Acacius. Mongus represented to Acacius that he was able, if confirmed in his post, to heal the divisions by which the Alexandrine church was rent. Acacius and Zeno readily lis-

tened to the promises of Mongus, and in spite of the vehement opposition of Simplicius, received the envoys whom he sent to discuss the terms of reunion. Shortly afterwards the Henoticon (An Instrument of Union) was drawn up, in which the creed of Nicaea, as completed at Constantinople, was affirmed to be the one necessary and final definition of faith; and though an anathema was pronounced against Eutyches, no express judgment was pronounced upon the doctrine of the two Natures (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 14)^a. Mongus accepted the Henoticon, and was confirmed in his see. Talaia retired to Rome (482-3), and Simplicius wrote again to Acacius, charging him in the strongest language to check the progress of heresy elsewhere and at Alexandria (Simplic. *Epp.* 18, 19). The letters were without effect, and Simplicius died soon afterwards. His successor, Felix III (II) espoused the cause of Talaia with zeal, and despatched two bishops, Vitalis and Misenus, to Constantinople with letters to Zeno and Acacius, demanding that the latter should repair to Rome to answer the charges brought against him by Talaia (Felix *Epp.* 1, 2). The mission utterly failed. Vitalis and Misenus were induced to communicate publicly with Acacius and the representatives of Mongus, and returned dishonoured to Italy (484). On their arrival at Rome a synod was held. They were themselves deposed and excommunicated; a new anathema was issued against Mongus, and Acacius was irrevocably excommunicated^b for his connexion with Mongus, for exceeding the limits of his jurisdiction, and for refusing to answer at Rome the accusations of Talaia (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 51; Felix, *Ep.* 6); but no direct heretical opinion was proved or urged against him. Felix communicated the sentence to Acacius, and at the same time wrote to Zeno and to the church at Constantinople, charging every one, under pain of excommunication, to separate from the deposed patriarch (*Epp.* 9, 10, 12). Once again, the envoy of the Pope was seduced from his allegiance, and on his return to Rome fell under ecclesiastical censure (Felix *Ep.* 11). For the rest, the threats of Felix produced no practical effect. The Eastern Christians, with very few exceptions, remained in communion with Acacius; Talaia acknowledged the hopelessness of his cause by accepting the bishopric of Nola; and Zeno and Acacius took active measures to obtain the general acceptance of the Henoticon. Under these circumstances the condemnation of Acacius, which before had been made in the name of the Pope, was repeated in the name of the council, and the schism was complete^c (485). Acacius, however, took no heed of the sentence up to his death in 489, which was followed by that of Mongus in 490, and of Zeno in 491. Fravitas (Flavitas, Flavianus) his successor, during a very

short patriarchate, entered on negotiations with Felix, which led to no result. The policy of Acacius broke down when he was no longer able to animate it. In the course of a few years all for which he had laboured was undone. The Henoticon failed to restore unity to the East, and in 519 the Emperor Justin submitted to Pope Hormisdas, and the condemnation of Acacius was recognised by the Constantinopolitan Church.

Tillemont has given a detailed history of the whole controversy, up to the death of Fravitas, in his *Mémoires*, vol. xvi, but with a natural bias towards the Roman side. The original documents, exclusive of the histories of Evagrius, Theophanes, and Liberatus, are for the most part collected in the 58th volume of Migne's *Patrologia*. It has been supposed that Victor Vitensis dedicated to Acacius his *History of the Vandal Persecution*, but this conjecture is not supported by adequate evidence: Sirmond *Vict. Vit. Prol.* [W.]

(8) Bishop of SELEUCIA and Catholicus of Persia, from A.D. 485, said to have been the first Nestorian patriarch. He is called the Assyrian, and was educated at the school of Edessa, where, for some reason not explained, he bore the name *ܐܕܐܢ* "suffocans quadrantem."

Thence he was summoned to Seleucia (on the Tigris) by his kinsman Babuaeus, bishop of that church. Having taught there for some years, and gained a great reputation by his learning and character, he was on the death of Babuaeus (A.D. 485) unanimously elected to the vacant see. After his elevation, it is said that he was driven by the threats or induced by the wiles of Barsumas bishop of Nisibis, the great Nestorian champion in those parts, to embrace Nestorianism. But his relations with Barsumas, who is said moreover to have compassed the death of his relative and patron Babuaeus, are very differently reported by others, and he appears in his dealings with this unscrupulous prelate to have shown great independence and moderation. If Acacius really became a Nestorian (and it is probable that his sympathies were in this direction), he was at least no blind partisan, as the following incident shows. Having been thrown into prison by the Magians, he was released by the Persian king and sent as ambassador to the emperor Zeno, being selected for this purpose on account of his learning and ability. On this embassy he was questioned by the Western bishops about his Nestorianism, and was urged (as a condition of communion) to dissociate himself from the scandalous doings of Barsumas. On the former point he replied that he knew nothing about Nestorius or Nestorianism; and for the latter, he determined to excommunicate Barsumas, but on his return found that prelate no longer living. He is said to have held a council at Seleucia, at which canons were passed allowing and even encouraging the marriage of the clergy. Altogether he seems to have been a wise, moderate, and enlightened ruler, but in the conflict of Nestorian and Monophysite authorities it is almost impossible to arrive at the truth. The date of his death is differently given by different authorities, and Assemani in this, as in other points, is not consistent with himself; but it must have taken place before the close of the century. Acacius wrote several orations on *Fasting*, as also on the *Faith*, in which latter

^a According to the present text of Evagrius (iii. 22), Zeno did not admit the Council of Chalcedon; but in writing to Simplicius he affirms that it was admitted by himself, by Mongus, and by all the churches.

^b Felix *Ep.* 6 fin. *Habe ergo cum his . . . portionem . . . S. Spiritus iudicio et apostolica auctoritate damnatus, nunquam anathematis vinculis exuendus.* As a retort Acacius removed the name of Felix from the 'Diptychs' (Theophan. p. 114).

^c This appears to be the best explanation of the "double excommunication" of Acacius. Comp. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xvi. n. 25, pp. 764 f.

"he exposed the errors of those who believe one substance in Christ." The authorities for all these statements will be found in Assem. B. O. i. p. 351, ii. p. 406 sq., iii. p. 69 sq., 378 sq. (especially this last reference). [L.]

ACATIUS. [ACACIUS.]

ACCA, the fifth Bishop of Hexham (A.D. 709-732), was a native of Northumbria and brought up in the household of Bosa, who became Bishop of York in 678 (Bede *H. E.* v. 20). A few years after this date he transferred himself to the service of Wilfrid, whom he accompanied in his missionary visit to Sussex about 685 (Bede iv. 14). He seems to have continued with him in the closest intercourse as long as Wilfrid lived. With him he went in 704 to Rome, visiting S. Willibrord in Friesland by the way (Bede iii. 13). Bede's mention of this probably led the pseudo-Marcellinus to reckon Acca among the twelve missionaries sent by Egbert to Friesland in 692 (see Bede, v. 10), falsely, no doubt. On the return from Rome he was made the confidant of Wilfrid's vision at Meaux (Eddius, c. 54). Wilfrid immediately before his death nominated Acca to the Abbey of Hexham (Edd. c. 62); and the same year he was appointed to succeed him as bishop. He governed the diocese of Hexham from 709 to 732, devoting himself to the completion of Wilfrid's designs, and to the maintenance of the religious education and art of the North on the Roman model. His skill in ecclesiastical music and architecture is mentioned by Bede with especial praise. He brought Mabanus a pupil of the Kentish Church to teach Gregorian music at Hexham, and kept him there for twelve years (Bede, *H. E.* v. 20). His magnificence in church building was not less than Wilfrid's, whose three churches, dedicated to St. Mary, St. Peter, and St. Michael, in the neighbourhood of Hexham, he completed (R. Hexham, *Hist. Hagust.* cap. 4). His greatest work, however, was the Library of Hexham, which he furnished with a great number of Lives of the Saints and other ecclesiastical books.

Of his administration of his diocese we know little. He blessed Huaehtbert, Abbot of Wearmouth, and Jarrow in 716 (Bede, *Hist. Abbat.* c. 15). His acquaintance with Bede had begun some years earlier; if the dedication by Bede of his Hexameron to Acca as abbot may be trusted, they must have been friends as early as 709. Bede acknowledges his obligations to Acca for some particulars of his history (*H. E.* iii. 13, iv. 14); and besides the Hexameron addressed to him a commentary on St. Mark, and a poem on the Day of Judgment (Sim. Dun. ap. Twysden, Coll. 95-98).

It was by Acca's persuasion that Eddius wrote his life of Wilfrid, and to him, conjointly with Tatberht, Abbot of Ripon, that invaluable work is dedicated (Edd. V. *Wilfr.* Prolog.). Of Acca's own writings only a single letter is preserved addressed to Bede pressing him to write a commentary on St. Luke. This is printed among the letters of Bede; and in Raine's *Memorials of Hexham*, i. 33.

In 732 Acca was driven from his see (Cont. Bed. 731, Sim. Dun. A.D. 732). The reason is unknown; but it was perhaps connected with the restoration of the metropolitan authority to York on the appointment of Archbishop Eg-

berht who consecrated Frithuberht as Acca's successor in 734. A tradition is preserved by Richard of Hexham that Acca spent his exile in the organization of the Church at Whithern, in Galloway (*Hist. Hagust.* cap. 15). He died Oct. 20, 740, and was buried at Hexham, outside the east end of the church. Two crosses were set up over the grave, one of which is supposed to be still existing (Raine, *Mem. Hexham.* i. p. xxxiv). His relics were translated in the 11th century, and again in 1154. He was commemorated in the calendar on the 19th of February.

(Bede, *H. E.* v. 19, 20; Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* Saec. iii. p. 1, pp. 209, &c.; Richard of Hexham, ed. Twysden, Dec. Scr. as cited above; Raine, *Memorials of Hexham*, vol. i. Pref. pp. xxx.-xxxv. 31-36.) [S.]

ACEMBES (Ἀκεμβής), of Carystus in Euboea, is named by Hippolytus (*Haer.* iv. 2; v. 13; x. 10); followed by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 17), with Euphrates the 'Peratic' as chiefs of the Ophite sect called Peratae. In the second passage the MS. of Hippolytus has Κελβής, in the third Ἀδεμής, which is also read by Theodoret. Possibly the true form of the name may be *Acelmes*: cf. Ἀκελιμᾶς (Suid.), Κέλμης, Κέλμης. In [Menander ap.] Joseph. c. Ap. i. 21 *Chelbes* is a Tyrian name. [PERATAE, OPHITES.] [H.]

ACEPHALI (from ἀ and κεφαλή, those without a head or a leader) is a term applied:—
1. To the bishops of the Oecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431, who refused to follow either St. Cyril or John of Antioch, the leaders of the two parties in the Nestorian controversy.
2. To a radical branch of Monophysites, who rejected not only the Oecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451, but also the notorious *Henoticon* of the Emperor Zeno, issued in 482 to the clergy, monks, and congregations of Egypt, with a view to unite the Orthodox and the Monophysites. Peter Mongus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, subscribed this compromise [ACACIUS]; for this reason many of his party, especially among the monks, separated from him, and were called *Acephali*. They were condemned, under Justinian, by a Synod of Constantinople, 536, as schismatics, who sinned against the churches, the pope, and the emperor. Comp. Mansi, *Conc.* t. viii. p. 891 sqq.; Harduin, *Conc.* t. ii. 1203, sqq.; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, vol. vii.; Hefele, *Concilien Geschichte*, vol. ii. pp. 549 and 744. [MONOPHYSITES.]
3. To the *clerici vagi*, i.e. clergymen belonging to no diocese (as in Isid. Hispal. *De Offic. Ecol.*, the so-called Egbert's *Excerpts*, 160, and repeatedly in Carovingian Councils: see Du Cange); [see DICT. OF CHRIST. ANT., art. VAGI CLERICI] and 4. It is said to be used sometimes for ἀντοκεφάλαι. [DICT. OF CHRIST. ANT. art. AUTOCEPHALI.] [P. S.]

ACESIUS (Ἀκέσιος), "a bishop of the Novatian sect (θηρηκείας)," invited by Constantine to the Council of Nicaea. After expressing his agreement with the decisions of the Council, he is said to have justified his separation from Catholic communion by severe Novatian views on discipline [NOVATIANISM]: whereupon the emperor replied, "Set up a ladder, Acesius, and mount alone to heaven" (Socr. *H. E.* i. 10; cf. Soz. *H. E.* i. 22). There seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the substantial truth of the anecdote which Socrates expressly says

was told him by a Novatian presbyter, Auxanon, who went with Acesius to Nicaea, being at the time a mere boy (*H. E.* i. 13; cf. ii. 98). At a later time, Acesius was bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople (*Soz. H. E.* ii. 32). Compare Lardner, *Credibility*, iii. 224, f. [W.]

ACHA, a daughter of Ella, King of Deira, sister of Edwin, the first Christian king of Northumbria. She married Ethelfrith, who was King of Northumbria from 593-617, by whom she became mother of Eanfrith, k. 633-634, Oswald, k. 635-642; Oswiu, k. 642-670; Oslaf, Oslac, Oswald, and Offa; and of Ebba, Abbess of Coldingham. (*Bede, H. E.* iii. 6. Flor. Wig. *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 632, 639.) [S.]

ACHATIUS. [ACACIUS.]

ACHEA (St.), of Kill-glais, near Ardagh, in Ireland, the daughter of St. Darerca, sister of St. Patrick, in the 5th century. Commemorated on the 5th of August. The name is also written Echea, Echi. (O'Clery, *Martyrol. Dungall.* ed. Todd and Reeves (Echi); Colgan, *Acta SS. Hiberniae*, p. 718.) [H. B.]

ACHILLAS (Ἀχιλλᾶς). (1) Patriarch of ALEXANDRIA, A.D. 311-312. During the episcopate of Theonas (283-301) he was ordained presbyter and placed over the catechetical school, where he distinguished himself alike by an ardent pursuit of philosophy and a consistent Christian life (*Euseb. H. E.* vii. 32, § 30). It was perhaps owing to his eminence in this office rather than to any triumphs achieved during his very brief episcopate (*Theodt. H. E.* i. 1, *ἁλὺον χρόνον πρὸς τῇ*) that Athanasius honours him with the title of "the great Achillas" (*Op.* i. 232). On the martyrdom of Peter he was raised to the patriarchal throne, but died apparently within a year, and was succeeded by Alexander. Epiphanius indeed (*Haer.* lxxviii. 3, p. 719; lxxix. 11, p. 735 sq.) represents Alexander as the predecessor of Achillas, who providentially dies soon after his elevation to make room for Athanasius; but the testimony of strictly contemporary authorities is decisive on this point (*Euseb. l. c.*; *Athan. Op.* i. 105, 140, 242). The length of his episcopate again is variously stated, the period assigned to it by different authorities ranging between three months and nearly ten years; but the time given above is probably correct (*Tillemont, M. E.* vi. 730 sq.). The only act recorded of his episcopate is the restoration of Arius to the diaconate and his promotion to the priesthood (*Sozom. i. 15*). As we are told that Achillas was the object of malignant attacks on the part of the Meletians (*Athan. ll. cc.*), it has been thought that this act of clemency to Arius was dictated by excess of zeal against their principles.

(2) One of the Alexandrian clergy, a friend and partisan of Arius, who was deposed by bishop Alexander, and retired from Alexandria with the heresiarch. His name is attached to the letter of defence written afterwards by Arius to Alexander. Contemporaries speak of him as a prime mover of Arianism (*Theodt. H. E.* i. 3 (4); *Epiph. Haer.* lxxix. 8 (p. 733); *Athan. Op.* i. p. 314 sq.). The name is written sometimes Ἀχιλλᾶς, sometimes Ἀχιλλεύς. The former seems to be correct. Jerome calls him a "lector" (*adv. Lucif.* 20, ii. p. 193), and in the existing text of bishop Alexander's letter in Théodoret (*l. c.*) he appears among the deacons; but in

another manifesto of Alexander (*Athan. Op.* l. c.) he is called a presbyter, and in the letter of Arius (*Epiph. l. c.*) he signs as such. The identity of the person can hardly be doubted. [L.]

ACHOLIUS, bishop of Thessalonica ("ad summum sacerdotium a Macedonicis obsecratus populus, electus a sacerdotibus"; *Ambros. Ep.* xv. § 12), baptised Theodosius, 380, before his Gothic war [THEODOSIUS], and died c. 383. Ambrose wrote a letter on the occasion of his death (*Ep.* xv.) to the church at Thessalonica, in which he compares at length his life and gifts with those of Elisha. As Elisha (he argues) was the instrument of proclaiming the discomfiture of the Syrians (2 K. vii.) so Acholius, by his prayers, drove back the Goths from Macedonia (*Ambrose, Ep.* l. c.; cf. *Ep.* xiii. § 7). Acholius was present at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (*Socr. H. E.* v. 8, Ἀσχόλιος; cf. *Vales. l. c.*). [W.]

ACLEJAM in the *Conflict of Adam and Eve* (p. 68 Dillm.) is the twin-sister of Abel and wife of Seth: further on she appears as *Lea*. In the Ethiopic 'Clementinum' she is called *Aclema* (Dillmann, p. 139), and by other late writers, Greek, Syriac, and Hebrew (all of whom interchange her with her equally legendary sister LUYA), *Climia*, *Chalmana*, *Calemora*, and *Caomena* (Dillm. ib. and *Fabr. Cod. Ps. Ep. V. T.* ii. 44). [H.]

ACTA ANDREAE. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTA ANDREAE ET MATTHAEI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTA BARNABAE. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 31.]

ACTA BARTHOLOMAEI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTA JOHANNIS. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 29.]

ACTA ET MARTYRIUM MATTHAEI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTA MARTYRUM. [MARTYRUM ACTA.]

ACTA MATTHAEI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 32.]

ACTA PAULI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 29.]

ACTA PAULI ET THECLAE. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTA PETRI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 29.]

ACTA PETRI ET PAULI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 27.]

ACTA PHILIPPI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTA PILATI. [DICT. OF BIBLE, art. PILATE.]

ACTA SIMONIS ET JUDAE. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 31.]

ACTA THADDAEI. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 24.]

ACTA THOMAE. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 30.]

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, APOCRYPHAL.—Under the name of Acts or Deeds (πράξεις, *Acta*, *Actus*), Circuits or Journeys (περίοδοι), and Martyrdom or Consummation (μαρτύριον, τελείωσις), of the various Apostles was comprised in the times of Christian antiquity a widely spread

and manifold literature, of which very important remains still exist. As early as the 2nd century numerous legendary reports concerning the fates of the Apostles were in circulation, in part, at least, of a very romantic character. The real history of the lives and deaths of most of the Apostles being shrouded in obscurity, a pious imagination was very early busily employed in filling up the large lacunae left in the historical reminiscences of the Church. Not a few of such narratives owe their origin simply to an endeavour to satisfy the pious curiosity or taste for the marvellous in members of the primitive Church; while others subserved the local interests of particular towns or districts which claimed to have derived their Christianity from the missionary activity of one of the Apostles, or their line of bishops from one immediately ordained by him. It likewise not infrequently happened that party spirit, theological or ecclesiastical, would take advantage of a pious credulity to further its own ends by manipulating the older legends, or inventing others entirely new, after a carefully preconceived form and pattern. And so almost every fresh editor of such narratives, using that freedom which all antiquity was wont to allow itself in dealing with literary monuments, would recast the materials which lay before him, excluding whatever might not suit his theological point of view,—dogmatic statements, for example, speeches, prayers, &c., for which he would substitute other formulæ of his own composition, and further expanding or abridging after his own pleasure, or as the immediate object which he had in view might dictate. Only with the simply miraculous parts of the narrative was the case different. These passed unaltered and unquestioned from one hand to another; ecclesiastical circles the most opposed in other respects having here equal and coinciding interests, while the critical spirit, usually so acute in detecting erroneous opinions or heretical tendencies, was contented here to lay down its arms, however troubled or suspected the source from which such legendary narration might flow. Although therefore these fables originated for the most part in heretical quarters, we find them at a later period among the cherished possessions of ordinary Catholics, acquaintance with them being perpetually renewed, or their memory preserved in Catholic Christendom, partly by the festal homilies of eminent fathers, and partly by religious poetry and works of sacred art. They present however, like all legends or myths preserved in popular memory, great difficulties in the way of a satisfactory treatment from a literary point of view, perpetually springing up, as they do, afresh, now here, now there, now in one shape, now in another, and again withdrawing themselves in a tantalising way, for a longer or shorter period, from the eyes of the historical inquirer. The older church martyrologies and calendars, subject as they were to continuous processes of change and augmentation, and the collectanea of later chroniclers and legend writers, who for the most part copied one from another, have furnished us with rich stores of legendary matter, which only in rare instances can be satisfactorily traced back to their original sources. This remark applies especially to the later Byzantine literature; since in the case of the

mediaeval Latin collections, such as those of Ordericus Vitalis in the 12th century, and the *Golden Legend* of Jacobus de Vitriaco in the second half of the 13th, the direct sources can, for the most part, be fairly ascertained. (The former of these works, Orderici Vitalis Monachi Uticensis *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Libri II*, was published by André du Chesne among the *Scriptores Normannici*, Paris 1619; the *Legenda Aurea*, or *Historia Longobardica*, is edited by Grässe, Leipzig 1845.) We still possess, with rare exceptions, all the authorities employed by Latin writers from the 7th and 8th centuries downwards, so that critical inquiries of this nature are seldom arrested at a later period than the times of Gregory of Tours († 595), Venantius Fortunatus († 609), and Isidore of Seville († 636), or, at the latest, of the venerable Bede († 735). Byzantine writers on the other hand, down to the 13th and 14th centuries, drew in part from sources now inaccessible. Among these Byzantine authorities may be reckoned along with the invaluable *Bibliotheca* of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople towards the end of the 9th century (*Μυρίβιβλον*, ed. Bekker, Berlin 1824), the Greek Menaea, and the numerous hagiologies which bear the name of Simeon Metaphrastes (10th century). Some of these are found in Combesius (*Auctarium Novum*), others in Surius and the Bollandists (*Acta Sanctorum*), for the most part only in Latin translations. To these may be added the chronographical works of Georgius Syncellus (published by Dindorf, Bonn 1829), and of the patriarch Nicephorus (also published by Dindorf along with Syncellus), Georgius Hamartolus (9th century, published in Migne's *Patrol. Graeca*, vol. cx), Georgius Cedrenus (11th century, ed. Bekker, Bonn 1838), and several others; finally the Ecclesiastical history of Nicephorus Callisti (14th century, Nicephori Callisti *Hist. Eccl.*, ed. Fronto Ducaeus, Paris 1630). In these later Byzantine writers we not seldom find remains or fragments of older legendary Acts of Apostles which are not without importance for the literary inquirer. It is possible that many authorities of which these writers made use may still lie buried in the dust of our public libraries. At any rate, it is the fact that during the last forty years, since Thilo and Tischendorf have turned their attention to this department of literature, numerous manuscripts, hitherto unknown or at any rate unprinted, have been brought to light; and we know of the existence of several others which still in vain await publication. The pieces published by Tischendorf in his edition of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Leipzig 1851) form but a small portion of already existing materials; for the rest, we are still obliged for the most part to have recourse to the older and often not very accessible collections of Neander (*Narrationes Apocryphae de Christo et Rebus Christianis*, at the end of his *Catechesis Lutheri Graeco-Latina*, Basel 1567), Fabricius (*Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, tom. i. and ii., Hamburg 1703, 2nd ed. 1719, tom. iii., 1719), Grabe (*Spicilegium Patrum et Haereticorum*, Oxford 1698), Birch (*Auctarium Cod. Apocr. Fabrician.*, p. i., Hamburg 1804), the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and the *Acta Sanctorum*. The older editions are often incorrect and not to be depended on, while the selection made in

recent publications is not always happy. How much still remains to be done in order merely to present our existing materials in a complete form and with good texts, is evident from the citations and references in Fabricius (ii. pp. 743-882, iii. pp. 568-660), Thilo (in the *Notitia Uterior Novae Codicis Apocryphi Fabriciani Editionis*, prefixed to his edition of the *Acta Thomae*, Leipzig 1823, and in various programmes), and Tischendorf (prolegomena to his edition of the *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, already referred to).

From all this it is clear that any comprehensive critical examination of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles will have great difficulties to contend with. Some of the oldest of these documents were derived merely from oral traditions with which later editors enriched at times their own written materials. Traces of such traditions we encounter as early as the middle of the 2nd century in Dionysius of Corinth, Papias of Hierapolis, Polycrates of Ephesus, Clement of Alexandria, and afterwards in Origen, Irenaeus, Tertullian, &c. But it is now no longer possible in many instances to determine how far even the older fathers made use of already existing written authorities. In some cases this can be clearly proved, as in that of the *Acts of Peter and Paul*, which are mentioned as early as the end of the 2nd century. Recent investigations moreover have shown that in large portions of these Acts genuine reminiscences are to be found, though not in reference to the legends themselves, yet in regard to the setting in which they are presented to us, their secular historical background or their geographical and ethnographical scenery (compare especially Gutschmid *Die Königsnamen in den Apocryphen Apostelgeschichten in der Rheinischen Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge*, XIX. pp. 161 sqq. 380 sqq.). Yet, at the same time, all efforts to derive from them any trustworthy particulars as to the actual histories of the Apostles themselves, or to extract from the confused mass of legends any sound historical nucleus, have hitherto proved almost always unsuccessful.

The legends concerning the labours of the Apostles in various countries are all originally connected with that of their separation at Jerusalem, which is as old as the 2nd century. The *Decretum Gelasii* (vi. 37, Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, Halle 1847, p. 220) refers, among *libri rejiciendi*, to one which it describes as "liber, qui appellatur Sortes Apostolorum, apocryphus." This book probably contained, besides the legend itself and an enumeration of the different countries which the Apostles took by lot, some account of the various fates which befel them there. It was a book of Gnostic or Manichean origin, if we may draw any conclusion from the connection in which we find it mentioned in Pope Gelasius's decree. Thilo (*Acta Thomae*, p. 91 sqq.), following St. Augustine (*de Util. Cred. c. 3, c. Adim. c. 17*), derives the whole legend from the Manichees, who are said to have purposely substituted it for the account of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Acts ii. But for proof of this he relies solely on the circumstance that nothing is said of the descent of the Holy Ghost in the *Περίοδος*, while the Apostles are there represented as unacquainted with foreign languages, and their divi-

sion among themselves of the different countries of the earth is said to have taken place immediately after our Lord's Ascension. But the inadequacy of this proof is evident from a comparison of the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, a Syriac work composed towards the end of the 4th century. (See Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, London 1864, p. 24 of the English translation.) In that work the Resurrection and the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit are represented, in accordance with an early tradition, as occurring on the self-same day. After the Lord's disappearance in the clouds, the Apostles retire to their *ὑπερβόαν*, and are at a loss to know how they are to preach the Gospel to all nations while ignorant of their different languages. Peter admonishes his companions to commit their care unto the Lord, whereupon ensues the miracle of Pentecost, and each Apostle receives his own special tongue. Empowered by the gift of the Holy Spirit, they first issue ordinances which shall be binding on all churches and then disperse themselves through the world. From this it is evident that this tradition of the Apostles being in perplexity how they should preach the Gospel to foreign nations does not exclude that of the miracle of the gift of tongues; but, on the contrary, might be employed to suggest a motive for it, even supposing the Manichees had endeavoured to put the miracle of Pentecost in the background. Moreover, the narrative of this miracle in the canonical Book of the Acts, and the enumeration there given of the various nations of the earth whose languages the Apostles spoke, if taken in connection with the command "Go teach all nations," &c. (Matt. xxviii. 19), brings us so near to the legend of the *Sortes Apostolorum*, that we cannot fix the original date of that tradition later than the 2nd century. The tradition varies however, as to the time which elapsed between the Ascension of the Lord and the fulfilment of His injunction (Matt. xxviii. 19) by the Apostles. Thus the Gnostic *Acta Thomae* (Tischendorf, *Act. Apost. Apocr.*, p. 190 sq.), Pseudo-Prochorus (*Acta Joannis*, c. i. in *Biblioth. Patr. Maxima*, ii. p. 46 sq.), and the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum* mentioned above (Cureton l. c.), represent the Apostles casting lots for the various countries of the earth immediately after the Ascension, and each of them forthwith departing to the province assigned him. The same tradition appears to be assumed in the apocryphal work *de Transitu Mariae* (Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, p. 125, and in a different text p. 114), which, placing the death of the Virgin in the second year after the Ascension, relates how the Apostles, as many as were still alive, were miraculously summoned from distant countries to attend her deathbed. Other apocryphal narratives, on the contrary, date their dispersion 24 years after the Ascension (Tischendorf, *Apocal. Apocr. Proleg.* p. xliii), while a tradition widely circulated in the 2nd century told how the Apostles remained by their Master's orders seven or twelve years in Jerusalem, before going forth on their missionary enterprises in the Gentile world. (Seven years is the time fixed in the *Clementine Recognitions*, i. 43, ix. 29; twelve years in Apollonius ap. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 18, and in *Petri et Pauli Predicatio* ap. Clement. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5, p. 762, Potter; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Nov.*

Testam. extra Can. recept. iv. p. 58.) The latter tradition assumes the existence of the legend of the Apostles dividing the countries of the earth by lot. This legend was known not only to Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 1) but perhaps also to Origen (though it remains doubtful how far the citation there made by Eusebius from Origen extends), and is found circumstantially related by Rufinus (*H. E.* i. 9, and in the *Expos. Symb. Apostol.*) and Socrates (*H. E.* i. 19). Compare St. Jerome (*in Jesaiam* 34, iii. p. 279, Martianay) and Nicephorus (*H. E.* ii. 39). Out of this tradition grew, as early as the 2nd century, the so-called διατάξεις or διαταγαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων as well as the διδαχὴ (διδάχα) or διδασκαλία τῶν ἀποστόλων. Notwithstanding the very extensive changes and amplifications which these works have experienced in the course of centuries, we can still find traces of the existence of three distinct original collections, of which the first forms the basis of the first six books, the second of the seventh book, the third of the eighth book of our present Apostolical Constitutions (*Constitutiones Apostol.*, ed. Lagarde, Leipzig and London, 1862).

Inasmuch as all these collections are more or less connected by their contents, it is somewhat difficult to determine their true relation to the Apostolical Constitutions as preserved in Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions. The first six books we still possess in a more ancient form in the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum* (published by Lagarde, Leipsic 1855), in the Abyssinian Constitutions, and in one part of the Coptic collection (published by Tattam, London, 1848). They are attributed to Clemens Romanus, and are addressed to Gentile Christians. Hilgenfeld has attempted to restore the original Jewish-Christian work, which formed the basis of this (*Nov. Test. extra Can. Rec.* iv. p. 79 sqq. Compare also his *Apost. Väter*, Halle 1853, p. 302 sqq.). The basis of the 8th Book of the Constitutions is the treatise περὶ χαρισμάτων attributed to Hippolytus (comp. διατάξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιῶν διὰ Ἱππολύτου, in *Hippolyti Opp.* ed. Lagarde, p. 73). It likewise corresponds to Books iii–vi of the Coptic Constitutions. The seventh book, whose contents stand in close connection with those of the first six books, has an introduction occupying 20 chapters, and consisting of a moralizing treatise concerning “the Two Ways,” which is preserved in part in its original form in the introduction to the Coptic Constitutions. The basis of this treatise is the second part of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas (cc. 18–21). A very ancient recension of this work, already known, according to Lagarde and Hilgenfeld, to Clemens Alexandrinus, is the so-called *Judicium Petri* (κρίμα Πέτρου), or *Duae Viae*, which is edited in Hilgenfeld’s *Novum Testam. extra Canonem receptum* (Fasc. iv. p. 95 sqq.), after Bickell (*Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, Giessen, 1843), Lagarde (*Reliquiae Juris Ecclesiastici antiquissimae*, Vienna 1856, p. 74, sqq.), and Pitra (*Juris Ecclesiastici Graecorum Historia et Monumenta*, tom. i., Rome 1864, p. 75, sqq.). According to this work the Twelve Apostles, before separating for their different spheres of labour in the various countries which they have assigned to themselves, assemble together for the purpose of making common ordinances for the whole of Christendom. Such ordi-

nances and regulations, either attributed to the Apostles themselves and, as here, assigned in groups to one or other among them, or put into the mouth of distinguished apostolical teachers (a Hermas, a Barnabas, an Ignatius, a Clement, or a Polycarp), were in very various forms in active circulation in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The Ebionitic περίοδοι Πέτρου, which were the groundwork of the Clementine Recognitions, are already familiar with three classes of apostolical regulations, the observance of which is incumbent on the Gentile Churches. The first of these contains 30, the second 60, the third 100, such *Mandates* (*Recogn.* iv. 36). One very old collection, not quite identical with any above-named, is the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum*, edited by Cureton, and also by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nona Collectio*, tom. x.), and Lagarde (*Reliquiae Jur. Eccles. antiquiss.*). This contains 27 Canons. The Ethiopic collection contains 38, the Egyptian 79, the Greek in its older form 50, in its later 85 Apostolical Canons. In like manner tradition assigned the composition of the Creed to the Apostles, each Apostle having one article to himself (see Rufinus, *Expos. Symboli Apostol.*, and Pseudo-Augustinus, *Sermo* 115). Besides these there were current during the 2nd century several other works entitled ‘the Preaching,’ ‘Preachings,’ or ‘Doctrine’ (κήρυγμα, κηρύγματα, and διδασκαλία) of Peter, Paul, Thaddaeus, Matthias, or James. These from the first contained both didactic and narrative portions. To this class of writings belonged the Jewish-Christian κηρύγματα Πέτρου, which Hilgenfeld has shown to be the groundwork of the three first books of the Clementine Recognitions, the Catholic κήρυγμα Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου (Hilgenfeld, p. 52 sqq.), the Syriac *Doctrina Addaei* (Cureton, p. 6 sqq.), the Gnostic Παραδόσεις Μαθθίου (Hilgenfeld, p. 50 sqq.), and the Ebionitic ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου (cf. Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16). The Precepts of Peter and Paul (*Petri et Pauli Praecepta*, Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου διατάξεις) still exist in MS in both Greek and Latin texts (*Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T.* tom. ii. p. 932). They are according to Grabe (*Spicileg.* i. 85 sq.) essentially identical with the latter part of the 8th book of the Apostolical Constitutions (c. 32 sqq.). A late recension of the κήρυγμα Πέτρου, which however in this form cannot be dated earlier than the 5th century, has been published in a Syriac version by Cureton (*Anc. Syr. Doc.* p. 35 sqq.). It is entitled ‘The preaching of Peter in the City of Rome.’ After a brief historical introduction the “Preaching” itself follows, which has a somewhat Monophysite colouring, and then the legend (drawn from the Acts of Peter) of the Apostle’s conflict with Simon Magus at Rome, and his martyrdom there along with St. Paul. The book, notwithstanding its later date, is of considerable importance, as being evidently based on very old materials. It proves how closely this kind of literature was connected at an early date with the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. On the other hand these latter (*e. g.* the Catholic *Acta Petri et Pauli*, and likewise the Acts of Bartholomew, Philip, and others) are wont to contain more or less detailed didactic expositions. In a similar way we find in the Jewish-Christian *Journeys of Peter*, περίοδοι Πέτρου, traces of an older work, the *Preachings of Peter*, already mentioned, which consisted chiefly, if not ex-

clusively, of speeches attributed to that Apostle. A critical examination therefore of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles cannot be conducted without taking into account these other works concerning their "Doctrine" or "Preaching."

And we find accordingly that these various "Acts," as well as the *διατάξεις* and *διδαχαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, are wont to take the traditional Parting of the Apostles as their starting-point. This is the case not only with the *Acta Thomae*, but also with the *Historia Joannis* of pseudo-Prochorus, the Greek Acts of Andrew and Matthew, the *Acta Jacobi Zebedaei* in the Apostolical Histories of Abdias, and with the Edessene legend of Thaddaeus. The legends also concerning the assignment by lot of their various provinces to particular Apostles vary considerably, which is the less to be wondered at as the names of the Apostles themselves are not in all such traditions the same. Some, as Thaddaeus and Bartholomew, are reckoned now among the Twelve Apostles, now among the Seventy Disciples. Jude is frequently identified with Thomas, and at a later date with Thaddaeus or with Simon. Elsewhere Nathanael is counted among the Apostles, while Cephas is distinguished from Peter, and Levi from Matthew. (For Thaddaeus compare the *Acta Thaddaei* and *Const. Ap.* vi. 14, with Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13, and the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum* in Cureton; for Bartholomew, the *Acta Bartholomaei* and *Const. Ap.* vi. 14, with the *Acta Philippi*; for Jude-Thomas Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13, the *Acta Thomae*, and the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum*; for Jude-Thaddaeus, the scholion to the Constitutions in Lagarde, p. 282, and pseudo-Hippolytus also in Lagarde, p. 283; in the first place he is also called Judas Zelotes, a name which is also found in the Chronographer of the year 354; for Jude-Simon see pseudo-Dorotheus in the Bonn edition of the *Chronicon Paschale* tom. ii. p. 138; for Nathanael the *Judicium Petri*; for Cephas the *Judicium Petri* and Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* i. 12; for Levi, Heracleon in Clem. *Strom.* iv. 9, p. 595, Potter.) The Apostolical Constitutions (vi. 14), following Matt. x. 2 sq., enumerate the Apostles thus:—Peter and Andrew, James and John the sons of Zebedee, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, James (the son) of Alphaeus (Jacobus Alphaei) and Lebbaeus with the surname Thaddaeus, Simon the Cananite and Matthias; to whom are added James the Lord's Brother and Bishop of Jerusalem, and Paul the Teacher of the Gentiles (*Doct. Gentium*, *δ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος*). The Acts of Thomas follow the catalogue in St. Luke (vi. 14 sq.), differing from it only in calling Simon *ὁ ζηλωτής* but *ὁ καναναίος*; while in substituting for Thaddaeus Jude (the brother) of James (Judas Jacobi) they make two Judes among the Apostles besides Judas Iscariot, viz. Judas Jacobi and Judas-Thomas. The *Judicium Petri* gives the following list:—John, Matthew, Peter, Andrew, Philip, Simon, James, Nathanael, Thomas, Cephas, Bartholomew. Here then Nathanael and Cephas occupy the places of Thaddaeus and James (the son) of Alphaeus. In the *Liber Generationum* (the *Chronicon* of Hippolytus) there is no catalogue of Apostles in the present text. The Chronographer of the year 354 enumerates them as follows:—Peter and Andrew, James and John (the sons of Zebedee), Philip and Thomas, Bar-

tholomew and Matthew, James (Jacobus Alphaei), and Judas Zelotes and Simon the Cananite; the Scholion to the *Constitutions* in Lagarde thus:—Peter and Andrew, James (Jacobus Zebedaei) and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas [and Matthew] James (Jacobus Alphaei) and Thaddaeus-Lebbaeus or Judas-Zelotes, Simon the Cananite and Matthias; pseudo-Hippolytus thus:—Peter, Paul, James (Jacobus Zebedaei), John, Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, Judas Jacobi, Thaddaeus called also Lebbaeus and Judas, James the Lord's brother, Simon the Cananite or *ὁ ζηλωτής*, Matthias; to whom are then added the Evangelists, Luke, Mark, and Philip; pseudo-Dorotheus thus:—Peter, Andrew, James (Jacobus Zebedaei), John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, Judas Jacobi, Simon-Judas, Matthias, Simon *ὁ ζηλωτής*; the catalogue in the *Chron. Pasch.* (ii. 142) entitled *τῶν ιβ' ἀποστόλων αἱ παρίδαι* (?) thus:—Peter and Andrew, James and John the sons of Zebedee, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, Thaddaeus-Lebbaeus, James (Jacobus Alphaei), Matthew-Levi, Simon the Cananite, Simon Zelotes, Judas Iscariot. The Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum* in Cureton gives no complete list of the Apostles; but, in speaking of the division of the respective provinces, it enumerates James (the Lord's brother), Mark, Judas-Thomas, Simon-Cephas, John, Andrew, Luke, Addaeus (Thaddaeus), and his disciple Aggaeus. Several of these lists have no further significance for the critical inquirer, being simply attempts to reconcile the various catalogues given in the New Testament. Such, for instance, is the identification of Thaddaeus with Judas Jacobi (so already Rufinus in *Praef. Comm. Orig. in Epist. ad Rom.*). The assignment moreover of special provinces to different Apostles in the Scholion to the *Constitutions* of pseudo-Hippolytus and pseudo-Dorotheus may in consideration of the late origin of these documents be here left out of account. On the other hand it seems worthy of remark, that in the older catalogues St. Paul's name is either omitted altogether, or added afterwards, as in the Constitutions, by a later hand. In the assignment of the various provinces he is altogether passed over, his peculiar missionary field being given to others, so that no room is left for the operations of the Apostle of the Gentiles. St. Paul indeed, according to the older view, which in this species of literature was adhered to even in later times, did not at all belong to the closed circle and sacred number of the Twelve. Even the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum*, which finds a niche for such disciples of Apostles as St. Luke and Aggaeus, makes only a passing mention of St. Paul, and that first in connection with Timothy, where it relates their journeying together through parts of Syria and Cilicia to impart to the Churches there the laws and ordinances of the Apostles, and once again afterwards towards the end where it speaks of St. Paul's journey to Rome and his martyrdom in that city. His own proper missionary field, Ephesus and all Asia, Thessalonica, Corinth and Achaia, is on the other hand assigned to St. John. It is unquestionable that such a depreciation of the Apostle of the Gentiles would in later times have been quite impossible, had not some very early tradition been equally unfavourable to his claims.

Still less agreement is to be found in respect

to the missionary field of labour assigned to the various Apostles than in respect to their names. Some of these discrepancies arise from simple substitution of one name for another; as when St. Andrew, according to one account, is sent among the Scythian tribes on the borders of the Euxine (Origen ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1), or according to another to Achaia (*Acta Andreae*, Tischendorf p. 105 sq.; *Abdias Hist. Apost.* iii. 2, 25 sq.), or when St. Matthew, who according to the older legend also laboured in Pontus (*Acta Andreae et Matthaei*, Tisch. p. 132 sq., *Acta et Martyrium Matthaei*, ib. p. 167 sq.) is afterwards transferred to Ethiopia (Socrates *H. E.* i. 19; *Abdias Hist. Apost.* vii). Other seemingly discrepant narratives come, on closer inspection, to the same thing: for example, the tradition that St. Thomas laboured in Parthia (Origen ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1; *Clem. Recogn.* ix. 29), and the apparently contradictory statement that he was the Apostle of India (*Acta Thomae*, Tisch. p. 190 sq.). At the same time there are traditions which are really and positively opposed to each other, as for instance the legend of St. Peter's labours in Rome, and the other tradition that the Prince of the Apostles had worked along with St. Andrew and St. Matthew in "the land of the barbarians," i.e. among the non-Greek tribes of the east and south-east of the Black Sea, or in the kingdom of the Cimmerian Bosphorus (*Acta Andreae et Matthaei*, Tisch. p. 151; *Acta Petri et Andreae* in Tisch. *Apocal. Apocr.* p. 161 sq.). The antiquity and credibility of these various traditions respectively is very different.

According to the oldest forms of the tradition, the Apostles divide into three groups: of which the first (Peter and Andrew, Matthew and Bartholomew) is said to have preached in the regions of the Black Sea; the second (Thomas and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Cananite) in Parthia; the third (John and Philip) in Asia Minor. With the exception then of three Apostles—James the son of Zebedee, who early suffered martyrdom in Jerusalem, the other James (Jacobus Alphaei), whom tradition universally confounded with the Lord's brother, and the substitute Matthias, of whom nothing more was known,—we have in these three groups all the Apostles together. They went forth two and two (Mark vi. 7), as is already indicated in the form of the catalogue in Matt. x. 2 sq. (compare also Luke x. 1, where the same command is given to the Seventy). Even the assignment of spheres of labour to the different groups follows the order of names in St. Matthew, except only that the precedence of Matthew to Thomas, which is found in Mark iii. 18 and Luke vi. 15, is here assumed. So we have first Peter and Andrew, then (with the omission of James the son of Zebedee, who was beheaded in Jerusalem) John and Philip, then Bartholomew and Matthew, then Thomas and (with the omission of James identified with the Lord's brother, and therefore supposed to remain behind in Jerusalem) Thaddaeus, and finally Simon the Cananite, for whom St. Matthew's catalogue provided no companion.

(1) The first group consists then of Peter, Andrew, Matthew, and Bartholomew. St. Andrew, who according to a tradition apparently known already to Origen (in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1) laboured in Scythia, is made by another tradition cer-

tainly older than the Gnostic Acts to have worked along with St. Matthew among the Anthropophagi on the Cimmerian Bosphorus (*Acta Andreae et Matthaei*, *Acta et Martyrium Matthaei*, comp. Gutschmid l. c. p. 392) and in "the land of the barbarians" to the east and south-east of the Greek colonies in Pontus. For the preaching of St. Andrew at Sinope there was an ancient local tradition appealing to his chair of white stone, which long continued to be shown in that city (Epiphani. Monachus, ed. Dressel, 1843, p. 47 sq.; and the Greek *Menaea* for 30 Nov.). Other traditions point to Sebastopolis in Colchis, Apsaros, Trebizond, Amasia, Nicaea, and Nicomedia, as having been the seats of this Apostle (Abdias, *H. A.* iii. sq.; pseudo-Dorotheus in *Chron. Pasch.* ed. Bonn, ii. p. 136; pseudo-Hippolytus in *Lagarde Const. Ap.* p. 283; and the Greek *Menaea* for 30 Nov.). The first canonical Epistle of St. Peter leads us by its address into the same region, being directed to the strangers of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia; and the same is the case with the already mentioned Acts of Peter and Andrew, which represent the two brothers as meeting in the land of the barbarians. So likewise the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum* (Cureton, l. c. p. 33) assigns to St. Peter, besides Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, also Galatia and Pontus; and that not only it would seem on the authority of the First Epistle, inasmuch as that epistle does not mention the earlier places. These regions belonged indeed, as well as the city of Rome, which is afterwards referred to, to the missionary sphere of St. Paul, who in this work has no province assigned him in the division made among the Apostles. In the case of St. Bartholomew likewise, his missionary field of labour is not to be sought elsewhere than in the kingdom of the Bosphorus. The Indians, to whom Eusebius makes him journey (*H. E.* v. 10), are simply confounded with the "Sindians," over whom the Bosphorian kings of the house of Polemo bore rule (Gutschmid, l. c. p. 174 sq.). The territory assigned in the Acts of St. Bartholomew to Polymius or Polemius, i.e. Polemo II, king of Pontus and Bosphorus, and then of Pontus and Cilicia, corresponds exactly to the region assigned in the other legend to the Apostles Peter, Andrew, and Matthew; with which agrees likewise the connection marked by the legend in Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 10) between the missionary labours of St. Bartholomew and the diffusion of St. Matthew's Gospel. Armenian local traditions point to the same neighbourhood, making the scene of St. Bartholomew's death to be the city of Areban, Alban, or Albanopolis, in the Greater Armenia, also called Korbanopolis and Urbanopolis (cf. Gutschmid l. c. p. 174, who supposes this to be the Armenian metropolis Erwandashat), while the tradition preserved in the *Acta Philippi* (Tisch. *Acta Ap. Apocr.* pp. 88, 91, 94; comp. the fragment from the pretended Crato in the Appendix to Steph. Praetorius' edition of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, 1595, which is also found in Fabricius l. c. ii. p. 685 sq. 931 sq., Tisch. l. c. proleg. p. lxx.) places it in Lycaonia, a country near to Cilicia, which, for a time formed part of the dominions of Polemo II.

(2) The second group of Apostles is transferred to Mesopotamia and Parthia. Not to speak here of Babylon, from whence the First Epistle of St.

Peter is dated, the local traditions of Edessa lay claim not only to Thaddaeus (Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13, *Doctrina Addaei* and *Doctrina Apost.* in Cureton, and the *Acta Thaddaei* in Tischendorf) but also to St. Thomas (Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13; Assemani *Bibl. Orientalis*, iii. p. ii. p. 34 sq.; Rufin. *H. E.* ii. 5, Abdias *Hist. Apost.* ix. 25; Fiorentini *Martyrol. Hieronym.* p. 147; comp. Thilo *Acta Thomae* p. 105 sq.). To the former (Thaddaeus) is ascribed in the *Acta Thaddaei* (Tisch. p. 263 sq.) five years' missionary activity in Amida on the Tigris, after which he is said to have journeyed through the cities of Syria and to have died a natural death at Berytus. A somewhat different account is given in the *Doctrina Addaei* (Cureton l. c. p. 20 sq.), according to which the Apostle, after many years' work at Edessa, dies in that city. Thomas, on the other hand, is in the *Clementine Recognitions* (ix. 29), and by Origen (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1, if the passage in question be really part of the citation from Origen), said to have preached in Parthia, and, according to the Gnostic *Acta Thomae*, in India, i.e. (as Gutschmid has shown, l. c. p. 162 sq.) in Aria, Drangiana, and Arachosia, over which countries, in the years A.D. 7-29, the Gundaphorus mentioned in the Acts reigned as king, himself deriving his descent from a Parthian dynasty (Gutschmid, l. c.). The bearing of this latter circumstance, however, on the legend of St. Thomas is perhaps of small significance, inasmuch as it is shown by Gutschmid's investigations that the Acts of Thomas are really based on a Buddhist work containing the history of a conversion, the scene of which must have been Arachosia, and its date the times of this Gundaphorus. We can hardly suppose that this Christian recasting of a Buddhist fiction, which implies considerable intercourse between Christian parties and the votaries of Buddhism, could have been already known to Origen. It seems indeed, that the last editor of the *Clementine Recognitions* certainly made use, in the corresponding portion of his work, of "the Book of the laws of the Countries," which was the composition of a disciple of Bardesanes; and yet, although the relations of Bardesanes to Buddhism might make it appear probable that these *Acta Thomae* were already in existence when that book was written, it seems certain that the statement that St. Thomas preached among the Parthians could not have been derived from the same source, but that, on the contrary, we must assume here, as elsewhere, the existence of an earlier Ebionitic tradition (comp. Hilgenfeld, *Clement. Recognitionen und Homilien* p. 310). On the other hand, we have an important statement in Moses of Chorene (ii. 32, 3, p. 144 ed. Whiston), who wrote between A.D. 459 and A.D. 481, and in Suidas (s. v. *ἀντιόχεια*), according to which the city of Edessa was possessed, during the years 91-108, by the Armenian branch of the Parthian dynasty (Gutschmid, p. 171). In any case, the boundary of the Parthian empire must have approached at that time so near to Edessa as to make a journey of the Apostle from thence into Parthia appear sufficiently credible, while the earlier tradition knew certainly as little of a preaching of St. Thomas among the Indians as it did of that of St. Bartholomew. Further, it is to Persia, i.e. the Parthian territory, that the Acts of Simon and Jude in

Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* vi. 7 sq.) assign the missionary activity of those Apostles. Their royal convert Xerxes (or rather Nerseh), who according to the 'Acts' reigned in Babylon, is Vardanes, the son of Artaban III., about whose history the 'Acts' otherwise prove themselves to be well instructed (Gutschmid p. 382 sq.), although the date of their composition certainly falls late in the times of the Sassanidae. Moses of Chorene (ii. 20. 16-21, p. 140 sq.) likewise is acquainted with the legend about Simon, according to which that Apostle preached the Gospel about A.D. 42 in Persia and under a king named Nerseh, and this legend is also connected in the authorities employed by him with that of Abgar king of Edessa. (See Gutschmid p. 381 sq., and article "Gotarzes" in *Allg. Encyclop. der W. und K.*) The fact that Moses of Chorene mentions only Simon and not his companion Judas agrees moreover with the subordinate position which the latter occupies in the Acts of Abdias. There also Simon is the leading person, and Judas remains entirely in the background. The original legend must therefore have named the former Apostle only, and not the latter. The central point of Simon's labours is according to the Acts, as already indicated, the city of Babylon (Abdias vi. 8, 19, 20), whence he issues forth in order to travel in company with Judas through the twelve provinces of the Persian monarchy, and finally to suffer a martyr's death in the city of Suanir (or Suanis, according to the reading in the *Martyrol. Hieronym.*). By Suanir we are to understand (according to the conjecture of Tillemont and Gutschmid) the Suani, a tribe in the northern part of Colchis. Moses of Chorene makes the death of Simon take place in Veriosphora, i.e., as Gutschmid has shown, in the land of the Iberians, on the southern and eastern slopes of the Caucasus, with which agrees the Georgian local legend, which claims Simon for Egrisse, i.e. Colchis. (Cf. Klaproth *Reise in den Kaukasus* ii. 113, Gutschmid p. 383 sq.) In Colchis however the missionary territories of both the Simons, that of Simon Peter and that of Simon Zelotes or the Cananite, would meet or overlap one another, and a series of missionary efforts extending from Babylon to the Caucasus is not a very probable undertaking. There is, on the other hand, no need to derive the legend of the sojourn of Simon Cananites at Babylon from 1 Pet. v. 13, nor to admit the highly improbable supposition that the traditional fame of the great Apostle Simon Peter should have given place to that of his less distinguished namesake. We might more readily find an explanation of this transference of Simon Cananites to Colchis in the assumption that the older tradition of Simon Peter's presence there had gradually fallen into forgetfulness under the influence or the legend concerning his work at Rome, were it not for the evidence afforded (e.g. in the Gnostic Acts of Peter and Andrew, which date from the 3rd century) that the older tradition was not so easily nor so soon displaced. With regard to Babylon, there would be a still greater difficulty in accounting for the confusion between the two Apostles in a similar way by an appeal to the dating in the First Epistle of St. Peter. If the name of the place were understood literally, it would exclude the need of supposing that Simon

Cananites was ever at Babylon, for it pointed to the presence of Simon Peter there; while on the other hand, if it were allegorically interpreted with most of the Fathers, as a designation of the city of Rome, there would remain no further occasion to find an Apostolical substitute for Simon Peter at Babylon. The connection on the other hand, into which the histories of Abdias bring St. Jude with St. Simon, is merely artificial, the product of later reflection. Jude or Judas is, in the older form of the Edessene legend, identified with Thomas (Eus. *H. E.* i. 13; *Acta Thomae* p. 190 sq.; *Doctrina Apostolorum*, p. 33), and in later ones with Thaddaeus; like Thaddaeus, he is often spoken of as one of the Seventy (cf. Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* i. 318, iii. 1. 302, 611; Niceph. *H. E.* ii. 40). Side by side with this we find another legend, similar to that of the *Acta Thaddaei*, which brings the Apostle Jude (Thaddaeus) from Edessa to Assyria, and from Assyria to Phoenicia, and in the latter country makes him suffer a martyr's death (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* iii. 2. 13 sq.).

The conclusion then at which we arrive is this:—The oldest traditions assign to the Apostles Peter, Andrew, Matthew, and Bartholomew, as their sphere of missionary labour, a region to the north of Palestine, extending into the kingdom of the Bosphorus and embracing the whole line of coast to the east and south of the Black Sea, especially Pontus and a portion of Armenia; while to the Apostles Thaddaeus, Thomas, and Simon Cananites, an eastward region is assigned, Thaddaeus being placed in Edessa, Thomas in Edessa and the Parthian empire, and Simon Cananites also among the Parthians and especially at Babylon. It is only necessary to remark that Jews abounded in all these countries, in order to indicate the Jewish-Christian character of such traditions. Besides the region between the Euphrates and the Tigris, in which according to Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 5. 2) innumerable myriads of Jews were to be found, we may refer for the kingdom of the Bosphorus to Gutschmid p. 177, and the inscriptions there cited; for Pontus to Acts xviii. 2; for Sinope in particular, to the fact that it is mentioned as the home of the Jewish translator of the Bible, Aquila (Epiph. *de Pond. et Mens.* 14, and Sifra, Behar i. 9, ap. Grätz *Gesch. der Juden* iv. p. 439, 2nd ed., and Anger *de Onkelo* i. 9). In the Acts of Bartholomew we have simply the story of a Jewish conversion annexed bodily as it stood; for Polemo II. according to Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 7, 3) became, in consequence of his marriage with the Herodian Princess Bernice, a proselyte to Judaism, but afterwards relapsed into heathenism (comp. Gutschmid, pp. 174, 177). The same may be suspected to have been the case with the legendary history of Thaddaeus, if at least the Izates king of Adiabene, mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 2) as a proselyte to Judaism, were really (as Gutschmid assumes, p. 172) the ancestor of the Christian kings Abgar VII. and Abgar VIII.

(3) The third apostolic group is assigned to Asia Minor, and consists of St. John and St. Philip, the former of whom is said to have laboured at Ephesus, the latter at Hierapolis in Phrygia. This tradition in respect to both Apostles was already fixed in the 2nd century, and in regard to St. John is generally held to be sufficiently

accredited. It is at any rate certain that from A.D. 170–180 and onwards the churches of Asia Minor were unanimous in regarding Ephesus as having been the last home and residence of St. John (Apollonius ap. Eus. *H. E.* v. 18; Polycrates of Ephesus, *ib.* iii. 31, v. 24; Irenaeus *Haer.* iii. 3. 4 and elsewhere, Eusebius *H. E.* v. 20, 24). The statement of Irenaeus however, concerning what he had received from the mouth of the aged Polycarp in reference to St. John, rests on a confusion of the Apostle with a presbyter of the same name, who must have lived and taught in Asia Minor and especially in Ephesus, down to the times of Trajan [see however POLYCARP]. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, the contemporary and friend of Polycarp, was probably an immediate disciple of the Presbyter, but certainly not of the Apostle (see his own words in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39, and compare them with Eusebius' remarks thereupon, which give the right interpretation of Papias' language; comp. also Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 36). [PAPIAS.] It was therefore a misunderstanding on the part of Irenaeus which first made Papias, as well as his contemporary Polycarp, an immediate disciple of the Apostle St. John (*Haer.* v. 33. 4). This John, called the "elder" or "presbyter" (i.e. a disciple of Apostles), who was from the close of the 2nd century more and more confounded with the Apostle, is named in an old tradition, as the successor of Timothy in the bishopric of Ephesus. The *Apostolical Constitutions* mention him in close connection with Ariston (or Arisdon), with whom he is also associated by Papias, and reconcile the contradictions in the popular tradition by making him to have been ordained by the Apostle St. John (vii. 46). (Compare the account drawn by Photius, *Bibl.* 254, from the Martyrdom of Timothy.) Abdias also makes the Apostle himself to have been Timothy's successor (*Hist. Apost.* v. 2). And if some scholars of our own time have thrown doubts not only on the prolonged life and labours of St. John at Ephesus extending down to the times of Trajan, but even on the fact of his ever having lived in Asia Minor (so, following the precedent of Lützelberger, quite recently Keim in his *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* I. 160 sq.), their objections seem to be quite overborne by the direct evidence of the Seven Epistles to Asiatic Churches in the Apocalypse, and the testimony there given to his presence in the isle of Patmos, even if it be granted that the Ephesian tradition may have been founded on the statements in that book. It is however certain that the earliest reminiscences of the church in Asia Minor, including those of the episcopate of Timothy at Ephesus, refer to the labours of St. Paul (Keim p. 161) in that region, and that the subsequent obscuration of the memory of the Apostle of the Gentiles by that of the Son of Thunder and Pillar-Apostle (Gal. ii. 10) St. John, was due in great measure to that Jewish-Christian tendency which even sought to exclude St. Paul from his peculiar foundations at Thessalonica and Corinth and in Achaia, and to substitute the memory of the beloved disciple (*Doctrina Apost.*, Cureton I. c. p. 34). The later traditions of the Church followed unsuspectingly these Jewish-Christian fictions, when their original purpose was no longer apparent. Not only Catholic fathers, like Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Ter-

tullian, &c., but also those Gnostic Acts (of which we now possess what is genuine only in fragments, and the rest in forms more or less altered by Catholic manipulation) speak unanimously of the residence of St. John both in Ephesus and Patmos (see *Acta Johannis* in Tischendorf; Prochorus de *Vita Miraculis et Assumptione Joannis*; pseudo-Mellitus de *Passione Joannis*, and Abdias *Hist. Apostol.* lib. v). His banishment to Patmos by Domitian is mentioned first by Irenaeus (*Haer.* v. 30, 3), Clemens Alexandrinus (*Quis dives salvetur* c. 42, p. 959 Potter) and the Gnostic Acts (cf. pseudo-Prochorus), which record the conversion of the whole island by the Apostle. His legendary martyrdom in boiling oil at the command of the same emperor is probably in its origin a Gnostic tradition, the earlier form of which placed the occurrence at Ephesus (Abdias v. 2), while local interests at a later period transferred it to Rome. Pseudo-Prochorus, against the usual tradition, asserts the composition not of the Apocalypse but of the Gospel in Patmos (compare also the pseudo-Hippolytus in Lagarde p. 283), and states that one of the seven deacons who accompanied St. John in all his travels served him on this occasion as amanuensis (pseudo-Prochorus p. 46 sq.). Another but much later author assigns this office directly to Papias, and has the temerity to cite the witness of Papias himself as his authority (compare the table of contents to the Gospel of St. John in a MS published by Cardinal Thomasius, *Opp.* ed. Vezzosi i. p. 344 with Hilgenfeld's observations thereon, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1865, p. 77; and the passage from the *Catena Patrum in Joann.*, edited by Corder, ap. Hilgenfeld p. 79).

As St. John, so also the other Apostle of Asia Minor, St. Philip, has a namesake with whom he is frequently confounded. According to a local tradition mentioned by Polycrates of Ephesus towards the end of the 2nd century (in *Eus. H. E.* iii. 31, v. 24), the Apostle Philip lay buried with two virgin daughters, who had reached a great age, at Hierapolis in Phrygia, while a third daughter who, it seems, had been married (comp. also Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 6, p. 535 Potter), rested at Ephesus. The same tradition is mentioned by Papias (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 39), and somewhat later by Proculus (*Eus. H. E.* iii. 31). In the Montanist controversies these daughters of Philip are referred to as having been prophetesses (Anon. in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17, and Proculus, as before). But in the canonical Acts of the Apostles it is the *Evangelist* Philip who has four daughters that prophesy (Acts xxi. 8), and the suspicion is an obvious one, that it was only the wish of the Church at Hierapolis to be able to fall back on Apostolic authority that led them to confound the Apostle with the Evangelist. This suspicion increases in force when we observe that Proculus also speaks of these prophetic daughters of Philip as four in number. It is moreover so improbable that both Philips should have had prophetic daughters, and that both should have been buried with them at Hierapolis, that the apparent discrepancy as to the number of the daughters between the witness of Polycrates and that of Proculus can hardly be esteemed of any consequence, nor indeed can the further difference that Polycrates relates that one of the daughters lies buried at

Ephesus, Proculus that they all four were resting at Hierapolis. The apparent greater exactness in one of these statements may be simply ascribed to legendary amplification. Yet so universally received was this false tradition at the close of the 2nd century, that the memory of the Evangelist and deacon was already completely lost in or confounded with that of his Apostolic namesake. The Gnostic *Acta Philippi* agree in this respect with the Catholic tradition. According to these Acts the Apostle Philip after making various circuits is crucified at Hierapolis (*Acta Philippi* Tisch. p. 75 sqq., containing however only the conclusion of the original work: fragments from its lost parts are preserved in Abdias lib. x., and the *Acta Philippi in Hellade* ap. Tischendorf, p. 95 sq., belong to one of its earlier sections). These same Acts represent the Apostle as suffering torture along with Bartholomew (one of the Seventy) and his sister Mariamne at Hierapolis, and Philip as actually dying there, while the other two are set free, Bartholomew being some time afterwards crucified in Lycaonia. Another but quite isolated statement is that of pseudo-Hippolytus (Lagarde, p. 283), according to which St. Matthew is burnt to death at (not the Phrygian but the Syrian) Hierapolis. This is evidently a mere confused echo of the legend in the Gnostic *Martyrium Matthaei*.

At least as well attested, in general estimation, as these accounts of St. John at Ephesus and of St. Philip at Hierapolis, are the Antiochene and Roman traditions concerning St. Peter. We have them in a double form, one Ebionite, the other Petro-Pauline. According to the former, which is most closely allied with the Simon-legend, Simon Peter, as Apostle of the true Prophet, meets his unhallowed namesake Simon Magus by the sea-side at Caesarea and follows him from thence through the maritime towns of Phoenicia and Syria as far as Antioch (so the *Clementine Homilies and Recognitions* on the testimony of an earlier work) and afterwards to the great metropolis of Rome, in order to oppose and frustrate by word and miracle his deceptive arts and machinations (so the Ebionite *Acts of Peter*, which formed the groundwork both of the later Catholic and the Gnostic *Acts of Peter and Paul*).

It is now universally acknowledged that under the false Simon of the pseudo-Clementine books we must recognise St. Paul, who even in the *Acta Petri* (Tischendorf, pp. 1-39), after a very careful revision by a Catholic editor, is still plainly discernible through his Simon-mask. For as the legendary fictions invented in the interest of Jewish-Christian schools laid claim to Ephesus and even Thessalonica and Corinth on behalf of St. John, they had yet stronger motives for assigning the two remaining chief theatres of St. Paul's preaching, Syria with its metropolis Antioch, and Rome the final goal of all his labours in the West, to St. Peter as the genuine Apostle of the Gentiles, and to represent him as tearing off the mask from his rival teacher in those two scenes of his most successful efforts and detecting in him the sorcerer and lying prophet.

In later times this Simon-legend, when its true meaning was no longer understood, remained as a recognised possession of the Catholic Church, and the same was the case with the no less widely-

spread story of St. Peter's doings at Antioch and Rome; to which the Corinthian Bishop Dionysius (circ. A.D. 170) adds, on the authority no doubt of older witnesses, a story of St. Peter having also laboured at Corinth (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 25). All these traditions had a common original in the Ebionitic legend, of which in these Catholic adaptations the anti-Pauline point was broken off, by the two Apostles being represented as peacefully teaching, journeying, and suffering martyrdom in each other's company. (Dionysius Corinth. l. c., Irenaeus *Haer.* ii. 3. 2 sq., Gaius presb. Rom. in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 25, Tertull. *Praescr. Haeret.* 36, Origenes in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1). And moreover in the Petro-Pauline reconstruction of the *Acta Petri* St. Paul is even permitted to take part in the conflict with Simon Magus himself (*Acta Petri et Pauli* ap. Tischendorf). The Gnostic Acts are likewise subsequent to this conciliatory recasting of the original Peter-legend (Pseudo-*Linus de Passione Petri et Pauli* in *Bibl. Patr. Max.* ii. p. 67 sq.). The legend of the two-fold episcopate of St. Peter, first in Antioch and then in Rome, belongs also in its origin to the 2nd century, though not expressly asserted by earlier writers than those of the 4th century (for the Antiochene episcopate, see Eusebius *Chron.* an. 2055 Abrah., *H. E.* iii. 36; for the Roman, Euseb. *Chron.* l. c., *H. E.* iii. 4, and the Chronographer of the year 354 ap. Mommsen *Abhandlungen der königl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Philo-histor. Klasse*, 1ter band, Leipzig 1850, p. 634). It is to the latter half of the 2nd century that the date of the oldest catalogue of Roman bishops must be referred, which traces their succession back to the Prince of the Apostles.

Notwithstanding its high antiquity however, this Roman legend concerning St. Peter must be regarded as a mere fiction invented to subserve certain powerful interests; while that other tradition, which points to the "lands of the barbarians" on the shores of the Euxine and to the Jewish communities which were settled there, is not only of equal authority but distinctly preferable, as not being burdened with the like suspicions as to the motive which led to its invention. It can moreover lay claim to an equal antiquity of origin; for though the Gnostic *Acts of Peter and Andrew*, and the *Acts of Andrew and Matthew* so closely connected with them, cannot be referred to an earlier date than the 3rd century, it seems certain that the legend or tradition which forms their groundwork must have been of a much greater antiquity, and the inscription prefixed to the First Epistle of St. Peter distinctly seems to be in its favour.

If then we would ascertain the earliest traditions in respect to the countries in which the Apostles laboured or suffered martyrdom, it is just those very traditionary legends which can be shewn to have existed in the 2nd century and have been generally supposed to be the best attested (as indeed they have received the widest circulation), which we shall have to subject to the most searching criticism. Such must be especially the case with the received traditions concerning the Apostles John, Philip, and Peter. These we must either entirely set aside, or, as in the case of the Ephesian tradition concerning St. John, admit their claims with considerable abatements.

But the like is also more or less the case with other legends concerning the deaths of most of the Apostles. Tradition, since the close of the 3rd century, has uniformly made them all martyrs except St. John, though much divided as to the manner of their deaths. In the case of the beloved disciple likewise, various legendary particulars have been added to adorn the simple tale of his natural departure (comp. John xxi. 23, with the *Acta Johannis* in Tischend. p. 274 sq., Abdias *Hist. Apost.* v. 23, pseudo-Mellitus *de Passione Johannis* ap. Fabric. *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* p. 621 sq., Augustin. *Tractat. in Joann.* 124, Ephraim Theopolit. in Photius *Bibl.* 226). There still remains however one perfectly trustworthy witness from the second half of the 2nd century, according to which at any rate the three Apostles, Matthew, Philip, and Thomas, along with Levi, who is generally identified with Matthew and otherwise quite lost to tradition, all died a natural death (Heracleon in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 9, p. 595 Potter). This witness deserves the more attention, inasmuch as it comes from a Gnostic source, i.e. from one of those circles in which afterwards sprang up the legends of the martyrdom of St. Matthew by fire, the crucifixion of St. Philip, and the impaling of St. Thomas (*Acta et Martyrium Matthaei, Acta Philippi, Acta Thomae*,—all three in Tischendorf). The statement that Philip died a natural death is supported by the local tradition in Phrygia (see ref. above). If indeed the person originally meant in that tradition was not the Apostle but the deacon Philip, the legend of his martyrdom at Hierapolis presupposes the same confusion of the persons whom it is hardly probable that Heracleon knew how to distinguish. It follows then, that the Church, as early as A.D. 170, no longer knew anything of the fate of the actual Apostle Philip. Nor did the Edessene tradition know of the pretended martyrdom of St. Thomas any more than of the violent death of Thaddaeus, whom, as we have already observed, the Greek Acts likewise represent as having died in peace.

Of the history of Jacobus Alphaei nothing more was known in very early times except so far as he was identified with James the Just, who according to a trustworthy account suffered a violent death in a tumultuous time (Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 9, 1; somewhat differently Hegesipp. in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23, and after him Clem. Alex. in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1). Jude the brother of James (Judas Jacobi), who in the lists of the Apostles is only mentioned by St. Luke, is (as already observed) regarded in the older forms of the tradition as the same with St. Thomas.

If therefore we omit James the son of Zebedee, who according to the canonical Book of the Acts (xii. 2) was put to death by Herod, and likewise St. Paul, there remain only Simon Peter, Andrew, Bartholomew, and Simon the Cananite, of whose deaths by martyrdom there could have been any tradition in the time of Heracleon.

The crucifixion of St. Peter is unanimously reported as a fact both by Gnostics and Catholics from the last decade of the 2nd century onwards, and the knowledge of it appears to have been derived from the old Ebionitic source (Orig. in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1, Tertull. *Praescr. Haer.* 36, *Acta Petri et Pauli*, pseudo-Linus, &c.), though handed down to us only in connection with the

Roman tradition, which appears to find some support in the passage in the appendix to the Gospel of St. John (xxi. 18). The Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, written at the end of the 1st or beginning of the 2nd century, contains at any rate nothing certain concerning the martyrdom of the Apostle (c. 5). As to the crucifixion of St. Andrew and St. Bartholomew, the tradition was current in the same Gnostic circles as those in which St. Matthew, St. Thomas, and St. Philip were revered as martyrs. In both cases the alleged localities to which the martyrdoms are assigned, must be taken into account—Patrae in Achaia for St. Andrew, Lycaonia for St. Bartholomew; for St. Andrew never was in Greece at all, and the ancient metropolis of Armenia from very early times disputed the possession of the bones of St. Bartholomew with the Lycaonians. The Acts of St. Bartholomew (preserved in Latin in Abdias *Hist. Apost.* lib. viii., in Greek ap. Tischend. p. 243 sq.), according to which the Apostle was flayed and beheaded, are certainly not older than the 3rd century. Not much later probably are the Acts of Simon and Jude, preserved to us only by Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* lib. vii.), which represent the two Apostles as perishing through a popular tumult in an idol temple at Suanir (or Suanis). Their author must at all events have had the history of Simon before him as an already existing tradition. This Simon is occasionally confounded with Simeon son of Clopas, bishop of Jerusalem, who was crucified in the reign of Trajan at the command of the proconsul Atticus (Hegesipp. in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32; pseudo-Hippolyt., Lagarde p. 284; pseudo-Dorotheus in *Chron. Pasch.* ii. p. 138, ed. Bonn; *Scholion in Const. Ap.* Lagarde, p. 282). The same Apostle in very late accounts is said to have preached the Gospel in Gaza and Eleutheropolis, and thence onwards in Egypt, Africa, Mauritania, and even as far as Britain; and at last to have suffered death by crucifixion in Ostrakina in Egypt (pseudo-Dorotheus l. c., comp. pseudo-Hippolyt. l. c., and Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ii. 40, who transfers what is substantially the same account to Jacobus Alphaei).

As respects their *origin* the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles may be divided into four different classes,—(1) Ebionitic, (2) Gnostic, (3) originally Catholic, and (4) Catholic adaptations or recensions of what were originally Ebionitic or Gnostic documents. The far greater number of the texts preserved to us belong to the fourth class. Only a few of the third class, and those for the most part late works, are now accessible. Of the first and second classes we have but remains and fragments, yet some of those of considerable importance. Nay even the Catholic adaptations have generally come down to us only at third or fourth hand. Few documents in their present form carry us back beyond the 5th century, though the nucleus of most of them is of much earlier date. The Gnostic Acts for the most part date from the second half of the 3rd century at latest; while the Ebionitic and some Catholic adaptations of them cannot be later than the second. And further, since Catholic writers were very apt to borrow from Gnostic sources, and conversely Gnostic writers from Catholic sources, it is often not easy to determine the exact literary relationship between them.

I. *Ebionite Acts of Apostles.* Such apocryphal Acts are mentioned as in use among Ebionite Christians by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 16 sq., 23). Among these the ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου were specially distinguished by their marked anti-Pauline tendency (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16). Remains of this work have recently been supposed to exist in a very ancient fragment now incorporated in the *Clementine Recognitions* (i. 22–74). Hilgenfeld however supposes this piece, which consists of polemical discussions between the Apostles and certain Jewish parties in the Temple at Jerusalem, to be rather a section of some old Petrine *Praedicationes* (κῆρυγμα, or more correctly κηρύγματα Πέτρου) professing to be written by St. Peter himself. Our present sources of information (e.g. *Clementis Epist. ad Jacobum* c. 20 in the Latin text, *Clem. Recogn.* i. 17, *Clem. Homil.* i. 20) certainly show an acquaintance with these κηρύγματα as a pseudo-Clementine writing. They were divided into ten books, the contents of which are preserved for us in *Recogn.* iii. 75, and were worked up in the composition of the three first books of the *Recognitions*. To them were added the old περίοδοι Πέτρου διὰ Κλήμεντος, of which we have two different recastings in the present *Clementine Recognitions* (ἀναγνωρισμοὶ Κλήμεντος, in ten books, published by Gersdorf, Leipzig 1838), and the *Clementine Homilies* (τὰ Κλημέντια) in twenty books (now at length published entire by Dressel, Goettingen 1853, and Lagarde, Leipzig 1865). These works contain addresses of St. Peter and disputations between him and Simon Magus, first in Caesarea and afterwards in other towns of Phoenicia and Syria, and have for their historical framework the family romance of Clement of Rome. To the same Petrine literature belonged the old Πράξεις Πέτρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ, which related the Apostle's conflict with the sorcerer at Rome, Simon Magus's miserable end, and St. Peter's crucifixion. All we now know of this work is derived from its later Catholic recasting in the Πράξεις Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου. But portions of it not contained in these Acts seem to have been made use of in the *Martyrium Petri et Pauli*, called after Symeon Metaphrastes (*Acta SS.* Jun. V. p. 411 sq.). Of Jewish-Christian origin were also the Histories of James the Elder (comp. Clem. Alex. in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 9, and Abdias *Hist. Apost.* lib. iv.), of James the Lord's brother (comp. Hegesipp. in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23), and of St. Matthew (in Clem. Alex. *Paedag.* ii. 1, p. 175 Potter, comp. Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 23). Among other Jewish-Christian histories of the Apostles are probably to be reckoned Acts of St. Andrew, which formed the groundwork of the Gnostic *Acta Andreae et Matthaei*, Acts of St. Bartholomew the basis of the Nestorian *Martyrium Bartholomaei*, perhaps also Acts of Peter and Paul, &c.; but of these very uncertain traces are all that remain to us.

II. *Catholic adaptations of Ebionite Acts.* Among all works of this class, the foremost place must be assigned to the *Acta Petri et Pauli*, Πράξεις Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, Greek and Latin (Thilo, *Acta Petri et Pauli*, Halle 1837, 1838; the Greek text in Tischendorf, l. c. pp. 1–39; the Latin text of the pretended Marcellus in Fabric. p. 632 sq.), in their present form not older than the 5th century, but in their main constituents belonging to the close of the second. They treat in their first section of St. Paul's

journey to Rome, in the second of his dealings with the Jewish-Christians there, and then of the audience of both Apostles before Nero, the overthrow of Simon Magus by their combined action, and their martyrdom together. The conciliatory purpose of the work in its present form is as undeniable as the stern anti-Pauline character of the (Ebionite) original. These Acts, as *Πράξεις Παύλου*, were already known to Origen (*in Joann.* t. xx. § 12). They are reckoned by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 3, comp. 25) among the Antilegomena; and in the catalogues of books of the N. T. of the Codex Claromontanus and of Anastasius Sinaita (Credner *Geschichte des Kanons*, 177, 241) among the Apocrypha of the New Testament. With these Acts was also probably connected the Petropauline *κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, from which Clemens Alexandrinus has preserved numerous extracts (see Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra Canon. rec.* iv. p. 52 sq.). This work is to be carefully distinguished from the Ebionite *κλήρυγμα*.

Lastly, there is the *Martyrium Bartholomaei*, a work in its present form of the 5th century (in *Abd. Hist. Apost.* lib. viii., and in the revised Greek text in Tischend. p. 242 sq.) and of Nestorian origin, but based on a much older narrative, which itself was the adaptation to Christianity of a Jewish tale of conversion. The scene of the narrative is the kingdom of the Bosphorus under Polemo II., with whose history the writer exhibits considerable acquaintance.

III. *Gnostic or Manichean Acts* are frequently mentioned by the Fathers of the 4th century and onwards, as made use of by various Gnostic sects and by the Manichees (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 25; Epiph. *Haer.* xlvii. 1, lxi. 1, lxiii. 2; Philastr. *Haer.* 88; Augustin. *de Actis c. Felic. Manich.* ii. 6, c. Adimant. 17, c. Faust. xxii. 79, c. Advers. Leg. et Proph. i. 20, *Tractat.* in Joann. cxiv; Evodius Uzalensis *de Fide c. Manich.* c. 38; pseudo-Augustin. *de vera et falsa Poenit.* c. 22; Turibius Asturicensis *Epist. ad Idacium et Leporium*, in Fabric. *Cod. Apocr.* ii. p. 754 sq.; Ephraim Theopilit. in Photius *Bibl.* 229; pseudo-Hieron in Fabric. *Cod. Apocr.* i. p. 8 sq.; Gelasii *Decretum de Libr. recip.* c. vi.; Innocent. ep. Rom. *ad Exuperium Epist.* iii [vi]; Photius *Bibl.* 114, 179; Timoth. presb. Constantin. in Fabr. i. p. 138 sq.; pseudo-Athanas. *Synops. Scr. Sacr.*; Nicephor. *Stichom.* ap. Credner *Geschichte des Kanons*, p. 242 sq.; pseudo-Mellitus, or Melito, *de Passione Joannis* in Fabr. iii. p. 604; pseudo-Melito *de Transitu Mariae* ap. Tisch. *Apocal. Apocr.* p. 124 and fr.). As the author of this work, as well as the originator of many Gnostic Gospels, is named a certain Lucius Charinus or Leucius Charinus (Λεύκιος Χαρίνος), who is spoken of as a Manichean. According to Photius, *Bibl.* 114, this work of Lucius Charinus bore the title *τῶν ἀποστόλων περίοδοι*, and contained the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul; in another place (*Bibl.* 179) the Byzantine scholar mentions a collection in use by a Manichean named Agapius, which bore the title *πράξεις τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, and was perhaps identical with the work attributed to Lucius Charinus. At any rate the apocryphal Acts above referred to are by no means the only ones of Gnostic origin. This Lucius Charinus is simply the legendary representative of the whole of this extensive branch of

literature, which certainly did not proceed from a single author. The date of its origin must be carried back to the 3rd century—for the most part rather to the beginning than the end—and in some cases even to the closing decades of the 2nd century. The extensive use made of these writings by the Manichees must not mislead us to attribute their authorship to members of that sect. According to the testimony of Epiphanius, they were largely in use among other heretical parties, and much that still remains to us seems frequently to favour older sectarian opinions, although in our present texts the most characteristic passages have been toned down or removed. Scarcely one of these Gnostic Acts of the Apostles has come down to us wholly untampered with; while on the other hand even in works, which have passed already several times through the reforming hands of Catholic revisers, some of the old Gnostic features, despite all their efforts, are still distinctly traceable. The great abundance of this literature need not surprise us, any more than the extensive use made of it by the Catholics. The original purpose with which these apocryphal writings were composed was that of diffusing a knowledge of the doctrines and customs of the various Gnostic schools, and of setting up against the Catholic tradition another which appealed with no less confidence to the authority of Apostles and their immediate disciples. And yet it was hardly as a sort of rival or additional canon that these writings were presented to the Christian public of those times. They aimed rather at supplying a popular kind of religious reading in the shape of tracts set forth by the Gnostic propaganda, which, professing to contain historical reminiscences from Apostolic times and composed in the credulous spirit of the age, seemed to satisfy the demands of pious curiosity and soon obtained an extensive circulation. Catholic bishops and teachers knew not how better to stem this flood of Gnostic writings and their influence among the faithful, than by boldly adopting the most popular narrations from the heretical books, and, after carefully eliminating the poison of false doctrine, replacing them in this purified form in the hands of the people. That this process of purification was not always complete need not surprise us when we consider how changeable or uncertain on some points was the boundary-line between Gnostic and Catholic doctrines. In general however these Gnostic productions, apart from any more or less marked assertion of heretical dogmas or rules of life, betray their real origin by the overgrowths of a luxuriant imagination, by their highly-coloured pictures, and by their passionate love for mythical additions and adornments in excess even of the popular belief in signs and wonders. The favourite critical canon—"the more romantic the more recent in origin"—does not hold good as against this branch of literature, in which exorcisings of demons, raisings of the dead, and other miracles of healing or of punishment, are multiplied endlessly. The incessant repetition of the like wonders baffles the efforts of the most lively imagination to avoid a certain monotony, interrupted however by dialogues and prayers, which not seldom afford a pleasant relief, and are sometimes of a genuinely poetical character. There is withal a rich appa-

tus of the supernatural, consisting of visions, angelic appearances, voices from heaven, speaking animals, and demons, who with shame confess their impotence against the champions of the truth; unearthly streams of light descend, or mysterious signs appear, from heaven; earthquakes, thunders, and lightnings terrify the ungodly; the elements of wind, and fire, and water minister to the righteous; wild beasts, dogs, and serpents, lions, bears, and tigers, are tamed by a single word from the mouth of the Apostles, or turn their rage against the persecutors; dying martyrs are encompassed by wreaths of light or heavenly roses and lilies and enchanting odours, while the abyss opens to devour their enemies. The devil himself is often introduced into these stories in the form of a black Ethiopian, and plays a considerable part. But the visionary element is the favourite one. Our Lord often appears to His servants, now as a beautiful youth, and again as a seaman, or in the form of an Apostle; holy martyrs return to life to manifest themselves, at one time to their disciples, at another to their persecutors. Dreams and visions announce beforehand to Apostles their approaching martyrdom, or to longing souls among the heathen the fulfilment of their desires. All this phantastic scenery has been left, for the most part, untouched by Catholic revisers, and remains therefore in works which in other respects have been most thoroughly recast. Yet was it only in very rare cases that these romantic creations of fancy were themselves the original object in view with the writers who produced them. That object was either some dogmatic interest, or, where such retired into the background, an ascetic purpose. Many of these narratives were simply invented to extol the meritoriousness of the celibate life, or to commend the severest abstinence in the estate of matrimony. On this point Catholic revisers have throughout been careful to make regular systematic alterations, now degrading legitimate wives to the position of concubines, and now introducing objections connected with nearness of kin or other circumstances which might justify the refusal or the repudiation of a given marriage. But where merely the praise of virginity was concerned, the views of Catholics and Gnostics were nearly identical, except that the former refused to regard the maintenance of that estate as an absolute or universal moral obligation.

Different recensions of the same texts, or here and there isolated fragments preserved in quotations by the Fathers, enable us to make some instructive comparisons, and afford a clue, by the help of which we may follow out the method whereupon later editions and recensions were constructed. Where texts differ, the shorter one is almost invariably the more recent. Narratives, which appeared on any grounds objectionable, were commonly abridged, and that often in a way which rendered them simply unintelligible.

The Gnostic Acts, of which we still have some certain knowledge, are the following:—

(i) ACTA PETRI (πράξεις or περίοδοι Πέτρου), dating perhaps from the end of the 2nd century, a Gnostic recasting of Catholic Acts, attributed to the authorship of Linus the disciple of Apostles. The conclusion of this work is still

preserved in a superficial Catholic redaction of the 5th or 6th century, which also bears the name of Linus and is entitled *Passio Petri*. (A Latin translation will be found in the *Bibl. Patr. Max.* ii. p. 67 sq.; the Greek text is still only in MS.) It must not be confounded with another book bearing the same title, the composition of pseudo-Abdias (*Acta SS.* Jun., v. p. 424, sqq.). The Gnostic prayers attributed to St. Peter, which are left nearly in their original form, are important for the knowledge of Gnostic doctrines. Further remains of this work are preserved in a more or less altered shape in pseudo-Hegesippus (*de Excid. Hierosol.* iii. 2), in the Acts of Nereus and Achilleus (*Acta SS.* May iii. p. 7 sq.), in various citations made by Fathers, in some additions in the present text of the Catholic Acts, and in another Catholic edition of the Acts of Peter, which was used by Johannes Malala, Anastasius Sinaita, Nicephorus Callisti, and Cedrenus.

(ii) ACTA PAULI. These likewise pretend to be written by Linus: their concluding section, which treated of the Apostle's martyrdom, has been put into fresh shape in the *Passio Pauli*, and attached to the *Passio Petri* mentioned above (the Greek text is contained in the same MS., the Latin in *Bibl. Patr. Max.* ii. p. 70 sq.). Another portion of these *Acta Pauli*, containing the history of the veil of Perpetua or Plautilla, has found its way, in a somewhat different recension, into some MSS of the Catholic *Acta Petri et Pauli*. These Acts formed originally, along with the *Acta Petri*, a far more comprehensive and important whole. The legend contained in this work, and the persons therein named, meet us again and again in subsequent ecclesiastical traditions.

(iii) ACTA JOHANNIS. Remains of these have been collected by Thilo (*Fragmenta Actuum S. Johannis a Leucio Charino conscriptorum*, Halle 1847). An extract from these Acts, made by Catholic hands, yet retaining numerous traces of the Gnostic original, and embracing only a very small part of the entire work, has been edited by Tischendorf from two MSS (*Acta Apost. Apoc.* p. 266 sq.). A much more thorough Catholic recasting of these Acts, based on an old Latin version, is found in pseudo-Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* lib. v). From the same source as this last is derived pseudo-Prochorus, *de Vita Miraculis et Assumptione S. Johannis*, a Latin *rifacimento* of what in the Greek text exists only in MS (comp. Thilo, *Acta Thomae* p. lxxvii. sq.), the περίοδοι Ἰωάννου συγγραφείσαι παρὰ Προχόρου (*Bibl. Patr. Max.* ii. p. 46 sq.), and pseudo-Mellitus (Melito), *de Passione S. Johannis* (in Fabric. l. c. iii. p. 604 sq.). Of these three texts that in Abdias comes the nearest to the original work (in its Latin dress). Pseudo-Mellitus, who from chap. 14 onwards presents quite the same text as pseudo-Abdias, has greatly abridged the earlier portions (cc. 4–13), and the conclusion (cc. 22, 23), which in Abdias still contain much Gnostic matter. Pseudo-Prochorus has likewise still some literal points of agreement with Abdias (compare cc. 8–11 of the Latin text of Prochorus with Abdias v. 2), but the great part of his narrative is occupied with accounts of St. John on the isle of Patmos, which are omitted by the others. A comparison of the concluding words in the Latin Prochorus with the commencement

of the narrative in Mellitus shews that both pieces originally constituted one whole. This, in the one work, is attributed to the authorship of Prochorus, one of the seven deacons and presumed companion of St. John; while for the other, the Catholic redaction, Melito of Sardis is made to lend his name.

(iv) ACTA ANDREAE. These, like the fore-mentioned Gnostic Acts, are often referred to by the Fathers, and were circulated among the Gnostics themselves in various editions. The oldest portions of them consist of the 'Acts of Andrew and Matthew among the Anthropophagi' (*Acta Andrae et Matthaei*, not *Matthiae* as is read in some MSS), and the closely allied work, the 'Acts of Peter and Andrew in the Land of the Barbarians' (*Acta Petri et Andrae*). Of these two the former is preserved to us in a Catholic recension, which is imperfect towards the end, the latter only in fragments, but both in Greek (Thilo, *Acta SS. Apost. Andrae et Matthiae*, Halle 1847; the same in Tischendorf, *Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 132 sq.; and *Acta Petri et Andrae* in Tisch. *Apocal. Apocr.* p. 161 sq.). The foundation of these Acts consisted in a legend known in Jewish-Christian circles, and probably already committed to writing. Based upon them is the Anglo-Saxon poem *Andreas and Elene*, edited by Jacob Grimm, Kassel 1840. A misunderstanding as to the land in which the Apostle is here said to have suffered martyrdom gave occasion for the pretended *Epistle of the Presbyters and Deacons of Achaia concerning the Passion of Andrew*, which has come down to us in a Catholic recension, much abridged towards the beginning, and in both the Greek and Latin texts (Greek in Woog *Presbyt. et Diacon. Achaiae de Martyrio S. Andrae Epistola Encyclica*, Leipsic 1747, and Tischendorf *Act. Apost. Apocr.* p. 105 sq.; Latin in Surius on 30 Nov. and elsewhere, and in a partially more complete excerpt in pseudo-Abdias *Hist. Apost.* iii. 35 sq. Fragments of the original text are found in Evodius de *Fide c. Munich.* c. 38, and in pseudo-Augustin. *de Vera et Falsa Poenit.* c. 22.). In order to combine and reconcile these two pieces another fiction was devised, the *περίοδοι Ἀνδρέου*, containing the narrative of St. Andrew's Journey from Pontus to Greece; this is referred to by Philastrius (*Haer.* 88) as a Gnostic invention, in contradistinction to other Gnostic *Acta Andrae* (the *Martyrium*). Pseudo-Abdias has preserved some excerpts of it (*Hist. Apost.* iii. cc. 3-34). We have a Catholic *rifacimento* of the Acts of St. Andrew (both the *Acta Andrae et Matthaei* and the *Martyrium*) in the *Vita Andrae* of the Monk Epiphanius (Epiphani *edita et inedita*, cura A. Dressel, 1843).

(v) ACTA ET MARTYRIUM MATTHAEI, a continuation of the former *Acta Andrae et Matthaei*, describing the completion of the work commenced by St. Andrew among the Anthropophagi by his fellow Apostle St. Matthew, and the death of the latter by a fire martyrdom. The Greek text, which is still preserved (Tischendorf, *Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 167 sq.), has been only slightly revised. The old Gnostic element is still very apparent, especially in the prayers. A Catholic excerpt is given by Nicephorus *H. E.* ii. 41.

(vi) ACTA THOMAE, one of the most famous among the Gnostic Apostolical histories. The

former half is preserved almost entirely in its original form (Greek text in Thilo *Acta Thomae*, Leipsic 1823, and Tischendorf *Act. Apost. Apocr.* p. 190 sq.). The Gnostic speeches and prayers which it contains, and which have hardly been tampered with by Catholic hands, have been submitted by Thilo to a learned and acute examination, who comes to the conclusion that they exhibit traces of alterations under Manichean influences—a point which perhaps admits of dispute. Of the latter half we have the conclusion containing the *Martyrium* in a short Greek extract (*Consummatio Thomae* in Tischendorf l. c. p. 235 sq.). An abstract embracing the whole work is found in Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* lib. ix), which for the mid-portions of the work (cc. 8-16 in Abdias) is still our only authority.

(vii) ACTA PHILIPPI. Of these, which are seldom mentioned by the Fathers, only fragments have come down to us. The *Martyrium of Philip* (*Acta Philippi* in Tisch. *Act. Apost. Apocr.* p. 75 sq., *Apoc. Apocr.* p. 141 sq.), forms according to a note in the MS only a part of the original work "from the 15th Act to the end." Of the Greek text we possess various recensions which have been more or less subjected to revision. Abstracts made from them by Anastasius Sinaita and in various Greek Menologies have been collected by Tischendorf (*Act. Apost. Apocr.* proleg. p. xxxi. sq.). The Vatican MS (mentioned in the *Acta SS.* May, i. p. 8 sq., but which has remained unedited) appears to contain further remains from that part of the work which immediately preceded the 15th Act. Besides this we have yet another fragment entitled *Acta Philippi in Hellade* (Greek text in Tisch. *Act. Apost. Apocr.* p. 95 sq.), which relates the Apostle's conflicts with Greek philosophers and with the High Priest of the Jews who had himself come to Greece for the purpose and suffers a miraculous punishment for his obstinate unbelief. The stories of miracles in the Greek Menaea seem to have been derived from these Gnostic Acts. These are adopted in part for the feast of the Apostle on 1 May in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and the rest reserved for the 6 June, the festival of the deacon Philip. In the *Martyrium* edited by Tischendorf we find, besides St. Philip, the Apostles John and Bartholomew and Mariamne sister of the latter, appearing on the scene. The statements in reference to Bartholomew (pp. 88, 91, 94) appear to point to the

(viii) ACTA BARTHOLOMAEI, the scene of which lay in Lycaonia. These Acts probably stood in a similar relation to those of Philip, as the *Acta Matthaei* to those of St. Andrew. Yet hitherto no trace of them has been discovered, except it be in a fragment published by Steph. Praetorius (Fabric. *Cod. Apocr.* ii. p. 685 sq., iii. p. 931 sq.), and attributed to the authorship of Crato, a disciple of Apostles.

(ix) ACTA PAULI ET THECLAE; written according to the testimony of Tertullian by a presbyter in Asia "out of love to Paul." The author, who must have lived in the 2nd century, was deposed from his ecclesiastical rank on account of this writing (*Tert. de Bapt.* 17, "sciant in Asia presbyterum qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum, atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse loco decessisse"). Tertullian

mentions, as special matter of offence, the rights given to women to preach and baptise after the example of Thecla. But still more objectionable perhaps was the Gnostic character of these Acts, which is discernible even in the present text, although the greater part of what was opposed to Catholic faith or practice, such as the fable of the baptised lion (still found by Jerome, *Vir. Ill. c. 7*), has been carefully removed. Of other doubtful stories, such as the appearance of our Lord in the form of St. Paul, as Thecla throws herself into the pool for the purpose of baptism, there remains now only a brief indication. But throughout the work its Gnostic origin betrays itself in the implied rejection of marriage, and in the commendation of total abstinence from all sensual indulgences by the example of St. Paul and Thecla. The groundwork of the fiction appears to have been a local legend, and the Queen Tryphaena, who is also a relation of the Emperor, was, as Gutschmid's investigations have established, a historical person, who seems really to have lived at the time when St. Paul travelled through Pisidia and Lycaonia (Gutschmid, *l. c.* p. 177 sq.). Notwithstanding the author's deposition from his ministry, the history of Thecla was universally welcomed in Catholic circles, frequently re-edited and often used as a subject of homiletic discourse. (Comp. the passages collected in the *Acta Sanctorum* for September, vi. p. 546 sq., in Grabe *Spic. Patr. i.* p. 87 sq., and in Tischendorf *Act. Apost. Apocr. proleg.* p. xxi. sq.) Founded upon it are the writing of Basil of Seleucia de *Vita et Miraculis S. Theclae*, (ed. Tiletanus, Antwerp 1608), and the *Acta Pauli et Theclae* of Simeon Metaphrastes (in Tiletanus, *l. c.* p. 250 sq.). The Greek texts which have come down to us give the impression (even in the case of the longer recension) of a frequently abrupt excerpt (in Tischendorf, *l. c.* p. 40 sq.).

(x) ACTA BARNABAE; first published by Papebroch (*Acta SS. Jun.*, ii. p. 431 sq.) from a Vatican MS, and afterwards by Tischendorf (*Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 64 sq.), who makes use in addition of a Paris MS. The text of these Acts is Greek. They profess to be written by John Mark, and treat of the journeyings together of the two Apostles Paul and Barnabas, their strife concerning Mark and consequent separation, Barnabas' missionary work in Cyprus, his martyrdom there, and the subsequent removal of his companion, Mark, to Alexandria. The present text, a few expressions only (near the commencement) excepted, contains no indications of a Gnostic origin, but is evidently nothing but an excerpt from a larger work. The original Acts could hardly have been older than the second half of the 3rd century, and the present text must have been written before the year 478, when the bones of Barnabas are said to have been discovered (Cedrenus *Hist. Compend.* p. 618 sq. ed. Bonn); for according to these Acts St. Barnabas was burned, and nothing remained of his body but ashes. The *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, ascribed to a Cypriot monk named Alexander (*Acta SS. Jun.* ii. p. 436 sq.), is a very late and worthless compilation made in the interest of the Milanese Church.

IV. Catholic reconstructions of Gnostic Acts have been frequently discussed already. We may here add to those mentioned above the

"Apostolical Histories" of the pretended Abdias [ABDIAS] (*Historia Certaminis Apostolici*, Fabricius *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* II. p. 402 sq.), of which certain parts have been frequently circulated as distinct works and under different names. The whole work, written in Latin in the second half of the 6th century, is a compilation from very various sources. Great use is made of Gnostic Acts, not in their original form, but in Latin translations of Catholic revisions. Such is specially the case with the histories of Peter, Paul, Andrew, John, Thomas, and perhaps also with that of Philip. We may also refer here to the biographies of the Apostles attributed to Simeon Metaphrastes (about the 10th cent.). Though they were written in Greek, the existing printed texts are for the most part Latin translations, e.g. in the *Legendarium* of Mombritius (1474), the *Vitae Sanctorum* of Lipomannus (1551 sq.), in Surius (1569 sq.), and (partially) in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists. These biographies go back in many instances to Gnostic sources, and Gnostic Acts were at any rate mediately used by the Church historian Nicephorus Callisti (*H. E.* ii. 36 sq.) and the Byzantine chroniclers.

V. Acts originally Catholic. Of these very few remain. Besides the already mentioned *Acta Bartholomaei*, which are of Nestorian origin, and are probably based on an older Jewish-Christian work, we may name the following:—

(i) DOCTRINA ADDAEI; in Syria, published by Lagarde (*Reliquiae Juris Eccles. Antiquiss.*), and Cureton (*Anc. Syr. Documents*, London 1864, with an English translation, p. 6). This work treats of the legend of Abgarus, and the missionary labours of Thaddaeus (Addaeus) and his disciple Aggaeus in Edessa, and must be carefully distinguished from the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, which in one MS. is bound up with it. It was written towards the end of the 3rd or in the beginning of the 4th century, but its groundwork must be much older, and it is not without importance for the history of the Canon of the New Testament. Much less original, and yet written before the middle of the 4th century, are the Greek *Acta Thaddaei* (in Tischendorf, *l. c.* p. 261 sq.), which already show acquaintance with the legend of the miraculous impression of the Lord's countenance on the handkerchief—a celebrated relique formerly in possession of the Edessenes. [ABGAR.] (On a method of fixing the *terminus ad quem* for the composition of these Acts by means of the interpolated glosses which they contain, compare Gutschmid, *l. c.* p. 171.) A late redaction of the same legend is found in Simeon Metaphrastes (Latin in Lipomann. *Sanctor. Hist.* i. 189; Greek in Combefis. *Orig. Constantinop. Manip.* Paris 1664, p. 75 sq.). The account given in Moses of Chorene was drawn from an Armenian version of these Acts, which has been lately rediscovered.

(ii) ACTA SIMONIS ET JUDAE. These Acts, professedly composed by one Crato, a disciple of the Apostles, are given in excerpt by pseudo-Abdias (vi. 7 sq.). The two Apostles are there represented as opposing Manichean doctrines in the person of two magicians, Zoroës and Arfaxat. The historical framework of the Acts is derived from the actual history of the Parthian empire about the middle of the 1st century after Christ. This appears to indicate a high antiquity

in the original legend, and perhaps the existence of an older Jewish-Christian work containing it, which possibly had passed through Gnostic hands before being made the basis of the present text. The latter conjecture is suggested by the romantic character of some of the details, the miracle of the speaking infant, the tamed tigers, &c.

Finally, the latest among all these apocryphal Acts of Apostles are the

(iii) ACTA MATTHAEI in Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* vii.) composed about the middle of the 6th century. To assume the existence of any earlier nucleus for these Acts is out of the question, inasmuch as Aethiopia, the country in which their scene is laid, became acquainted with Christianity not earlier than the time of Athanasius (Rufinus *H. E.* i. 9). Their historical framework moreover is that of a late period; while, as we have seen, in the case of other legendary histories, it is wont to be of a much earlier date. Here it points to the time of King Elesbaas, who about the year 524 conquered the Sabaeans; though the names of other kings, Aeglippus (Aglebā, Aglebāl) and Beor (Bawaris) are borrowed from a much older Aethiopian dynasty (Gutschmid, l. c. p. 386 sqq.). These Acts, as they appear in the work of Abdias, are connected in a certain way with the Acts of Simon and Jude before mentioned, a connection which may be due to their author himself. [R. A. L.]

ACUANITAE. [ACUAS.]

ACUAS (*ʿAkōbas*), an early teacher of Manicheism, who is said to have come from Mesopotamia, and introduced the heresy into Etheuthropolis. The Manicheans were sometimes named after him Acuanitae (*ʿAkōvanītai*). Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.* lxi. 1) calls him a veteranus, and places the rise of his followers in the fourth year of the reign of the emperor Aurelian (A.D. 273). [E. B. C.]

ACYLAS. [AQUILA.]

ACYLLINUS. [AQUILINUS.]

ADALARIUS (Athalarius, Adelherius, Adelherus), a priest who accompanied St. Boniface in his expedition to Frisia in 754, and shared with him the glory of martyrdom. See Willibald's account in *Act. SS. Boll.* Jan. 1, 471. His body was translated from Utrecht with that of St. Eoban to Erfurt, and buried in the monastery of St. Mary. In the breviary of Erfurt he is commemorated with a double rite on April 20, as *Episcopus et Martyr*. The title of bishop seems to be a baseless assumption, but it probably gave rise to Baillet's statement, which rests apparently on no historical foundation, that Adalard was the first and only bishop of Erfurt, the see after his death being united to that of Mainz. See Herschen, *Analecta Bonifaciana*, *Act. SS. Boll.* Jun. 1, 494. Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, ii. Jun. 58, and iv. *Index Topog.* 93. See also ADALHARD. [C. D.]

ADALBERT, a prince of the royal race of Northumbria, who devoted himself about the year A.D. 740 to missionary exertions in Holland. Selecting the neighbourhood of Egmond as the scene of his labours, he devoted himself with much zeal to the work of spreading the faith among the heathen Frisians, and after his death was long held in veneration by the inhabitants as their spiritual father. An imper-

fect life of him is given in Mabillon, *Act. Bened.* iii. 586. [G. F. M.]

ADALBERT, S. (1) (Teut. "nobly bright," Engl. forms Ethelbert, Albert), a deacon, commemorated June 25. The Bollandists give his acts written by the monks of Egmond and Mettoch. According to these he was a disciple of St. Egbert, and was by him sent into Germany with St. Willebrord and ten others, A.D. 690. He accompanied St. Willebrord when the latter was sent by Pepin of Heristal into Frisia, and there died. His body was preserved at Egmond, and a church and monastery were founded there in his honour by Theodoric II. For a discussion of the statement of Marcellinus that he was son of St. Oswald, king of Deira, see Le Cointe, iv. 392-394. According to him he was present at the Synod of Utrecht in 702, and died in 705, Baillet (Juin, p. 310), considers the Acts very corrupt. (*Act. SS. Boll.* Jun. v. 94-110; Mabillon, *Act. SS. Ben.*, i. 631-646.)

(2) Count of l'Ostrevant, commemorated on April 22. He married Regina, niece of King Pepin, with whom he dedicated himself to a life of devotion, alms-giving, and good works. From the documents of the church of Denain we learn that they founded the monastery at that place, where their remains rest above the high altar. They are said to have had ten daughters. The exact date of their death is not known, but they flourished about the middle of the 8th century. *Act. SS. Boll.* April, iii. 73.

(3) A soldier, father of Werinbert, a monk of St. Gall. This Werinbert supplied materials for the first part of his work, to the anonymous monk of St. Gall, who, late in the 9th century, wrote on the personal history of Charles. At Werinbert's death the author takes up the narrative from his youthful recollections of Adalbert's stories about his campaigns against the Huns, and Saxons, and Slaves, when he served before 800 under Keroldus, brother of Queen Hildegardis. He describes Adalbert as a secular man, and little versed in literature, and confesses that he was a reluctant pupil. The old man's perseverance in repeating his tales has been the means of preserving to us some interesting particulars about Charles's expeditions, whatever may be their historical value. *Monumenta Carolina*, in *Rib. Rev. Germ.* iv. 666, 667. [C. D.]

ADALGISILUS, also written Adelgisus, "Dux Palatii;" appointed in 632 guardian of Sigebert, King of Austrasia in his childhood. *Act. SS. Belg.* ii. 354, 367, and Ghesquier's note, p. 368. [C. D.]

ADALGISUS (Teut. = noble pledge). (1) i. q. St. Grimo, abbat of Tholey, q. v.

(2) or ALDGILSUS (Baeda lib. v. c. 19), a king of Frisia in 678, when St. Wilfrid touched those shores on his way to Rome. Though it is not stated that he was himself baptized, he gave St. Wilfrid every facility for converting his people, and indignantly refused Ebroin's offer of a peck of gold coin in return for the saint or his head. Tearing the letter into fragments, and throwing them into the fire, he sent back the answer, "So may the Maker of the world utterly cut off his reign and life, who breaks plighted faith with a friend." It is thought that Adalgisus gave Dagobert of Austrasia permission to build a monastery in his territory. Mabill. *Ann.* i. 540; *Batavia Sacra*, p. 25. For

what is known and conjectured further on the history of this king—there written Aldegillus—in obscure and vexed period, see Urbo Emmius, *Re. Frisicar. Hist.* pp. 48–50.

(3) or ADELCHISUS, son of Desiderius the last king of Lombardy and his wife Ansa, associated with his father in the government soon after his succession. He assisted his father in building, in 759, the monastery of Brescia for his sister Ansilberga. Gisla, the daughter of Pepin and Bertrada, was destined for him, but the marriage did not take place. That it was entertained is a proof to Mabillon that Gisla was not yet tied by monastic vows. The strong opposition of Stephen IV. to her brother's Lombardic matrimonial alliance (Gibbon, vi. 155, ed. Milman) was perhaps sufficient to make void the proposal; though, see Mabill. *ubi infra* after Eginhard. At the descent of Charles into Italy in 773, when Desiderius was being blockaded in Pavia, Adalgisus went to Verona with Autchar a Frank, and the wife and sons of Carloman. They were kindly received by Charles, but from that time history is silent about Adalgisus. Mabill. *Ann.* ii. 226. [C. D.]

(4) ADELGISUS, Duke sent by Charles in 782 against the Vandals, and treacherously cut off by some rebellious Saxons. Krantzii *Re. German. Script.* ii. 38. [C. D.]

ADALGUDIS, co-founder with her husband Grimo in 697 of a nunnery at Limours dio. Paris (if this not Limeux dio. Bourges is Lemansum Gall. Chr. vii. 421). See the charter of foundation with her subscription in Mabill. *Ann.* i. 704. A *placitum* of Childebert III. in 703, vindicating the property of this convent, of which Adalgudis, then a widow, was an inmate, against the claims of one Aigatheus, may be seen in *Gall. Chr.* vii. Instr. p. 4. [C. D.]

ADALHARD (ADELHARD, ADELARD). (Teut.=nobly, stern). S. abbat of Corbie. His long life, 753–826, forms a link of connection between the 8th and 9th ages; though the most stirring scenes of his life took place shortly before its close, his prominence during the last 25 years of the 8th century demands that his biography should be included in the present work.

The original materials available for our information are—1. A life written by Paschasius Radbert, his disciple, in a flowing style, and overlaid with rhetorical embellishments. 2. There is a more succinct account by Gerard, monk and cellarer of Corbie in the 11th century, afterwards abbat of La Seauve, in Guienne, compressed from the diffuse life by Paschasius, with the object of presenting Adalhard's acts in an historical form. 3. Gerard's book on the posthumous miracles of S. Adalhard, with a continuation by an anonymous monk of Corbie, adds little or nothing of value. 4. A memoir of Adalhard's last years is included in the '*Translatio S. Viti*' in Jaffé's *Bib. Re. German.* i. pp. 7–11.

Adalhard had all the natural advantages of noble birth and high abilities. His father was Count Bernard, son of Charles Martel. He was thus cousin-german to Charles the Emperor. He was born in Artois, perhaps at a village called Huise (Hustia), near Audenarde. Brought up at the Courts of Pepin, Carloman, and Charles, he might have shone as a courtier, but he became disgusted at the prevalent vices, and made

Charles' rejection of his Lombard princess Ermengarde an excuse for retiring to Corbie, a Benedictine abbey on the Somme, a few miles above Amiens, where he took monastic vows about 773. There he was entrusted with the care of the garden, but his earnest desire was seclusion, and as he could not escape at Corbie from the frequent visits of his relations, after two years he retired to Monte Cassino. Thence he was soon recalled by the importunity of Charles, and his subsequent attempt to lead a recluse's life at Corbie was frustrated by the abbot Nordram compelling him to share in the government of the monastery; the duty of instructing and directing the monks falling to his share. In these duties he was eminently successful. His eloquence and wisdom procured him the name of Aurelius Augustinus, while Alcuin addresses him as Antonius (Alc. *Epp.* cvii.). It is uncertain at what date precisely he became abbat of Corbie. He was allowed to remain there, quietly performing his duties till 796, when Charles obliged him to mingle in state affairs, and sent him into Italy as chief minister to his son Pepin. In this capacity he won high fame for practical wisdom and strict integrity. Pope Leo III. treated him with an intimacy, says Gerard, such as had been extended to no Frank before by the popes. It is not improbable, considering his relationship to Charles, that Adalhard had some hand in arranging the coronation in St. Peter's basilica on Christmas day, 800. In 809 he was sent by Charles to Rome with another abbat and two bishops. The object of this journey was to obtain the Pope's consent to the decisions of a council which Charles had summoned at Aachen in the spring of the same year on the subject of the Procession of the Holy Ghost (Robertson, *C. H.* ii. 171–173). See the curious dialogue held between the Pope and the Missi, in Mansi *Concil.* xiv. 18. At Pepin's death in 810, Adalhard acted as guardian to his son Bernard, then a boy of 12 years. As a proof that this position of authority was distasteful to him, immediately on Charles' death in 814 he returned to Corbie. He was present the same year at the Council of Noyon. His disgrace followed immediately afterwards. It has been attributed to very various causes. It is stated (Robertson, ii. 251), that with his brother Wala he had tried to induce Charles to nominate Bernard as his successor in the place of Louis. Others say that they took part in the actual conspiracy of Bernard, a supposition, says Baillet, amply disproved, since the conspiracy was not detected till two or three years after the dismissal of Adalhard and the compulsory monasticism of Wala. The hagiologists attribute all to the malicious calumnies of political enemies. Louis' ample public apology on their restoration may favour this view. According to the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, Louis' courtiers painted Adalhard as an ambitious demagogue, a statement which seems as gratuitous as the assertion in the same article that he was an open preacher of equality in the application of the laws to nobles and villains. If it be true that Adalhard had always lived as a recluse at Court, his banishment to the abbey of Noirmoutiers in an island called Here off Poitou, could have affected his peace of mind very little, especially as his brother Wala was put in his place at Corbie. He was recalled from exile in 822, about which

date must be fixed his mission-tour into Saxony, and the foundation of New Corbey, as it is spelt, in the diocese of Paderborn. It seems from the statement of Sainte-Marthe, that the origination of this scheme was due to Wala and the younger Adalhard, but our Saint is reckoned its first abbat. He returned to his old monastery in 823, and lived there in the practice of great austerities and virtues till his death, at the age of 73, in 826. Several parish churches in the Netherlands and on the Lower Rhine, are dedicated to St. Adalhard. He is commemorated on Jan. 2. He was buried at Corbie: his epitaph may be seen in Mabill. *Ann.* ii. 500.

Adalhard's personal character is on all hands allowed to have been very high. If we check the rather profuse eulogies of his biographers with the ascertained historical facts in which he took part, our impression will be that he maintained through a long life of more than common difficulties a very high standard of integrity and of personal goodness. He had high administrative qualities, which were developed during the actual government of his own monastery, and the virtual government of a kingdom. He seems to have retained through life a singular degree of humility. He would often seek advice from the meanest monk, and he was noted for a singular faculty of shedding tears. (The metonym Jeremiah belongs, however, says Mabillon, to his brother Wala.) His liberality bordered on profusion, but the present age would render its warmest acknowledgments to his anxiety for the promotion of learning beyond the walls of his own monastery. See Chalmers' *Biog. Dict.* He was celebrated in debate, Agobard praises his wisdom in the *Conventus* of Attigny, 822. (Mab. *Ann.* ii. 467). He was present at Compiègne in 823.

The writings of Adalhard were probably numerous, but many have perished, and as many perhaps, existing in MS., are still unpublished. Mabillon intended to print some *Capitula* of instructions to his monks, which he found on the same MS. as the *Statuta* of Corbie (*Act. SS. o. s. B. v.* 308), and 52 sermons (*Nouvelle Biographie Générale*). He did publish a *placitum* of Adalhard's, in his *Iter Italicum*, i. 53-56. His most important work, *De ordine Palatii*, is lost, but Hincmar, who had seen Adalhard and copied this work, gives some considerable extracts (*Opp. ed Paris*, 1645, ii. 206-215). Hincmar mentions another lost treatise on the Paschal Moon. Adalhard's *Statuta Antiqua Abbatiae Corbiensis*, copied from the original MS., dated Jan. 822, are in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, i. 586-592. A letter addressed to a certain Count by Adalhard, Fulrad and another, as *Missi* of Charles, dating, says Jaffé, between 801 and 814, may be seen among *Epp. Carolinæ*, *Bib. Rer. German.* iv. 417.

All authors who have written with any care on this period mention Adalhard. The following notices should be particularized:—Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, i. Jan. 34-37. The dates above are chiefly taken from him. *Gall. Chr.* x. 1266. Mabillon, *Ann.* ii. *passim*. See *Index Generalis*, p. 758. *Act. SS. Boll.* Jan. i. 95-123. Guizot, *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*, ii. 116, 344-385. [C. D.]

ADALONGUS (1) (or ADALONUS, ABDALONGUS), Bishop of MARSEILLES, when that city was betrayed to the Saracens by Maurontus in

739: whether they actually occupied it is disputed. Adalongus was inserted among the Saints of March 1 by Molanus in his additions to Usuardus' *Martyrology*, but he is not recognized by the modern Breviaries or by the Bollandists. *Gall. Chr.* i. 640; Le Cointe, v. 17.

(2) (ADALUNC or ADALUND, *Metrop. Salisburg.* iii. 323), with his brothers, Hiltipalt or Kerpalt, and Antonius or Otakir, founded the Benedictine monastery of Schliersee in Bavaria about 779. It was consecrated by Aribio, Bishop of Frisingen. Wigul. Hund (*loc. citat.*) gives the original charter of foundation, but apparently doubts its genuineness. See also Mabill. *Ann.* ii. 246. [C. D.]

ADALTRUDIS, wife of Nemfidius, Patrician, and joint-donor with him of some estates near Digne to the monastery of SS. Mary and Victor at Marseilles. Adaltrudis having taken the veil after her husband's death, the donation was disputed by Antenor the Patrician, who had surreptitiously removed and burnt the instruments kept above the altar of St. Victor. The dispute, taken up by Abbo the Patrician, came before Charles in 780. Adaltrudis, by some duplicates of the charters, which she had kept hidden, convinced the *missi* of the validity of the donation, and her statements being corroborated by inhabitants of Digne, the village in question, Caladium (Chandel) was confirmed to the monastery. See the instrument which is the authority for this history in *Gall. Chr. i. Append.* 106.; Mabill. *Ann.* ii. 252. [C. D.]

ADALWIN (Teut. = noble friend), abbot of St. Haimeranus, and 4th, or acc. to an ancient rhyme (in Mabill. *Ann.* ii. 160), 5th bishop of Regensburg. In 792, two years after he became bishop, he presided at a council which Charles, during a years' stay at Regensburg for the prosecution of his war against the Huns, summoned for the condemnation of the Felician heresy. See Einhardi *Ann.* and *Ann. Lauresham.* in Pertz *M. G. H.* i. p. 179, and Mansi *Concil.* xiii. 855. Hund supposes that the transfer of the Cathedral from the monastery of St. Haimeranus to the church of St. Stephen within the walls of Regensburg, which was only confirmed about 800 by Pope Leo, was first proposed at this council. He argues the probability that the exchange was made under pressure from Charles, and against the judgment of Adalwin, who at his death in 814 preferred to be laid among his predecessors in the old cathedral. *Metrop. Salisb.* i. 188; Mabill. *Ann.* ii. 303. [C. D.]

ADAM, BOOKS OF—I. THE CONFLICT OF ADAM AND EVE. In 1853 Dillmann printed in the 5th vol. of Ewald's *Jahrbücher d. bibl. Wissenschaft* a work, half history, half religious romance, under the name *The Book of Adam of the Christian East*—*Das christliche Adambuch d. Orients* (also published separately, Göttingen, 1853). The original was an Ethiopic MS. at Tübingen, a recent paper copy brought home by the missionary Krapf from Abyssinia. The full title in the MS. is "The conflict of Adam and Eve which they had to wage after their expulsion from the Garden and during their stay in the Cave of Treasures according to the command of the Lord their Creator and Preserver." This description agrees with the contents of the first 70 pages out of the 125 occupied by the translation. But the story proceeds without the slightest break to depict on

a smaller scale the fortunes of the patriarchs down to Melchisedec, who is made a son of Cainan and grandson of Arphaxad. Here too (p. 116) there is no decisive break; but the narrative changes its character, becoming very brief and chiefly occupied with chronology and genealogy. The legendary matter is slight and scattered, and lacks the vigour of the earlier fables. Here also for the first time (at least in clearly genuine portions of the text) appear distinct literary notices, direct quotations from the Bible, and Christian doctrines nakedly set forth. The last page of all contains allusions to Adam and Eve and to the 'treasures' of their 'cave,' but feebly expressed and nowise answering to the bold prophetic language of the original author. The account of the meeting of Melchisedec and Abraham (120, 122) shews no appreciation of the extraordinary office previously assigned to Melchisedec. There are moreover theological differences which can hardly be accidental. The hand of a second author is betrayed by these signs with tolerable certainty. The 104 pages (13-116) of the proper work have a few short passages which look much like interpolations; not merely heads of sections incorporated with the text, as noted by Dillmann, but didactic comments interrupting the story, and out of harmony with it (73 f., ? 100 f., 101, 103, 107: this last page contains 4 such insertions, one of them misplaced by 2 lines). The occurrence of a similar intrusive paragraph at p. 121 indicates that the interpolation is of later date than the concluding portion of the book. To a like origin we may safely refer a detached sentence on the marriage of Noah's sons, which avowedly follows the "Seventy-two wise interpreters" "in the first of the Greek books of the Bible" (99).

After the Fall, which is not itself described, the exiles are represented as permitted to dwell in the "Cave of Treasures," under the western boundary of the Garden. They have to endure a series of trials, partly from the unfamiliar elements of nature, partly from the malice and cunning of Satan, who with his attendant 'Satans' assumes various shapes to compass their destruction. Yet from the first God makes known to them His covenant, promising that in due season they shall be redeemed by His Word which created them and which they 'transgressed'; and from time to time in their worst extremity He visits them either by His Word or His angels, to give them comfort or enlightenment. Soon He promises to take on Himself human trouble and death; and when Adam and Eve offer on a hastily raised altar their own blood, gathered up from the sharp rocks, He announces that he will one day offer His own blood on the altar, and 'blot out the debts.' At His command gold, frankincense, and myrrh are brought by angels, dipped in the water by the tree of life, and given to Adam as 'tokens' out of the Garden: these are the sacred 'treasures' of the cave, where they are deposited one on each side, the gold to give light by day and night, the frankincense for perfume, and the myrrh for consolation. Then follow in order various events, all pointing back to the Fall, and yet marking steps in the new life; the beginning of clothing, of food, of marriage, of agriculture (and with it of an Eucharistic offering,

of which Adam and Eve 'communicate'), of birth, of rivalry of lovers, and of murder. When Adam dies, Seth embalms the body and places it in the cave with a light burning before it, and then receives a renewal of the covenant.

The descendants of Seth are warned by one patriarch after another to have no dealings with the posterity of Cain. At length the catastrophe is brought about by Satan's devices in the days of Jared, and the time of the Flood draws near. Noah carries the body of Adam into the ark, his three sons following with the sacred tokens. After his death the young Melchisedec, divinely summoned to fulfil the command of his forefathers, approaches the ark. It opens miraculously at his touch, a voice from heaven pronounces him priest, and he brings out the body of Adam, his great-grandfather Shem bearing the tokens. With the help and guidance of Michael they journey onwards for three days till they reach a spot where the rock opens and receives the chest containing the four sacred objects. There Melchisedec remains, clothed and girded with fire, to serve God before the body of Adam to all time.

Thus ends the original book of Adam; at least, thus limited, the narrative forms a complete whole. The drama of primitive history is imperfect so long as the body of Adam has not reached its final resting-place. When at length it is restored to the ground whence it was fashioned, on the spot in the centre of the earth where the Second Adam is to accomplish redemption, and when the priest has been divinely consecrated to serve before it for ever, then the work of the First Adam is done.

The merits of this Book of Adam are of a kind to which it is impossible to do justice in a bald summary. In the less interesting chronicle of O. T. events which follows, though worthy of study for the sake of comparison with other Oriental traditions of Jewish history, it will suffice to notice a few salient points. In the days of Nahor, at an interval of 33 years, two great storms of wind are said to have swept the earth, and broken to pieces all the idols (118 f.). Peculiar stress is laid on the intermingling of the seed of Lot with the people of God in Ruth and "Emnan" (Naamah, 1 Kings xiv. 21, 31) as representing Moab and Ammon (123 f.). Daniel is made to be a son of Jehoiaquim, born as his mother was being carried captive to Babylon; and Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael sons of Jechoniah (129). There is a curious passage on the fate of Jewish writings during the Captivity; "The scribes and the expositors [Targumists? LXX] corrupted the writings, and the Hebrews changed them, and the Syrians and Greeks lost a great part of them," &c. (130); the seeming purpose being to account for the defects in the genealogies, and especially for the rare occurrence of the names of women. "But I, O my brother," the author proceeds further on (132), "have studied much and explored much in the old writings of the Greeks and Hebrews, and have found the names of the wives written in them." He accordingly supplies from his own stores the information which was wanting, he says, to the Jews. Of his records the most cherished is a genealogy of the Virgin Mary. Its absence in "the old historians" (a strange description of the Gospels) had exposed the Christians, he assures us, to the

mockery of the Jews. But henceforth the mouth of the unbelievers is stopped, "and now they know that Mary is of the seed of David and of the seed of the patriarch Abraham." The loss of the pedigrees among the Jews he attributes to three burnings of "the Law and the Prophets," "once in the days of Antiochus, who burnt the whole house, the second time when the strong-holds of Jerusalem were destroyed, the third time when the writings were burnt" (133).

The legendary basis of the original work is evidently taken from Jewish traditions of greater antiquity, probably much older than the N. T., and sufficiently widely spread to have left traces even in Mahometanism. The form in which it is cast is on the other hand purely Christian. The narrative is often diffuse and consequently wanting in strength: but the style is admirably adapted for its purpose, simple, sincere, and in the best sense popular; and the pervading spirit is a pure and deep religious feeling which seldom flags. The direct introduction of Christian dogma is avoided with a true artistic instinct; while type and prophecy are skillfully contrived to shadow forth Christian beliefs and rites. Redemption is on the whole the prevailing idea. God is set forth as carrying on from the first a saving process in man, educating him through a succession of "conflicts" for his final restoration to the Garden and the realm of light, and encouraging him in the struggles, not merely by ever renewed teaching and help, but by an abiding covenant from generation to generation and the growing hope of a future descent of Himself into the conditions of human life. These prophecies of the Incarnation have an uniform character: they are technically Patripassian. Once only (when the voice from Adam's body speaks to Melchisedec on the second evening of the journey, p. 114; cf. p. 14) is it said that "the Word of God" will come down and suffer and be crucified and wet the crown of Adam's head with "His blood." Elsewhere the suffering and death are invariably predicated of the one "God" or "the Lord" of Adam and his children. Of a Son of God or an Anointed of God there is nowhere a hint. On the other hand in the part of the book which follows the establishment of Melchisedec at Golgotha the Patripassian language completely disappears: not only is "Christ" freely named, but we hear of "the suffering of our Redeemer Jesus Christ" (135) and of "our Lord Christ" as "crucified and dying after the body" (137); as well as (in an apparent interpolation, p. 121) of "the crucifixion of the Son of God." This peculiarity of the earlier language is imperfectly accounted for by the dramatic form; it can proceed only from the belief natural to the author himself. The place held by "the Word of God" is very remarkable. Sometimes the term might be thought a mere metaphor for God speaking: yet oftener the Word of God appears distinctly as a person. Usually God sends His Word to speak to Adam, and His angel or angels to help him; and both modes of intervention are often combined in the same incident; while at times the Word acts and an angel speaks. In one striking passage just before the close (p. 115) the Word and the angels ascend together into heaven. This conception of the Word is not of Christian, much less of Alexandrine origin; but it corresponds essentially with that found

in the Targums, and so represents an early Palestinian tradition. The few and slight allusions to the Holy Spirit are interesting as far as they go. Before the Fall His "glories" "satisfy" Adam and Eve, so that they neither hunger nor thirst (34): He descends upon accepted sacrifices (61, 115): the voice from Adam's body out of the ark came to Melchisedec "through the Holy Spirit" (113): His measure of length, applied to the height of the Garden above Eden and to the ark, is three times the ordinary measure (83, 106).

A remarkable negative characteristic of the *Conflict of Adam and Eve* is its independence of all influence from the Books of Henoch and of Jubilees. The capital difference lies in the interpretation of Gen. vi. 1-4, where it is the sons of Seth who mix with the daughters of Cain (94 f.), not the watcher angels with the daughters of Seth. Here the author (if it be not rather an interpolator: the language on the whole suggests the one alternative, the position of the comment [100 f.: cf. 83] the other) argues against what "earlier sages have written and said" on behalf of the antagonistic view. Elsewhere, as in the names of Adam's daughters and the manner of Cain's death, he ignores the more ancient, or more anciently recorded, legends.

The time and place at which *The Conflict of Adam and Eve* was written admit of only a loose determination. The immediate original of the Ethiopic version, Dillmann says confidently (7 f.), was not Greek and is shown by various signs to have been Arabic. The names of months are Egyptian as pronounced by Arab lips. It follows that the Arabic version came into Abyssinia out of Egypt, where it must have been executed during the period of Arab supremacy, i.e. not earlier than the 7th century. Again there are no internal signs, of language or of matter, that it was originally composed in Greek; and no clear traces of use by Greek or Latin writers. On the other hand various late Syriac and Arabic documents exhibit coincidences too extensive to be fortuitous, though it is possible that they were indebted to some kindred book constructed of similar materials. Much characteristic detail appears from Dillmann's notes to recur in a late collection bearing the name of Clement, extant in Ethiopic at Tübingen and apparently in Arabic at the Vatican. The same may be said of what appears to be another recension of the same work, an 'Apocalypse of Peter' by the hand of Clement, preserved in Arabic at Oxford and Rome (Nicoll, *Cat. codd. orient. Bodl.* II. i. 49 ff.; Assemani, *Cat. codd. orient. Vat.* III. i. 282; cf. Tischendorf, *Apocal. Apoc.* xx ff.), corresponding with the description of certain Arabic 'Revelations of St. Peter' shown to James of Vitry at the siege of Damietta in 1219. A still closer connexion is discernible with a Syriac book called *The Cave of Treasures*, on which some information may be gleaned from various notices in Cureton's publications and from Assemani (*B. O.* ii. 498; iii. 281). The two known copies, in the British Museum and the Vatican, were both written at the beginning of the 18th century in Chaldee letters on paper (Cureton, *Corp. Ign.* 360; Assemani, *l. c.*). The verbal coincidences leave no doubt that *The Conflict of Adam and Eve* itself supplied, to say the least, the foundation for the later work, which has a much more chronolo-

gical form (partly reproduced in the 'Apocalypse of Peter'); and two of the quotations (in Cureton, *Corp. Ign.* 287; *Spicil. Syr.* 94 f.) shew that the supplementary matter had been already added at the end (118 f., 135). On the other hand *The Conflict of Adam and Eve* (134) is free from the interpolation of 3 names into the genealogy taken from Matt. i. (at v. 8), which *The Cave of Treasures* has in common with some other Syriac writings (Cureton, *Syr. Gosp.* vii f.). These various marks point to a Syrian origin. Curiously enough a passage attributed to Ephrem himself, the pride of Syriac literature, from his "doctrinal discourses on Paradise," is cited by G. Synellus (i. 26 Dind.), the purport of which nearly coincides with statements in the *Conflict of Adam and Eve*; and vaguer references elsewhere to the same effect are not wanting (Dillmann, 10). It is true the passages referred to do not appear in Ephrem's published writings. But according to Dillmann (10) "nearly all that is contributed in the Book of Adam towards describing the original state and the change of man after his banishment from the Garden rests on Ephremic thoughts and expressions and is to be read here and there in his writings, specially in the hymns on Paradise; and even of the legends and biblical interpretations occurring in our book several may be distinguished in Ephrem's printed works;" of which his notes supply instances. Indeed he thinks himself justified in affirming that the author either expanded a short (as yet unknown) treatise of Ephrem, or worked up the scattered notices which he found throughout Ephrem's works. It seems a more natural inference that both drew from a common tradition familiar to Syrian Christians at least as early as the 4th century. Dillmann (11) reasonably suggests the 5th or 6th century as the probable date of the *Conflict*. The Patristic language seems to imply a popular form of Monophysitism; and the other indications of doctrine and ritual are hardly compatible with an earlier date; as far at least as can be judged while Syriac literature is almost wholly buried in manuscript. The Monophysite character of the Egyptian Church under the Arabs is well known.

A *Life of Adam*, described in terms which might be applied to the beginning of the *Conflict*, occupies 54 leaves in one of D'Abbadie's Ethiopic MSS. (No. 125 of his Catalogue). He says that it is almost unknown in Abyssinia.

The preface and compressed notes which Dillmann has added to his beautiful German translation are rich in illustrative matter without superfluities. He passes over the theology; and he has failed to detect the structure of the book. In other respects his learning and judgement have provided help such as rarely offers itself to the readers of first editions. But the true charm and value of the book is independent of curious erudition. As an unaffected romance of the Christian East, sympathetically painting the infancy of mankind in the light of God's unchanging counsel, without thought of controversy or any secondary purpose, it stands alone.

II. ADAM, TESTAMENT OF. A remarkable group of fragments, bearing in the MSS. the name *Testament of our father Adam the First*, was published by Renan in 1853 (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. v. t. ii. pp. 427-470) with a translation, introduction, and illustrative notes. It is extant

only in Syriac and Arabic versions, with a double recension in each language. Part of the Syriac text is likewise printed in Wright's *Syriac Apocrypha*, pp. 61 ff. There are altogether four parts; but the 4th occurs only in a single Syriac MS., which omits the second. The first two are closely connected: they are a Horarium of the universe for night and for day, distinguishing at each of the 24 hours the adoration paid by some one order of created beings, as angels and demons, men, animals, abysses, &c. The third part, fragmentary in the Syriac, headed *More of Adam our first father*, contains short prophecies spoken by Adam to Seth, relating to the Incarnation, the restoration of Adam, the making of the cross (such is evidently the sense) from the wood of the fig-tree identified with the tree of knowledge, and the Deluge. It ends as follows "And I Seth have written this testament; and after the death of my father Adam my brother and I buried him at the east of Paradise, opposite the town of Henoch, the first which was built on the earth. And the angels and the virtues of the heavens themselves celebrated his obsequies, because he had been created in the image of God. And the sun and the moon were darkened, and there was darkness during seven days. And we sealed this testament, and placed it in the Cave of Treasures, where it has remained to this day, with the treasures which Adam had brought out of Paradise, the gold, the myrrh, and the frankincense. And the sons of the Magian kings shall come and take them and bring them to the Son of God in the cave of Bethlehem of Judah." Then follows a colophon "End of the Testament of our father Adam." The fourth part is called *More of the Testament of our father Adam*. It is a short account of the different orders of "heavenly powers," angels, archangels, principalities, &c.

These fragments evidently represent a work current under different titles in the early ages. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 89 B) notices 'revelations (apocalypses) of Adam' along with 'many' apocryphal writings in Seth's name among the books held sacred by his 'Gnostici,' an Ophitic sect. From the form of his language Lücke (*Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh.* 232) has doubtfully inferred the existence of one or more Apocalypses of Adam recognised by the Church; and appealed in confirmation to the ascription of "ecstasy" and prophecy to Adam by Tertullian (*De an.* 11) in reference to Gen. ii. 24 (or Eph. v. 31 f.): but neither passage will bear the strain. 'A book which is called the *Repentance of Adam*, apocryphal,' is condemned in the Gelasian Decree (vi. 30 in Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kanons*, 219); that is either at Rome about 500 or (apparently) in Spain between 500 and 700 (Credner, 282-9). According to Samuel of Ani, an Armenian historian, about 590 a band of Syrian Nestorians, "men of honeyed words," entered Armenia intending to propagate their doctrine, but were driven away with anathemas. They translated however their sacred books for the benefit of some disciples whom they made. These books were the *Kawrdosag* (the Vision of St. Paul, the *Revelation of Adam*, the *Testament* [sic], the *Infancy of the Lord*, the *Sebios*, the *Cluster of Blessings*, cf. Gennad. *de vir. ill.* 1], the *Book which ought to be hid*, and the *Exposition of the Gospel* of Mani (Renan, 430 f. on

the authority of M. Dulaurier). In this enigmatical and miscellaneous list *The Repentance of Adam* is distinguished from *The Testament*. Yet if, as appears likely, Adam's name belongs to both titles, the nature of the existing fragments is not such as to compel us to suppose that they designate two wholly distinct books. G. Syn-cellus (18) and Cedrenus (i. 17) say that 'Adam in his 600th year repented and knew by revelation the thing concerning the Watchers [the 'sons of God' in Gen. vi. 1 ff.] and the Deluge, and repentance and the Divine Incarnation, and the prayers which are sent up to God at every hour of day and night from all creatures through Uriel the archangel of repentance;" and Cedrenus adds an enumeration for 12 hours which agrees very nearly with the Syriac "Hours of Day." Every hour in this passage except the Watchers and Uriel (cf. B. of Henoch ix. 1; xx. 2, &c. and Dillmann, p. 98) corresponds with something in the extant fragments: and it is to be observed that "repentance" and "revelation" are prominent words, while "testament" holds a yet more significant place in the Syriac prophecy. Thus the three names are brought together. The authority chiefly followed hereabouts by G. Syn-cellus and Cedrenus is the *Book of Jubilees*. In one place a *Life of Adam* is referred to by G. Syn-cellus (9); but there is nothing except internal evidence to shew the origin of the passage quoted above. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 16) mention Adam among the O. T. personages whose names were affixed to apocryphal books.

The name "Testament" is familiar in apocryphal literature to denote the supposed last words of a prophet. Besides the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* we hear of the *T. of Moses* (in the catalogue of books appended to the Chronography of Nicephorus: Credner, *l.c.* p. 121), and the *T. of Job* (Decret. Gelas. *ib.* 220). Nor was it unnatural that such last words should be regarded as the fruit of a "repentance" (cf. *Test. Rub.* 1, 2—*καὶ νῦν ἀκούσατέ μου, τέκνα, ἃ εἶδον . . . ἐν τῇ μετανοίᾳ μου*). Thus the Gelasian Decree (*l.c.* 220) notices a *Repentance of Origen*, a *R. of St. Cyprian*, and a *R. of James and Mambres*. The hymns uttered by the *Pistis Sophia*, in the Gnostic work bearing the same name, are likewise, as Renan (p. 430) points out, called "repentances" (47, 51 f. &c.).

The Hours and the Prophecy have every appearance of forming parts of one work. In each Adam speaks to Seth, and refers to his past sin, and there is considerable similarity of tone. They are probably however mere extracts: the several passages are disconnected, and the dramatic framework is perceptible only at the end. A sort of introduction indeed occurs in the Arabic recensions, which likewise place the hours of day before those of night (Renan, 462 ff.); and the materials may well have been derived from a corresponding part of the original work: this is however all that can safely be allowed. The fourth part, on the Heavenly Hierarchy, may possibly belong to the same book as the other Syriac fragments, as it certainly belongs to the same literature: but it is addressed to "my friends" instead of Seth, and it reads rather like a later appendix. Internal evidence suggests that 'the Repentance of Adam' is merely a second title; and the same may be said, though with less certainty, of 'the

Revelations of Adam.' The book doubtlessly underwent various modifications, as indeed is shown by the existing texts; and the names may belong to different recensions. Strangely enough, in one of the Arabic MSS. "our text forms part of an apocryphal work attributed to St. Clement, and entitled *The secret books of purity*" (Renan, 438, 471; and see above, p. 36, b). It evidently enters likewise into the composition of the 'Apocalypse of Peter' mentioned under I. (Nicoll, *Cat. Cod. Or. Bodl.* II. i. 49 ff.) Traces of it occur elsewhere in the catalogues of Syriac and Arabic MSS.

In the Coptic Apostolic Constitutions (80-88 Tattam), where private prayers are enjoined at every third hour (cf. Clem. *Strom.* vii. 40, p. 854), there are traces of the characteristic language of the Syriac "Hours:" they are wanting in the corresponding Greek recension (viii. 34). At the seventh hour of the night and tenth of the day mention is made of healing of the sick by unction with holy oil (cf. James v. 14 f.) which "the priest of God" mingles with water. The reference to the legend of the 'Cave of Treasures' at the end of the Prophecy implies a connexion with the *Conflict of Adam and Eve* published by Dillmann. An earlier paragraph gives Lehora as the name of the sister for whom Cain was jealous of Abel, and makes her the younger sister. 'Lehora' probably represents the LUYA of the *Conflict*: but the exact form, as also the inversion of the two sisters, is found now only in late and secondary authorities, *e.g.* Euty chius. Lastly Renan (p. 464) points out a connexion between some passages in Euty chius and in one of the Arabic recensions. These various coincidences are not however sufficient to fix the age or country of the *Testament of Adam*. If it is the book meant by Epiphanius, it cannot be later than the 4th century, and nothing decisive can be urged against this date, though it is impossible to speak with confidence.

The *Testament*, as it stands, is short and unpretending: yet a lofty spirit pervades a great part of it. The leading idea of the Hours is the community of all created things in the adoration of their Maker. The last hour of the day is assigned to the "Prayer of men to the benevolent Will [*εὐδοκία*] which dwells before God, Lord of all things." In the Prophecy Adam is assured that his premature desire to become a god shall be fulfilled at last as a result of the Incarnation and Glorification, so that he shall learn, "he and his children, that there is a justice in heaven." No distinctive doctrine is to be found beyond what lies in the passages already cited. There is no evidence that the *Testament* is of Gnostic origin (Renan, 428, 434 f.) in the proper sense of the word, though like other apocryphal productions claiming the authority of O. T. names it may have been used by some Gnostic sects. But it appears to lie outside Greek and Latin Christianity, and is thus an interesting monument of an almost unknown world of ancient creeds.

III. LIFE OF ADAM. See under I. and II.

IV. BOOK OF THE DAUGHTERS OF ADAM, condemned in the Gelasian Decree (ap. Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.* 218) as apocryphal. A second title (if the reading is sound) is 'Leptogenesis,' which usually means the Book of Jubilees. As however the daughters of Adam there occupy only 6 lines

in the 4th chapter, some other book appears to be meant; unless 'Gelasius' knew it only by this reference (e. g. from Epiph. *Haer.* 287 B), and invented the first title.

V. STORY AND CONVERSATION OF ADAM. As Jewish legend furnished materials to the Syrian Christians who wrote I. and II., so another form of it is in like manner the base of a Greek work not unworthy to be classed with them. *The Story and Conversation of Adam [and Eve], revealed by God to Moses [read Seth] His servant, taught by the archangel Michael* (such is the simplest of the descriptive titles found in MSS.), begins, after the first few lines, with the murder of Abel. At God's bidding Michael commands Adam "The mystery which thou knowest proclaim not to Cain thy son, for he is a son of wrath: but grieve not, for I will give thee instead of him another son; he shall shew thee all that thou shalt do" (3). By this introduction Seth is at once marked as the organ of revelation, and he is distinguished throughout by special prerogatives; so that the proper title of the book would be the *Apocalypse of Seth*. Another independent work seems to be incorporated in the middle, probably with little change, interrupting the narrative for 17 chapters by a confession from Eve's lips: it might well be called a *Testament or Repentance of Eve*.

The true subject of the book is the death of Adam, and his giving place to Seth. In his mortal sickness he collects his sons around him. Afflicted at his groans, Eve and Seth approach the Garden to pray for the oil of mercy from the Tree, but in vain: he will die, Michael tells them, within three days. Eve then describes the circumstances of the Fall at great length (cc. 14-30), the embellishments of the Biblical account having at times some imaginative beauty. She goes out to pray, but is raised up by an angel to see Adam (his spirit) borne up in a chariot of light. He is washed in the Acherusian lake, and committed by "the Father of the universe" to Michael to be placed in the third heaven. God Himself descends to give promises of restoration and resurrection to the body. It is buried by angels, and Abel's body with it. Within a week Eve is laid in the same grave, and Michael returns to heaven singing Hallelujah.

Various echoes of N. T. language indicate that the book is of Christian origin, though there is no quotation and no distinct Christian doctrine. The phrases 'son of wrath' (3), 'Thy elect angels' (32), 'vials' associated with incense (33, 38), perhaps "the Father of lights" (36, in one MS. only, but that the best), "the third heaven" along with "Paradise" (37, 40), the turning of sorrow into joy (39), "Receive my spirit" (42), and some others less distinct, when taken together, sufficiently betray their origin: but they are confined to the Sethian chapters. Besides the borrowing of the framework and various details from Jewish tradition, there are points of connexion with other extant apocryphal books, as in Seth's quest of the "oil of mercy" (9, 13; *Ev. Nicod.* 19), and the dipping by angels in the Acherusian lake (*Apoc. Pauli* 22, p. 51 Tisch.: cf. Plat. *Phaed.* 113 A). The original language appears to be Greek: the biblical narrative is evidently used in Eve's confession through the medium of the LXX. (cf. 27 *ἐνθ' ἡ-*

τας κρῖνεις, Ps. lxxv. 3), and the play of words in the phrase 'oil of mercy' can be only Greek (τὸ ἐλαῖον—sometimes written ἐλεον—τοῦ ἐλέου: see Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* 687 f.). Grammar however and inflexions are of a debased type, and the tone is that of an Oriental population, such as might be found in Palestine or Western Syria. It seems impossible at present to find evidence as to date: no early century from the second onwards can be put out of question.

The work was first published in 1866 in Tischendorf's *Apocalypses Apocryphae* under the fictitious title *Apocalypsis Mosis*. Moses is named in the headings of the 4 known MSS.; but there is not the slightest reference to him in the text, and the narrative is in the third person except in c. 34, where (? by inadvertence) Eve is made the speaker. It seems likely that ΣΗΘ or ΤΩ ΣΗΘ should be read for ΜΩΣΗ, though the by no means uniform headings may have received their present shape after the substitution had taken place. Two of the MSS. (A B) present a recension deformed by verbose amplifications and other changes, and unfortunately this is the chief source of Tischendorf's text. The purest as well as earliest MS. (D) is reproduced in full in Ceriani's *Monumenta Sacra et Profana* (V. i. 21 ff. Milan 1868), specimens only having been used by Tischendorf; but 18 chapters are wanting in the middle. No one of the 4 MSS. is complete; and the text is in a bad state in all. There is an English version of Tischendorf's text in the volume of the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library' devoted to Apocryphal literature.

VI. LIBER ADAMI, also known as *Codex Nasaraeus*, properly *The Great Book or Treasure of the MANDAITES*. [H.]

ADAMANTIUS.—1. [ORIGEN.]

2. The name of the orthodox interlocutor in a Dialogue against various heresies. The author is unknown: but at an early period it was assumed that he must be identical with 'Adamantius': for similar cases see ARCHELAUS, BARDEISAN, CAIUS. The next step was to suppose that by 'Adamantius' must be meant Origen, whose name stands at the head in some if not all MSS. and in a short Greek summary. This confusion must have taken place before 380, if a note at the end of c. 24 of the Origenian *Philocalia* was written by the compilers; but this is uncertain. Again Anastasius Sinaita (*Hodeg.* qu. 48) in the 6th century quotes the Dialogue under Origen's name. On the other hand about 453 Theodoret refers to 'Adamantius' and Origen separately among his authorities (*Haer. fab.* i. praef. 25). These are the only allusions to the book in ancient times.

Origen's authorship, though defended by J. R. Wetstein and others, does not merit serious discussion. Style, doctrine, and indications of date are alike conclusive. Again internal evidence gives no support to the conjecture that Origen was dramatically intended as the chief speaker under the name Adamantius; indeed the author cannot have been an admirer of Origen. But such suppositions are needless, for 'Adamantius' is a sufficiently common name. The date is approximately fixed by an allusion to the contemporary "God-fearing" emperor, who "built up what" his persecuting predecessors "pulled down, loved what they

hated, and pulled down the temples and idols which they honoured" (i. p. 816 E Ru. = 282 Lom.); a description which applies to no one but Constantine in his later years (330-337; cf. Heinichen on Eus. *Vit. Const.* iii. 54). With this period agrees the language about "the God-Word consubstantial, eternal" (i. p. 804 C Ru. = 255 Lom.), and "the Holy Trinity consubstantial and inseparable" (v. p. 871 D Ru. = 416 Lom.), which points to the recent (325) determination of Nicaea. The Dialogue moreover makes large use of the writings of Methodius, who suffered about 312 (Clinton, *F. R. i.* 361); chiefly his treatise *On Free Will* (Routh, *Rel. Sac.* ii. 79 ff.; Alb. Jahn, *Method. Platonizans*, Halle 1865, pp. 118-124), but also that *On the Resurrection* (Jahn 79, 87). The principal passage taken (with some abridgement) from the former work is likewise given entire by Eusebius (*P. E.* vii. 21 f.) as from a treatise *On Matter* by Maximus, a writer whom he elsewhere (*H. E.* v. 27) places at the end of the 2nd century; and from Eusebius it was copied into the *Philocalia* (l.c.), where it stands alone among genuine extracts from Origen. Routh pointed out that the Dialogue was immediately indebted not, as is usually said, to Maximus but to Methodius: we are not therefore further concerned with MAXIMUS here. The author possibly threw his argument into a dialogue in imitation of Methodius, four at least of whose works were dialogues; though the borrowed matter retains hardly a trace of its original form in this respect. Neander's conjecture (*Gnost. Syst.* 206 f.) that the whole treatise is a patchwork made up of different genuine dialogues of the 3rd century, such as that said to have been held by Origen with Candidus (*Hier. c. Ruf.* ii. 19), has nothing to recommend it: but it is likely enough that the author made liberal use of works now lost.

The heading in some, perhaps all, MSS. is *Against the Marcionists*, a title which applies only to a small part. The summary already noticed describes the Dialogue as being "on the right faith in God," and the early translators adopted these words as a title: but it is not satisfactory. In the Greek editions the Dialogue is cut into five sections; a perverse arrangement which disguises the true structure. The MSS. (? all) with better reason divide into three dialogues, of which the former two answer to Sections I. II., and the third has three heads, (1) without a title, (2) *On the Christ*, (3) *On the Resurrection*. The last corresponds with Wetstein's Section V.: his III. and IV. are arbitrary. Properly speaking the whole Dialogue falls into two parts, A (Sections I. II.) against two Marcionists, and B (III.—V.) against a Bardesanist: each part ends with a formal judgement by the umpire. The second part is clearly divided into three heads, with transitive speeches from the umpire (849 A B Ru. = 360 f. Lom. in IV., and end of IV.). Two Valentinians are brought in to complete the discussion of the great question of the origin of evil under the first head, and a Marcionist briefly interrupts the argument of the first and third heads. When the umpire is apparently about to give his final decision, the subject of the first part is resumed by an argument with one of the Marcionists, and then the Dialogue is brought to a close in due form. On the whole it seems likely that the author began by writing

the first part as an independent work, and at a later time continued it by the more composite second part, taking advantage of the opportunity to add near the end a last word on the earlier subject. There are no traces whatever of interpolation.

In I. Adamantius a Catholic and Megethius a Marcionist agree to hold an amicable controversy before the heathen Eutropius as umpire in the presence of an audience. Each disputant states his own 'definition' of primary doctrine, Megethius declaring for three first 'principles,' the Good God, the Demiurge, and the Evil One. After a short discussion, closed by an orthodox dictum from Eutropius, Megethius proceeds to attack the authority of the canonical gospels on various grounds, and then returns to the three 'principles,' arguing chiefly from the supposed antagonism of the Law and the Gospel. Here (II.) Marcus another Marcionist interposes, maintaining two 'principles' only, by identifying the Demiurge or Just God with the Evil One. The argument is mainly conducted by reference to so much of the N. T. as the Marcionists accepted. At the close Eutropius pronounces in favour of Adamantius, and prays to be himself "numbered with" "the Catholic Church." Marinus a Bardesanist now (III.) desires to dispute with Adamantius before the umpire. He dissents from Catholic doctrine on three heads, the creation of the devil by God, the birth of Christ from a woman, and the resurrection of the body. In one place Megethius, though at first checked by Eutropius as having had his say, strikes in to express agreement with the doctrine that the substances of good and evil are alike without beginning or end. Presently (IV.) Droserius declares his discontent with the arguments of Marinus and his wish to substitute "the definition of Valentinus" on the origin of evil, such definition being in fact part of the Valentinian's exposition in Methodius's Dialogue *on Free Will*. To this Adamantius soon opposes his own "definition," which is the orthodox reply from the same Dialogue, attributed (as we have seen) by Eusebius to Maximus. In the midst Valens another Valentinian objects to the doctrine of Droserius that matter existed prior to its qualities. At length Eutropius again decides for the teaching of the Church, and calls on Marinus to plead, if he chooses, on his second head. In the rest of the section accordingly the Bardesanist doctrine of Christ's "heavenly" body is discussed, and Eutropius gives judgement as before, bidding Marinus proceed to his third objection. In the last section (V) the resurrection of the body is impugned and defended, first on physiological and then on biblical grounds. Once Megethius interrupts Adamantius to protest against his reading of 1 Cor. xv. 38 as at variance with Marcion's. The discussion is ended by a declaration of Eutropius that he has been satisfied about the resurrection. Adamantius asks to expound his own view positively, as founded on Scripture; but soon breaks off, exclaiming impatiently at the want of competent cultivation (*ἀπαίδευσία*) in his antagonists. Eutropius declares that want to be the cause of all worthless things (*φάλῳ*): in it, he says, were born and bred (*ἢ συμπεφύκασι καὶ συνήθησαν*) Megethius, Droserius and Marcus, Valens and Marinus. Once more Adamantius sets himself to refute the Marcionists' doctrine out of

their own apostle St. Paul, and a short disputation with Marcus ensues. Finally, Eutropius professes himself satisfied with the arguments of Adamantius and anxious to join the Catholic Church, on which and its doctrine he pronounces in elaborate panegyric. The concluding acclamation in praise of Adamantius is probably not genuine.

The Dialogue cannot rank with the productions of the greater Fathers; yet it has considerable merits of its own. We look in vain for depth of thought or elevation of tone; but argumentative and exegetical power are by no means wanting. The heretics and their doctrines can scarcely be said to be fairly treated, and a somewhat offensive air of intellectual superiority is assumed towards them. On the other hand a genuine attempt is made to reproduce a part at least of their arguments; and there is hardly any scurrility. The controversy is to all appearance with the nameless heretics of the author's own day, not directly with the writings or original doctrines of Marcion, Bardeisan, and Valentinus. The literary merits of the work are clearness and occasionally some little vigour. As a dialogue it shews no dramatic power; indeed the language of the heathen umpire for the most part whimsically resembles that of the orthodox champion. The style is bald and unattractive; and not a few words, inflexions, and constructions belong to a rude and popular form of Greek.

The Dialogue was printed first in Latin, translated from a single MS. by John Pic, at Paris in 1556. Another version, paraphrastic in character, by Lawrence Humphrey one of the Zurich refugees, from a MS. lent by Froben, is dated Basel 1557, but appeared first, according to Wetstein, in the Basel Origen of 1571. It was reprinted by Genebrard (ii. 533 ff.), along with a third translation by Périon (i. 497 ff.), in his Paris Origen of 1574. The first Greek edition, containing likewise Origen's *Exhortation to Martyrdom* and *Epistle to Africanus*, is due to J. R. Wetstein the younger, Basel 1674. It has a version and copious notes, which supply some good illustrations as well as abundance of worthless matter. Wetstein followed a Basel MS., probably that used by Humphrey, and obtained some information from Hyde about an Oxford MS. (see below). The Dialogue was included by De la Rue in his great edition of Origen, Paris 1733 (i. 800-872): he somewhat improved the text with the help of four MSS., Vatie. 1089, two at Paris (evidently Reg. 56, 219), and one belonging to T. Gale, now at Trinity College, Cambridge, a modern copy of an Oxford MS., evidently Bodl. Gr. Misc. 25 (ol. 2040). De la Rue is followed by the later reprints of Origen's works. Besides these five MSS. others are said to exist at Dublin (288) and Venice (496). Trinity College, Cambridge, possesses a copy of Reg. 56, with various readings and supplements from Reg. 1219, made at Paris for Isaac Voss.

The Dialogue has shared the neglect which usually befalls works unfortunate enough to be known as 'spurious.' For both text and illustration it needs and deserves a good edition. [H.]

ADAMANTUS. [ADANTUS.]

ADAMAS.—[OPHITES.]

ADAMIANI.—An obscure sect who supposed themselves to be restoring primitive innocence by calling their community Paradise, and worshipping in a state of nudity. They met for divine service in hypocausts. They stripped at the door (where chamberlains were stationed to receive the clothes), entered and sat down naked, both sexes alike, and so continued while the readings and other parts of the service proceeded. The office-bearers and teachers were mixed indiscriminately with the rest of the congregation. The whole sect professed absolute continence; and excluded from communion any offender against the rule, alleging as a precedent Adam's expulsion from the Garden after eating the forbidden fruit.

Such is the report furnished by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lii. 458 ff.). He states expressly that he followed oral accounts, having never met with any Adamians or found them noticed in books; and he affects a gratuitous scepticism as to their existence. He supplies no mark of place or time, but oral statements would probably be contemporary; hence the date seems to be the middle of the 4th century. Later writers merely borrow from Epiphanius.

Theodoret (*Haer. fab.* i. 6) gives the name Adamitae to the followers of PRODICUS, whether on good authority or by a confusion, it is impossible to say. There is at all events no ground for supposing any connexion between the two sects. [H.]

ADAMNAN, an Irish name, the diminutive of Adam, and interpreted by Colgan *Parvus Adam*. (1) The first who is of record as so called was a Scot, of Irish extraction, who happens to be mentioned by Bede (*H. E.* iv. 25) in connection with Coludi-urbs (Coldingham), a mixed monastery, situated on the Border, in the modern Berwickshire. As a young man he had committed some offence which weighed upon his mind, and was revealed in confession to an Irish priest. A penitential course of life having been prescribed to him, in which brevity was intended to be coupled with intensity, the confessor returned to Ireland, and soon after died. Adamnan resolved upon a voluntary continuance in his strict discipline until the end of his life, and remained at Coldingham, from about 670, in the practice of the utmost self-denial, tasting meat and drink only on Sundays and Thursdays, and frequently spending whole nights in watching and prayer. He observed with sorrow the laxity of discipline in the monastery, and, it is said, had a revelation of its approaching destruction by fire which came to pass after the death of the abbess Aebba, about the year 679. He is commemorated in the English Martyrology of Wilson at the 31st of January, at which day his festival is found in Colgan (*Actt. SS. Hib.* p. 224) and Bollandus (*Actt. SS. Jan.* tom. iii.). See also Mabillon *Annal. O. S. Bened.* tom. i. p. 510.

(2) Ninth abbot of Hy or Iona (*sed.* 679-704), the most able and accomplished of St. Columba's successors (Bede *H. E.* v. 15, 21). He was born in Ireland, at Drumhome, in the south-west of the county of Donegal, and was, by his father Ronan, of the same lineage as St. Columba. By his mother, Ronnat, he was con-

nected with that branch of the Hy-Neill race, who occupied the district where Rath-both (Raphoe) was situate; of which church, when it became a bishop's see, he was, under the softened name of Eunan (ADHAMNAN=Owman, Onan, Eunan), adopted as the patron saint. He entered the monastery of Hy under Seghine, the fifth abbot, during whose incumbency, and that of the three immediate successors, he acquired such a reputation for piety and learning as recommended him for the presidency of the Columbite order, now in the meridian of celebrity and importance. On the death of Failbhe, the eighth abbot, in 679, Adamnan was chosen his successor, being now fifty-five years of age. Among his contemporaries were the valiant Bruide, son of Bile, sovereign of the Picts, and Aldfrid, the Northumbrian prince, who had been an exile in Ireland, and was styled by the natives *Dalta Adhamnain*, or "alumnus of Adamnan." The death of Ecgfrid, in 685 ("post bellum Ecgfridi," Adam. *Vit.* Col. ii. 46), restored Aldfrid to his country and the enjoyment of his hereditary rights; so that, when his former instructor, now abbot of Hy ("presbyter et abbas monachorum qui erant in insula Hii,"—Bede, *H. E.* v. 15), went, in the year following, on a mission to procure the liberation of some Irish captives whom Berct had carried off from Meath (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 26; Tighernach, 685), he was received at the Northumbrian court with great kindness, and succeeded in bringing back to Ireland, in the enjoyment of their liberty, sixty of his fellow-countrymen (Tighernach, 687).

In 688 he visited King Aldfrid a second time, having been sent by his nation on an embassy to him (Adam. *Vit.* Col. ii. 46). On this occasion he made some stay in Northumbria, during which he visited various churches of the Angles, and among others, Jarrow, where the abbot, Ceolfrid, had a discussion with him regarding Easter and the Tonsure, which resulted in the conversion of Adamnan from the British to the Catholic usage, and his earnest advocacy of the latter. Ceolfrid's account of the transaction is preserved by Bede (*H. E.* v. 21). It was probably about this time that Adamnan presented to Aldfrid the book *de Locis Sanctis*, of which Bede makes such honourable mention (*H. E.* v. 15). On his return to Hy he laboured hard to bring the brotherhood round to the adoption of his views regarding the two great questions which then divided the British Churches, but without immediate success. In 692 he visited Ireland on some business of importance (Tighernach, 692); and this was probably his first endeavour to bring the Irish into conformity with the Saxon Church. How long he remained is uncertain, but he returned to Ireland in 697, and at his instance a synod of ecclesiastics and chieftains was held at Birr, near the middle of Ireland, where an enactment was solemnly promulgated, exempting women from going to battle. The acts of this assembly are preserved, entitled the "Law of Adamnan," without the assistance of which it would be very hard to understand what was meant by the Annals of Ulster, in recording, at the year 696, "Adomnanus ad Hiberniam pergit, et dedit Legem Innocentium populis." He appears to have remained for some years after this in Ireland, furthering his social reform, and urging the adoption of the Catholic Easter and Tonsure.

He was certainly there in 701, when he convened a synod at Tara, to condemn a chieftain who had been guilty of a gross outrage; and Bede also states that he celebrated in Ireland his last Easter, in the following summary which he has left us of the closing scenes of our saint's life: "Returning home [from Northumbria], he endeavoured to bring his own people that were in the isle of Hii, or that were subject to that monastery, into the way of truth, which he had learned and embraced with all his heart: but in this he could not prevail. He then sailed over into Ireland, to preach to its people, and by modestly declaring the correct time of Easter, he reduced many of them, and almost all that were not under the dominion of the Society of Hii, to the Catholic unity, and taught them to keep the legal time of Easter. Returning to his island, after having celebrated the canonical Easter [which fell this year on the 30th of March] in Ireland, he most earnestly advocated in his own monastery the Catholic observance of the season of Easter, yet without being able to prevail; and it so happened that he departed this life before the next year came round, the Divine goodness so ordering it, that as he was a great lover of peace and unity, he should be taken away to everlasting life before he should be obliged, on the return of the season of Easter, to differ still more seriously with those who would not follow him in the truth" (*H. E.* v. 15). He died in the year 704, aged seventy-seven, on the 23rd of September, which is the day of his commemoration both in the Irish and Scotch calendars.

In Ireland he is the patron saint of the churches of Raphoe and Drumhome, in the county of Donegal; of Errigal, Dunbo, Bovevagh, and Grellach, in the county of Derry; and of Skreen, in the county of Sligo. In Scotland he is especially venerated in the churches of Furvie and Aboyn, in Aberdeenshire; of Forglen, in Banff; of Tannadice, in Forfar; and in the islands of Inchkeith and Sanda; among which his name has assumed the various disguises of Eunen, Teunan, Thewnan, Ainan, Skeulan, and Arnold.

Of his character for learning and the graces of the Christian ministry, we have the highest testimony in the almost contemporary statements of Ceolfrid and Bede, the latter of whom styles him "vir bonus et sapiens, et scientia scripturarum nobilissime instructus." Alcuin classes him among the "Praeclari patres Scotorum." His undoubted writings are (1) the work *De Locis Sanctis*, of which Bede has transferred into the body of his history large portions of two chapters (*H. E.* v. 16, 17). It was first printed in full by Gretser, with Bede's extracts on alternate pages (Ingoldst. 1619, 4to.), and subsequently, from a better manuscript, by Mabillon (*Act. SS. Ord. Bened.* saec. iii. pt. 2, p. 456). The substance of the narrative was taken down by the author, as he states, on wax tablets, from the dictation of a Franco-Gallic bishop, called Arculf, and when arranged, transferred to membranes. (2) The *Vita S. Columbae*, in three books, which was compiled by him between the years 692 and 697, from earlier memoirs and from the traditions of the island. The Latinity of this work is not so flowing or free from Celticisms as the former one, but it is a much more precious relic of antiquity, and is one of the

most important pieces of hagiology in existence. It was first published by Canisius (*Antiq. Lectt.* Ingoldst. 1604), then by Messingham (*Florilegium*, Par. 1624), Colgan (*Trias Thaumaturga*, Lovan. 1647), Baert (in *Ac tt.* Jun. tom. ii. 1698), Pinkerton (*Vitae Antiquae*, Lond. 1789), and lastly, from the autograph of Dorbene, a monk of Hy, who died in 713, collated with six other manuscripts, by William Reeves, D.D. (*Irish Archaeol. and Celt. Soc.* Dublin, 1857, 4to.). In the Append. to the Preface is a memoir of St. Adamnan (pp. xl.-lxviii.), a popular summary of which is given by the Comte de Montalembert, in *Les Moines d'Occident* (xiii. 3), under the head *Adamnan*.

(3) An Irish bishop, whose church of *Rathmaighe-anaigh* is now known as the parish church of Raymoghly, near Raphoe, in the east part of the county of Donegal. The place was of early importance, as St. Brugach, a disciple of St. Patrick, who is in the calendar at Sept. 1; and a St. Ciaran, who died Nov. 1, 784, were also commemorated here. Adamnan's obit, as *episcopus sapiens*, is all that is recorded of him, which appears in the Irish Annals, under the year 731 (*An. Uist.* 730; *F. Mast.* 725). [W. R.]

ADANTUS (Ἀδαντος), one of Manes' twelve disciples. (Petrus Siculus, *Hist. Man.* -xvi.) Photius (*Contra Man.* i. 14) writes the name as Adamantus. In the Greek form of Anathema (ap. Cotelier's *Patres Apost.* I. p. 545) he seems to be called Ἀδμυ. [E. B. C.]

ADAUTCUS, M. (1) An Italian of noble family, who had been intendant of the imperial treasury (*Rationalis*), martyred under Diocletian A.D. 303 (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 11; Rufin. *ib.*; Damasus, *Carm.* xxiv.): burned together with a whole town in Phrygia and all its inhabitants, according to Rufinus, but Eusebius only mentions both facts consecutively without connecting them. (2) Another, also called AUDACTUS, is assigned by the Martyrologies to the same persecution as joined with St. Felix (Baed., &c., and Baron. Aug. 30); the name being given to a chance comer, name unknown, who meeting Felix on his way to martyrdom, declared himself forthwith to be a Christian too, and was thereupon also beheaded. [A. W. H.]

ADDA (1) Son of Ida, king of Northumbria, succeeded his brother Glappa, as king of Bernicia in 559, and reigned eight years (Sim. Dun. *Mon. H. B.* 649; Nennius, *ibid.* 75).

(2) One of the companions of S. Cedd in his mission to the Middle Angles in 653. He was an Englishman by birth, and brother of Uтта, abbot of Gateshead (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 21). [S.]

ADDAS, (Ἀδδας, Ἀδας), one of the three first disciples of Manes. According to the Acts of Archelaus he was originally sent to preach his master's doctrines in Scythia, and was afterwards commissioned with the others to collect Christian books (*Archel. et Man. disput.* liii., liv.). He was subsequently sent as a missionary to the East, τὰ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς μέρη (*Ib.* xi., given in Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.* lxvi. 31). Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* vi. 31, gives his name as Baddas (Βαδδᾶς); Photius, *Contra Man.* i. 14, calls him Buddas (Βούδδας), and Petrus Siculus, *Hist. Man.* xvi. Buddas (Βουδδᾶς); but this is apparently only a confusion with the account of Manes' supposed predecessor Terebinthus [TEREBINTHUS].

Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* 85, mentions certain writings of Addas, one of which was entitled *μύδιον*, in allusion to Mark, iv. 21, and which was refuted by Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus. The Greek form of abjuration (ap. Cotelier's *Patres Apost.* vol. I. p. 544) mentions a work against Moses and the Prophets as written by Adas in conjunction with Adimantus [ADIMANTUS.] (Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* I. pp. 63, 433; Baur, *das Manichäische Relig.* pp. 414, 466). [E. B. C.]

ADDI, a "comes" or gesith, who possessed land in the neighbourhood of Beverley. One of his servants having recovered from a severe illness in consequence of the prayers of S. John of Beverley, Adda bestowed the village of North Burton on the church there (Bede, *H. E.* v. 5; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 129). [S.]

ADECERDITAE, properly *Hadecerditae*, the name given by 'Praedestinatus' (i. 79) to a 'sect' who said, according to Philastrius (*Haer.* 125), that Christ preached after his death to all that were in Hades, that they might repent and be saved. It was a widely spread opinion in the early Church. [H.]

ADELBERT [ALDEBERT].

ADELOPHAGI, the name given by 'Praedestinatus' (i. 71) to a sect who, according to Philastrius (*Haer.* 86), "did not eat their meat with men," alleging prophetic example (? Ezek. xxiv. 17, 22); and believed the Holy Spirit to be created. [H.]

ADELPHIUS, a Gnostic, contemporary with Plotinus (Porph. *V. Plot.* 16). He is not mentioned by Christian writers. [H.]

ADELPHIUS (Adelfius) (1) A member of the first Council of Arles 314; supposed to have been bishop of Lincoln. (Aug. *Opp.* ix. App. 1095 A; cf. Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 350; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 313.)

(2) An Egyptian bishop and confessor, exiled by the Arians (Athan. *Ap. de Fuga*, 7) to the Thebaid (*id. Hist. Ar.* 72). In 362 he writes as Bishop of Onuphis in the Delta (*id. Tom. ad Ant.* 615, 616). Athanasius addressed a letter to him c. 371, in which he briefly defends the Catholic faith against the objections of Arians and (by anticipation) of Nestorians and Eutychians (pp. 728-732). [W.]

ADELPHUS, chorepiscopus to Adolius, bishop of Arabissus, in the middle of the 5th century. He signed as proxy for his diocesan at the council of Chalcedon, 451. (Labbe, iv. pp. 86, 332, 571.) Moschus, *Spirit. Prat.*, c. 129, followed by George of Alexandria in his life of Chrysostom, antedates the episcopate of Adelphus by half a century, and confusing him with the unnamed bishop of Cucusus by whom Chrysostom was honourably received on his arrival at his place of exile, makes the saint lodge at his house at Cucusus. He relates also a vision of Chrysostom in glory, seen by Adelphus at the time of his death. (Tillemont, xi. 623; Baronius, *Annal.* ann. 407, § 29.) [E. V.]

ADEODATUS (1) A natural son of Augustine, of great promise (*De Beata Vita*, 6)—*horrori mihi erat illud ingenium*, Augustine says—who was baptised with his father in 387, being at the time about fifteen (*Confess.* ix. 6). He appears as an interlocutor in Augustine's treatise *De Beata Vita* (cc. 6, 12, puer ille minimus omnium,

18), written in 386 and contributed largely to his treatise *De Magistro*, written two years later. He seems to have died soon afterwards (*Cito de terra abstulisti* [*Deus*] *vitam ejus, et securior eum recorder . . . Confess. ix. 6*). [W.]

(2) Bishop of Rome; succeeded Vitalianus in April, A.D. 672, and reigned above four years, dying in June, A.D. 676. (Clint. and Jaffé, fr. Anast. B.) Anastasius records that he was a Roman monk, and that his father's name was Jovinianus; and gives as his character that he was most mild and benign, particularly in his hospitality towards men of every condition, and especially towards pilgrims. Two letters of his are extant, (1.) Dec. 23rd, A.D. 673, confirming the liberties of St. Peter's monastery at Canterbury, at the request of Abbot Hadrian (Mansi, xi. p. 103); (2.) to the Gallican bishops, giving privileges to St. Martin's of Tours (M. loc. cit. xi. 103). [G. H. M.]

ADIMANTUS (*Ἀδελμάντος*), one of Manes' twelve disciples. Photius (*Contra Man.* i. 14) and Petrus Siculus (*Hist. Man.*, xvi. *Ἀδελμάντος*), in their list of the twelve, after mentioning his name, add that he was sent as a missionary into various regions; but he seems to have met with especial success in Northern Africa, where he was still held in the highest veneration in Augustine's time, and considered an authority second only to Manes himself (Augustine, *Contra Adim.* 12. 2; *Contra Faust.* i. 2). He wrote a book, apparently in Latin, in which he endeavoured by a series of examples to prove a contradiction between the Old Testament and the New, taking them chiefly from the Pentateuch, but also a few from the Psalms, Proverbs, and the Prophets. In the Greek form of abjuration (*ap. Cotelier's Patres Apost.*, vol. i. p. 544.) it is ascribed to Adas as well as Adimantus. Augustine answered most of these objections in his treatise *Contra Adimantum*; but he admits elsewhere (*Contra Advers. Legis et Prophet.* ii. 42) that he had been obliged, through want of leisure, to leave a few unexamined, which he hoped at some future time to take up and refute (compare also *Serm. de Script.* xii.). He mentions (*Contra Adv. Leg.* i. c.) that Adimantus' praenomen was Addas, "Adimanti, qui praenomine Addas dictus est;" this is the reading in the Benedictine edit. from the older MSS.,—the common editions read "proprio nomine," which would have implied a confusion between the names of two of the most celebrated of Manes' disciples—a charge brought against this father by Beausobre (*Hist. de Manich.* i. 432). [E. B. C.]

ADOLIA, a wealthy matron of Antioch, an old friend and correspondent of Chrysostom. Her property was the cause of much anxiety and family discomfort, which Chrysostom earnestly exhorted her to free herself from by distributing her wealth to the poor. His counsels do not appear to have found a ready response, and his letters manifest considerable dissatisfaction. One cause of complaint was Adolia's want of readiness to visit her spiritual guide in his place of exile. "Cucusus," he reminded her, "was but a short distance from Antioch. The season was favourable. It was neither too hot nor too cold. Old and sickly as he was, were he not a prisoner, he would come and see her." Her plea of severe sickness was only half

believed. That of the treachery of friends and business engagements only strengthened his arguments for her renunciation of her property. "At any rate she might write to him more frequently. He had sent six letters, and only received two. Want of means of transmission might be some excuse. But when Libanius came from Antioch, whom everybody knew, why did she not send a letter by him? Perhaps he started without her hearing of his intention. He could only say that he was always inquiring if any one was going near Antioch, who could take a letter to her." Tillemont is inclined to identify her with the Adolia mentioned by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.*) as having served God virtuously to the best of her ability, but not so excellently as her sister Ousia, whom he had seen in the monastery of Hesycia, τὰ ὅλα σεμνολάτῃν. (Chrysost. *Epist.* xxxii., lii., lviii., cxxxiii., clxxx., cccxxi.) [E. V.]

ADOPTIONISTS (*Adoptiani*, *Adoptivi*),^a the followers of a Christological heresy in the age of Charles the Great, in Spain and Gaul, who held that Jesus Christ, as to his human nature, was the Son of God only by adoption or by name.

1. *History.*—The history of this sect is confined to the West, while all the older Christological controversies took place mainly in the East. It originated in that part of Spain which was under the rule of the Saracens, where the Catholics had to defend the eternal and essential sonship of Christ against the objections both of the Arians and the Mahometans. The Council of Toledo, 675, in the preface to the *Confessio Fidei*, states: "Hic etiam Filius Dei natura est Filius, non adoptione." But about a century afterwards Elipandus, the aged Archbishop of Toledo, and primate of Spain under the Mahometan dominion, endeavoured to modify the orthodox doctrine, by drawing a distinction between a natural and an adopted sonship of Christ, and by ascribing the former to his divine, the latter to his human nature. He did this, perhaps (as Neander suggests), with the hope of avoiding the objections of Mahometans. Having little confidence in his own opinion, he consulted Felix, bishop of Urgel or Urgella in Catalonia, in that part of Spain which, since 778, was incorporated with the dominion of Charles the Great. Felix was more learned and clear-headed than Elipandus, and esteemed, even by his antagonist Alcuin, for his ability and piety. Neander (iii. 317) regards him as the originator of Adoptionism; at all events, he reduced it to a formal statement. Confirmed by his friend, Elipandus taught the new doctrine with all the zeal of a young convert, although he was already eighty years of age, and taking advantage of his influential position, he attacked the orthodox with overbearing violence. He found many friends, but also vigorous opponents; among whom Etherius, Bishop of Osma or Othma (formerly his pupil), and Beatus, a presbyter and abbot, took the lead in the defence of the old and the exposure of the

^a The Germans, after the mediaeval Latin *Adoptiani*, say *Adoptianer*, *Adoptianismus*, as they say *Creatianer*, *Subordinatianer*, etc. But in English, where we have the nouns adoption, creation, subordination, from the corresponding Latin nouns, the spelling of those derivative theological terms with an *o* instead of an *a* seems to be more natural, and is universally accepted in the case of *subordinationist* and *subordinationism*.

new Christology. Elipandus, who was a man of violent temper, and jealous of his dignity, charged his opponents with confounding the natures of Christ, like wine and water, and with scandalous immorality (he calls Beatus a "disciple of Antichrist, carnis immunditias foetidus et ab altario Dei extraneus"), and pronounced the anathema on them. Pope Hadrian being informed of these troubles, issued a letter in 785 to the orthodox bishops of Spain, warning them against the new doctrine as rank Nestorianism. But the letter had no effect; and, generally, the papal authority plays a subordinate rôle in this whole controversy. The Saracen government, indifferent to the theological disputes of its Christian subjects, did not interfere. But when the Adoptionist heresy, through the influence of Felix, spread in the French portion of Spain, and even beyond the Pyrenees into Septimania, creating a considerable commotion among the clergy, the Christian Emperor Charles called a Synod to Regensburg (Ratisbon) in Bavaria, in 792, and invited the Bishop of Urgel to appear, that his case might be properly investigated. The Synod condemned Adoptionism as a renewal of the Nestorian heresy; and Felix publicly and solemnly recanted before the Synod, and also before Pope Hadrian, to whom he was sent. But on his return to Spain he was so much reproached for his weakness, that, regardless of his solemn oath, he yielded to the entreaties of his friends and reaffirmed his former opinions. Charles, who did not wish to alienate the Spanish portion of his kingdom, and to drive it into the protection of the neighbouring Saracens, directed Alcuin, who in the mean time had come to France from England, to send a mild warning and refutation of Adoptionism to Felix. When this proved fruitless, and when the Spanish bishops, under the lead of Elipandus, appealed to the justice of the emperor, and demanded the restoration of Felix to his bishopric, he called a new council at Frankfurt on the Main in 794, which was attended by three hundred bishops. As neither Felix nor any of the Adoptionist bishops appeared in person, the council, under the lead of Alcuin, confirmed the decree of condemnation passed at Ratisbon. Subsequently Felix wrote an apology, which was answered and refuted by Alcuin. Elipandus reproached Alcuin for having 20,000 slaves (probably belonging to the convent of Tours), and for being proud of his wealth. Charles sent Archbishop Leidrad of Lyons and other bishops to the Spanish portion of his kingdom, who succeeded, in two visits, in converting the heretics (according to Alcuin 20,000). About that time a council at Rome, under Leo III., pronounced, on very imperfect information, a fresh anathema, erroneously charging the Adoptionists that they denied to the Saviour any other than a nuncupative Godhead (Harduin, iv. 928). Felix himself appeared, 799, at a Synod in Aix-la-Chapelle, and after a debate of six days with Alcuin, he recanted his Adoptionism a second time. He confessed to be convinced by some passages, not of the Scriptures, but of the fathers (especially Cyril of Alexandria, Leo I., and Gregory I.), which he had not known before, condemned Nestorius, and exhorted his clergy and people to follow the true faith (Hard. iv. 929-934; Alcuin, *Epp.* 92, 176; and the *Confessio Fidei Felicis* in Mansi, xiii. 1035, sq.). He spent

the rest of his life under the supervision of the Archbishop of Lyons, and died 818 (not 816, as Neander has it). He left, however, a paper in which the doctrine of Adoptionism is clearly stated in the form of question and answer; and Agobard, the successor of Leidrad, felt it his duty to refute it (*Adv. Dogma Felicis Episc. Urgellensis, libri III., Opera Agob. ed. Baluze, Par. 1666, t. i.*). Elipandus, under the protection of the government of the Moors, continued openly true to his heretical conviction. But Adoptionism lost its vitality with its champions, and passed away during the 9th century. Slight traces of it are found occasionally during the middle ages. Duns Scotus (1300) and Durandus a S. Porciano (1320), admit the term *Filius adoptivus* in a qualified sense. (See Walch, *Hist. Adopt.* p. 253; Gieseler, *Church History*, 4th Germ. ed. vol. ii. part i. p. 117, note 13.) The defeat of Adoptionism was a check upon the dyophysitic and dyotheletic feature in the Chalcedon Christology, and put off indefinitely the development of the human side in Christ's Person. (Comp. Dörner, ii. p. 311.) In more recent times the Jesuit Vasquez, the Lutheran divines G. Calixtus and Walch, have defended the Adoptionists as essentially orthodox (Gieseler, l. c.).

II. *Doctrine.*—The doctrine of Adoptionism is closely allied in spirit to the Nestorian Christology; but it concerns not so much the constitution of Christ's person, as simply the relation of his humanity to the Fatherhood of God. The Adoptionists were no doubt sincere in admitting at the outset the unity of Christ's person, the communication of properties between the two natures, and the term *Theotokos* (though in a qualified sense) as applied to the Virgin Mary. Yet their view implies an abstract separation of the eternal Son of God and the man Jesus of Nazareth, and results in the assertion of two distinct Sons of God. It emphasized the dyophysitism and dyotheletism of the orthodox Christology, and ran it out into a personal dualism, inasmuch as sonship is an attribute of personality, not of nature. The Adoptionists appealed, without good reason, to Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, and Isidore of Seville. Sometimes the term *adoptio* is indeed applied to the Incarnation by earlier writers, and in the Spanish liturgy (the *Officium Mozarabicum*), but rather in the sense of *assumptio* or *ἀνάληψις*, i. e. the elevation of the human nature, through Christ, into union with the Godhead; and in a passage of Hilary (*De Trinit.* ii. 29) there is a dispute between two readings—"carnis humilitas *adoptatur*," and "*adoratur*" (Alcuin)—although the former alone is consistent with the context, and "*adoptatur*" is used in a more general sense for *assumitur* (so Agobard). They might, with better reason, have quoted Theodore of Mopsuestia as their predecessor, but they were probably ignorant of his writings and doctrine of the *υἱὸς θεός*, which is pretty much the same as their *filius Dei adoptivus*. (See Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii. p. 318, f.) The fundamental point in Adoptionism is the distinction of a double Sonship in Christ,—one by nature and one by grace, one by generation and one by adoption, one by essence and one by title, one which is metaphysical and another which is brought about by an act of the divine will and choice. The idea of sonship is made to depend

on the nature, not on the person; and as Christ has two natures, there must be in him two corresponding Sonships. According to his divine nature Christ is really and essentially the Son of God (*secundum naturam* or *genere*), begotten from eternity; but according to his human nature he is the Son of God only nominally (*nuncupative*) by adoption, or by divine grace. Begotten Son of God (*Unigenitus*, *μονογενής*, *secundum adoptionem*, or *gratia*, *electione*, *voluntate*, *beneplacito*). By nature he is the *Only* (John i. 14), by adoption and grace he is the *First* begotten (*Primogenitus*, *πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*, Rom. viii. 29; comp. Col. i. 15). Thus *Epist. Episc. Hisp. ad Episc. Galliae*, in Alcuin's *Opera*, ed. Froben ii. 568: "Nos confitemur et credimus, Deum Dei filium ante omnia tempora sine initio ex Patre genitum—non adoptione sed genere, neque gratia sed natura—pro salute vero humani generis, in fine temporis ex illa intima et ineffabili Patris substantia egrediens. . . . secundum traditionem Patrum confitemur et credimus, eum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, non genere esse filium Dei sed adoptione, neque natura sed gratia." The Adoptionists quoted in their favour mainly John xiv. 28; Luke i. 80, xviii. 19; Mark xiii. 32; John i. 14, x. 35; Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. xi. 3; 1 John iii. 2; Deut. xviii. 15; Ps. ii. 8, xxii. 23, and other passages from the O. T., which they referred to the *Filius primogenitus et adoptivus*; while Ps. lx. 4 (*ex utero ante Luciferum genui te*), xlv. 2; Is. xlv. 23; Prov. viii. 25, were understood to apply to the *Filius unigenitus*. None of these passages, which might as well be quoted in favour of Arianism, bear them out in their peculiarity. Christ is nowhere called the *adopted* Son of God. Felix inferred from the adoption of the adopted children of God, that they must have an adoptive head. He made use of the illustration, that as a son cannot have literally two fathers, but may have one by birth and the other by adoption, so Christ, according to his humanity, cannot be the Son of David and the Son of God in one and the same sense, but he may be the one by nature and the other by adoption. (Alcuin, *Contra Felicem*, i. 12, and iii. 1.) It is not clear whether he dated the adopted Sonship of Christ from his exaltation (Dorner, ii. 319), or from his baptism (Walch), or already from his birth (Neander). He speaks of a double birth of Christ, compares the baptism of Christ with the baptism or regeneration of believers, and connects both with the *spiritualis generatio per adoptionem* (l. c. ii. 15); but, on the other hand, he seems to trace the union of the human nature to the divine to the womb of the Virgin (l. c. v. 1). The Adoptionists, as already remarked, thought themselves in harmony with the Christology of Chalcedon, and professed faith in one divine person in two full and perfect natures—"in una persona, duabus quoque naturis plenis atque perfectis," Alcuin, *Opp.* ii. 567; they only wished to bring out their views of a double Sonship, as a legitimate consequence of the doctrine of two natures.

The champions of orthodoxy, among whom Alcuin, the teacher and friend of Charles the Great, was the most learned and able—next to him Paulinus of Aquileja and Agobard of Lyons,—unanimously viewed Adoptionism as a revival or modification of the Nestorian heresy, which

was condemned by the third Oecumenical Council (431). (Alcuin, *Contra Felicem*, l. i. c. 11:—"Sicut Nestoriana impietas in duas Christum dividit personas propter duas naturas; ita et vestra indocta temeritas in duos eum dividit filios, unum proprium, alterum adoptivum. Si vero Christus est proprius Filius Dei Patris et adoptivus, ergo est alter et alter," etc. Lib. iv. 6, 5: "Nonne duo sunt, qui verus est Deus, et qui nuncupativus Deus? Nonne etiam et duo sunt, qui adoptivus est Filius, et ille, qui verus est Filius?") Starting from the fact of a real incarnation, the orthodox party insisted that it was the eternal, only begotten, Son of God who assumed human nature from the womb of the Virgin, and united it with his divine person, remaining the proper Son of God notwithstanding this change. (*Ibid.* ii. 12:—"Nec in illa assumptione alius est Deus, alius homo, vel alius Filius Dei, et alius Filius Virginis: sed idem est Filius Dei, qui et Filius Virginis; ut sit unus Filius etiam proprius et perfectus in duabus naturis Dei et hominis.") The learned Walch defends the orthodoxy of the Adoptionists, since they did not say that Christ, in his twofold Sonship, was *alius et alius*, ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος (which is the Nestorian view), but that he was Son *aliter et aliter*, ἄλλως καὶ ἄλλως (*Ketzehistorie*, vol. ix. pp. 881, 904). Baur (ii. p. 152) likewise justifies Adoptionism, as a legitimate inference from the Chalcedonian dogma, but on the assumption that this dogma itself includes the Nestorian dualism in the doctrine of two natures. Neander, Dorner, and Niederer, concede the affinity of Adoptionism with Nestorianism, but affirm, at the same time, the difference and the new features in Adoptionism (see especially Dorner, ii. p. 309, sq.).—The radical fault of this heresy is, that it shifts the whole idea of Sonship from the person to the nature. Christ is the Son of God as to his person, not as to his nature. The two natures do not form two sons, since they are inseparably united in the one Christ. The eternal Son of God did not in the act of Incarnation assume a human personality, but human nature. There is therefore no room at all for an adoptive Sonship. Christ is, in his person from eternity, by nature what Christians become by grace and regeneration. The Bible nowhere calls Christ the *adopted* Son of God.

III. *Sources*.—1. The writings of the Adoptionists: a letter of Elipandus, *Ad Fidelem Abbatem*, a. 785, and one to Alcuin; two letters of the Spanish bishops,—one to Charles the Great, the other to the Gallican bishops; *Felici Libellus contra Alcuinum*; the *Confessio Fidei Felicis*; fragments of a posthumous book of Felix addressed *Ad Ludovicum Pium Imp.* 2. The orthodox side is represented in *Beati et Etherii adv. Elipandum libri II.*; Alcuin, *Seven Books against Felix*, *Four Books against Elipandus*, and several letters; *Seven Books of Paulinus*, Bishop of Aquileja, *Adv. Felicem Orgeletanum*; Agobard of Lyons, *Adv. Dogma Felicis Episc. Urgellensis*; a letter of Charlemagne (792) to Elipandus and the bishops of Spain; the acts of the Synods of Narbonne (788), Ratishon (792), Francfort (794), and Aix-la-Chapelle (799); all in Harduin IV.; Mansi XIII.; Gallandi XIII.; and in the *Opera Alcuini*, ed. Froben, Ratisb. 1777, tom. i. and ii. A minute and carefully accurate history of the controversy is given by Chr. G. F. Walch, *His-*

toria Adoptionum, Gotting. 1755, and in his *Ketzergeschichte*, vol. ix. 667, sqq. Comp. also Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. iii. pp. 313-339; Gieseler, vol. ii. P. 1, p. 111, sqq.; Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menscheiung Gottes*, Tübingen, 1842, vol. ii. pp. 129-159; Dörner, *Entwicklungs-Geschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, second ed. Berlin, 1853, pp. 306-330; Niedner, *Lehrbuch der christl. K. G.*, Berlin, 1866, pp. 424-427; J. C. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church from 590 to 1122* (Lond. 1856), p. 154, sqq. See art. ELIPANDUS and FELIX. [P. S.]

ADRIANUS, an alleged Bishop of St. Andrews, martyred by the Danes A.D. 874 (*Breviar. Aberdon.* March 4). [A. W. H.]

ADRIANUS. [HADRIANUS.]

ADRIANISTAE. [HADRIANISTAE.]

AEDESIUS or HEDESIUS, M., a noble Lycian, brother of Apphianus, a student at Alexandria, where he was martyred by drowning about A.D. 306 (Euseb. *De Mart. Palaest.* v. 14; Syriac *Acta* in Assemani, *Act. Mart.* ii. 195, sq.). [A. W. H.]

AEDESIUS and FRUMANTIUS. [FRUMANTIUS.]

AEDSIND or AEDSHIN (written also Adelphius, Aigiulphus), stated in the life of S. Foillanus to have been brother of Brendanus, Bp. and Phimolaga, King of Ireland, and maternal grandfather of SS. Fursaues and Foillanus. He was long embittered against the saints, and their mother, because she had married their father without his consent. After a time, he became reconciled to them. His death was in the first half of the 7th century (*Act. SS. Belg.* iii. 16, 19). [C. D.]

AEINUS (Aelvous, Epiph. *Haer.* 165c, 169A [Iren.], 176B; Aἰῶνος Hippol. *Haer.* vi. 30; *Aenos Tert. Val.* 8; Iren. 7 [s. q.]; *Enos* ib. 135). A suspicious word. [VALENTINUS.] [H.]

AELIAN, Bishop of SELINUS, or TRAJANOPOLIS, in Isauria, present at the Council of Chalcedon, 451, and signed its acts. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 854, &c.) His subdeacon Paulus signs the 6th *Actio* for him. (*Ib.* 1483.) [E. V.]

AEGIDIUS S. (Aγίδιος, Dim. form of αἶγ or αἰγῆ, *Ital.* Sant' Egidio, *Span.* San Gil, *French.* S. Gilles, *Engl.* St. Giles), abbat and confessor, a saint of whom in proportion to his wide-spread celebrity and popularity there is singularly little trustworthy information. All writers agree in throwing discredit upon the acts from which the life of the saint, as it is popularly given, has been composed. (Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Septembre, col. v.; Stilling in *Act. SS. Boll.* Sept. i. 289.) The following appears to be the only incontestable point of history, that Aegidius, an abbat in Languedoc, was sent by his bishop, St. Caesarius, in 514, to Pope Symmachus at Rome, on a request about the readjustment of the provinces of Southern Gaul (Labbe, *Concilia*, iv. p. 1310). The question whether this person is identical with S. Aegidius, whose date a legend fixes in the reign of Charles Martel (see the quotation from the Antwerp Breviary in *Boll.* p. 291), though the original Acts, written not later than the 9th or 10th

century, name the king Flavius,* has divided modern hagiologists and historians. Mabillon, who, when he wrote the *Analecta Vetera* (iii. 433), had no hesitation in pronouncing their identity, afterwards (*Annales* i. 99) changed his view, and is followed by Stilling (*loc. citat.* p. 291 seqq.) against the Benedictine editors of the *History of Languedoc*, i. 666, Baillet, and most of the moderns. Assuming then that Aegidius, the friend of St. Caesarius, is not identical with the person whom we know as St. Giles, and premising that much confusion as to the chronology has arisen from the attempts of modern writers to harmonize what is incapable of harmony, we may take as the most probable view that arrived at by Stilling after much laborious research—that Aegidius was born in Greece, perhaps of noble parentage, about 640, and came to the coast of Provence about 25 years later. He thinks that 'Caesarius' is a scribe's interpolation, and does not mark a second bishop of Arles of that name, while he gives reasons for concluding that Veredemus, the saint's companion in his solitude, was identical with Veredemus, bishop of Avignon, who flourished about 700; he holds that Aegidius lived a hermit's life near the Guerdon, a tributary of the Rhone, till 670 or 671, when he penetrated to a still deeper solitude in a forest, where he was discovered by King Flavius, i. e. Wamba (or possibly Ervigius), a Catholic king of the Visigoths (not Amalaric or Theudo, who were Arians, as Mabillon, nor Theodoric, king of Italy, nor Childebert, king of France, as others, who defend the earlier date, suppose), in the following way. A hind pursued in the chase by the king's dogs, and wounded by an arrow, fled for refuge to the cave where the saint lodged. He supported his life on the milk of this hind, and the fruits and herbs of the forest, spending all his time in acts of devotion. Struck by the sight of the saint kneeling in prayer, with the wounded hind by his side, the king ordered him to be left unmolested, and according to one account he resisted all attempts to draw him from his solitude, and died in his cavern. But according to the commonly-received legend, he obeyed the royal summons, and after a short visit to the court returned about 673 (Stilling, p. 296) to his solitude, and founded the monastery which after his death bore his name. Pope Benedict II. is said to have granted him a privilege of exemption, and some cypress-wood, of which the doors of the church were formed about 684. If we may believe the *Acta* he foretold the destruction of his monastery by the Saracens, which must have taken place about 720, when according to our supposition the saint would be 80 years of age. At this point we must suppose that his interview with Charles Martel at Orleans took place, Aegidius having escaped from the Saracens into the part of Gaul which was subject to the Franks. This course was actually adopted by SS. Baudelius and Romulus of Nismes. The *Acta* carry him back to his monastery, where we must suppose that he died before the second irruption of the Saracens in 725, unless we imagine that he attained

* A name common to several Visigothic kings. The title *vallis Flaviania*, by which the site of this abbey is distinguished in mediaeval documents, seems to connect its foundation with one of these kings.

a very extreme old age. This view, which is consistent and presents no insuperable difficulty, seems préférable to that which would reject the latter part of the *Acta* as spurious, and refer the foundation of the monastery to the posthumous fame of sanctity and miraculous power which attracted pilgrims to the hermit's resting-place. On the previous connection of the Goths with this site see citations from Godfrey of Viterbo and Otto of Frisingen in Catel's *Histoire des Comtes de Toulouse*, pp. 4, 5.

Some (e.g. Mabillon, *Annal.* i. 99, Baillet, *ut supra*) have argued from the style of the existing abbatial buildings against the antiquity of the foundation as claimed above. But this argument would be equally valid against the historical mention of the abbey as one of those included in the list presented in 817 to the Council of Aachen (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 481). Copies of bulls and letters issued by Popes John VIII. Martinus I., Adrian III., Stephen V., and Sergius III., between the years 879-910, confirming the independence of the Abbey of St. Gilles from the bishops of Nîmes, are to be seen in Ménard, *Histoire de Nîmes*, t. i. Preuves, pp. 11-16. This author (t. vii. 618-621), writing in 1758, gives a succinct history of the abbey and town of St. Gilles, with full references to authorities. Pilgrims were attracted, he says, in great numbers to the saint's tomb from all parts of Christendom, and the town owes its origin to the necessity for their accommodation on the spot. It soon came into the hands of the counts of Toulouse. He exposes the common error which asserts that it became an independent county and the capital of Lower Languedoc. The counts of Toulouse were however frequently called counts of St. Gilles, from the accession of Raymond IV., Count of Rouergue, Nîmes, and Narbonne, who cherished a special devotion for the saint (cf. Catel, *Hist. des Comtes de Toulouse*, p. 131), and is commonly distinguished from other counts of his name as "Raymond de St. Gilles." The situation of the town on a small arm of the Rhone, which furnished it with an accessible and safe harbour, may have stimulated the devotion which during the 11th and 12th centuries is remarked by many writers. Among these the Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, who travelled in Europe in 1160, noticed the crowds of foreigners who used to flock to St. Gilles from the most distant countries. Others remark the fair held on September 1, which, says Ménard, though it still lasts, is now far less frequented. To this date we may probably refer the great extension of the *cultus* of St. Gilles, especially in England and Scotland; for instance, we may suppose that pilgrims from Oxford on their return built the church in the north suburb of their city, and instituted the annual fair, which to this day bears the name of their patron, while London, Edinburgh,^b and most of the other principal British cities, possess 11th or 12th century churches under this dedication.

It is beyond the scope of the present article to give the subsequent history of the abbey and town of St. Gilles. The former, a Benedictine

foundation, was secularized by Pope Paul III. in 1538; and the Upper Church was demolished in part by the Duc de Rohan, when the Huguenots no longer found it tenable as a fort, in 1562. A good description of the present state of this Upper Church, begun in 1116 by Alphonso, son of Count Raymond IV., originally 290 feet in length by 88½ feet in breadth, and in its integrity "probably the grandest church in the South of France," may be seen in Murray's *Handbook to France*, p. 520, edit. 1869, where it is stated that in the Lower Church, which is still complete, and adjoins the church already mentioned, the central part over the tomb of St. Giles is of earlier date than the rest, perhaps a relic of the church consecrated by Urban II. in 1096. The celebrated spiral staircase, called *Le vis de St. Gilles*, is the only relic of the priory, and itself narrowly escaped destruction at the Revolution. The town, which in Ménard's time contained only 3500 inhabitants, has revived, and now numbers 6804.

Of such personal characteristics as may be gathered from the Acts of this saint, perhaps the most remarkable is his intense—as we should say—morbid humility, which withdrew him from the notice of his countrymen, and the open exercise of practical virtues, to a desert, and led him to refuse treatment for an accidental lameness that he might be able to practise more rigid self-mortification. From this anecdote he has been esteemed the patron of cripples. St. Giles' Cripplegate, built about 1090 (Newcourt, *Repertorium*, i. 355) is dedicated to him, and it has often been noticed that churches built under his patronage are generally at the entrance of towns, e.g. St. Giles-in-the-Fields, London. "Every county in England, except Westmoreland and Cumberland, has churches named in his honour, amounting in all to 146, and Warrington in Devon is named after SS. Martin and Giles conjointly." *Calendar of the Anglican Church* (Parker), p. 106. A brotherhood of St. Mary and St. Giles is mentioned by Newcourt, in connection with the church at Cripplegate. Matilda, Queen of Henry I. founded a hospital of St. Giles outside the city walls of London for lepers. St. Giles' church in Rome used to be much frequented by women before childbirth. (*Mirabilia Romae*, p. 38, edit. 1618.) Other monasteries and churches, dedicated to St. Giles, are at Liège, St. Hubert in the Ardennes, Sentiges in Hungary, St. Quintin in Picardy, Bamberg, Brunswick, Munster, and Nuremberg. See *Stilting*, pp. 285-287.

Modern ingenuity has attributed the selection of extra-mural and secluded spots by the founders of these churches to a recognition and imitation of the saint's love of privacy (J. J. Moore's *Historical Handbook for Oxford*, p. 201). Why churches should have been so situated for the benefit of cripples is certainly not apparent. If it was "in order to afford poor and lame travellers a ready opportunity of resorting to them, on their entering from the country" (Blunt, *Annotated Prayer Book*, preface, p. 55), the end in view must have been very partially secured.

In art St. Giles is generally represented as an aged man, with a long white beard; a hind, sometimes having its neck pierced with an arrow, rests its head or forefeet in his lap, or crouches at

^b St. Giles was accounted the tutelar saint of Edinburgh. Preston of Gorton brought an arm-bone to the city, which was encased in a silver casket. For an account of the church at Edinburgh under this saint's invocation see *Iustorum Semita*, ii. 332-335.

his feet. "In pictures his habit is usually white, because such pictures date subsequently to the period when the abbey of St. Giles became the property of the reformed Benedictines, who had adopted the white habit. Representations of St. Giles are seldom met with in Italy, but very frequently in early French and German art." (Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 34.) A drawing of the saint after Albert Durer, given in the same work, p. 201, represents him as unbearded (see also the woodcut from painted glass in Parker's *Calendar*, &c. p. 106), and with his hand pierced by an arrow.

Giles is a common Christian name; nowhere more so than in Belgium. Its frequency as a surname, both in France and England, may be seen by reference to modern biographical dictionaries.

It is now generally allowed that it was another Aegidius who wrote some medical treatises in Latin verse (Trithemius, *De Viris Illustr.* lib. 2, cap. 22; Hoffmann, *Lexicon*, s. v. Aegidius).

The relics of the saint, buried in the church dedicated by himself to St. Peter, but translated by Abbat Antulphus in 925 to the neighbouring abbey (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 483), were allowed to rest in peace, till the Albigensian war in 1209 exposed them to danger, when they were transported to Toulouse and laid over one of the altars in the church of St. Saturninus (St. Sernin), where the body still was when Baillet wrote. Pope Urban IV. added to the honour of the saint, by giving his office a place in the Roman Breviary as a semi-double; but since the middle of the 16th century it has been reduced to a simple office. St. Giles, whose name was received into the English Martyrologies subsequently to the time of Bede (*Beda, Martyrologium* in t. iv. p. 117. ed. Giles), still retains a place in the reformed English Calendar; the Sarum Epistle and Gospel were *Ecclus.* xxxix. 5-9, St. Luke xi. 33-36. His festival is kept on September 1.

The original materials for the life of Aegidius are:—(1) the life by an anonymous author, published from the collation of six MSS. by Stilling, with his critical notes in *Act. SS. Boll.* Sept. i. 299-304; (2) two lives in prose, and one in verse, mentioned by Baillet; (3) Acts, kept in the treasury of the parish of SS. Leu and Gilles in Paris, commended by René Benoit, Curé of St. Eustache, and André Du Saussay, Bishop of Toul. (4) Miracles, composed by Petrus Guillelmus, Librarian of St. Gilles, in 1120, edited by Jaffé in *Pertz, Monumenta*, xiv. 316-323. A tract by J. L. Spoerl on St. Giles, as the patron of Nuremberg, was published at Altorf in 1749. [C. D.]

ÆLIUS PUBLIUS JULIUS, bishop of Debelum, a colony in Thrace, towards the close of the second century, one of several bishops who attested by their subscriptions their rejection of the Montanist pretensions to the gift of prophecy. It does not distinctly appear to what document, or on what occasion these signatures were affixed, or for whose use they were specially destined. They are produced in a letter, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 19), by Serapion, bishop of Antioch; but may have been copied by him from a letter of Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, which Serapion cites on the same occasion, in order to show that the activity of the Mon-

tanist school of prophecy was "abominated by all the brotherhood in the world." Aelius ascribes the Montanist prophecies to demoniacal possession, and attests with an oath that Sotas, bishop of Anchialus, had been prevented by "the hypocrites" from exorcising the Montanist prophetess Priscilla. Similar stories are elsewhere told of other bishops [MONTANISM]. The anomalous combination of three gentile names in Aelius Publius Julius deserves to be noticed. [G. S.]

ÆLOAEUS [ELOAEUS].

ÆLURUS TIMOTHEUS. [TIMOTHEUS.]

ÆNEAS, of Gaza (Gazaeus), a Christian philosopher of the Neoplatonic school, a disciple of Hierocles of Alexandria, flourished c. 487 A.D. All we know of him is drawn from his own writings, of which we only have a dialogue, entitled *Theophrastus* from one of the interlocutors, *On the Immortality of the Soul and the Resurrection of the Body* (Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* tom. x. pp. 629-664), and 25 letters, which have been printed by Aldus in his *Epistol. Graec. Collectio*, Ven. 1499. From his letters it appears that he was a friend of his fellow-townsmen Procopius, and had the same correspondents. His date is ascertained in his *Theophrastus*, where he asserts (as "a cool, learned, and unexceptionable witness, without interest and without passion," (Gibbon, *D. & F.*, ch. 37) that at Constantinople he had heard the confessors whose tongues Hunneric, son of Genseric, had caused to be cut out in the persecution of the orthodox at Tipasa, A.D. 484, speak articulately. (*Theophr.* ap. Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* x. p. 661; cf. Victor Vitens. *de Persec. Vandal.* v. 6; Gibbon, *u. s.*)

His *Theophrastus* is praised by Ritter for the brilliancy of its style and successful imitation of Plato's dialogues. Its chief purpose is to attack the doctrine of the previous existence of souls, and to establish those of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. He maintains an incessant creation of souls by God, and holds that a soul cannot exist anteriorly to its descent into an earthly body. Without the body man cannot be. The body contains a germ, enclosing something of the Eternal within itself, and therefore, though it decays, and appears to perish, is destined to be renewed and come to perfection (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 459; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* i. 689; Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* x. 629-664; Oudin. i.; Brucker, *Hist. Ant. Philos.* iii. 527; Ritter, *Philosoph. Chretienne*). [E. V.]

ÆON, in the Valentinian and some later systems, is the name for the various subordinate heavenly powers evolved from the Supreme Deity. How a word signifying an "age" came to be applied in this manner has never been satisfactorily explained. Philo's usage is merely Platonic; and both the αἰών of Greek philosophy and the Αἰών of Greek mythology are alien to the Gnostic conception. We should probably look rather to some secondary employment of the Shemitic equivalent עולם (*O'lam*). The plurality of Aëons here creates the difficulty. There was undoubtedly (Jablonski, *Opusc.* i. 373 f.; Movers, *Phoen.* i. 544 f.) a Phoenician deity called in Greek Αἰών (Sanchun. ap. Eus. *P. E.* i. 10; Damasc. *de Princ.* 268 Αἰών κοσμοκράς, 385 Οὐλαμὸς), who appears to have been introduced at Alexandria (Damasc. ap. Suid. s. v.

Διαγνώμων, Ἡράσκος, Ἐπιφάνιος). The supreme "Bythus" was indeed by some Valentinians called the "Perfect Aeon" (Iren. 5) or the "Never-aging Aeon" (Auct. Valent. ap. Epiph. *Haer.* 168B; cf. *AGERATUS*), &c.; but these designations evidently presuppose a plurality.

In Bardeisan's system the Syriac *Ite, Beings* (Ephr. Syr., as quoted by Hahn, *Bardes.* 58 f.), may perhaps represent the Aeons. They are said to occur under their proper name "Olamim" in the Mandaean *Thesaurus*. Mani too had true Aeons, "saecula" (*Ep. fund.* ap. Aug. c. *Ep. Man.* 11; Aug. c. *Faust.* xv. 5; cf. Flügel, *Mani* u.s.w., 274 ff.).

For the doctrine of Aeons see VALENTINUS, GnosticisM. [H.]

AERIUS, Ἀέριος, founder of the heretical sect of the AERIANS, c. 355, still living when Epiphanius wrote against heresies, 374–376. He was the early friend and fellow-disciple of Eustathius of Sebasteia in Pontus [EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTEIA]. While they were living an ascetic life together the bishoprick of Sebasteia became vacant. Each of the friends was a candidate for the office. The choice fell on Eustathius. This was never forgiven by AERIUS. Eustathius endeavoured to soften his friend's disappointment by at once ordaining AERIUS presbyter, and setting him over the hospital established at Sebasteia for the reception of strangers, the maimed, and incapable (ξενοδοχεῖον, or πτωχοτροφεῖον). But all his attempts were fruitless. The irritated pride of AERIUS caused him to take a prejudiced view of all his rival's proceedings; envy deepened into dislike, and dislike into open hostility. He threw up his charge, deserted the hospital, and openly published grave charges against his bishop; whom he accused of being entirely changed, having deserted the ascetic life, and being simply intent on the amassing of wealth. Eustathius spared no pains to regain his friend: he tried caresses, entreaties, warnings, threats, in vain. The rupture with himself widened into a rupture with the Church. AERIUS and his followers, who amounted to a considerable number of both sexes, openly separated from their fellow-Christians, and professed ἀποταξία, or the renunciation of all worldly goods. Very hard measure seems to have been dealt to them by the Christians of the day. They were denied not only admission to the churches, but even access to the towns and villages; and they were compelled, even in the depth of winter, when the country was covered with snow, to sojourn in the open fields, or in caves and ravines, and hold their religious assemblies in the open air exposed to the severity of the horrible Armenian winter. Little mercy would be inculcated by the ecclesiastical rulers towards the followers of one who ventured to bring Scriptural weapons to the attack of the fast-growing sacerdotalism of the age; who dared to call in question the prerogatives of the episcopate; and who was struggling to deliver the Church from the yoke of ceremonies which were threatening to become as deadening and more burdensome than the rites of Judaism. The protest of AERIUS was premature. Centuries had to elapse before it could be effectually renewed. The AERIANS were proclaimed heretics by the united verdict of an offended hierarchy, and their voices died out unheeded.

Our only knowledge of the tenets of AERIUS is from Epiphanius. Augustine's account, in his work, *De Haeresibus*, c. 53, is merely an epitome of the statement of Epiphanius. AERIUS, "to the world's misfortune," μέγα κακὸν τῷ κόσμῳ, was still "living in the flesh and surviving in life" when Epiphanius wrote. His teaching was still fresh, and his followers not few or unimportant, while the principles he enunciated—so remarkable an anticipation of those propounded by the Protestant churches at the Reformation—went so fearlessly to the root of much that the Church was beginning to cling to as its most precious possession, that we cannot feel much surprise at the excessive vehemence of the language employed by Epiphanius with regard to his teaching: *μανιώδης μᾶλλον ἢ περ καταστάσεως ἀνθρωπίνης*. He even plays upon his name, declaring, with reference to Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12, that AERIUS was rightly so called: *ἀέριον γὰρ ἔσχευεν πνεῦμα ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀέριων πνευμάτων τῆς πορνείας τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ οἰκῆσαν κατὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*.

Whether, as Epiphanius asserts, he went beyond ARIUS in his impieties or no, his early connection with Eustathius will hardly allow us, with some Protestant writers, to call in question the Arian character of his teaching, which is distinctly affirmed by Epiphanius. But it was not on this that the charge of heresy was grounded. Epiphanius specifies four special counts, each of which he thinks sufficiently important to call for particular refutation. (1) The first of these, with which the name of AERIUS has been chiefly identified in modern times, is the assertion of the equality of bishops and presbyters, *μία τάξις, μία τιμή, ἐν ἀξίᾳ*. He bases this view on the language of the Apostolic Epistles, where no such distinction can be generally maintained, and from the identity of many of their functions. When he says that each *χειροθετεῖ*, the ambiguity of the word leaves it uncertain whether he denied the grace of orders and the necessity of episcopal ordination. Augustine's statement (*l. c.*) "*docuisse fertur quod episcopum non potest ordinare*" must be a misrepresentation of his tenets. No one ever denied a bishop's power to ordain. The only question was whether he alone possessed that power. (2) AERIUS also ridiculed the observance of Easter as a relic of Jewish superstition, to be cast aside now that "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us." (3) Prayers and offerings for the dead he regarded not as useless only, but as pernicious. If they availed to the benefit of the departed, no one need trouble himself to live holily: he would only have to provide, by bribes or otherwise, a multitude of persons to make prayers and offerings for him, and his salvation was secure. (4) All set fasts he condemned. A Christian man should fast when he felt it to be for his soul's good: appointed days of fasting were relics of Jewish bondage. Epiphanius charges his followers with showing their contempt for Church usage, by gratifying their appetites to a greater degree than usual on Wednesdays and Fridays and the solemn weeks before Easter, and fasting on Sundays; and indulging in undisguised mockery of those who followed the rule of the Church.

Philaster, whose authority when unconfirmed by other testimony is very small, confounds the

Aerians with the Encratites, and asserts that they practised abstinence from food and rejected marriage (Philast. *Haer.* 72).

The only original authority on Aerius and his followers is the *Panarium* of Epiphanius, *Haer.* 75. A summary of his statements is given by Augustine, *De Haeres.* 53; Philaster, *l. c.*, is simply misleading. The student may further consult Schröckh, *Christliche Kirch. Gesch.* vol. vi. pp. 226-234; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* vol. iii. pp. 221, sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii. pp. 461-463 (Clark's translation); Herzog, *Real Encycl.* vol. i. 165; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccles.* vol. ix. pp. 87, sq. [E. V.]

AERIUS, a Christian sophist, a native of Cyrus, and friend and correspondent of Theodoret. Theodoret wrote to him early in his episcopate, inviting him to the consecration of the church he had built at Cyrus; and again (c. 442) in behalf of Celestiacus, formerly a wealthy senator of Carthage, who had lost his all in the sack of the city by Genseric. (Theodt. *Ep.* 30, 66.) [E. V.]

AETHELBERHT,
AETHELFERTH,
AETHELHARD,
AETHELWULF,
AETHELWALD,
AETHELWIN,
AETHELWOLD,

See under ETHEL-
HARD, &c.

AETIUS (*'Aétios*), the founder and head of the strictest sect of Arianism, upon whom, on account of the boldness of his reasonings on the nature of God, theological bitterness with its customary exaggeration, affixed the surname of "the ungodly," *áθεος* (Soz. iii. 15): an epithet, however, not to be taken in its modern sense of "atheist," which, as implying intention and system, is far too strong. He was the first to carry out the doctrines of Arius to their legitimate issue, and in opposition both to Homoiousians and Homoiousians maintained that the Son was *unlike*, *ἀνόμοιος*, the Father, from which his followers took the name of Anomoeans. [ANOMOEANS]. They were also known as Eunomians [EUNOMIANS], from his amanuensis and pupil Eunomius, who proved the principal apologist of the party; and as Heterusiasts and Exukontians, as affirming that the Son was *ἐξ ἑτέρας οὐσίας* from the Father, and created *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*.

The events of his singularly vagrant and chequered career are related from very different points of view by the Eunomian Philostorgius, and the orthodox writers Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Gregory Nyssen. The friendly pen of Philostorgius carefully softens all the offensive features of his history, which his theological adversaries delight to paint in the blackest colours. After making all due allowance for the unfairness of party spirit, we must regard Aetius as a bold and unprincipled adventurer, endowed with an indomitable love of disputation, which, together with an ostentatious delight in displaying his dialectic skill, led him, without any depth of conviction, into incessant arguments on the nature of the Godhead, the person of our Lord, and other transcendental subjects, and rendered his life one unwearied and fruitless strife, not only

with the orthodox but with the less pronounced of the Arian party who shrunk from accepting his dogma of the dissimilarity of the Father and the Son. Born of comparatively humble parentage, "his restless and aspiring spirit urged him to try almost every profession of human life. He was," in the graphic words of Gibbon, "successively a slave, or at least a husbandman, a travelling tinker, a goldsmith, a physician, a shoemaker, a theologian, and at last the apostle of a new church" (*Decline and Fall*, c. xxi.). He was born at Antioch. His father, who had held some minor office, possibly as apparitor, under the president of the province, having died insolvent, his property was confiscated to discharge his official liabilities, and Aetius, then a child, and his mother, were left in a state of extreme destitution (Philostorg. *H. E.* iii. 15; cf. Valesius' notes; Suidas, *sub. voc.* 'Aétios). According to Gregory Nyssen, he became the slave of a woman named Ampellis; and having obtained his freedom in some disgraceful manner, took up the trade of travelling tinker. Gregory paints a lively picture, for which he probably drew largely on his imagination, of the future heresiarch travelling the country with his leathern tent, and mending pots and pans with his little hammer and portable anvil. He soon tried a higher flight, and applied his hand to richer metals, practising the art of a goldsmith. Having been convicted of substituting copper for gold in an ornament entrusted to him by a soldier's wife for repair, he gave up his trade, and attaching himself to an itinerant quack, picked up some knowledge of medicine. He met with a ready dupe in an Armenian, whose large fees placed Aetius above the reach of want. He now began to take rank as a regular practitioner at Antioch, and attended the consultations of the physicians of the place, where his loud voice, ready tongue, and power as a disputant were, according to Gregory, at the command of any who would pay for them (Greg. Nyss. *adv. Eunom.* lib. i. vol. ii. p. 293). Philostorgius knows nothing of this passage in his history, but tells us that his mother's death having rendered it unnecessary for him to carry on his trade, he betook himself entirely to the study of philosophy and dialectics, to which he had already devoted his nights, and became the pupil of Paulinus, the Arian bishop, the friend of Eusebius the historian, recently removed from Tyre to Antioch, c. 323 (Philost. iii. 15). Aetius attached himself to the Aristotelian form of philosophy, and with him, Milman remarks (*Hist. of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 443) the strife between Aristotelianism and Platonism among theologians seems to have begun. His chief study was the Categories of Aristotle, the scope of which, according to Socrates (*H. E.* ii. 35), he entirely misconceived, and which he simply employed as instruments for building up sophistical arguments to prove his prosaic and unimaginative doctrines, repudiating the prevailing Platonic mode of argument used by Origen and Clemens Alex. The jealousy and ill-will he had excited as an indomitable disputant, whom it was equally hopeless to silence or to convince, broke out when the death of Paulinus, after a six months' tenure of the see, deprived him of his protector, c. 324. His successor Eulalius yielded to the popular feeling, and

banished Aetius to Anazarbus in Cilicia, where he again gained his livelihood by his trade, disputing at the same time with all who would enter into argument with him. Here his dialectic skill charmed the heart of a grammarian, who took him home and instructed him more fully, receiving repayment by his menial services. Unable to resist his combativeness, he tried his polemic powers against his benefactor, whom he put to public shame by the open confutation of his interpretation of Scripture. On the ignominious dismissal which naturally followed, Athanasius, the Arian bishop of the place, opened his doors to the outcast, and read the Gospels with him. He prosecuted his study of the New Testament by reading St. Paul's epistles at Tarsus with Antonius, who, like Athanasius, had been a disciple of Lucian, Arius' master. On Antonius' elevation to the episcopate, Aetius returned to Antioch, where he studied the prophets, particularly Ezekiel, with Leontius, afterwards bishop of that see, also a pupil of Lucian. The storm of unpopularity to which he had already been forced to yield was again excited by his unbridled tongue and the obtrusive impiety of his doctrines, and soon drove him from Antioch. Cilicia was once more his haven of refuge; but his former good fortune seemed to have forsaken him, and he was defeated in argument by one of the Borborian Gnostics. Overwhelmed by the disgrace of his defeat, he left Asia, and betook himself to Alexandria, and soon recovered his former character as an invincible adversary by vanquishing in argument the Manichean leader Aphthonius, whose fame had contributed to draw him to Egypt. Aphthonius, according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 15) only survived his defeat seven days. Here Aetius again took up his former professions, studying medicine under Sopolis, and practising gratuitously for the benefit of the poor, and working as a goldsmith at night and at spare hours, undertaking any jobs that required a hand of more than ordinary skill.

On the murder of Gregory the Arian bishop of Alexandria, and the triumphant return of St. Athanasius in 349, Aetius felt it prudent to return to Antioch, of which his former teacher Leontius was now bishop. By him Aetius was ordained deacon c. 350 (Philost. iii. 17; Socr. *H. E.* ii. 35; *Athanas. de Synod.* § 38, Oxford translation, p. 137; Suidas, s. v.), with permission to teach publicly. This was far more to his taste than the humbler duties of the diaconate, which his patron permitted him to repudiate. His ordination was successfully protested against by Flavian and Diodorus, though still laymen, and he was inhibited from the exercise of his ministry (Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 24). Epiphanius erroneously asserts that he was admitted to the diaconate by George of Cappadocia, the intruding bishop of Alexandria (Epiph. *Haeres.* lxxvi. 1). Aetius now developed more fully his anomoean tenets, teaching openly that the Son was created ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, and was dissimilar to the Father, and exerted all his influence to induce the Arian party to refuse communion with the orthodox. His failure exasperated him, and he now began to withdraw himself from the less pronounced Arians, and in his turn to refuse to hold communion with them (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 359). This schism in the Arian party was still further developed at the first council of Sirmium,

A.D. 351, where he attacked the respectable semi-Arian (Homoiousian) bishops, Basilus of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Sebaste, with a vehemence and ability that, according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 16), reduced them to a humiliating silence. Exasperated by his discomfiture, Basil denounced his opponent to the weak and cruel Gallus, who, having been named Caesar in 351, had fixed his abode at Antioch, and declared himself a champion of a faith which he never allowed to restrain his passions or influence his conduct. Gallus ordered the pestilent heretic to be put to death by "crurifragium;" but his life was spared at the intercession of the bishop Leontius, who refuted the calumnies of his enemies; and being subsequently introduced to Gallus by Theophilus Blemmys, he speedily gained his friendship, and acquired so much influence with him that he was sent by Gallus to his brother Julian to win him back from the paganism into which he was lapsing. Gallus also appointed him his religious teacher (Philost. *H. E.* iii. 27; Greg. Nyss. *u. s. p.* 294).

The fall of Gallus in 354 caused a change in the fortunes of Aetius. He was accused of complicity in the massacre of Domitian and Montius, but escaped the vengeance of Constantius, and returned to Alexandria in 356 to support the waning cause of Arianism against the influence which Athanasius, though again banished, exerted from his desert hiding-place. The see of Athanasius was then occupied by George of Cappadocia, under whom Aetius served as a deacon, and when nominated to the episcopate by two Arian bishops Serras and Secundus, he refused to be ordained by them on the ground that they had held communion with the Homoiousian party (Philost. iii. 19). Here he was joined by his renowned pupil and secretary Eunomius, who had been drawn from Cappadocia by the fame of his wisdom, and eventually became the most powerful champion of his master's doctrines (Greg. Nyss. *u. s. p.* 299; Socr. *H. E.* ii. 22; Philost. *H. E.* iii. 20). Greater troubles were now at hand for Aetius. The sense of his defeat, which still rankled in the breast of Basil of Ancyra, was exasperated by his disappointment once more in not obtaining the see of Antioch after the death of Leontius, and he denounced his vanquisher to the civil power. Constantius had taken Arianism under his imperial protection. The views of Aetius were heterodox even to the heterodox, and his theological errors were rendered more unpardonable by his supposed complicity in the treasonable designs of Gallus. He was accordingly given over to Basil and his party, by whom he was banished to Pepusa in Phrygia. The influence of the court prelates Ursacius and Valens soon procured the revocation of the decree of banishment. But the untiring hostility of his opponents, after a short interval, drove him again into exile. The hard irreverence of Aetius, and the determination with which he pushed to the utmost the legitimate conclusions from the principles of Arius, shocked the more religious among the Arian party, and forced the bishops in self-defence to use all measures to crush one equally dangerous as an ally and an opponent. His doctrines were also becoming alarmingly prevalent. "Nearly the whole of Antioch had suffered from the shipwreck of Aetius, and there was danger lest the whole (once more) should be submerged" (Leter

of George bishop of Laodicea, ap. Soz. *H. E.* vi. 13). They therefore employed all their influence with Constantius to procure the summoning of another council to settle the great theological controversy. The synod was appointed for Nicomedia in Bithynia. But a violent earthquake which shattered the city, prevented its assembling there, and the intrigues of the court party and the influence of the all-powerful eunuch Eusebius brought about its division into two synods. That for the west met at Ariminum; that for the east at Seleucia in Isauria, A.D. 359. The latter council, after four or five days' deliberation, separated without having come to any definite conclusion. "The Arians, Semiarians, and Anomoeans, mingled in tumultuous strife, and hurled mutual anathemas at one another" (Milman, *Hist. Christ.* iii. c. 8). Whatever triumph was gained rested with the opponents of the Aetians, who appealed to the emperor and the court, and a second general council was summoned to meet at Constantinople (St. Athanas. *de Synod.* § 10, 12). Of this council Acacius was the leading spirit, and by some strange combination of circumstances a split occurred among the Anomoean followers of Aetius. The party triumphed, but its founder was sent into banishment. The place of his exile was Mopsuestia: but the emperor hearing that he was kindly treated there by Auxentius the bishop, ordered him to be transferred to Amblada in Pisidia, a wild and barbarous place at the foot of Mount Taurus. Here, however, he gained the goodwill of the savage inhabitants by the power of his prayers, having, as they supposed, averted a pestilence caused by the extreme heat (Theod. ii. 23; Soz. iv. 23, 24; Philost. iv. 12; Greg. Nyss. *u. s. p.* 301).

The death of Constantius, A.D. 361, put an end to Aetius' exile. Julian, on his accession, recalled all the banished bishops, and wrote a private letter to Aetius, evidencing an agreeable recollection of his former intercourse, and inviting him to his court (*Ep. Juliani*, 31, p. 52, ed. Boisson; Soz. v. 5). He furnished him with public conveyances to facilitate his return, and at the instance of Eudoxius (Philost. ix. 4) presented him with a landed estate in the island of Lesbos as a token of his goodwill. The ecclesiastical censure was taken off Aetius by Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch (Philost. vii. 5), who, with the bishop of his party, compiled a defence of his doctrines (Phil. viii. 2). According to Epiphanius (*Haer. u. s.*), he was consecrated bishop at Constantinople, though not to any particular see; and, in conjunction with Eunomius, consecrated bishops for his own party in the capital and elsewhere (Philost. viii. 2). On the death of Jovian, A.D. 364, Valens, on his return from Illyricum to Constantinople, showed special favour to Eudoxius, between whom and Aetius and Eunomius a schism had arisen. Aetius in disgust retired from the city to the farm given him by Julian in Lesbos (Philost. ix. 4). The revolt of Procopius once more endangered his life. He was accused to the governor, whom Procopius had placed in the island, of favouring the cause of Valens, A.D. 365-6, and his life was only saved by the intervention of a powerful favourite of Procopius, who was a kinsman of two of Eunomius' most attached followers (Philost. ix. 6). Aetius once more returned to Constantinople,

where he resided for a short time with Eunomius, his firm friend through all his vicissitudes, and Florentius, the bishop to whom they had entrusted their party. His death took place A.D. 367. His last hours were watched over by Eunomius, by whom and his theological adherents his funeral was performed with much magnificence (Philost. ix. 6).

Aetius was the author of several letters to Constantius and others, filled with theological technicalities and subtle disquisition on the nature of the Deity (Socr. ii. 35), and of 300 heretical propositions, of which Epiphanius has preserved 47 (*Haeres.* lxxvi. § 10), together with a refutation of each. [E. V.]

AETIUS. (1), a Palestinian bishop, who condemned the ARCHONTIC Peter of Capharbaricha, about a generation before 361 (Epiph. *Haer.* 291). A Bishop of Lydda (Diospolis) of this name subscribed the C. of Nicaea (325). Yet he had been claimed not long before by Arius as a partisan (Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 5: cf. v. 7; Epiph. *Haer.* 731c); he took part in the Arian Synod of Antioch in 330 (Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 20); and the Arian historian Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 12) accuses him of having joined the Athanasians in the hope of evading a charge of fornication, adding that he died soon after by an appropriate judgment. An Aetius stands second among the Palestinian bishops who subscribed the C. of Sardica (347: *Ath. Ap. c. Ar.* 50), and who two years later specially congratulated Athanasius on his return from exile (*Ath. ib.* 57; cf. *H. Ar. ad Mon.* 25).

(2). A bishop of the Valentinians at Constantia in Cyprus. According to Polybius (*V. Epiph.* 59) he was struck dumb by Epiphanius for his blasphemies, and died on the 7th day. [H.]

AETLA, a pupil of S. Hilda in the monastery of Whitby, who according to Bede became bishop of Dorchester. He is probably the same as Haeddi, who was bishop of the West Saxons from 676 to 705; see HAEDDI: but Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* 622) supposes him to have been the bishop of a new see established for the South Angles in 679, in consequence of the decree of the Synod of Hertford. Dorchester, however, was still a part of Wessex, nor was the see finally fixed at Winchester until the translation of S. Birinus by Haeddi, which took place before 693. Perhaps Aetla may have been a diminutive of Haeddi (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23; *Ang. Sacra*, i. 192, 193). [S.]

AFRICANUS, an imaginary writer on heresies referred to by "Praedestinatus" (i. heading and c. 83). [H.]

AFRICANUS, JULIUS (Ἀφρικανὸς), a Christian writer at the beginning of the 3rd century, twice called by Suidas Sextus Africanus (*s. vv.* Ἀφρικανὸς, Σωσάννα), but this was probably a lapse of memory. No other ancient writer calls him Sextus, or Sextus Julius, by which combination it has been proposed to reconcile Suidas with the other authorities. He may have been, as Suidas also asserts, a Libyan by birth; but a great part of his life was passed at Emmaus in Palestine, not however the village Emmaus described by St. Luke (xxiv. 16) as distant sixty stadia from Jerusalem, a point taken for granted by the ancient authorities

(Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 21; Hieron., in *libro de Locis Hebraicis*, s. v. Ἐμμαοῦς, ii. p. 439; et in *Epitaph. Paulae*, iv. p. 673); but, as Reland has shown in his *Palaestina*, pp. 427, 758 (see also Smith's *Dictionary of Geography*, s. v. Emmaus), the town Emmaus situate in the plain country, (1 *Macc.* iii. 40) at the distance of 22 Roman miles (= 176 stadia) from Jerusalem. This town Emmaus having become ruined, Africanus, A.D. 221, went on a successful embassy to the Emperor Elagabalus, and was placed by him at the head of a commission for the restoration of the city, which thenceforward bore the name Nicopolis (Euseb., *Chron.*; Hieron., *De Vir. Illust.* cap. 63). According to Sozomen (*l. c.*) the town did not then first receive that name, but had been built a little after the destruction of Jerusalem, and had been called Nicopolis to commemorate the Roman victories over the Jews. Georgius Syncellus, in a passage, supposed by Scaliger to have been derived from the first part of the *Chronica* of Eusebius, names not Elagabalus, but his successor Alexander, as the emperor to whom the embassy was sent. It is quite possible that two or three years may have intervened between the sending of the embassy and its successful termination. Two Syrian writers (the earlier of whom however lived at the end of the 12th century), Dionysius Barsalibi and Hebedjesu, represent Africanus to have been Bishop of Emmaus (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii. p. 158, iii. p. 14). Against this statement must be set (besides the silence of earlier authorities, none of whom asserts Africanus to have been even a presbyter), the fact that Origen in his letter to Africanus (see below) addresses him as "brother," which is not the language of a presbyter writing to a bishop. The letter also concludes with a salutation sent to "our good Pope Apollinarius;" and it is most natural to conjecture that this Apollinarius (of whom we do not read elsewhere) and not Africanus was bishop of the place to which the letter was sent. If not a bishop at this time (about A.D. 238), Africanus could scarcely have become one afterwards; for he addresses Origen as "son," and if he were not then a bishop, this must indicate some considerable difference of age; but Origen was then over fifty, so that Africanus could scarcely have been less than seventy.

Cedrenus (*Hist. Comp.*, p. 207) places Africanus as flourishing in the reign of Pertinax, A.D. 193. Eusebius (*H. E.*) places his notice of him under the reign of Gordian, A.D. 238-244. Hence Scaliger, in the *ιστοριῶν συναγωγῇ* appended to his edition of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius (p. 392), places Africanus the chronographer under Pertinax, and the author of the *Cesti* under Gordian. But even if we accept the unsupported testimony of so late an author as Cedrenus, it is possible that one man's literary activity may have extended over the whole intervening period; he may have been born A.D. 170, or a little earlier, and died A.D. 240, or a little later.

We have been able to find no authority for the statement made by Cave, and repeated by several subsequent writers, that Africanus died about A.D. 232.

Africanus seems to have been a man of considerable personal activity. He mentions in his *Chronica* cited by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 31) that he made a journey to Alexandria on account of

the celebrity, for his knowledge of philosophy and Grecian science, of Heraclas, who afterwards, A.D. 233, became Bishop of Alexandria, and who had been placed by Origen in charge of the catechetical class, about A.D. 213. Africanus elsewhere (ap. Syncellum, p. 56, Routh, *Rel. Sac.* ii. 250) refers to this visit to Egypt. He also states (Routh, ii. 243) that he had personally visited the two spots which had been identified with the resting-place of Noah's ark, viz., Mount Ararat in Parthia (Armenia), and Celaenae (Apmæia, ἡ Κιβωτὸς) in Phrygia. He describes the Dead Sea from personal observation. He seems to have visited Edessa. To these travels we must add his journey (to Rome?) on the occasion of his embassy; and if, as there seems good reason, we are to ascribe to him the *κεντροί*, the list of his travels must be further extended.

Africanus ranks with Clement and Origen as among the most learned of the ante-Nicene fathers (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 35; Hieron., *Ep. ad Magnum*, 83, vol. iv. p. 656). His great work, which was intended to give a comparative view of sacred and profane history from the creation of the world, demanded an extensive range of reading; and the fragments that remain contain references to the works of a considerable number of historical writers.

The only work of Africanus which has come down to us in a complete state is his letter to Origen already mentioned. This has been preserved in several MSS., and is referred to by many authors (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 31; Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.* cap. 63; Photius, cod. 34; Suidas, s. v. Ἀφρικανός; Niceph. Call., *H. E.* v. 21, and others). The correspondence originated in a discussion between Origen and a certain Bassus, at which Africanus was present, and in which Origen appealed to the authority of that part of the Book of Daniel which contains the story of Susanna. Africanus, "as was proper," acquiesced at the time, but afterwards wrote a short letter to Origen urging with great vivacity several objections to the authenticity of this part of the book; that the story is wanting in gravity, that it contains internal improbabilities, that the kind of prophetic inspiration ascribed to Daniel is different from that attributed to him in the genuine book, that he is made to quote the language of his predecessors which no true prophet has done, that the style is different from that of the genuine book, that this section is not in the Book of Daniel as received by the Jews, and that it contains a play on Greek words which shows that it was originally written in Greek and not in Hebrew, in which all the books of the Old Testament are written. Origen replied at greater length, refuting these objections with more or less success. He thinks it likely that the lost Hebrew original contained a play on words which the translators endeavoured to preserve. He contends that the argument that this section is not owned by the Jews would prove too much, and would oblige us also to reject the story of Bel and the Dragon, the Song of the Three Children, and many other passages found in the Greek text and not in the Hebrew. And he urges an argument, afterwards pressed by Rufinus against Jerome, that it would be a degradation to the Church if she were forced to cast aside her sacred books, and go begging to the Jews to give her unadulterated Scriptures.

This letter of Africanus has been regarded as proving that he was acquainted with Hebrew; but he makes no objections which might not have been urged on slight knowledge of the language, or on information derived from Jewish sources. A passage in Origen's reply conveys the impression that he did not rate his correspondent's Hebrew acquirements very highly; and the chronological work of Africanus is based on the Septuagint and not on the Hebrew, the fragments preserved showing that in some cases he did not look beyond that version (see Routh's *Fragments*, iii., v., vii.). It seems probable that while Africanus had that slight knowledge of Hebrew which a learned and inquisitive man could scarcely have lived in Palestine without acquiring, it was not enough to enable him to make much use of the Hebrew Bible.

The date of the correspondence between Africanus and Origen is limited by the considerations that Origen writes from Nicomedia, having previously visited Palestine, and that he makes a reference to his labours in a comparison of the Greek and Hebrew texts which indicates that he had already published the *Hexapla*. These conditions are best satisfied by a date about A.D. 238. This correspondence was first printed in a Latin translation by Leo Castrius (Salamanca, 1570), appended to his commentaries on Isaiah. Of subsequent editions the more remarkable are Wetstein's (Basle, 1674), with notes intended to extenuate as much as may be Origen's defence of the story of Susanna; and De la Rue's, who gives the letters, with notes replying to Wetstein, in the Benedictine edition of Origen, vol. i. The letters were printed also in Gallandii *Bibl. Vet. Pat.* vol. ii.; and the letter of Africanus, but not that of Origen, is given in Routh's *Rel. Sac.* ii. 225.

Not less celebrated than the letter of Africanus to Origen, is his letter to Aristides, of whom nothing else is known, on the discrepancy between our Saviour's genealogies as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke. This has not been completely preserved, but a considerable portion is given by Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 7), and Routh (*Rel. Sac.* ii. 228) has published this together with a fragment not previously edited. A compressed version of the letter is given also in Eusebii ad Stephanum, *Quaest.* iv. (Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.*, vol. i.). Africanus begins his letter by rejecting an explanation previously offered, namely, that the genealogies are fictitious lists, designed to establish our Lord's claim to be both king and priest by tracing his descent in one Gospel from Solomon, in the other from Nathan, who it was assumed was Nathan the prophet. Africanus insists on the necessity of maintaining the literal truth of the Gospel narrative, and protests against the pious fraud of attempting to draw dogmatic consequences from any statements not founded on historical fact. He then proceeds to give his own explanation, founded on the levirate law of the Jews, and professing to be traditionally derived from the Desposyni (or descendants of the kindred of our Lord), who dwelt near the villages of Nazareth and Cochara. According to this view Matthew gives the natural, Luke the legal, descent of our Lord. Matthan, it is said, of the house of Solomon, and Melchi of the house of Nathan, married the same woman, whose name is given as Estha. Heli the son

of Melchi (the names Matthat and Levi found in our present copies of St. Luke are omitted by Africanus), having died childless, his uterine brother Jacob, Matthan's son, took his wife and raised up seed to him; so that the offspring Joseph was legally Heli's son as stated by St. Luke, but naturally Jacob's son as stated by St. Matthew. For a critical examination and defence of this solution, see Mill *On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, p. 201. Serious doubts as to the trustworthiness of the testimony on which it rests are suggested by a story, which Africanus tells on the same authority, of a destruction of genealogies by Herod in order to conceal the ignobleness of his own origin; a story, the details of which are completely contradicted by history. And Africanus was not likely to be a severe critic of the evidence, since he maintains that in default of being able to produce a better solution we ought to accept his even on weak testimony.

Besides references to this letter to Aristides in places already indicated of Eusebius, Jerome, Photius, and Nicephorus Callistus, the solution of Africanus is adopted by St. Augustine (*Retract.* lib. ii. cap. vii.).

We come now to give an account of the great work of Africanus, his "accurately laboured" (*Eus., H. E.* vi. 31) treatise on chronology, in five books. As a whole this work has been lost, but we can form a good idea of its general character from the still remaining *Chronicon* of Eusebius, which was based upon it, and which undoubtedly incorporates much of it. Eusebius himself, p. 132, mentions the writings of Africanus among his authorities for Jewish history, subsequent to the times of which the Hebrew Scriptures treat. Several fragments of the work of Africanus can be identified by express quotations, either by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio* and *Demonstratio Evangelii*, or by other writers, in particular by Georgius Syncellus in his *Chronographia*. These have been collected by Gallandi (*Bibl. Vet. Pat.* vol. ii.), and more fully by Routh (*Rel. Sac.* vol. ii.). Photius describes the work of Africanus as concise, but omitting nothing necessary to be recorded; as beginning from the Mosaic cosmogony, and going down to the coming of Christ, and afterwards touching cursorily on the events after Christ down to the reign of Macrinus. An extract from the work itself, preserved by Georgius Syncellus (p. 212), shows that the chronicle was brought a little further down, to the consulship of Gratus and Seleucus, the fourth year of Elagabalus, Olymp. 250, 1, A.D. 221. The year of the world (5723) assigned in the extract to this consulship is the same as that named by Photius for the conclusion of the chronicle. The work must have been published early in that year, and before the result of the Olympic contests was known, for the list of Olympic victors copied from Africanus by Eusebius terminates with the 249th Olympiad. The ancient chronologers usually arranged their work in two parts, a *χρονολογία* and *κανών*; the former part containing historical and chronological discussions, the latter drawing out their results into tables, in which each year was marked with its place in the different series compared, as, for instance, its dates, according to the Olympiads, A.U.C., after Christ, its number in such an emperor's

reign, its consuls, and so forth. It is of this latter part that the word chronicon in the singular number is properly used. This part, containing the expanded results, is also sometimes called τὸ κατὰ πλάτος, as the former is κατ' ὁμῶδα. Now Anianus calls the five books of Africanus τὰ κατ' ὁμῶδα. Yet that they were not unaccompanied by a κανὼν appears from Fragment xxxvi. in Routh, where Africanus says that ἡμέτερος κανὼν places the first Olympiad in the reign of Jotham, King of Judah.

The following is an account of the plan of the work, and of some of its principal results. Before the time of Africanus, the Christian Apologists had been forced to engage in some chronological discussions in order to remove the heathen contempt of Christianity as a novelty, by demonstrating the great antiquity of the Jewish system, out of which the Christian sprang. Thus Tatian (*Or. ad Graec.* cap. 39), Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.* iii. 21), Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, i. 21), discuss the question of the antiquity of Moses, and, following Josephus (*cont. Apion.* i. 16), arrive at the conclusion that Moses was a contemporary of Inachus, and that the Exodus took place 393 years before the coming of Danaus to Argos. Africanus first set himself to make a complete synopsis of sacred and profane history from the creation of the world, where should be put in their proper places the most important facts recorded in Scripture or by secular historians. To establish a synchronism between sacred and profane history, he used as a fixed point the accession of Cyrus, which, alleging the authority of Diodorus, Thallus, Castor, Polybius, Phlegon, and others, he placed Olymp. 55, 1. Counting backwards then in sacred history, he computes 1237 years between the Exodus and the end of the 70 years' captivity or the first of Cyrus. Similarly going back in profane history he computes, on the authority of Hellanics and Philochorus, 1020 years between Ogyges and the first Olympiad, and, adding 217 years between the first Olympiad and Cyrus, he finds also 1237 years between Ogyges and Cyrus, and concludes that Moses and Ogyges were contemporaries. He thinks it likely that there was a connection between the Ogygian deluge and the plagues of Egypt; and he confirms his conclusions by showing that it can be deduced from Polemo, Apion, and Ptolemaeus Mendesius, that Moses was a contemporary of Inachus, whose son, Phoroneus, reigned at Argos in the time of Ogyges. In the sacred history Africanus follows the Septuagint chronology; he counts 2262 years to the deluge: he does not recognize the second Cainan: he places the Exodus A.M. 3707. In computing the years of the Judges he is blamed by Eusebius for lengthening the chronology by adding, without authority, 30 years for the elders after Joshua, 40 for anarchy after Samson, and 25 years of peace. He thus makes 740 years between the Exodus and Solomon. Our Lord's birth he places in the year of the world 5500, and two years before our common computation of Anno Domini. But he allows only one year for our Lord's public ministry, and brings the crucifixion thus to the year A.M. 5531. He has a mystical calculation, in which he makes the 31 years of our Saviour's life the complement of the 969 years of Methuselah. To the period of the

70 weeks he devoted especial attention, and it seems to have been the subject of a separate treatise (Routh, ii. 306). He calculates the commencement from the 20th year of Artaxerxes: from this to the death of our Lord he counts only 475 years; but he contends that the 70 weeks of Daniel are to be understood as 490 lunar years of 354 days each, which are equivalent to 475 Julian years. And here he makes a curious remark, which is worth quoting as illustrating the extent of his scientific knowledge. He apologizes for using the popular value for the length of the year, 365½ days, and says that he is well aware that it would have been more accurate to use the value 365½₁₅. This is a correction in the wrong direction, making the year longer than its value, according to the Julian calendar, instead of shorter as it really is. The explanation evidently is, that he accepted as accurate the cycle of Euctemon and Meton, in which 235 months, containing in all 6940 days, were made equivalent to 19 years. This gives the length of a year used by Africanus. He computes correctly that the substitution of the Metonic for the Julian value of the length of a year would make a difference in his calculation of six days and a quarter; and if his astronomy is not up to the highest scientific standard of his age, his arithmetic is entitled to all praise. In like manner he computes that the difference between the Metonic value for the length of a month, 29½₂₃, (for so the corrupt figures in the present text must be corrected) and the common value, 29½, is $\frac{3}{94}$ of a day, a quantity which he regards as too small to affect his calculations.

Another interesting passage in the *χρονικά* is one in which he treats of the darkness at the crucifixion, and shows, in opposition to the Syrian historian Thallus, that it was miraculous, and that an eclipse of the sun could not have taken place at the full moon. Lastly, we may notice his statement that the remains of Jacob's terebith at Shechem, Gen. xxxv. 4, were in his time still remaining, and were held in honour; and that Jacob's tent had been preserved in Edessa until it was struck with lightning in the reign of the Emperor Antoninus [Elagabalus?]. Africanus probably had personally visited Edessa, whose king, Abgarus, he elsewhere mentions.

The work in all probability concluded with the Doxology, which St. Basil has cited (*De Spir. Sanct.* §. 73, iii. 61) in justification of the form of doxology *ὁν Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι*.

It remains to speak of another work, the *κεστοί*, expressly ascribed to Africanus by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 31), Photius (l. c.), Suidas (l. c.), and Syncellus (p. 359), the last-named writer being supposed by Scaliger to have copied his statement from the *Chronica* of Eusebius. According to this authority, the work consisted of nine books; and it is probably owing to errors of transcribers that we now find Photius enumerating 14 and Suidas 24. The work seems to have received the fanciful name of *Cesti*, or variegated girdles, from the miscellaneous character of its contents, which embraced the subjects of geography, natural history, medicine, agriculture, the art of war, &c. The portions that remain have suffered by mutilation and addition, different copyists having selected those parts which related to the subjects in which they were interested, and having added precepts

from later writers. The military precepts have been published by Thevenot, *Veteres Mathematici*, Paris, 1693; several of the agricultural are included in the *Geoponica* of Cassianus Bassus, Cambridge, 1704, and an extremely curious summary of some of the medical precepts is given by Michael Psellus (Lambecii *Comm. de Bibl. Caes. Vind.* vii. 223). Modern critics have been unwilling to ascribe this work to our Africanus, on account of its completely secular character; of the repulsiveness of some of its contents, as, for instance, the directions for poisoning provisions and wells included in the art of war; and on account of the superstitious reliance on the efficacy of charms, so unlike what the critical and sceptical spirit of the letter to Origen would dispose us to expect from Africanus. And some incredible things, to which the writer gives his personal attestation (c. 29), lay him open to the charge not merely of credulity, but want of veracity. It has been held that if Julius Africanus were the writer, it must have been while he was yet a heathen; and the notice in Suidas has given rise to the conjecture that we must distinguish the Libyan Sextus Africanus, the author of the *Cesti*, from Julius Africanus of Palestine, the ecclesiastical writer. But the external evidence for ascribing the *Cesti* and *Chronology* to the same author is too strong to be easily set aside, and is not without some internal confirmation. Thus the author of the *Cesti* was better acquainted with Syria than with Libya; for he mentions the abundance of a certain kind of serpent in Syria, and gives its Syrian name (*Vet. Math.* p. 290), but when he gives a Libyan word (*Geopon.* p. 226) he does so on second-hand testimony. And he was a Christian, for he asserts (*Geopon.* p. 178) that wine may be kept from spoiling by writing on the vessels "the divine words, Taste and see that the Lord is gracious." The unlikelihood of Africanus having written such a work becomes less if we look upon him not as an ecclesiastic, but as a Christian philosopher, pursuing his former studies after his conversion, and entering in his note-books many things more in accordance with the spirit of his own age than of ours. It was probably in his character of philosopher that he presented himself to the emperor to plead the cause of Emmaus, and these books, which Syncellus tells us were dedicated to the Emperor Alexander, may have been presented to prove his claim to that character.

The Syrian writers who speak of Africanus as a bishop also ascribe to him commentaries on the New Testament (Assemani, *l. c.* and ii. 129). Citations purporting to be from Africanus are made in the catenae of Macarius on St. Matthew (Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* viii. 676), and of Nicetas on St. Luke (Mai, *Script. Vet.* ix. 724). That he should have engaged in such a work is consistent with the praise given him by Origen as a diligent student of Scripture.

Of works, the ascription of which to Africanus is clearly erroneous, we may mention the Acts of the martyrdom of Symphorosa and her seven sons (Bolland. *Acta Sanct.*, July 18). The spuriousness of these Acts is abundantly proved by S. Basnage (*Annal.* ii. 46). The manuscripts not only claim these Acts for Africanus, but also assert, on the authority of "Saint Eusebius the historian," that he wrote the acts of nearly all the martyrs of Rome and of all Italy. Such a

statement it is needless to discuss. For further information see Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* iv. 240, ed. Harles. [G. S.]

AGAPE, a Spanish lady, a disciple of MARCUS of Memphis. From her and her own disciple Helpidius Priscillian received the rudiments of his doctrine (Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* ii. 46 [61]; Hieron. *Ep.* 75 § 3). She was thus one of the links between the Gnosticism and Manichaeism of the East and the Priscillianism of Spain. Jerome no doubt had her chiefly in view when he spoke of "Gnostics deceiving noble ladies of Spain, mingling pleasure with fables, and claiming for their own folly the name of knowledge" (*Com. in Es.* lxiv. 4; cf. *l. c.*). [H.]

AGAPE (Iren. 7, 135; Epiph. *Haer.* 165, 169). [VALENTINUS.] [H.]

AGAPETUS, bishop of Rome, was, we are told, a Roman by birth, the son of Gordianus a priest (Anast. quoted by Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, p. 763; Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum*, p. 73). He was already an old man when, six days after the death of Johannes II. he was elected pope at the beginning of June, A.D. 535. The election may perhaps have been influenced in his favour by Theodahad the Gothic king, whom we find soon after employing him as legate to Constantinople.

On his first accession, however, he began by formally reversing an act of Bonifatius II., one of his own immediate predecessors. On the death of the antipope Dioscorus, A.D. 530, Bonifatius II. had stooped to the unnecessary revenge of fulminating anathemas against him, and forcing all his clergy to subscribe the decree which contained them. This decree Agapetus caused to be burnt in the midst of the assembled congregation (*Anast.* vol. i. p. 100).

We next find him entering Constantinople on the 19th Feb., A.D. 536 (Clint. *F. R. p.* 765). He was sent thither by Theodahad to avert, if possible, the war with which he was threatened by the emperor Justinian in revenge for the murder of his queen, Amalasontha: and we are told that he succeeded in the objects of his mission (*Anast.* vol. i. p. 102). But he certainly failed to avert the war; Justinian, we are told, had already incurred such expense as to be unwilling to turn back (Liberat. quoted by Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, vii. p. 314): and, as a matter of fact, Belisarius took Rome within the year. But Agapetus, who had already shown his independence of mind in his correspondence with Justinian, probably had other objects in view besides the avowed one, which brought him to Constantinople. The year before Anthimus, who was suspected of Monothelitism, had been appointed Patriarch of Constantinople by the influence of Theodora. Agapetus, on his first arrival, refused to receive Anthimus unless he could prove himself orthodox, and then only as bishop of Trebizond, for he was averse to the practice of translating bishops. At the same time he boldly accused Justinian himself of Monophysitism; who was fain to satisfy him by signing a "libellus fidei" and professing himself a true Catholic. But the emperor insisted upon his communicating with Anthimus, and even threatened him with expulsion from the city if he refused. Agapetus replied with spirit that he thought he was visiting an orthodox prince,

and not a second Diocletian. Then the emperor confronted him with Anthimus, who was readily convicted by his antagonist. He was formally deposed, and Mennas substituted; and this was done without a council, by the single authority of the pope Agapetus; Justinian of course allowing it, in spite of the remonstrances of Theodora (Anast. vol. i. p. 102; Theophanes, *Chronogr.* p. 184). Agapetus followed up his victory by denouncing the other heretics who had collected at Constantinople under the patronage of Theodora. He received petitions against them from the Eastern bishops, and from the "monks" in Constantinople, as the Archimandrite coenobites were beginning to be called (Baronius, vii. p. 322); and would no doubt have proceeded to demand their expulsion, when he was cut short by death, on the 21st April, A.D. 536 (Clint. *F. R.* p. 765). His body was taken to Rome and there buried in St. Peter's basilica, Sept. 17th. There are five of his letters remaining:—1. July 18th, A.D. 535, To Caesarius, bishop of Arles, about a dispute of the latter with bishop Contumeliosus (Mansi, viii. p. 356). 2. Same date, to same, "de augendis alimoniis pauperum" (M. viii. p. 855). 3. Sept. 9th, A.D. 535, Reply to a letter from African bishops to his predecessor Johannes (M. viii. p. 848). 4. Same date, reply to Reparatus, bishop of Carthage, who had congratulated him on his accession (M. viii. p. 850). 5. March 13th, A.D. 536, to Peter, bishop of Jerusalem, announcing the deposition of Anthimus and consecration of Mennas (M. viii. p. 921). [G. H. M.]

AGAPETUS, bishop of the Macedonians at SYNNADE. The sect was fiercely persecuted by Theodosius, the Catholic prelate, whose motive was not to enforce orthodoxy but to extract money. During his absence from Synnada Agapetus convened the clergy and laity of his sect and persuaded them to accept the Homoousion. Having thus united the whole people of Synnada in a common creed, he took possession of the churches and the episcopal throne, from which Theodosius on his return was unable to oust him. (Soer. vii. 3.) [L.]

AGAPETUS, bishop of RHODES, one of the metropolitans to whom the Emperor Leo wrote respecting the death of Proterius. His answer is extant (Labbe. *Conc.* iv. 1891, ed. Coleti). His name appears affixed to the encyclical Epistle of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 459, directed against Simony (*ib.* v. 49). [L.]

AGAPETUS (or AGAPIUS) (1) Bishop of SELEUCIA, metropolis of Isauria, present at the councils of Nicaea and Antioch, A.D. 341. (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 58, 586.)

(2) Bishop of APAMEA, succeeded his brother Marcellus in the reign of Arcadius c. 398. He was a disciple of St. Marcellian, and had been conspicuous for eminence in ascetic virtue. Theodoret speaks of him with high commendation, and bestows on him the epithet *δ πανέμφημος* (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 28; v. 27; *Rel. Hist.* c. 3). [E. V.]

(3) A friend and correspondent of Chrysostom, whom he addresses with much respect, *αἰδεσιμώτατε καὶ θαυμασιώτατε*. He appears to have offered to visit Chrysostom in his banishment at Cucusus, but he begs him to content himself with writing. "The season was unfavourable,

and the Isaurian banditti rendered the journey hazardous" (Chrys. *Ep.* xx, lxxiii). [E. V.]

AGAPIUS, bishop of CAESAREA, succeeded Theotecnus, towards the end of the 3rd century. He is praised by his contemporary Eusebius, from his personal knowledge, for the laborious character of his episcopate, the minute oversight of his diocese, and his great liberality to the poor. Eusebius' friend, the saint and martyr Pamphilus, was ordained presbyter by him (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32; Niceph. vi. 37). [E. V.]

AGAPIUS (Ἀγάπιος), one of Manes' twelve disciples (Petrus Siculus, *Hist. Man.* xvi.; Photius, *Contra Man.* i. 14). Petrus Siculus and Photius (*ibid.*) mention a book of his entitled *Heptalogus* (cf. also the Greek form of abjuration, ap. Cotellier's *Patres Apost.* i. p. 544); and Photius (*Biblioth.* cod. 179.) gives an account of two other works of his, respectively containing twenty-three, and one hundred and two chapters. These two works were dedicated to a female follower named Urania, and maintained the doctrine of the two principles, the sinful nature of the body, and the duty of abstinence from flesh, wine, and marriage. He seems to have studiously veiled his ideas under Christian terms, but to have attacked the Old Testament and to have made great use of the apocryphal Acts of the twelve Apostles, and especially those of St. Andrew. Photius gives some praise to his style, and allows him to be not devoid of controversial power. Photius adds that in some parts of these works he seems to have combated the errors of the Arian Eunomius, (*μάχεσθαι δὲ δοκεῖ πρὸς τὴν Εὐνομίου κακοδοξίαν*); but this is probably only his own conjecture, as Agapius could hardly have been personally acquainted with Manes, if he had lived on so far into the fourth century. [E. B. C.]

AGATHA, a virgin martyred at Catania in Sicily under Decius A.D. 251, Feb. 5, according to her *Acta*; but under Diocletian according to the Martyrol. and Aldhelm (*De Virgin.* 22); mentioned by Pope Damasus A.D. 366 (*Carm.* v.), and by Venantius Fortunatus, c. A.D. 580; inserted in the canon of the Mass by Gregory the Great according to Aldhelm (*ut supra*, and see also S. Greg. M. *Dial.* iii. 30); and commemorated in a homily by Methodius c. A.D. 900. Her name is in the Carthag. Calendar of c. A.D. 450, in Ruinart, p. 695. Her legend is the not uncommon one, in the heathen persecutions, of an attempt by the Roman judge, in this case a Consular named Quintianus, to obtain possession of her person and wealth by means of the persecuting edicts against Christians; changed, when he was foiled by her unflinching purity, into hideous attempts to outrage her in the common stews, followed by cruel tortures, and ended by his causing her to be rolled naked over live coals mixed with potsherds, under which torments she died. St. Peter is said to have once miraculously healed her wounds, when the judge refused to allow them to be dressed. A church is said to have been dedicated to her at Rome by Pope Symmachus about A.D. 500; and a second, rebuilt there by Ricimer A.D. 460, was enriched with her relics by Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iii. 30). Gregory II. also built a church dedicated

o her at Rome in 726. She is likewise honoured as patroness of the island of Malta. And her veil, carried in procession, is said to have frequently averted eruptions of Mount Etna from the town of Catana (Butler's *Lives of Saints*). Her name is still in the black letter calendar in the English Prayer-book; and her "letters" were regarded in the Middle Ages as a charm against fire. See also the Homily against *Peril of Idolatry*, p. iii.; and below under St. AGNES. [A. W. H.]

AGATHIAS, one of the most interesting and valuable of the Byzantine historians, whose history embraces a period of six years of the reign of Justinian, from A.D. 553 to A.D. 559. Agathias was born, as he himself tells us in the preface to his history, at Myrina, a small town in Aeolis, at the point where the river Pythicus enters the Elaitic Gulph. His father's name was Memnonius, his mother's Pericha, the former a rhetorician, the latter a woman praised for her affection and wisdom, but who died when her child was three years old. An epigram written by her son makes her lament the fact that she was buried away from her native country in the dust of Constantinople, so that it is probable that Memnonius had removed to the metropolis for the purposes of his profession soon after the birth of his child, and that Agathias would receive his education there. That education, however, had also been carried on at Alexandria, and it was not till the year 554 that, after some time spent in that city, the youth returned to Constantinople (*Hist.* ii. 16). He would then be about seventeen or eighteen years of age, for the probability is that, as conjectured in the short notice of his life prefixed to his history, he was born about A.D. 536 or 7. On his return to Constantinople he devoted himself to the study of the Roman law, and was a successful pleader in the courts, a circumstance from which he has received, like so many others of that time, the name of scholasticus, or lawyer.

It has been doubted whether Agathias was a Christian or a heathen, and it must be allowed that the latter supposition is favoured by the absence of all specific confession of Christian truth in his writings; by the manner in which he speaks of the protomartyr Stephen, whom he refers to as "*said*" to have voluntarily exposed himself to danger and death by stoning for behoof of those who favoured the Christians (iii. 5); by his allusions to the latter as if he did not belong to them (iii. 24); by his frequently speaking of God simply as the *ὁ κρείττων*; by his satirical account of those controversies in which one Uranius was wont to engage with regard to the divine nature, controversies from which the combatants departed, having neither given nor received any benefit, but having been only turned from friends to enemies of one another (ii. 29); and by his evident admiration of the pagan philosophers (ii. 12). On the other hand, however, his adoption of the Christian sentiment of Matt. xvi. 26, and that almost in the very words of Scripture, "for what shall we be profited though we gain the whole Persian empire, but lose our own souls" (iii. 12); his poems to the Archangel Michael; his praise of the Franks as all Christians, as entertaining the most correct sentiments with regard to God, and as celebrating the same feasts as *we* do (i. 2); together with

his general tone when speaking of the Greek or Barbarian idolatry, might suggest the opposite conclusion. The writer of the life already alluded to infers from his general tone in speaking of the religious errors and rites of heathen nations, that he must have learned toleration in the Christian school of adversity and persecution for his own faith, and that he had embraced Christianity, if not from conviction, at least from a desire to escape the violence to which, as a heathen, he would have been exposed. But toleration was not then learned in such a school, and what of it Agathias exhibits is rather that of the philosopher than the earnest believer. It seems probable, upon the whole, that he had gained from Christianity those just notions of God and religion to which he often gives expression, but that he had not embraced its more peculiar truths.

The profession of the law had no attractions for him. He pursued it under the pressure of necessity, and he bitterly mourns over being obliged to sit from morning till evening in the royal porch turning over law-books, troubled by crowds, and involved in the causes of the courts, when he would so much rather have been engaged in reading the writings of the wise ancients, in the enjoyment of that freedom from care which was so necessary to literary pursuits (iii. 1). He was, indeed, mainly the man of letters. His first literary efforts were poetical. He wrote a number of epigrams or sonnets on a great variety of subjects, and published them, along with other short pieces of a similar kind, in an anthology. Many of these have been preserved, and are appended to his history.

It was at the age of thirty that Agathias turned his attention more particularly to history itself, of which he entertained the most lofty and just ideas. It seemed to him that it was that storehouse of the past from which lessons for the present were to be drawn, and that it was the great encourager of noble deeds. Previous historians, too, with the exception of Procopius, whom he greatly admired, afforded him little satisfaction. He thought them unjust to the departed, and too laudatory of the living. Above all, the times were eventful, illustrating even that sympathy which Neander has said so often shows itself in critical periods between nature and man. Everywhere war; the northern barbarians desolating Italy with their incursions; Africa a scene of tumult; Asia not less so; comets appearing in the sky; and earthquakes laying waste the cities of the East and the islands of the Aegean with a frequency and a terribleness of destruction which has never been exhibited since. Agathias was, even as a young man, struck with these things (ii. 16); and, partly under the impression which they produced, partly at the solicitation of friends who had no doubt observed the impression, and been both by it and otherwise convinced of his fitness for the task, resolved to devote himself to history, and especially to continuing the *History of Procopius* (Praef. and iv. 29). The principles upon which he resolved to proceed, and which he has fully stated in his preface, were in a high degree excellent, and the calm, reflective, even philosophic, tone of what he has written, proves that he adhered to them. He is undoubtedly one of the ablest and most trust-

worthy writers of his time, and he is all the more interesting that he stands on the very verge of the period when the last rays of light were about to be swallowed up in the long darkness that followed. He wrote in five books, taking up the thread of events at the point where Procopius had dropped it, and beginning with the defeat and death of Teias the last king of the Goths, and the victorious progress of the eunuch Narses, one "among the few," says Gibbon, "who have rescued that unhappy name from the contempt and hatred of mankind" (*History of the Roman Empire*, c. xliii.). From this he pursues the story of the campaign of Narses against the Franks and the Alemanni, then turns to the war of Rome against the Persians and Huns, dwelling much upon the history of Chosroes, and breaking off with the internal dissensions of the Huns and their destruction of one another at the instigation of Justinian. He did not begin to write till after the death of Justinian and the accession of Justin the younger, A.D. 565; the fourth book was not written till after the death of Chosroes in A.D. 577; and the publication of the whole probably soon followed, how soon it is not easy to say, for the year of his death is assigned by some to A.D. 582, by others to a date not earlier than A.D. 594.

Agathias is valuable for the facts which he mentions, many of which are not to be found elsewhere. He has been largely depended on by Gibbon for that part of the reign of Justinian to which his history relates. At the same time his notices of the religion and customs of the nations that he speaks of are highly important. His style has been characterized by Vossius as *tersa et florida* (*de Hist. Graec.*, lib. ii. p. 270). It is, however, marked much more by the latter than the former quality, being often stilted and pretentious, so that Gibbon has not unaptly spoken of his "prolix declamation" (c. xliii.). Partly, perhaps, because of the honour in which he was held as a historian, but mainly because of more substantial benefits conferred by him upon his native city, he was along with his father Memnonius honoured by it with a statue (*vita Agathiae*, p. 16).

Agathias may be consulted for such particulars as the following: the six years, A.D. 553-559; the wars of the Empire with the Alemanni, Goths, &c., his accounts of which he often intersperses with interesting remarks on the manners, customs, and religion of these nations; the war with the Persians, where he takes occasion to describe the religion of Zoroaster; the campaigns of Belisarius and Narses; the character, history, and fate of Chosroes, king of the Persians; the terrible earthquakes and plagues which desolated the East in the middle of the 6th century; together with many incidental notices of cities, forts, and rivers, philosophers and subordinate commanders.

His history was published in Greek at Leyden, by Vulcanius, A.D. 1594. The same scholar afterwards published separately a Latin translation of it. Both the Greek text and the Latin translation were again published together at Paris, A.D. 1660; but the best edition is that of B. G. Niebuhr, in the *Corpus Script. Hist. Byzant.* The Latin translation, and the notes of this edition, are those of Vulcanius. [W. M.]

AGATHO, bishop of Rome; originally Sicilian monk, succeeded Donnus, A.D. 616 (in June or July, Jaffé's *Regesta Pontificum* p. 166). The event of his reign was the sixth oecumenic council at Constantinople, the summons to which was sent by Constantine Phocas during the pontificate of Donnus, but arrived after his death. In A.D. 679, preliminary metropolitan synods were held in the ecclesiastical provinces of the Western Church, among the rest one at Hatfield, in England, presided over by Theodorus of Canterbury (*Bede* H. E. iv. 17). Agatho, we find from a letter of his own, had hoped that Theodorus would attend his synod at Rome, to be held in the spring of the next year, and would go as one of the delegates from the Western Church to Constantinople. But Theodorus declined the invitation. He was just then involved in a dispute with Wilfrith, bishop of York; and hearing that Wilfrith was on his journey to Rome to plead his cause in person, he sent one Cenwald thither, to arrive if possible before him, and give his version of the matter in dispute. The synod of the Western Church assembled in the autumn of A.D. 679, and sat till the following spring. We hear of three sessions:—1. October, A.D. 679, present 16 bishops, in which the affairs of the British Church were generally discussed, and in which probably Cenwald was heard (Wilkins, i. p. 45). 2. Present more than 50 bishops and priests, in which Wilfrith's petition was received (*Edd. Vit. Wilfr.* 29). 3. March 27th, A.D. 680, present 125 bishops, in which Wilfrith's acquittal was pronounced, and he allowed to take his seat among them (*Edd.* 51), while they proceeded to choose delegates for the Council at Constantinople:—bishops Abundantius of Paternum, Johannes of Rhegium, and Johannes of Portus. These they entrusted with a commendatory letter to the emperor, in which it was stated that the legates were not empowered to argue about uncertainties, but only to define and defend what was certain and immutable. To these legates from the council, Agatho added some others to represent himself personally. These were Theodorus, archbishop of Ravenna, who had newly reconciled his see with that of Rome, two priests, a deacon and a sub-deacon, and some monks. I sent by them a private letter to the emperor, in which he apologized for having been obliged to send such unlearned men, evidently with reference to Theodorus of Canterbury, "the philosopher," whom he had wished to send, assert the supremacy of the Roman see over the Eastern Church, and the absolute infallibility of its bishop, and concluded by saying that if the council were to agree in heterodox decrees, he and the Western Church should hold fast by the old faith.

The two bodies of delegates travelled together, and did not reach Constantinople, where their coming was anxiously expected, till the 10th of September, A.D. 680 (*Baron.* viii. p. 682). Eight days after they were honourably received in the Blachernal, and on the 7th of November the Council began its sittings in the chamber called Trullus of the Imperial palace. The proceedings of the Council will be found elsewhere. [*Dict. of Chr. Ant.* art. 'Constantinople, Sixth Council of.'] The Western legates seem to have strictly adhered to Pope Agatho's instructions, and to have confined themselves to protesting

against the reading of certain passages from the fathers in favour of Monothelitism, which they said were forged. Nevertheless, in the seventh sitting the scale was turned in their favour by the adhesion of Georgius, patriarch of Constantinople: and it does not seem to have been thought very humiliating to the Western Church, that their victory involved the anathematization of Pope Honorius, one of Agatho's predecessors.

Agatho just lived through the sessions of the Council. It broke up on the 16th Sept. A.D. 681, and he died the 10th Jan. A.D. 682, before the return of his victorious delegates to Italy. (Jaffé's *Regesta Pontificum*, pp. 166, 167; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. viii. pp. 659-716.)

Eight letters and decrees of his are extant.—
1. Giving privileges to Wearmouth Abbey, at the request of Biscop Baducing (Beda, *H. E.* iv. 18).
2. To Theodorus of Ravenna, inviting him to Rome, Agnelli, *Vit. Theodori*, 4, in Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. 3. & 4. The letters referred to above, to the Emperor Constantine (Mansi, xi. pp. 234, 286). 5. Decree giving privileges to St. Peter's, Medeshamsted (Peterborough) (*Mon. Angl.* i. p. 66). 6. Ditto to Hexham and Ripon Monasteries (Eddius, *Vit. Wilfridi*, 45, 49). 7. Ditto to St. Paul's, London, at the request of Earconwald, its bishop (*Mon. Angl.* iii. p. 299). 8. Letter to the Universal Church, claiming for all papal decrees the authority of St. Peter himself (Gratian, i. *Dist.* 19, c. 2). [G. H. M.]

AGATHOPODES, more properly **AGATHOPUS**, a deacon of Antioch, named Rheos Agathopus, one of the two companions of St. Ignatius in his journey to his martyrdom at Rome, and one of the authors of the *Acta* of that martyrdom (S. Ignat. *Epist. ad Smyrn. et ad Philadelph.*; T. Smith in *Præf. ad Acta S. Ign.*); himself however not known to have been a martyr, although in Baronius' *Martyrology* (April 25). He appears in the first set of Pseudo-Ignatian epistles as an "elect man," who has "renounced life" and followed Ignatius from Syria (*ad Philadelph.* 11); and as hospitably received by the Church of Smyrna (*ad Smyrn.* 10). He is reproduced in the second set of spurious epistles (*ad Tars.* 10; *ad Ant.* 13; *ad Philip.* 15). [A. W. H.]

AGATHOPUS. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. § 59, p. 538) quotes Valentinus from "his epistle to Agathopus." I. Voss and others without reason identify this otherwise unknown person with the Rheos Agathopus mentioned above. As Voss observes, the name is found in several inscriptions. [H.]

AGELIUS appears to have been the immediate successor of Acesius, as bishop of the Novatian body at Constantinople, A.D. 345, and to have held his see forty years till his death in 384. He suffered during the fierce persecution of the Homoiousians by Macedonius, described by Socrates, and fled from Constantinople (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 38). As a Homoiousian he was also persecuted by Valens, and banished by him (Socr. *H. E.* iv. 9; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 9). Venerable for his age, his sufferings for the orthodox faith, and the apostolic simplicity of his life, he was consulted by Nectarius (*ὡς κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑπόφρων*) when Theodosius had opened his plan for restoring peace to the divided church in 383.

Doubting his ability in disputation, Agelius deputed his *lector*, Sisinnius, a fellow-pupil of the Emperor Julian under Maximus, to represent him. The result was favourable to the Novatians, who were acknowledged as orthodox, and permitted to hold their meetings within the city (Socr. v. 10; Soz. vii. 12). When near his end, Agelius named Sisinnius as his successor. This was displeasing to the people, who desired Marcian, the tutor of the princesses, to whose influence they owed the restoration of their liberty of worship. Agelius yielded to their wishes, on the condition that if Sisinnius outlived Marcian he should be the next bishop (Socr. v. 21; Soz. vii. 14; Clinton, *F. R.* i. 509, ii. 443). [E. V.]

AGENNETHUS (Iren. 54: cf. 56). [VALENTINUS; EPIPHANES.] [H.]

AGERATUS (Iren. 6, 135; Epiph. *Haer.* 165, 169; cf. Auct. Val. ap. Epiph. 168B). [VALENTINUS.] [H.]

AGIL or **ST. AISLE** (quem propter celeres motus infantiae *Agilum* nominaverunt), was the son of Agnoald, councillor of Hildebert, prince of Burgundy and Austrasia, and his wife Deuteria. His father was on friendly terms with the eminent Celtic missionary, COLUMBANUS, who persuaded him to devote his child at an early age to the monastic life. Accordingly he entered the monastery of Luxeuil about the year A.D. 590. There he devoted himself to study and prayer, and in the year A.D. 615 was deputed by a synod of the Frankish churches to accompany EUSTACIUS, abbot of Luxeuil, on a missionary tour in Bavaria. After labouring in that country with no little success, he was requested by Dagobert, the successor of Clothaire, to undertake the superintendence of a neighbouring monastery. Accordingly he set out thither about the year A.D. 636, and surrounding himself with numerous ardent followers continued till an advanced period of his life to carry on the missionary operations, which had been so successfully begun by Columbanus. (*Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* ii. 303-312.) [G. F. M.]

AGILBERT, bishop of Dorchester and afterwards of Paris. He appears in Bede first as "pontifex quidam, natione Gallus," from which the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* conclude that he had been consecrated by French bishops without any see. After his consecration he studied in Ireland, whence he came into Wessex about the year 648, and was appointed by king Cenwalch successor to Birinus in the bishopric of the West Saxons. In this position he continued for several years, but being unable to learn English, Cenwalch, who knew no other language, introduced another bishop, Wina, to whom he gave half of Agilbert's diocese, placing his see at Winchester. Agilbert, disgusted at this proceeding, left Wessex and went to Northumbria, whence, after taking part with Wilfrid, and his own priest Agatho, at the synod of Strenshall, in 664, he retired to France. There he received and consecrated Wilfrid (whom he had already ordained priest) at Compiègne, and was, about the year 668, made bishop of Paris. Bede places his promotion to the see of Paris before the consecration of Wilfrid. Cenwalch, who had in the mean time quarrelled with Wina, invited him to return to Wessex, but he was unwilling to leave Paris, which is said to have been his

native place, and sent his nephew Leutherius, who was made bishop of Dorchester in 670. In 669 Agilbert entertained Theodorus on his way from Rome to Canterbury. His name is attached to a single charter as bishop of Paris, probably of the year 670. The year of his death is unknown, but it took place in the monastery of Jouarre on the 11th of October. It is questionable whether he is the Agilbert who, according to Fredegar, was sent in 680 by Ebrioin to the duke Martin, to deceive him by taking a false oath on an empty reliquary. (v. Fredegar, ii. 97; ap. Bouquet, ii. 451; Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7, 25-28; iv. 1, 12; *Gallia Christiana*, sub. sed. Paris; Eddius, v. Wilfridi, x. xii.) [S.]

AGNELLUS, archbishop of Ravenna, was born A.D. 486, and held his bishopric from 556 to 569; and died at the age of 83. Agnellus was of noble birth, and considerable wealth, and enjoyed the favour of Narses, who on the defeat of the Goths made over to him all the property possessed by them in Ravenna. On the death of his wife he entered holy orders, and became *præfectus* of the church of St. Agatha; and in 556 was consecrated bishop. He reconciled the churches that had been polluted by Arian services in the time of Theodoric, built the church of St. Gregory, and adorned others with gifts and ornaments. He was the author of *Epistola de Ratione Fidei ad Arminium* against Arianism (*Bibl. Patr.* Colon. 1618, vol. v. p. 642). He was buried in the church of St. Agatha, and his epitaph is given by Muratori, p. 1823, i. Ravennas. and Oudin. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 529; Clinton, *F. R.* ii. p. 482; Oudin, i. p. 1443; Rubeus, *Hist. Ravenn.* lib. iii. p. 169.) [E. V.]

AGNES, M., a virgin either 12 or 13 years old, beheaded at Rome under Diocletian, after vain efforts first made to overcome her faith by vile outrage: celebrated by St. Ambrose (*De Offic.* i. 41, *De Virg. ad Marcell.* i. 2), St. Jerome (*Epist.* 97 ad *Demetriad.*), St. Augustine (*Serm.* 273, 286, and 354), Sulp. Sever. (*Dial.* ii. 14), Prudentius (*perì Στεφάνου*, xiv.), Venant. Fortunatus (*Poem.* vii. iii. 35), Aldhelm (*De Virgim.*); and by her *Acta* in Syriac in Assemani, *Act. Mart.* ii. 148 sq.; besides *Acta* falsely attributed to St. Ambrose, a doubtful homily of St. Maxim. Taurin., and some verses questionably assigned to Pope Damasus. And her name is in the Carthag. Cal. of c. A.D. 450, Jan. 21; in Ruinart p. 695. Her legend resembles that of St. Agatha, save that St. Agnes had made a vow of virginity, and that her suitors, and not at first the judge, were her persecutors. One who tried to outrage her in the brothel to which she was sent was struck blind, and then healed at her intercession. Finally, having refused to burn incense to idols, and making the sign of the Cross when the officers tried to force her to do so, she was beheaded, apparently without actual torture. A church at Rome, in her honour, said to have been built in the time of Constantine the Great, was repaired by Pope Honorius, A.D. 625-638, and another was built at Rome by Innocent X. (Assemani, *Act. Mart.* ii. 154, 155). See also *Act. SS.* Jan. 21, on which day also her name stands in the black letter calendar of the English Prayer-book. Baeda and Usuard place her day on Jan. 23; the *Menolog.* and *Menaee*, on July 5. It is one of four

(St. Margaret's, St. Lucy's, and St. Agatha's days being the other three) appointed in England by the Synod of Worcester, under Walter de Cantilupe, A.D. 1240, "ferianda ab operibus mulierum tantum" (Wilk. i. 678). [A. W. H.]

AGNOEA (Iren. 108). [BARBELIOTÆ; OPHITES.] [H.]

AGNOËTÆ (Ἀγνοῦται, from ἀγνοῖν, *be ignorant of*), is a name applied to two sects who denied the omniscience either of God the Father, or of God the Son in his state of humiliation.

I. The first were a fraction of the Arians, and called from Eunomius and Theophrastus "Eunomio-Theophrontians" (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 24). Their leader, THEOPHRONIUS of Cappadocia, who flourished about 370, maintained that God knew things past by memory, and things future only by uncertain prescience. Sozomenus (*H. E.* vii. 17) writes of him: "Having given some attention to the writings of Aristotle; he composed an appendix to them, entitled *Exercises of the Mind*. But he afterwards engaged in many unprofitable disputations, and soon ceased to confine himself to the doctrines of his master [EUNOMIUS]. Under the assumption of being deeply versed in the terms of Scripture, he attempted to prove that though God is acquainted with the present, the past, and the future, his knowledge on these subjects is not the same in degree, and is subject to some kind of mutation. As this hypothesis appeared positively absurd to the Eunomians, they excommunicated him from their church; and he constituted himself the leader of a new sect, called after his own name, 'Theophrontians.'" [S.]

II. Better known are the *Agnoëtæ* or *Themistiani*, in the Monophysite controversy in the sixth century. THEMISTIUS, deacon of Alexandria, representing a small branch of the Monophysite Severians, taught, after the death of Severus, that the human soul (not the divine nature) of Christ was like us in all things, even in the limitation of knowledge, and was ignorant of many things, especially the day of judgment, which the Father alone knew (Mark xiii. 32). The question of Christ concerning Lazarus, "Where have ye laid him?" (John xi. 34), likewise implied ignorance of this fact. The majority of the Monophysites rejected this view, as inconsistent with their theory of one nature in Christ, which implied also a unity of knowledge, and they called the followers of Themistius *Agnoëtæ*. The orthodox, who might from the Chalcedonian dogma of the two natures in Christ have inferred two kinds of knowledge, a perfect divine, and an imperfect human admitting of growth (Luke ii. 52), nevertheless rejected the view of the *Agnoëtæ*, as making too wide a rupture between the two natures, and generally understood the famous passage in Mark of the official ignorance only, inasmuch as Christ did not choose to reveal to his disciples the day of judgment, and thus appeared ignorant for a wise purpose (κατ' οἰκονομίαν). The question concerning Lazarus was explained from reference to the Jews and the intention to increase the effect of the miracle. Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, wrote against the *Agnoëtæ* a treatise on the absolute knowledge of Christ, of which Photius has preserved large extracts. Sophronius

patriarch of Jerusalem, pronounced the anathema on Themistius.

Agnoëtism was revived by the Adoptionists in the 8th century. [ADOPTIONISTS.] Felix of Urgel maintained the limitation of the knowledge of Christ according to his human nature, and appealed to Mark xiii. 32.

Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* xii. p. 634; Mansi, *Conc.* xi. 502; Leont. Byz. *De Sectis, Actio X.*, cap. iii.; Photius, *Cod.* 230 (ed. Bekk., p. 284); Baronius, *Annal.* ad A.D. 535; Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereien*, viii. 644-684; Baur, *Lehre v. der Dreieinigkeit*, &c., ii. p. 87 ff.; Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, &c., ii. p. 172 f.; comp. MONOPHYSITES. [P. S.]

AGOBARD (in Lyonese dialect Agobaud), S., Archbishop of Lyons, holding a high rank in the intellectual and political movements of his age, was born in 779 of Gallic parents settled in Spain, and was removed into Gallia Narbonensis in 782. (Mabillon, *Iter Ital.* p. 68, quoting a MS. note, probably in the autograph of Agobard himself. See *Hist. Littér. de la France*, iv. 567.) Thence he was brought to Lyons by Archbishop Leidrad in 798, who ordained him priest in 804. Subsequently, probably in 813, Leidrad, oppressed by age and infirmities, gave him a share in the administration of his diocese, and episcopal ordination; when he retired into a monastery in 816, Agobard was, "with the consent of the emperor, and the entire Synod of Gallican Bishops," appointed his successor. (Ado, *Chron.* cf. Hug. Flav. *Chron. Virdun.*) "Some persons objected to the appointment on the ground that Agobard had been consecrated by three bishops in the see of Lyons at the order of Leidrad, whereas the canons lay down that there should not be two bishops together in one city, and that a living bishop should not choose his own successor." The weight of this charge will depend, says Henschen (*Act. SS. Boll.* Jun. i. 749), on whether we adopt the reading of the text *Chorepiscopus*=Suffragan Bishop, or Rainaud's conjecture *Coepiscopus*=Coadjutor Bishop, which latter title would imply a right of succession. The whole transaction is represented in a different, and, perhaps, a truer light in *Gallia Christ.* iv. 55, where a quotation from a Grenoble breviary is transcribed at length. According to this document the emperor and some few bishops supported Agobard's nomination, while the great body of Gallican bishops opposed it, met in synod at Arles, and decided that Leidrad should return to his see, and that for the future no more *co-episcopi* should be appointed. In spite of this decision Agobard still retained his see, and ruled it vigorously and wisely.

His first polemical attack was against the writings of Felix, Bishop of Urgel, the heresiarch of the Adoptionists (see *Mosheim*, ed. Stubbs, i. 517), who had been banished by Charles to Lyons, where he had lately died. Agobard's treatise, addressed to the emperor, tended to prove that the heresy of Felix was equivalent to Nestorianism in a milder form. It is chiefly a *catena* from the fathers.

Of the same character is a series of four works against the Jews, who appear to have flocked to Lyons about this time in great numbers under the shelter of Louis's protection. The first is a remonstrance to the emperor against their inso-

lent bearing and outrages against the Christians; the second opposes their superstitions; in the third he addresses Adalhard, Abbat of Corbie, and other chief officers of the palace, asking how he ought to deal with the case of Jewish servants postulating baptism against their masters' consent; the fourth is a letter addressed to Nebrius, Bishop of Narbonne, complaining of the disadvantages suffered by Christians in their commercial relations with Jews.

Other works in this class are tracts exposing and refuting the popular superstitions of the day (1.) *Against the law of Gondobad, and the impious contests which spring from it*; (2.) *On thunder and hail*, popularly ascribed to sorcery; (3.) *Against the Judgment of God . . . or those who hold the damnable opinion that the truth of Divine judgment is disclosed by fire or water or single combat*.

Agobard also wrote a book in answer to some strictures of Fredegisus, abbat of St. Martin's, Tours, in which he defends some former statements, and declares strongly against the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture (see *Herzog*); a letter to Bartholomew, Bishop of Narbonne, on a prevalent epilepsy; and a further complaint against the Jews to Matfred, a courtier.

His practical works on Church discipline and points of doctrine are of more permanent interest.

These are (1.) to Bishop Bernard on the *privileges and rights of the priesthood*, an able and useful work; (2.) *on pictures and images*, the best known and most frequently controverted of Agobard's works (see particularly Cave, *Hist. Literaria* ii. 12, and *Hist. Lit. de la France*, iv. 575, 576), probably undertaken in connexion with the synod of Paris in 824 (Cave, *H. L.* ii. 72), which ordered that images should be retained but not superstitiously venerated. Agobard draws most of his arguments from St. Augustin, citing also Popes Leo I., Gregory I., and sometimes Eusebius of Caesarea, adapting them however rather freely. He certainly goes beyond the opinion of his western contemporaries in respect to the use of images in worship. "He even appears," say the Benedictine compilers just cited, "to espouse the side of those who blame the *cultus* of images; and this is why our separatist brethren, who dislike this practice, esteem this treatise so highly, and sometimes quote it with satisfaction." St. Marthe (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 56) characterizes the work as containing "*si nonnulla duriora, nihil certè contra fidem*." See the comments of Rainaud and Mabillon in Le Cointe, *Ann.* t. viii. an. 840, n. 14.

(3.) *On the truth of the Faith, &c.*: an exhortation to the people of Lyons.

(4.) *A letter to Ebbo Bishop of Rheims on hope and fear*: a manual of choice selections, of which only the preface has been printed.

(5.) *On the administration of Ecclesiastical property*: a tract directed against the prevalent usurpations of the rights of the Church by lay landholders, and even by bishops and other ecclesiastics.

(6, 7.) *On Divine Psalmody*, which is really a preface to a book *On the correction of the Antiphonary*, written with much animosity against Amalarius, a priest of the Church of Metz, who had called in question the changes and retrenchments lately introduced by Agobard into the

office-book of his church. The alteration had been made on the principle of excluding everything but the pure Word of God, "lest," he says, "we should offer strange fire to the Lord." Cardinal Bona (*De Divina Psalmodia*, p. 383, ed. Paris, 1663) reckons this as not the least of Agobard's errors.

(8.) A less bitter work on the same subject has the title, *A book against the four books of Amalarius*.

The third class of Agobard's writings are connected with the one event of his life, which has left a serious stain upon the integrity and uprightness of his character—his participation in the rebellion of Lothaire against his father, Louis, in 833. The most influential of Lothaire's episcopal partisans was Ebbo of Rheims, but Agobard ranked next to him, and while acknowledging the crime, tried to vindicate it. "So detestable an act," says St. Marthe, "in a man, however faultless in other respects, is quite beyond excuse." The document affirming Louis's deposition at the synod of Compiègne was issued by Agobard, and is certainly from his pen. The pieces extant on this subject are (1) a *lamentable letter* (Masson's title) to Louis on the *division of the empire* among Louis' sons—a dissuasive against a fresh partition for the sake of Charles the youngest; (2) a letter to Louis on the *comparison of ecclesiastical with civil government*, asserting the dignity of the Church as superior to the majesty of the empire. (3) To this is appended an *Epistle of Gregory IV.* in reply to those Gallican bishops who were attached to the side of Louis. Masson ascribed this letter to Agobard's pen, but it is now acknowledged to be the genuine production of Gregory; (4) *An Apology* for Lothaire and Pepin, in which the motive for their revolt is stated to have been the reformation of abuses at court. (5) The *cartula* of Louis's deposition mentioned above, presented by Agobard to Lothaire as emperor. It is thought that the other bishops presented similar documents. Some have uselessly laboured to palliate Agobard's guilt in this revolt on the ground of an oath taken to Lothaire (*Rainaud*, t. viii. p. 28). He was probably sincere in his repentance. Having followed Lothaire into Italy, he was in 835 at the Council of Thionville deposed from his see, and some further steps were taken at Cremieu in 836, but his absence saved him from more direct punishment, and in the following year he recovered Louis's favour and the see of Lyons. Employed confidentially by Louis on state affairs, he died at Saintonge, during a visit for some political object, on June 6, 840 (not 841 as Hugh of Flavigny states. See *Gall. Christ.*).

The claims of Agobard to the title of *Saint* are not undisputed. The Bollandists give him a place in their work on the following grounds, as explained by Henschen in a rather meagre critical notice: (1) because Masson, his first editor, allows him the title; (2) because he is commonly called St. Aguebaud in the church of Lyons; (3) because he is included in the local martyrologies, and a rite of nine lections is assigned to him in the *Breviarium Lugdunense*. Du Saussay uncanonizes him, on the ground, as Henschen thinks, of his complicity in Lothaire's rebellion; but inconsistently, as he recognizes the sanctity of Bernard, Archbishop of Vienne.

There are no proper *Acta*. Agobard's character is well sketched by St. Marthe, in these terms: "He was a man of high intellect and consummate erudition for his age, skilled in theology, patristic learning, and tradition; acute in interpreting, and very severe in defending Church discipline and the ancient canons; a deadly enemy of superstitions; obstinately wedded to an opinion which he had once adopted; vigorous and bold in his writings, but in other respects timid, and scarcely daring to raise his voice in the society of the great; unimpeachable in his morals, faithful to the laws of the Church, and constant in his attendance at the sacred offices." A marked, but still an inconsistent feature of his character, is that liberal independence of thought which has attracted Protestant writers; for those who would applaud his tract on images, his exposure of popular superstitions, and his canons on the inspiration and use of Holy Scripture, would reprobate as narrow and intolerant his opposition to the Jews, and his rigid "sacerdotalism." See Baluze's estimate of his character in Cave, *H. L.* ii. 11.

Agobard's works were lost to the world, until a MS. copy was discovered by Papius Masson, who rescued it from a bookbinder's hands in Lyons, and finding its value, published it (Paris, 1605, 8vo.). For this and similar bibliographical anecdotes, see Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 279, sqq.

A second and far more valuable edition, with illustrative notes, was undertaken by M. Baluze (Paris, 1666, 2 vols. 8vo.). His text is more accurate than that of Masson, and is substituted for it, though without the notes in the later editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, t. xiv. pp. 234–329. Select quotations from the Epistles are in Bouquet, *Rec. vi.* 356–368. Lists of Agobard's works are given in Cave, *Hist. Lit.* t. ii. pp. 12, 13, and with full comments in *Hist. Lit. de la France*, t. iv. pp. 571–581. To the prose writings above enumerated should be added two small poems, *The Epitaph of Charles the Great*, and *On the Translation of the Relics of SS. Cyprian, Speratus, &c.* These are of no merit; his prose is generally written in a simple and natural style, without embellishment. He made more use of assertion than argument, and borrowed largely from ancient writers, showing the closest acquaintance with the works of St. Augustine and with Holy Scripture.

A list of the authors who till his own time had contributed to elucidate the history of Agobard may be seen in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Med. et Inf. Latinitatis*, s. v.; those of later date in Potthast, *Bibliotheca Hist. Med. Aevi*, p. 108. As a local historian Menestrier (*Hist. Civile de la Ville de Lyon*, pp. 214–237) is very valuable; while Dr. Hundeshagen, who contributed the article 'Agobard' to Herzog's *Real Encyclopädie*, gives the results of late critical research in his *Commentatio de Agobardi Vita et Scriptis*, Giessae, 1831. [C. D.]

AGRICOLA, martyred with his slave Vitalis by crucifixion at Bologna (under Diocletian, according to a letter [55] falsely attributed to St. Ambrose), his body being pierced with large nails more in number than his limbs. The authority for his story is a sermon preached by St. Ambrose (*Exhort. ad Virgin.*) at the dedication in 393 of a church at Florence, to which

the relics of both martyrs, just found by St. Ambrose at Bologna, were transported by him. See also Paulinus of Nola (*Poem.* xxiv.), Paulinus in *V. S. Ambros.* (xxix.), Greg. Turon. (*De Glor. Mart.* 44, *Hist. Franc.* ii. 16). [A. W. H.]

AGRIPPA CASTOR (Ἀγρίππας Κάστωρ), an ecclesiastical writer who lived in the reign of Hadrian (about A.D. 135) described by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 7.) as ἐν τοῖς τότε γνῶριμώτατος συγγραφέυς, and by Jerome as "vir valde doctus" (*De Vir. Ill.* cap. xxi). He is the first who is mentioned as having written against heresy. He wrote against BASILIDES, and gave what Eusebius accounted as a most satisfactory refutation and complete exposure of his imposture. That Agrippa wrote also against Isidorus, the son of Basilides, seems to be an unwarranted inference from the statement of Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 4) that Basilides and Isidorus were opposed by Agrippa, Irenæus, Clement, and Origen. [G. S.]

AGRIPPINUS, probably *praedecessor* of Cyprian—his *decessor* Donatus—(Pearson, *Ann. Cyp.* A.D. 248). The interval is described by Augustine (*de Bap.* i. iii. 12) as "ab Agrippino usque ad Cyprianum;" and Cyprian (*Ep.* 71, 4) speaks of him as "bonae memoriae vir cum caeteris, &c. . . . qui illo in tempore gubernabant" (*Ep.* 73) "multi jam anni et longa aetas ex quo sub Agrippino," &c. These must explain Augustine's term *praedecessor* and his phrase "paucis ante se annis" in *Bap. c. Don.* iv. 6

He held the First Council of Carthage (A.D. 215-7, Labbe, *Conc.* vol. i. p. 735; A.D. 186-7, Morcelli, vol. ii. p. 44) consisting of seventy (Aug. *de Bap. c. Petil.* xiii. 22) bishops of Africa and Numidia (Cyp. *Ep.* 71), which decided for the rebaptism of heretics; he being according to Augustine, the *author* of that novelty. This seems to favour his earlier date, as, if the later were taken, Tertullian's opinions would have been adopted by rather than from his church, whereas he speaks in his catholic treatise *De Baptismo* as if rebaptism were the accepted rule (*Ad nos editum est.* c. 15). On the contrary, Hefele (*Concil.* ii. § 4) decides for the later date because Tertullian, praising the Greek use of councils, mentions no African council. Döllinger (*Hipp. und Kall.* p. 190) maintains that Carthage is alluded to when Hippolytus says that rebaptism was of Callistus' time (*Philogophum*, p. 291), and so gives A.D. 218-222 as date of Council, accepting the possibility of Tertullian's having influenced the African view. Hippolytus, however, writes of Rome, and Tertullian speaks of *general* councils. The arguments for the earlier date are more weighty. The expression of Novatus, one of the oldest of the 87 bishops, in A.D. 257 (*4th Sent. Epp.*) seems noticeable. He could scarcely have called them "sanctissimae memoriae viros," had not their generation completely passed away, nor "collegas," if they had been quite beyond memory. Vincent. Lirin. and Facundus Hermian. (l. x. 3) do not seem to have been in possession of other information than we have. [E. W. B.]

AHIMNIUS (AHYMNUS, AHYMMUS; 2 MSS. and August. *de Bap. c. Don.*), bishop of Ausuaga (Ausuagga) (Ausana, Ausagga, Vict. Vit. *Fell.*) in Prov. Zeugit. of Africa (together with bishops Fortunatus, Optatus, Privatianus, *Donatulus*, Felix), consults Cyprian as to restoration of

Ninus, Clementianus, and Florus, who in the Decian persecution, after enduring the question before the native magistrates, succumbed to the greater severity of the proconsul, and had spent three years subsequently in penance. The case referred by them to Cyprian (who reserves it to next council) had been referred to them by bishop Superius of the diocese where it happened. The occasion of their meeting was to consecrate a bishop for Capsa (*Ep.* 56), and as *Donatulus* subsequently appears (*Conc. Carth. de Bap.* iii. Suffrag. 69) as bishop of that place he no doubt was the person ordained. Münter in a list full of errors, p. 15, *Prim. Ecc. Afr.* considers the name Ahymnius Phoenician; Gesenius Greek. [E. W. B.]

AIDAN (ÆEDAN), ST., Celtic Apostle of Northumbria, and first bishop of Lindisfarne, though his name is not included in the oldest martyrologies, except as an insertion in the MS. additions to Usuard, enjoyed the highest reputation for holiness and practical wisdom during his life, and was venerated as a Saint from the date of his death, 651. Bede, who was born twenty years after this epoch, "has made his character and life the subject of one of the most eloquent and attractive pictures ever drawn by the pen of the venerable historian" (Montalembert, *Monks of West*, iv. 23, Transl.). Stilling (*Commentary*, in *Act. SS. Boll.* Aug. vi. 688), who examined the mediæval biographies of this Saint, states that they were entirely drawn from Bede and added nothing from other sources. There are no records of Aidan's birthplace, or early life. He is first noticed by Bede (*H. E.* iii. 5) as a monk of Hy or Iona under the 5th Abbat Seghen, and of the full canonical age for the Episcopacy. His ordination was due to the ill-success of a missionary named Corman,^a who had been sent to convert Northumbria by the elders of the Scottish Church (i.e. the heads of the Columban monasteries) at the request of King Oswald of Northumbria, himself converted during his seventeen years' exile in Scotland (Montalembert, iv. 5 and Genealogical table). When Corman had reported to the synod of his Church his want of progress, which he ascribed to the stubborn and barbarous spirit of the English, and the fathers were perplexed what to recommend, Aidan, one of the assessors, attributed Corman's failure to his too great severity. "You did not," he said, "after the Apostolic precept, first offer them the milk of more gentle doctrine, till by degrees through the nourishment of God's Word they might have strength to receive and practise God's more perfect and exalted counsel." This discreet advice convinced the synod that Aidan possessed the great qualification for missionary success which Corman lacked. He was consecrated bishop probably in 635; Bede's authority makes for this date rather than 634 or 636. (Alford, *Annales*, ii. 239.) He fixed his own residence on an island^b near Bamborough, called Lindisfarne (afterwards Holy Island), which became the monastic and episcopal capital of Northumbria. Whether the choice of this spot rather than Cataract, where James the Italian deacon

^a The name rests only on the more than suspicious authority of Hector Boëthius (lib. ix.)

^b It is accessible from the mainland by a strip of sand at low water. Cf. Scott, *Marmion*, canto II. 9.

still kept alive the relics of the Christianity which Paulinus had planted and Penda's invasion had nearly obliterated, was due to his determination to have no connexion with the Gregorian missionaries (Hook, *Archbishops*, i. 118), or in imitation of the local particulars of St. Columba's monastic foundation (Montalembert, iv. 19), or from the reasons which had decided Oswald to apply for missionaries to Iona rather than to Canterbury (*ibid.* p. 14), cannot well be decided.^c Lindisfarne would be more favourable than York to the development of the monastic system, and its local situation in Bernicia, Oswald's hereditary domain, within sight of his residence at Bamborough, would alone account for the change. The intercourse between king and bishop was very close until Oswald's death in 642. Aidan did not easily acquire the English tongue, and Oswald at first acted as his interpreter. He also in all things humbly and willingly obeyed his admonitions.

It was probably the life of Aidan rather than his preaching which converted Northumbria to Christianity. (See Lappenberg, *Anglo-Saxon Kings*, p. 158, ed. London, 1845.) "He left his clergy," says Bede, "a most wholesome example of abstinence and continence, and the highest commendation of his teaching was that his own life corresponded with it." He hated display, and, except in cases of urgent need, always travelled on foot. Thus he was able to stop frequently during his journeys, and to urge travellers either to accept the Faith, or, if they were already Christians, to commend it by their lives. He seems to have possessed a singular charm of manner and address, which first won his hearers, and then incited them to an imitation of his own self-denial and austerity. This Bede contrasts with the greater laxity of his own age. "All who accompanied him, whether monks or laymen, were under obligation to meditate, that is, either to read the Scriptures or to learn the Psalter." He would hurry away from the king's table, where however he was rarely a guest, to read or pray, and many persons followed his example of fasting on Wednesday and Friday, except during Eastertide, till the ninth hour. He never flinched from rebuking vice or oppression in the rich and powerful, and when they claimed his hospitality, he gave them no presents, but bestowed whatever he had received from the rich either in the relief of the poor or in redeeming captives, especially those who had been unjustly sold. Many of these freedmen were raised to the priesthood (Baeda, *H. E.* iii. 5). Education was an important feature of his system. At the beginning of his mission he took personal charge of twelve English youths (*H. E.* iii. 26). As each church and monastery was founded, it became a school where a complete education was given by monks who had followed Aidan from Scotland. For his personal use he retained nothing of the grants of land received from the king and nobles, except a church or chapel, a small chamber, and a few fields at each of the principal *villae* (*H. E.* iii. 17). Aidan survived his patron and partner in good works, the Bretwalda Oswald, who rivalled if he did not surpass the bishop in posthumous

glory. At the untimely death of this prince in battle with the pagan king of Mercia, Penda, in 642, Northumbria was divided between Oswald's brother Oswy, who claimed Bernicia, and Oswin, son of Osric, of the Deiran stock, who, returning from exile, was received in his father's dominions. Oswin, already a Christian, and endowed with a saintly spirit in addition to singular comeliness and grace of person, lived on terms of close friendship with Aidan, who retained his episcopal jurisdiction throughout divided Northumbria, as he had held it in Oswald's reign. We are told of no direct intercourse between him and Oswy. Indirectly his prayers availed the king, who was besieged by Penda in his fortress of Bamborough, and would have been burnt with the town, had not the wind suddenly changed, it was believed, at the intercession of Aidan, and hurled back the flames on the besiegers (*H. E.* iii. 17).

None of Aidan's sermons have been preserved, and but few of his sayings. What we have are very characteristic. Besides the words already mentioned, which are thought to have led to his mission, he once said to Oswald on Easter-day, seizing his hand as he was ordering the distribution of a silver dish and its contents among the poor, "May this hand^d never perish!" (*H. E.* iii. 14); and Oswin, who ventured to complain when the bishop had bestowed on a poor beggar a splendid horse, the king's own present, received the following rebuke. "What sayest thou, O king? Is that son of a mare dearer to thee than this son of God?" The young king threw himself at Aidan's feet, professing that he would never henceforth grudge anything to the children of God, whereupon the bishop began to shed tears, and answered a priest's enquiry as to the cause of his sadness in the Celtic tongue. "I know that the king will not live long, for never till now have I seen a king so humble; and so I think that he will soon be taken from this life, for the nation is not worthy of such a ruler." (*H. E.* iii. 315.) Shortly after Oswin was betrayed to Oswy and murdered by him on August 20, 651. Aidan survived him only twelve days. He was at the royal *villa* near Bamborough when a violent illness seized him. They pitched a tent to protect him against the west wall of a small church, so that he expired with his head leaning against a post which served as a buttress. This post stood intact after the church had been twice burnt down, and chips from it were reputed efficacious for the cure of diseases. Aidan's body was buried at Lindisfarne, at first in the monastic cemetery, then in St. Peter's church beside the altar. On the night of the bishop's death Cuthbert, then a youth, while tending some sheep on the mountains, saw a band of angels descend from heaven, and return with a soul of surpassing brightness. This vision he considered a decisive call to undertake the monastic life (Baeda, *Vita S. Cuthberti*, iv.). Bede qualifies his very high praise of Aidan in only one particular. He adhered to the heterodox Celtic Easter (*H. E.* iii. 3, 17). "His zeal for God was not altogether according to knowledge: for he was wont to keep Easter Day, according to the

^c There is no authority for Baillet's supposition that Aidan was bishop of York for three years (Aolt, col. 505). Stilling exposes the error.

^d "Nunquam inveterescat haec manus." Its history is traced till the 16th century by Alford, *Annales*, iii. 262. See also *Act. SS. Boll.* Aug. ii. 87.

custom of his country, from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon." Aidan continued the Celtic practice, it seems without contradiction, till his death, though James the Roman deacon at York kept "the true and Catholic Easter with all whom he could bring to the knowledge of the truer way." Though the difference involved the observance of a double Easter in the same diocese, and a serious clashing of fast and festival, all men tolerated it patiently whilst Aidan lived, seeing that he could not depart from the custom of his country, while he diligently laboured to practise the works of faith, piety and love, for which reason he was deservedly beloved by all, and was held in veneration by such bishops as Honorius of Canterbury, and Felix of East Anglia (*H. E.* iii. 25).

It remains only to notice that Aidan predicted a storm which overtook Uтта, a priest, who was sent by Oswy to fetch home from her exile in Kent his destined bride, Eanfleda, daughter of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and that a flask of oil which Uтта had received from Aidan for the purpose actually allayed the storm (*H. E.* iii. 15). Aidan also patronised Heiu, the first nun in Northumbria, and the celebrated Abbess Hilda, whom in her early monastic life he constantly visited and diligently instructed (*H. E.* iv. 23). Eata, one of Aidan's twelve boys, was, on bishop Colman's departure into Scotland in 664, made abbat and afterwards bishop of Lindisfarne. Colman carried away part of the bones of Aidan, and left the rest at Lindisfarne. In ecclesiastical art this Saint is sometimes represented with a stag crouching at his feet (*Husenbeth's Emblems*). He is commemorated on August 31. Bamfborough Church is dedicated to him. The Theological College at Birkenhead is a modern foundation. [C. D.]

AIGRADUS (written ANGRADUS, Trithemius, Cave, &c.; also ANSGRADUS, ANSGARDUS), monk of Fontanelles (S. Vandrille), near Rouen, flourished about 699. He wrote at the request of St. Hilbert, the fourth abbat of S. Vaudrille, the life of his predecessor St. Ansbert, who ruled the monastery from 678 to 695, during eleven years of which period he was also archbishop of Rouen. This life, written in an elegant style, and with some taste and judgment, has been unhappily interpolated by a later hand, so that it is hard to decide, says Henschen in the *Acta SS. Boll.*, what is Aigradus' genuine work: he fully proves that the work is interpolated; but the editors of the *Hist. Lit. de la France* do not think that its integrity or value have been seriously affected. It was first printed by Surius on Feb. 9, the day of St. Ansbert's death (pp. 938-949, ed. 1571); and more accurately, with critical notes, by the Bollandists, Feb. vol. ii. pp. 347-356.

The compilers of *Gallia Christiana* (xi. 167), and all modern authors, attribute to Aigradus the fragment of the life of St. Lantbert or Lambert, edited as anonymous by Mabillon, *Acta SS. Bened.* saec. iii. par. 2, pp. 462-465. He had received his monastic institution under St. Lantbert, who succeeded St. Wandregisilus, founder of Fontanelles in 667, and became archbishop of Lyons in 678. The fragment preserved contains little more than the introduction, which is of some historical value. The Bollandists have erred in supposing that Aigradus claims to have written the life of St. Conedus, hermit of Fon-

tanella. See besides the places already cited Henschen's previous commentary, *Act. SS. Boll.* Feb. ii. 343, and *Histoire Lit. de la France*, iv. 33-35, 57. [C. D.]

AIGULPHUS, M., abbot of Lerins, deported to an islet between Corsica and Sardinia by his own monks, who after horrible tortures murdered him and his companions about A.D. 660 (or 651, according to some), and who is placed in the martyrologies Sept. 3 (Baron. *Ann.* ad an. 644, and *Martyr.* Sept. 3, Surius Sept. 3). [A. W. H.]

AKIBA, BEN JOSEPH (עקיבא), RABBI, was, according to tradition, a proselyte of Canaanitish race, and descended from Sisera. He was originally a herdsman in the employ of a rich man named Kalba-Sabua. His master's daughter, Rachel, fell in love with him, and they were secretly married; but her father, on discovering it, expelled them from his house. She persuaded him, though he was forty years of age, to begin the study of the law; and for some years she lived by herself in the deepest poverty, while he attended the lectures of R. Nachum of Gimso and R. Eliezer ben Hyrcan. There is a legend that when he became a renowned teacher he gave his wife a golden ornament, with a representation of Jerusalem on it; R. Gamaliel's wife asked her husband for a similar present, but he answered that only a wife who had shewn such fidelity in poverty deserved such a reward. Akiba is said to have told his disciples, "what you are and what I am, we owe to my wife." He taught at Bene Berak, which some place near Joppa and others near Azotus. He is celebrated as one of the chief founders of the rabbinical school of interpretation; he held rigidly to the written text, even in preference to any emendation of the Masora, and maintained that every particle and even letter had its separate meaning. Hence it is said in the Talmud (*Menach. fol. 29*), "when Moses ascended into the mount, he found God tying crowns (sc. קראי) to the letters, and he said to him, "Lord, what delays thy hand?" He answered, "many ages hence there will arise a man by name Akiba ben Joseph, who shall make unnumbered stores of comments on every tittle." He also strongly held the mystical character of Solomon's song. He seems to have been the first who attempted to systematise the immense mass of halachoth or authoritative decisions of former rabbis, as he arranged them in chapters according to their subject matter, and also invented a set of mnemonics to facilitate their committal to memory. This Mishna of R. Akiba, as it was called, or Middoth (cf. Epiphanius *contra Haer.* § 15, § 33, of the four current *δευτεράσεις*, *δευτέρα δὲ ἡ τοῦ καλουμένου Ραββιακιβά*), was oral and not committed to writing; but it no doubt served as the first idea of the subsequent Mishna of R. Jehuda. He is said to have also studied those dark questions of cosmogony and theosophy which the Jewish gnosis of that time sought to discover in the Mosaic account of the creation and in Ezekiel's chariot; hence it is said "four rabbis plunged into these mysteries, Ben Asai, Ben Soma, Elisha, and Akiba, and only the last passed through, sound in body and soul." He held that these chapters should not be read aloud except before qualified hearers, and that none should study them under thirty years of age. Four of

his moral sayings are given in the *Pirke Aboth*, iii. 10-13.

Akiba threw himself with all his energy of character into the national discontent against the Roman government under Trajan and Hadrian. He spent several years in travelling in different countries to visit the Jews and animate their hopes, and we hear of him in Africa (Cyrene?), Arabia, Nisibis, the chief seat of Jewish learning in Mesopotamia, Cilicia, and Cappadocia. He became an enthusiastic supporter of Simon Bar Cochba, who was the leader of the rebellion against Titinius Rufus, the Tyrannus Rufus of the Talmud; and he applied to him the prophecies of Numbers xxiv. 17, and Haggai ii. 6. The rebellion lasted more than three years, and was finally crushed by the capture of Bethar (Beth Zor), A.D. 135 (or, according to some writers, 125). R. Akiba was one of the many victims who fell after the suppression of the movement; the tradition is that he was torn to death with iron combs. At his death it was said that "the arms of the law were broken and the fountains of wisdom stopped up." Jerome seems to allude to him in his *Comm. on Eccles.* iv. 13, "Hebraeus meus, cujus saepe facio mentionem, cum Ecclesiasten mecum legeret, haec Baracibam (so Epiphanius. *con. haer.* 15 Ἀκὶβάν ἢ Βαρακὶβάν), quem unum vel maxime admirantur, super praesenti loco tradidisse testatus est." In his *Comm. on Is.* viii., he calls him Akibas, and mentions him as Aquila's teacher. (Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. pp. 60-68, 116, 117, 157-194; Frankel's *Zeitschrift für Gesch. und Wissen. des Judenthums*, iii. pp. 45-51, 81-93, 130-148.) [E. B. C.]

ALARIC (Teut. prob.=Athalaric, "noble ruler"), general and king (398) of the Goths, the most civilized and merciful of the barbarian chiefs who ravaged the Roman Empire. His life has already been given in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. It therefore remains here, after recapitulating its chief events in outline, to draw out Alaric's attitude towards, and influence upon, Christianity.

Alaric first appears among the Gothic army who assisted Theodosius in opposing Eugenius, 394. He led the revolt of his nation against Arcadius, ravaged the provinces south of the Danube, and invaded Greece 395. Athens capitulated, and afterwards Corinth, Argos, and Sparta. Stilicho, general of the Western Empire, the only man who could cope with Alaric, on his second expedition into Greece (see *Gibbon* iv. 27, note, ed. Smith), attacked Alaric in Peloponnesus, and hemmed him in. His escape is referred by Zosimus to Stilicho's carelessness, but by Claudian, with greater probability, to intrigues with the Court of Constantinople, which was jealous of Stilicho's interference. Under the title of Master-General of Eastern Illyricum, 398, he became the ally of Arcadius, and secretly planned the invasion of Italy. In the winter of 402 Alaric crossed the Alps, towards the close of that year penetrated into Italy, and was defeated by Stilicho at Pollentia on Easter Day 403, after which he retreated from Italy with some further losses. In 404 he exchanged the prefecture of Eastern for that of Western Illyricum, and the service of Arcadius for that of Honorius, and, after the incursion

and annihilation of Rhadagaisus and his Sclavonian hordes in 405, he was subsidized for his supposed services to the empire by the payment of 4000 pounds of gold. Stilicho's ruin and death in 408, the subsequent massacre of the Goths settled in Italy, and Honorius' impolitic refusal of Alaric's equitable terms, caused the second invasion of Italy, marked by the first blockade of Rome, which ended in a capitulation. Alaric retiring with a large ransom. At the second siege in 409, preceded by the capture of Ostia, the city was surrendered unconditionally, and Alaric set up Attalus as emperor, in opposition to Honorius, who remained at Ravenna. At the close of the third siege, in 410 (August 24), the city was in the hands of the Goths for six days, during three of which the sack was continued. Alaric's intended invasion of Sicily and Africa was prevented by his death at Consentia late in 410.

The authorities for this history are given in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, and they may be examined more fully in the notes to *Gibbon's Roman Empire*, vol. iv. pp. 23-112.

The effect of Alaric's conquests on the cause of Christianity, and on the spiritual position of Rome in Western Christendom, is well traced by Dean Milman (*Latin Christianity*, i. 120-140). Alaric and his Goths had embraced Christianity probably from the teaching of Ulphilas, the Arian bishop, who died in 388 (Mosheim, ed. Stubbs, i. 233). This age witnessed the last efforts of Paganism to assert itself as the ancient and national religion, and Rome was its last stronghold. Pagans and Christians had retorted upon each other the charge that the calamities of the empire were due to the desertion of the old or new system of faith respectively, and the truth or falsehood of either was generally staked upon the issue. The almost miraculous discomfiture of the heathen Rhadagaisus by Stilicho, in spite of his vow to sacrifice the noblest senators of Rome on the altars of the gods which delighted in human blood, was accepted as an ill omen by those at Rome who hoped for a public restoration of Paganism (*Gibbon*, iv. 47-49, ed. Smith; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 122). Rome, impregnable while Stilicho, her Christian defender, lived, could submit only to the approach of Alaric, "a Christian and a soldier, the leader of a disciplined army, who understood the laws of war, and respected the sanctity of treaties." In the first siege of Rome, 410, both Pagan and Christian historians relate the strange proposal to relieve the city by the magical arts of some Etruscan diviners, who were believed to have power to call down lightning from heaven, and direct it against Alaric's camp. That Pope Innocent assented to this public ceremony rests only on the authority of the heathen Zosimus (v. 41). It is questioned whether this idolatrous rite actually took place. Alaric perhaps imagined that he was furthering the Divine purpose in besieging Rome. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* ix. cap. 7) mentions as a current story that a certain monk, on urging the king, then on his march through Italy, to spare the city, received the reply that he was not acting of his own accord, but that some one was persistently forcing him on, and urging him to sack Rome.

The shock felt through the world at the new

of the capture of Rome in Alaric's third siege, 410, was disproportioned to the real magnitude of the calamity: contrast the exaggerated language of St. Jerome, *Ep. ad Principiam*, with Orosius, l. vii. c. 39, and St. Augustine *De Civ. Dei*, ii. 2 (a work written between 413 and 426 with the express object of refuting the Pagan arguments from the sack of Rome), and his tract, *De excidio Urbis* (*Opp.* t. vi. 622-628, ed. Bened.). The book in which Zosimus related the fall of Rome has been lost, so that we have to gather information from Christian sources; but it is plain that the destruction and loss was chiefly on the side of Paganism, and that little escaped which did not shelter itself under the protection of Christianity. "The heathens fled to the churches, the only places of refuge . . . There alone rapacity and lust and cruelty were arrested and stood abashed" (Milman, p. 133). The property of the churches and, in some instances at least, the persons of Christian virgins were respected. Several characteristic anecdotes, preserved by Jerome, Orosius, and others, are found in all accounts of the siege. The Pagan inhabitants of Rome were scattered over Africa, Egypt, Syria and the east, and were encountered alike by St. Jerome at Bethlehem and by St. Augustine at Carthage. Innocent I. was absent at Ravenna during the siege of Rome. On his return heathen temples were converted into Christian churches; "with Paganism expired the venerable titles of the religion, the great High Priests and Flamens, the Auspices and Augurs. On the pontifical throne sat the bishop of Rome, who would soon possess the substance of the imperial power. The capture of Rome by Alaric was one of the great steps by which the pope rose to his plenitude of power" (Milman, p. 139).

Alaric was instrumental in driving Paganism from Greece as well as Rome. Zosimus (v. 7) asserts that on his approach to Athens its walls were seen to be guarded by Minerva and Achilles. Gibbon, while wishing to give Zosimus the full benefit of an age of credulity, confesses "that the mind of Alaric was ill prepared to receive, either in sleeping or waking visions, the impressions of Greek superstition . . . The invasion of the Goths, instead of vindicating the honour, contributed, at least accidentally, to extirpate the last remains of Paganism; and the mysteries of Ceres, which had subsisted eighteen hundred years, did not survive the destruction of Eleusis and the calamities of Greece" (vol. iv. p. 37).

The conquests of Alaric, though achieved at an age when the Church boasted many eminent saints and writers, afford far fewer materials for the martyrologist and hagiologist than those of Attila. Alaric, though an Arian, is nowhere recorded to have persecuted the Catholics whom war had placed in his power. Jornandes and Isidore of Seville, Gothic historians, and Orosius, a Spanish Catholic, are equally silent on this point. The following facts of personal history have been preserved. In the sack of Rome Marcella, an aged matron, was thrown on the ground and cruelly beaten (Jerome, *Ep. ad Principiam*); a nameless lady who persistently repelled her capturer, was conducted by him to the sanctuary of the Vatican; and an aged virgin, to whose charge some sacred vessels had

been entrusted, through her bold constancy preserved them intact. At the plunder of Nola in Campania, St. Paulinus its bishop is said to have prayed, "Lord, let me not suffer torture either for gold or silver, since Thou knowest where are all my riches" (Fleury, *Ecol. Hist.* ed. Newman, bk. xxii. c. 21). Proba, widow of the prefect Petronius, retired to Africa with her daughter Laeta, and her granddaughter Demetrias (Jerome, *Epist.* cxxx. t. i. p. 969, ed. Vallars.), and spent her large fortune in relieving the captives and exiles. (See Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* t. xiii. p. 620-635.) Valuable contributions to the history of Alaric not already mentioned are Sigonius, *Opp.* t. i. par. i. p. 347, sqq. ed. Argellati; Aschbach, *Gesch. der Westgothen*. [C. D.]

ALBANUS, M. (1) The protomartyr of Britain—if he ever existed (and the doubt may at least serve to signalize the remarkable paucity of martyrs in the several conversions of these islands): martyred probably at Verulamium, and according to either the "conjecture" or the "knowledge" (*conjectimus* or *cognoscimus*) of Gildas, in the time of Diocletian, and if so, A.D. 304, but according to another legend, which however still speaks of Diocletian, in 286 (*Anglo-Sax. Chron., Lib. Landav.*). Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 13, and *De Mart. Palæst.* xiii. 10, 11), Lactantius (*De Mort. Persecut.* xv. xvi.), and Sozomen (i. 6), deny that there was any persecution during the time of Constantius in "the Gauls," which term included Britain. It is possible, however, that Constantius may have been compelled to allow one or two martyrdoms. And it is at least certain, that 125 years after the latest date assigned to Alban's martyrdom, 144 after the earliest, viz. A.D. 429 (Prosper, *Chron.*), Germanus visited his relics in Britain, and it is to be presumed at Verulamium (Constant. in *V. S. Germani*, written A.D. 473-492). Gildas mentions him in 560 (whose statement however about the persecution is of no value, being simply a transference of Eusebius's words to Britain, to which Eusebius himself says they did not apply), and Venantius Fortunatus (*Poem.* viii. iv. 155) about 580. Bæda in 731 copies Constantius, and certain *Acta* otherwise unknown. And the subsequent foundation of Offa in 793 only serves to identify the place with the tradition. The British Life discovered by the St. Alban's monk Unwona in the 10th century, according to Matthew Paris, in *VV. Abb. S. Alban.*, is apparently a myth. And the Life by William of St. Alban's in the 12th century is of the ordinary nature and value of Lives of the kind and date. But the testimony of Germanus, in Constantius' Life of him, seems sufficient proof that a tradition of the martyrdom of somebody named Albanus existed at Verulamium a century and something more after the supposed date of that martyrdom. That he was a heathen, who sheltered a clergyman flying from persecution, and who, when himself dragged in that clergyman's robe (*caracalla* or *amphibatus*) to the tribunal on a charge of favouring the clergyman's escape, affirmed himself (being unbaptized) to be a Christian, and who, upon refusing likewise to sacrifice, was condemned to be scourged and beheaded; that he miraculously divided a river, when the crowd blocked up the bridge, on his way to the place of execution, and brought up a fountain at the place itself, to

quench his thirst; that the intended executioner was converted and suffered with him, while the actual executioner's eyes dropped out at the instant of his beheading him; all this represents a belief as old as the 7th century (Baed. i. 7), but is of course pure fiction, as much so as are the equally stereotyped numbers of 888, or 989, or 889 companions of his martyrdom. His reputation seems to have extended to the Continent, as (not to mention Venant. Fortunatus in 580, above referred to) Norman-French Lives and tracts about him appear to exist. The English poet Lydgate also, in 1439, "translatyd the glorious Lyves of Seynt Alban and Seynt Amphiball oute of Frensh and Latyn" into English verse; and his work was printed at St. Alban's, 4to, 1534, by one John Hertford (Hardy's *Description. Catalogue*, &c. i. 23). Aaron and Julius are the two names preserved of his companions, or at any rate contemporaries, in martyrdom. And for these there is the evidence of a Welsh tradition anterior to Geoffrey of Monmouth (viz. in the *Lib. Landav.*) connecting them with Caerleon. They were invented certainly before Gildas's time. The amplification of the persecuted priest into the legend of Amphibalus is a twelfth century fiction. He is first found by name in Geoffrey of Monmouth and is conjectured to have arisen out of St. Alban's cloak (*amphibalus*). His "inventio," and his miracles, appear to date from the time of William of St. Alban's. St. Alban of Verulamium is frequently confounded in the martyrologies with

(2) Albanus of Mentz, martyred at Mentz no one knows when, according to Baeda under Diocletian also, according to Sigeberht (in *Chron.*), who says he had been driven from Philippi with Theonistus its bishop, in 425, and respecting whom Rabanus Maurus goes so far abroad as to call him an African bishop flying from Hunneric, and whose day is June 21 (Baron. June 21), as the British St. Alban's is June 22. St. Alban of Britain, and Gildas, St. Patrick, and St. Petroc, are the four British saints who found entrance into Saxon and into early Continental calendars.

[A. W. H.]

ALBERHT. (1) King of East Anglia in 749. On the death of Elfwald he divided the kingdom with Hunbenna (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 662).

(2) (Aldberht, Chr. Sax.) Abbot of Ripon: he succeeded abbot Botwin in 786; was probably present at the legatine Council of the North, held in September 787, the acts of which were signed by an abbot *Aldberich*. He died in the autumn of the same year (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 666; Spelman, *Concilia*, i. 301).

(3) Archbishop of York. See ETHELBERHT. See also ALDBERHT; ALUBERHT; EADBERHT.

(4) The ninth abbot of Glastonbury in Malmesbury's list; dated 712.

[S.]

ALBINA, daughter-in-law of Melania, the friend of Rufinus, and mother of St. Melania, a wealthy and devout Roman lady (Pall. *Hist. Laus*, 118, 120). Shortly before the taking of Rome by Alaric she retired with her daughter and Pinianus, her son-in-law, to Africa; and after seven years there to Jerusalem, where they became acquainted with Pelagius. There, probably, she died (Aug. *de Grat.* l. Epp. 124, 5, 6; Hier. *Ep.* 143). In these passages Albina, not Albinus, appears to be the correct reading.

[I. G. S.]

ALBINUS. (1) An Englishman (Bede, *H. E.* v. 20) brought up at Canterbury in the monastery of S. Augustine under abbot Adrian, whom he succeeded according to Bede in 710. He was instructed in Latin and Greek by Adrian and Theodore. Bede was induced by him to undertake his Ecclesiastical History, towards which Albinus contributed his own knowledge of the period of the Conversion. This was communicated to Bede through Nothelm, who had been sent to Rome to search the archives there for materials. Bede's letter of thanks to Albinus is still extant. According to W. Thorn and Elmham, Albinus was blessed as abbot by archbishop Brihtwald on the 22nd of April, 708, and died in 732. He was buried in the church of S. Mary under the abbey of S. Augustine, and was afterwards translated in the time of abbot Wido. His name is attached as witness to a charter of Ethelbert II., king of Kent, Feb. 20, 732 (Bede, *H. E.* Praef. and v. 20; Elmham, ed. Hardwicke 294, 295, 301).

(2) [ALCUIN.] [S.]

ALBOIN, king of the Langobardi, or Lombards, and founder of the kingdom subject to that people in Italy, was the son of that Audoin under whom the Lombards emerge from obscurity to occupy Pannonia, invited by the emperor of Constantinople, in accordance with the usual Byzantine policy, as a check to the Gepidae. In the wars with the latter nation Alboin first appears. The confused accounts of them which Procopius preserves exhibit the tribe and their prince as rude and ferocious barbarians, and personally Alboin appears to have possessed the qualities which would fit him to be the leader of such a tribe. He is described as "vir bellis aptus et per omnia strenuus" (Paul. *Diac.* i. 27) (a man well fitted for warfare and every way energetic), "statura procerns et ad bella peragenda toto corpore coaptatus" (id. ii. 28) ("he was tall of stature, and his whole frame was built for a life of war"). That he was personally a Christian, though an Arian, is proved by a letter from a Gallic bishop to his first wife, a Gallic princess, which deplores, not his heathenism, but his heresy (Sirmond. *Conc. Gall.* i.). The passages which might seem to imply that the Lombards were not converted till the end of the century, either refer to a conversion from Arianism, or speak merely of some part of Alboin's mongrel host. Procopius distinctly calls them "Langobardos, jam tum Christianos" (who were by that time already Christians).

Succeeding to his father's power, Alboin accomplished, by the aid of the Avars, the destruction of the Gepidae. The characteristic story of the circumstances which led to his marriage with Rosamond, the daughter of Cunimund their king, may be legendary, but the fact of the marriage is rescued from uncertainty by the subsequent notoriety of his wife (see Gibbon, c. xlv.). The conquest of Italy followed. An expedition of 2200 Lombards about fifteen years before, had been despatched to the assistance of Narses, in virtue of some kind of agreement,* and tempted as well by a solid bribe

* Langobardi jam pridem foederati (Paul. *Diac.* iii. 1); ἀναευσθείς τῇ τῷ βασιλεὺς συνθήκῃ (Procop. iv. 26). These expressions throw light on the obscure words of Nicetius, Bishop of Trèves (Sirmond. i. *Conc. Gall.*), "Ipse Imperator suis ipsum (sc. Alboinum) proponit."

as by the vague attractions of Italy. Their behaviour may be reasonably supposed to have been the first cause of the hatred which henceforth attached to their name in Italy, and confirms the idea already formed of their character (πρὸς τῇ ἄλλῃ ἐς τὴν διαίταν παρανομία, τὰς τε οἰκοδομίας, αἷς ἂν ἐντύχοιεν ἐνεπίπρασαν, καὶ γυναιξὶ ταῖς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ καταφενγούσαις βιαζόμενοι ἐπλησίαζον, their conduct was marked by universal license, and in particular they burnt every dwelling which they came to, and violated the women who had taken refuge in sanctuary, Procop. iv. 33). They had been dismissed on this account by Narses, but they had doubtless carried home such reports of Italy as would render superfluous the specimens of its produce with which Narses is said to have accompanied the invitation which now called them to avenge his injuries. That invitation is itself doubtfully authentic, and is rejected by Muratori (*Annal.* ann. 567). But it is supported by historical analogies, and by the direct evidence of the majority of writers,^b and is therefore accepted by the moderns (*Troja*, lib. iv. 7), in spite of the silence of the Greek authors, and some incoherence in one of the chief witnesses (Anastas. *Vit. Joann.* iii.; Muratori, iii. 233). Alboin's army was heterogeneous. Besides 20,000 Saxons accompanied by their families, who recrossed the Alps after the conquest, Muratori has deduced (*Antich. It. i.* diss. 1) from Italian topography the presence of the Bavarians, and Paul (ii. 26) adds distinctly the names of several other tribes. The number of the army is unknown. That it was considerable is shown by the fact that it was in reality a migration of the whole tribe, and by the extent to which it changed the character and arrangements of population in Italy. Alboin left Pannonia in April, 568, the passes were unguarded, and he learnt from his own success, the need of securing his rear and the frontier of his future kingdom by entrusting the defence and government of Venetia Prima, his first conquest, to Gisulf his nephew, with the title of duke and the command of those whom he should himself select among the most eminent of the "Farae" or nobles (Paul. ii. ix.). From this point the conquest was rapid. In Liguria (the western half of north Italy), Genoa, with some cities of the Riviera, alone escaped. Pavia held out for three years: we may suppose that its siege was not very vigorously pressed; and as a matter of fact, we know that a great part of Alboin's force was detached in flying squadrons which ravaged the country southwards all through Tuscany and Aemilia, to so great a distance that Paul mentions Rome and Ravenna as almost the only exceptions to the devastating inroad.^c The conquest of a part of S. Italy and the foundation of the duchy of Beneventum under Zotto, has been by some attributed, without certain evidence, to this interval. The death of Alboin followed the fall of Pavia. If an interval of three years and six months is to be allowed between the two events as Muratori thinks;^d at any rate nothing is known of its history. The story of his death

is like that of his early life in the picture which it gives of a thoroughly barbaric society, where the scull of an enemy is used as a drinking-cup, and the men hold their banquets apart from the women. It may be read in Gibbon's forty-fifth chapter. Paul avouches that the cup was still to be seen in his own day.

Alboin reigned so short a time in Italy that we can form little idea of his policy towards the conquered people. His protection of the bishop of Treviso (Paul. Diac. ii. xii.) to whose prayer he granted all the possessions of his see, exhibits him as clement; and although we are told that he vowed he would lay Pavia in ruins, it appears that at the last moment he relented and spared the city whose obstinate resistance had so much exasperated him (*id. ib.* xxvii.). The favourable view which these facts suggest would be confirmed by an incidental expression in Paul, "populis extinctis, exceptis his regionibus quas Albuinus cepert" (the population destroyed, except in those districts which Alboin himself had conquered) (ii. xxxii.), and opposed more feebly by the negative evidence that no beneficial institution or law is ascribed to him: or by suggesting that perhaps the anecdote of the bishop of Treviso becomes somewhat suspicious when we remember that the bishops of Aquileia and Milan fled from the conqueror. The cruelties which gave the Lombards their reputation seem to be proved only against his successors.

It would seem that Alboin left behind him a hero's memory, not in the land of his conquests, but in the country of his birth, for Paul tells us that in his own time among the Bavarians, of whom Alboin had led a band into Italy, whose frontiers touched those of the kingdom which he founded, and whom a common enmity to the East Franks linked to some degree to the Lombards, the praises of Alboin were still repeated, "hactenus etiam apud Baioariorum gentem . . . eius liberalitas celebratur:" and a certain duke of the Veronese march, who opened the tomb of Alboin and took from it some of its ornaments, found an occasion for the vanity common to all men, as Paul quaintly puts it, in the boast that he had seen Alboin, "Alboin se vidisse jactabat."

The chief authority for the life of Alboin, Paulus Diaconus, lived towards the end of the 8th century, in the last days of the Lombard monarchy; but as one of his ancestors served in the invading army, his account of the conquest may be more authentic than that of an annalist writing so long after the event would otherwise be. [E. S. T.]

ALCHFLEDA, a daughter of Oswin, king of Northumbria, by his wife Eanfleda. She married Peada, king of the Middle Angles, in 653, he having become a Christian under the influence of her father and brother. Bede speaks of her as being implicated in the murder of Peada (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 21, 24). [S.]

ALCHFRITH (1) (ALCHFRID, ALHFRID, ALUCHFRID, EALFRID, ALFRID, ALCFRID). Son of Oswiu, king of Northumbria. He married Cyniburga, daughter of Penda, and was instrumental in bringing his brother-in-law Peada to baptism. He took part with his father in the battle of Winwæd, in which Penda fell, and seems to have been admitted by him to a share in the

^b Anastas. *In Vita Joh.* iii.; Muratori, *Script. Ital.* iii. 133; Mellitus, *Op. S. Isidori*, i. 680 (ed. 1797); Isidore of Seville, *S. Isidori Chronicon*. (ed. Roncelli, 1787).

^c "Invasit" is Paul's word.

^d *Scr. Ital.* i. 435 a; but in *Annal.* ad ann. 573, a different view appears to be taken.

royal title and power. The period of his influence in Northumbria is marked by the rise of Wilfrid, who had been brought up in the household of Oswiu, and on his return from Rome in 658 was taken by Alchfrith for his chief friend and adviser. He bestowed on him lands at Æstanforde, and a monastery at Ripon which he had before given to Scottish monks. Alchfrith took a more decided part than his father in the change of the Paschal Custom at the council of Strenshal in 664, and the same year sent Wilfrid to France to be consecrated bishop. Some time after this probably, Alchfrith took up arms against his father (Bede, iii. 14) perhaps in alliance with his Mercian kinsfolk. He now disappears from history. Egfrith, his brother, succeeds Oswiu in 670; no mention being made of Alchfrith, whence we conclude that he was either dead or in exile. According to Simeon of Durham, Osric, who succeeded to the Northumbrian throne in 718, was a son of Alchfrith. As there seems to have been a tradition at Gloucester that Osric, king of the Huiccas, the founder of the monastery there, was identical with this king of Northumbria, it is not improbable that Alchfrith had taken refuge in Mercia. He must not be confounded with Aldfrith, another son of Oswiu, who became king of Northumbria in 685, who was an enemy of Wilfrid, and an upholder of the Irish learning. If Osric were the son of Alchfrith, Oswald, the founder of Pershore, and king of Huiccia, was another son and Kyneburga, abbess of Gloucester, a daughter. Alchfrith would thus be ancestor of the viceroys of the Huiccas, who were famous founders of monasteries in the 8th and 9th centuries (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 14, 21, 24, 25, 28, v. 19; Eddius, *V. Wilfridi*, cap. 7, 8, 9, 10, 12; *Monasticon Angl.* i. 542).

(2) (ALFRITH, EALHFRITH). This name is borne by a disciple of Wilfrid, who was employed in his negotiations with Aldfrith, king of Northumbria, under the name of "Magister Alfridus," and who is probably the same learned teacher to whom Alldhelm wrote an epistle congratulatory on his return from Ireland (Edd. *V. Wilfr.* c. 56; Alldhelm, *Ep. ad Ealfridum*). [S.]

ALCHMUND (1) (ALKMUND, EALHMUND). The ninth bishop of HEXHAM; consecrated in 767 with archbishop Ethelberht of York, April 24. He died Sept. 7, 781, and was buried near his predecessor Acca. An account of his translation and of miracles attributed to him is given by Ailred of Rievaulx in his 'History of the Saints of Hexham.' (Sim. Dunelm. *M. H. B.* 663-665; Ailred, *Saints of Hexham*, in Raine's *Memorials of Hexham*, I. 190-197; Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.* saec. iii. p. 1, pp. 214, 215).

(2) The thirteenth bishop of WINCHESTER: he attended the council of Clovesho in 803 with four abbots and two priests. His name is attached to several charters from 802 to 805. (Fl. Wig. *M. H. B.* 619; Kemble, *C. D.* v. 65, &c.)

(3) An abbot of this name attended the council of Clovesho in 803 amongst the clergy of the diocese of Leicester. He was evidently a person of mark, for he was present at the legatine council of 787, and attested charters of Offa and Kenulf of Mercia from 789 to 803. (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 187, v. 64; Spelman, *Conc.* i. 301, 325.)

(4) King of Kent, father of Egberht, king of Wessex.

(5) (ALHMUND, ALKMUND) The martyr. Of this saint, who is commemorated on the 19th of March, hardly anything can be positively stated. According to the hagiographers, he was the son of Alcred, king of Northumbria, who was put to death, as stated by Simeon of Durham, in 800, by the servants of Eardulf. (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 671; Flor. Wig. 547.) His claim to the honours of martyrdom are not explained, but he must have become very early an object of veneration, as a church at Shrewsbury was founded under his dedication by Ethelfleda, the daughter of Alfred. According to the tradition which is given by Alban Butler from a MS. sermon in his own possession, Alkmund's remains were first buried at Lilleshall, and thence translated to Derby. The church founded by Ethelfleda was endowed as a college for ten prebendaries by king Edgar, but after the Conquest the college was suppressed, and the abbey of Lilleshall founded out of its revenues. Several churches in Derbyshire and Shropshire are dedicated to S. Alkmund (*Acta SS. Boll.* March iii. p. 47; *Mon. Angl.* vi. 262).

ALCHRED, king of Northumbria. He was son of Eanwin, a descendant of Ida, but not in the direct royal line. He succeeded Moll in 765, to the exclusion of his son. He married a wife named Osgearn or Ofgeofu, in 768. A letter from the royal couple to bishop Lullus is preserved among the letters of S. Boniface, in which they thank him for his presents and request his prayers, and his assistance to the ambassadors whom they had sent to king Charles. They present him with twelve "sagos" and a gold ring. Lappenberg has identified him with the king of Northumbria to whom S. Willehad applied for leave to go as a missionary to the Frisians. Alchred, according to the 'Life of Willehad,' assembled his bishops, and after mature deliberation sent him to the work. In 774 he was deposed by his nobles and banished. He took refuge first at Bamborough, and afterwards with Cynocht, king of the Picts. His son Alhmund is said to have accompanied him in exile. [ALCHMUND, (5).] (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 663, 664; Bonifac. *Ep.* 119; Lappenberg, *Hist. Eng.* ed. Thorpe, i. 215, 216.) [S.]

ALCIBIADES, of Apamea, a propagator of heretical doctrines and trafficker in professed spiritual powers, who found his way to Rome from the valley of the Orontes (cf. Juv. *Sat.* iii. 62) in the time of Hippolytus, in the early part of the third century. If we are to accept the statement of Hippolytus, Alcibiades was led to Rome by what he had heard of the heretical teaching of Callistus, then bishop of Rome, and his school. On this ground-work he conceived the hope of erecting a more subtle philosophical system, composed of elements derived from the Ebionites, the Pythagoreans, Eastern Magicians, and Jewish Cabbalists. He brought with him as his credentials "the book of Elchaisai" (or "Helesesai," Euseb. vi. 38), received from the hands of an angel. The history of this volume and what we learn of its contents is in striking correspondence with the modern 'Book of Mormon.' Alcibiades was openly met and successfully resisted by Hippolytus, and his heresy appears to have been speedily and effectually crushed. See ELCESAITES. (Hippolytus, *Philosophum.* lib. ix. c. 8, 12; Euseb. *H. E.*

vi. 38; Theod. *Haeret. Fab.* ii. 7; Epip. *Haer.* xix. 5). The untrustworthy Nicephorus (*H. E.* v. 24) makes Alcibiades an opponent of the Elcesaites. [E. V.]

ALCIMUS AVITUS. [AVITUS.]

ALCUIN (Ealwine, Alchwin, Alchuin, Alquinus, Flaccus Albinus); Alcuine (*V. S. Willibrordi* cap. xxxiv. "Carmiger indoctus cecinit hos Alcuine versus") Alcuinus ("Qui legat, Alcuinum, dicat rogo Christe, tuere. *Epigr.* 279"). Alcuin was born of noble Northumbrian parentage about 735. The exact date of his birth and the names of his parents are unknown, but the year 735 is accepted by the best authorities, Mabillon and Froben, as an approximation; and the position of his family is determined by his own words. He was, he tells us (*V. S. Willibrordi*, lib. i. c.1), the hereditary representative of the noble house from which S. Willibrord, the apostle of the Frisians, sprang. As such he possessed and ruled a little monastic society which had been founded by Willigis, the father of S. Willibrord, in honour of S. Andrew, on one of the promontories of the Yorkshire coast between the Humber and the North Sea.

He was brought up from infancy in the school founded by archbishop Egbert in connexion with the church of York. Here he received instruction both from the archbishop, himself the disciple and friend of Bede, and from Ethelberht, the master of the school, who became archbishop in 767. The nature of the education thus obtained is described by the biographer of Alcuin, who drew his information from Sigulf, a pupil in the same school, as beginning with grammar and leading up through the liberal discipline of literature and philosophy to the study of the Holy Scriptures. It involved certainly a fair acquaintance with the Latin poets, some knowledge of the Greek Fathers, handed down from Theodore and Adrian, and as much Hebrew as could be learned from the study of S. Jerome. The library of York contained books in all the three languages, including the works of Aristotle and Cicero (*Alc. de Pontiff.* vv. 1525-1562).

Alcuin was the favourite pupil of Egbert, who is said to have presaged great things for him, and who provided for his advancement in secular as well as theological learning. With Ethelbert, before his promotion, it is probable that Alcuin visited Rome, and on his journey spent a short time in study at one or two French monasteries.

He received the tonsure early in life, and was ordained deacon by Ethelbert soon after 767, on the feast of the Purification. A second visit to Italy, on a mission from Ethelbert to Charles the Great, falls probably between 767 and 780: on the occasion either of this or of the earlier visit Alcuin heard at Pavia a disputation between a learned Jew and Peter of Pisa, who was Charles's instructor in grammar. The king seems to have distinguished Alcuin with favour. It is uncertain whether Alcuin succeeded Ethelbert in the charge of the school of York when the latter became archbishop, or at a later period; but he was employed by him in conjunction with Eanbald in directing the architectural works proceeding at York, and when Ethelbert retired from the archbishopate in 780, was intrusted with his library. The new archbishop Eanbald sent Alcuin to Rome

for his pall in 780. On this journey he fell in again with Charles at Parma, where he spent Easter 781, and was pressed by him to leave England and attach himself to his court. Having completed his errand, Alcuin obtained from his archbishop and king leave of temporary absence, and accepted Charles's invitation; joined his court about 782, and remained for eight years a member of his household, taking charge of the Palatine schools and being provided for by the gift of the monasteries of S. Lupus at Troyes, and Bethlehem at Ferrières, with the cell of S. Judoc on the coast of the Morini. During this period Alcuin was busily employed in teaching, in writing and revising books for educational and ecclesiastical uses, and in organizing schools on the model of the Palatine school, in which Charles might carry out his design of restoring the knowledge of the sacred languages, the text of the Bible and service books, and the moral rigour of ecclesiastical discipline. How laboriously Alcuin fulfilled the duties thus incurred, the list of his works will show: the extent of his influence is proved by his letters, and the success of his work by the literary history of the following century.

In 790 Alcuin returned to Northumbria, possibly with a view to the security of his property, and perhaps with credentials from Charles. Ethelred, who had after ten years of exile and imprisonment, just recovered his throne, attempted to retain him at his court, and the love of his country, which appears strongly in his letters, might have induced him to remain. But the necessities of the Church compelled him to return. The heresy of the Adoptionists under Felix and Elipandus on the one hand, and the conduct of the empress Irene on the subject of image worship, had roused the religious instincts of Charles. Alcuin rejoined him in 792 as the champion of orthodoxy, and in conjunction with other English scholars, acting also, according to Simeon of Durham, who repeats the words of an apparently contemporaneous historian, as the representative of the English bishops, he took a leading part in the important measures which were completed in the council of Frankfort. He never returned to England, but spent the remaining years of his life in the reformation of the religious houses which were intrusted to him by Charles, and in the cultivation of that learning and sanctity which have made him a bone of contention between the rival orders of monks and canons. He governed the monastery of S. Martin at Tours with the power and name apparently of abbot [Ep. 81, ed. Migne], although he was still a deacon; and although he was an admirer of the monastic ideal, he had never taken the vow of a true monk, he retained his monasteries of Ferrières and Troyes, and about the year 800 undertook the charge of another at Cormery on the Indre. Shortly before his death he founded a hospital for pilgrims at Duodecim Pontes near Troyes. As old age grew upon him he withdrew from work, and with the imperial permission divided his preferments among his disciples. He died on Whit Sunday, May 19, at Tours, and was buried by the archbishop within the church of S. Martin, not outside as he had desired.

This short notice comprises nearly all that can be said to be known of the chronology and sequence of events of Alcuin's life, and it is unnecessary to do more than mention the vexed

questions regarding it which have been debated at great length by Mabillon, Chifflet, and Froben, but which, owing to the materials brought to light by their discussions and to the growth of a more critical chronology, are questions no longer. Such were the supposed identity of Alcuin with Albinus, abbot of S. Augustine's; and the notion that he was a disciple of Bede, which was maintained on the hypothesis that Alcuin lived to be a hundred years old, or that Bede lived until the year 760. The date of Alcuin's death has also been questioned, owing to mention made of him apparently as alive as late as the year 815, to which Mabillon was at one time inclined to give credit. But the evidence of contemporary annalists is conclusive, and the later mention must be set aside, as deficient in authority, or as referable to other persons of the name of Albinus. A question which has been debated with much more zeal and critical power, is whether Alcuin was a monk or a secular clerk. Mabillon and Froben argue that he was a monk, on the ground principally of his being a member of the church of York, which they assume to have been Benedictine, of the high admiration which he professed for monasticism, and of the position of abbot which he held in several monasteries. On the other side is arrayed the evidence of his biographer, who records him as standing to the order of canons in the same position in which Benedict of Aniane stands to the monks, and the fact that his disciples and successors in his several churches were chiefly canons. The positions of Mabillon and Froben are very questionable. The church of York was certainly not monastic or Benedictine in such a sense as to exclude secular clergy who were members of the archbishop's court and household; it was most probably a mixed society necessarily containing clerks, incidentally containing monks: there is no evidence for regarding Alcuin as a monk, much for regarding him as a secular deacon. Again, Alcuin's professions of admiration for monasticism are to be interpreted rather of an ideal which he felt himself too busy and too worldly to aspire to before he grew old. It is unnecessary to add that the office of ruler of a monastery could at this period be held by a secular, or even by a layman, and with or without the title of abbot. This title, although given him by Charles and others, Alcuin seldom if ever assumes. What however seems decisive as to his profession during the greatest part of his life, is the evidence of his letters that he retained and spent his private fortune in a way which would have been incompatible with a monastic character, even at a period when the rigour of monasticism was so far relaxed as to allow a layman to be an abbot. Still it is possible, and by no means improbable, that he, like many other noble Northumbrians, received the monastic tonsure in preparation for death; but there is no evidence that he did so. Froben is much less confident of his conclusion than Mabillon, but the matter would hardly have been so long debated without the spur of monastic zeal and jealousy. The question whether Alcuin was brother to Aquila, archbishop of Salzburg, is settled by Froben on very satisfactory grounds in the negative.

The position of Alcuin in the maintenance and development of medieval learning is capable of

distinct definition. The schools of Northumbria had gathered in the harvest of Irish learning, of the Franco-Gallican schools still subsisting and preserving a remnant of classical character in the 6th century, and of Rome, itself now barbarized. Bede had received instruction from the disciples of Chad and Cuthbert in the Irish studies on the Scriptures, from Wilfrid and Aeca in the French and Roman learning, and from Benedict Biscop and Albinus in the combined and organized discipline of Theodore. By his influence with Egbert, the school of York was founded, in it was centred nearly all the wisdom of the West, and its greatest pupil was Alcuin. Whilst learning had been growing in Northumbria, it had been declining on the continent: in the latter days of Alcuin, the decline of English learning began in consequence of the internal dissensions of the kings, and the early ravages of the Norsemen. Just at the same time the continent was gaining peace and organization under Charles. Alcuin carried the learning which would have perished in England, into France and Germany, where it was maintained whilst England relapsed into the state of ignorance from which it was delivered by Alfred. Alcuin was rather a man of learning and action than of genius and contemplation like Bede, but his power of organization and of teaching was great, and his services to religion and literature in Europe, based indeed on the foundation of Bede, were more widely extended, and in themselves inestimable.

It is probably owing as much to the unhappy condition of England during the 9th century as to the more important position occupied by Alcuin on the continent, that few names of his English pupils have been preserved, compared with the numerous French scholars who were indebted to him, for some part at least of their education. Many of his English scholars followed him to France, and found a more favourable field of work there than at home. His most famous English pupil was Eanbald II., archbishop of York. The names of Osulf, Calwinus, Witzo, Waldramn, Raganhard, and a few others, have come down to us. Fridugis, afterwards his successor at Tours, and, later, abbot of S. Bertin, was another. Sigulf, the priest of York, his successor at Ferrières, upon whose information the ancient life of Alcuin is founded, must have been rather a companion than a pupil. Amongst his scholars in the Palatine school were Charles himself, with his sons Charles, Pipin, and Lewis, his sister Gisela, and his daughter of the same name; Angilbert, afterwards abbot of S. Riquier, Adalhard, abbot of Corvey, Rigbod, archbishop of Trèves, Rictrudis, a noble nun of Chelles, and Gundrada, the sister of Adalhard. His most famous pupils during his later years at Tours were Rabanus Maurus, afterwards archbishop of Mentz; Hatto, abbot of Fulda; Haimo, bishop of Halberstadt; Samuel, abbot of Lorsch, and afterwards bishop of Worms; Adalbert, abbot of Ferrières; Aldric, bishop of Sens; and Amalarius, deacon of Metz. The connexion of Ferrières with the school of York was maintained as late as the middle of the 9th century, when we find abbot Lupus in correspondence with the archbishop and abbot of York.

A distinctive peculiarity of Alcuin's association with his pupils and friends is found in the assumed names under which they write to and

about one another. Alcuin is himself Flaccus Albinus, the Horace of the society; Charles is David; Angilbert is Homer; Adalhard, Antony; Amalarius is Symposius; Hatto is Bonosus; Riculf is Damaetas; Archbishop Eanbald is Simeon; Fridugis, Nathanael; Aldrad of Milan is Peter; Rigbod is Macarius; another prelate is called Onias; another, an English one, Speratus. Some of the names are formed by a play on the proper name of the bearer. Arno, archbishop of Salzburg, is Aquila; Withso is Candidus; Rabanus is called Maurus, because of his swarthy complexion; Bruno is another Candidus, perhaps by antiphrasis; Hechstan is Alta Petra; Anthropos, Stratocles, Theophilus, Mopsus, and Gallicellula, cannot be identified, but it would be easy to suppose the two first translations of Mann and Ludwig or Hereberht. Of the ladies, Gisela was Lucia; Rictrudis, Columba; and Gundrada, Eulalia.

The foregoing lists comprise the names of nearly all Alcuin's most regular and frequent correspondents; to them most of his letters are addressed, and several of his works dedicated. Besides them, however, we find amongst those to whom he wrote, Pope Adrian I., Ethelred and Eardulf, kings of Northumbria, Offa, Egferth, and Kenulf, kings of Mercia; the patriarchs George of Jerusalem and Paulinus of Aquileia; archbishops Ethelhard of Canterbury, Laidrad of Lyons, Nifridius of Narbonne, and Theodulf of Orleans, his great competitor in the restoration of learning in France; bishops Kinbert of Winchester, Ethelbert of Hexham, Higbald of Lindisfarne, Tidferth of Dunwich, Alheard of Elmham, and Remedius of Coire; abbots Benedict of Aniane, Morold of Farfa, and Friduin of Wearmouth; the monks of Wearmouth, Jarrow, Lindisfarne, and Withern; Colcu the reader, and Joseph, who was probably a clerk of York, and acted as Alcuin's agent in the management of his property.

Amongst the historical subjects on which light is thrown by Alcuin's letters may be enumerated the conquests of Charles, and the extension of the Church through them among the Germans, Wends, Slaves and Avars (*Epp.* 3, 33, 36, 39, 108, 129), the jealousy of Offa and Charles (*Epp.* 8, 47, 48, 49), the devastation of Lindisfarne by the Norsemen (*Epp.* 9, 13, 14, 15, 16), the archbishopric of Lichfield and the troubles of Ethelhard (*Epp.* 10, 57, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 114), the revolutions of Northumbria (*Epp.* 11, 47, 60, 61, 115, 116), the process of electing the archbishops of York (*Epp.* 54, 55), the introduction of Roman improvements into the service of the churches of England (*Epp.* 65, 1), his friendly relations with the imperial family (*Epp.* 120, 121), and with the Irish schools (*Ep.* 225), and the heresy of the Adoptionists.

The works of Alcuin are divided by Froben into seven classes, to which may be added those doubtfully and more erroneously attributed to him.

1. Of these the most important are the letters, of which much has been said above. The first attempt at the collection of these was made by Canisius, who printed 67 from a St. Gall MS. in his *Lectiones*; to these several were added by Ussher, Martene and Durand, Baluze, and D'Achery. Mabillon discovered and published 26 from a Ratisbon MS., in his *Analecta*; and a

very large addition was made to them by abbot Froben from MSS. at Salzburg and elsewhere, which brings up the number in the editions of Alcuin's works to between two and three hundred. Several others exist still in MS. (especially in the Cotton collection), and among them some of considerable interest.

2. The exegetical works of Alcuin are principally compilations from the fathers. They are (1) on Genesis, addressed to Sigulf, and drawn from S. Jerome, S. Gregory, and S. Ambrose; (2) on the penitential and gradual Psalms, addressed to Arno; (3) on Canticles, to Daphnis; (4) on Ecclesiastes to Onias, Candidus, and Nathanael, chiefly from S. Jerome; (5) on Hebrew names to Charles, compiled from Bede; (6) on S. John, to Lucia and Columba, taken largely from Bede, Gregory, Augustine, and Ambrose; (7) on the Epistles to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, from S. Jerome and S. Chrysostom, the latter through the translation of Mutianus; (8) on the Apocalypse, published for the first time by Cardinal Mai from a Vatican MS.

3. The dogmatic writings of Alcuin are—(1) *De Fide Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis*, addressed to Charles, written about 802, and being a concentration of S. Augustine's works on the subject; (2) Twenty-eight questions on the Trinity, treated in the same way, and addressed to Fridugis; (3) on the procession of the Holy Ghost, addressed to Charles, a collection of testimonies from the fathers; (4) two works against Felix of Urgel, one in one book addressed to the abbots and monks of Septimania, composed of testimonies; the second in seven addressed to Felix himself, and containing much learning and independent argument; (5) Four books against Elipandus of Toledo, on the same subject and plan.

4. Alcuin's liturgical works are chiefly adaptations or recensions of the parts of the service books. (1) *Liber Sacramentorum*, from the use of Tours; (2) *De Psalmorum usu*, an arrangement of the psalms, and a few original prayers; (3) *Officia per ferias*; (4) *De Baptismi caeremoniis*. With these are associated three books or letters on moral and mental philosophy. (1) *De virtutibus et vitiis*, from Augustine, addressed to Count Wido; (2) *De animae ratione*, to Eulalia, also from Augustine; (3) *De Confessione*, to the scholars of Martin's at Tours.

5. The biographies of S. Martin, from Sulpicius; of S. Vedast, S. Riquier, and S. Willibrord. The latter is interesting from the fact of the relationship between Alcuin and the saint.

6. The poems of Alcuin are of a very varied character; they include prayers, hymns, inscriptions for churches, altars, and books; epitaphs, enigmas, and epigrams, triplets on Scripture history, and epistles to Leo III., Charles, Angilbert, Arno, and others of his correspondents.

The most important and longest of the poems is that *De Pontificibus et Sanctis Ecclesiae Eboracensis*, in 1657 lines, giving an account of the church of York and its great men from the foundation to the accession of Eanbald. The early part is based on Bede; but from the consecration of Egbert to the end, it is full of original information respecting the schools and library of York, the acts of the archbishops, and the career of the author. In a few particulars it agrees with the chronicle of the Northumbrians, which

was used by Simeon of Durham for the early part of his chronicle, and it is the most ancient authority for the period of which it treats.

7. The *Opera Didascalica* consist of dialogues on the subjects of grammar, orthography, rhetoric and the virtues, and dialectic; a discussion on the course and phases of the moon, and a dialogue on miscellaneous subjects between Alcuin and Pipin.

8. The most important of the "Opera Dubia" is the *Confessio fidei*, the authorship of which was asserted to be Alcuin's by Mabillon, with considerable show of argument against Dailé, who declared that it was later than the time of Anselm. Its bearing on the Eucharistic controversy, and on the doctrines of Calvinism, has imparted a sentiment of partisanship to all the criticism on the subject. Mabillon's argument was attacked by Basnage on internal evidence, but it was by no means satisfactorily refuted; and unless the statements of Mabillon as to the date of the MS. can be disproved, no sufficient argument from its contents can be adduced against him. The *Disputatio Puerorum* is a dialogue of the age of Alcuin, with no determinate marks of authorship. It is on religious matters generally.

Fifty-three propositions, *ad acuendos Juvenes*; a series of puzzles and arithmetical problems, are ascribed to Alcuin; but they appear among the works of Bede also, and there is nothing in them to determine the authorship. The rest of the "opera dubia" are poems of very much the same character as the authentic ones.

9. The "opera supposita" are—(1) The *Liber de divinis officiis*, a compilation of later date (as late as the 11th century), and unworthy of the reputation of Alcuin; (2) four Homilies, some of which are elsewhere ascribed to Paul the Deacon, Ambrosius Autpertus, and Bede; and a few verses.

The share of Alcuin in the composition of the *Libri Carolini* is another vexed question, into which the odium theologicum has intruded. It cannot be discussed here; but it may be said that all arguments against it, based on the lateness of the authority of Hoveden and Matthew of Westminster, are futile.

The bibliographical history of Alcuin's works would fill a volume. Many of the separate treatises were printed in the 16th century, but the first attempt at a collected edition was that of Du Chesne, Paris, 1617. After this was published, the Commentary on Canticles was printed by Patrick Young in 1638, and large accessions to the number of letters and smaller treatises were made. But the earlier editions were all superseded by the splendid edition published in 1777, by Froben, abbot of S. Emmeran's at Ratisbon, which contained all that Germany could supply in the way of additions to the edition of Du Chesne. To this Cardinal Mai added in 1837 the Commentary on the Apocalypse; and it is by no means improbable that, as is certainly the case with the letters, other small treatises may be still in MS. The edition of Alcuin in Migne's *Patrologia* contains not only all the works ascribed to him, but a great apparatus of critical and historical matter, reprinted from Du Chesne, Mabillon, Chifflet, and Froben.

The life of Alcuin was written during the century after his death by an anonymous author,

who derived his information from Sigulf, the companion and disciple of Alcuin. This is printed in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* saec. iv. t. 1; in Surius, *Vit. SS.* May 19; in the *Bollandist Acts*, May iv. pp. 335-344; and in the editions of Du Chesne, Froben, and Migne. It is a good specimen of a second-rate medieval biography. Mabillon's *Elogium* and the life by Froben are both very good, and leave little to be desired in point of criticism. But there is no biography of Alcuin at all corresponding with the importance of his position, and the data existing for drawing a picture of the times. Among minor works on the subject are Lorenz, *Alcuin's Leben*, 1829, translated into English by Slee; and Monnier, *Alcuin et son influence littéraire, religieuse et politique chez les Francs*, Paris 1853. The article in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. iv. pp. 295, &c., is antiquated by Froben's edition. [S.]

ALDBERHT (1) One of the bishops of East Anglia at the period at which the History of Bede closes.

His name is omitted in the list of the bishops of Dunwich, to which it must have belonged, or else misplaced; for the fifth bishop, to whom the name of Aldberht is given must have been later than the time of Bede.

(2) The 9th bishop of Hereford in the ancient lists. He signs a charter of Offa as "electus" in 777, and as bishop in 781. He died before the Legatine Council of 787, which is signed by his successor Esne, or Aeine.

(3) An etheling of the West Saxons, who rebelled against or was persecuted by Ina. In 724 he was driven into Surrey and Sussex, whither Ina pursued him, and slew him in battle in 725. *Chr. Sax.* 724, 725. [S.]

ALDEBERT, ELDEBERT, ADELBERT, a celebrated impostor opposed by St. Boniface, condemned in the Council of Soissons in 744, and in that of Rome in 745. What is known of him is gathered entirely from St. Boniface's letters. He is described as a Gaul by nation, but of what parentage it is not stated. He is called a new Simon Magus, who, while he claimed the priestly office, was living an immoral life, and by his empty preaching leading people astray from the teaching of the Church. He used to set up crosses and oratories in the fields, and to persuade the people to leave the churches and frequent these places. He laid claim to such sanctity that he consecrated buildings in his own name, and gave his hair and nails to be honoured equally with the relics of St. Peter. He had received episcopal ordination from some bishops, whom he had deceived by his pretensions. After this he considered himself of equal rank with the Apostles; and when the people came and asked permission to confess their sins before him, he told them that they had no need to confess to him, since he knew all their sins before they disclosed them.

The acts of the Synod at Rome under Pope Zacharias, in which Aldebert, and another schismatic named Clement, were condemned, are found at length in Boniface's Epistles, No. 50. Though they had previously been condemned, deprived, and cast into prison in a provincial Synod at Soissons, they were still leading the people astray. The sentence of the Synod at Rome, signed by the Pope, seven bishops, and

seventeen priests, confirmed the decision of St. Boniface, and threatened excommunication against Aldebert or any of his followers who persisted in spreading his errors. Some documents written by Aldebert, consisting of an autobiography, a letter, which he professed to have received from our Lord through the agency of St. Michael, and a prayer in which he invoked eight angels by name, were preserved by the Pope. Two years afterwards he wrote to St. Boniface, urging him to make further inquisition, if necessary, into the case of Aldebert, but his schism seems to have been then quite suppressed. Milman (*Latin Christianity*, Bk. iv. ch. 5) confesses that he cannot discern, with some Protestant writers of Germany, even M. Bunsen, in these obscure persons (Aldebert and Clement) "sagacious prophets and resolute opponents of Papal domination, which was artfully and deliberately established by Boniface—a premature Luther and Calvin. Neither the jealousies nor the politic schemes belong to the time. The respect of Boniface for Rome was filial, not servile."

For the original documents with respect to Aldebert consult S. Bonifatii *Epist. in Monumenta Moguntina, Bibliothec. Rer. German.* tom. iii. [C. D.]

ALDEGUNDIS, S. (Teut. "noble war,") born in Hainault about the year 630. She was of noble stock, her father being St. Walbert or Gualbert, nearly related to Clothaire, her mother St. Bertilia. When still a girl she devoted herself to a life of virginity. Being pressed by her parents to marry, she replied, "I desire a husband whose estates are heaven and earth and sea, whose farms will yield their crops for ever, whose riches increase daily, and will never diminish. If you can, mother, find me such a husband, not a man, sinful, wayward, and mortal."

Soon afterwards she left her home, found S. Amandus, bishop of Maestricht, at Haumont, and by him and St. Aubert, bishop of Cambrai, was admitted to the vows of a nun. She then retired to a waste place on the Sambre, called Malbode, now Maubeuge, where she built a convent, and instituted an order of canonesses, over whom she presided with great wisdom, though she was exposed to the attacks of her enemies, both men and demons. Her acts are detailed in three MS. lives given at length by the Bollandists, but they contain so much of the supernatural that the present age would give them little credit. There seems, however, no reason to doubt the principal facts. Her death took place, after much suffering from a cancer in the chest, on January 30, 684, though the date is questioned. On this day she is commemorated with a double office of the first class. She was translated a few years after her death to the Abbey of Maubeuge, again on June 6, 1161, and a third time on May 26, 1439. Accounts of the two latter translations by eyewitnesses are appended to the Bollandists' account. (See *Act. SS. Boll.* Jan. ii. 1034-1054; Mabillon, *Act. SS. Ben. saec. ii.* 807-815; *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, i. 415.) [C. D.]

ALDRITH, king of Northumbria. He was the son of Oswin; but as Bede (*H. E.* iv. 26, *Vita Cuthb.* c. 24) calls him Nothus, his mother was probably a concubine. He spent his early life

in Ireland (according to William of Malmesbury, *G. R.* i. 52), or rather perhaps at Iona (Bede, *V. Cuthb.* 24, Anon. *V. Cuthb.* 28), where he acquired a love of learning and learned men.

In 685 he became king on the death of Ecgfrith; and by his pacific policy restored the condition of the kingdom, which Ecgfrith had ruined by his wars.

In 687 he was visited by Adamnan, abbot of Iona, who came to ransom some Irish captives, and presented his book on the holy places to him. Aldhelm, also, the abbot of Malmesbury, who had been a fellow-student with him, probably in Wessex, dedicated his work on Metres to Aldfrith, under the name of Acircius. He was a friend and benefactor also of Benedict Biscop, and was himself very learned in the Scriptures, and such a lover of books that on one occasion he gave eight hides of land for a copy of the *Cosmographi*.

On his accession, he restored Wilfrid to his church at Hexham, and a little later to York; but in 692 he quarrelled with him, and restored the bishops whom Wilfrid had displaced. Some years after this he made an ineffectual attempt to be reconciled with him at the council of Etswinapath, but, this failing, he maintained a hostile position towards him as long as he lived. It is not improbable that the division, although originating in the claims of Wilfrid on his church estates, was widened by the jealousies of the two schools in the Northern Church, the one of which, represented by Wilfrid and Acca, maintained the Roman as contrasted with the Irish learning, and the Roman as opposed to the Kentish supremacy; whilst the latter, represented by Benedict Biscop and Aldfrith, with the bishops Cuthbert, Bosa, and Eata, retained many Irish sympathies, and was thoroughly at one with the comprehensive church policy of archbishop Theodore.

Of the administration of secular affairs by Aldfrith, although Henry of Huntingdon calls him "strenuus in bellis," little is recorded, but the period of his death is referred to by Bede as the date of the decay of ecclesiastical purity in Northumbria. According to William of Malmesbury (*G. R.* i. 52), who only amplifies the statement of Bede (*H. E.* iv. 26) his dominions were much diminished by the successes of the Picts.

His last days were troubled by remorse for his behaviour to Wilfrid, and he left strict injunctions to his successor, whoever he might be, to come to an agreement with him (Eddius, c. 57).

Aldfrith died Dec. 14, 705, at Driffield, in Yorkshire (*Chr. Sax.* ad 705), where a monument was shown as his in the time of Camden. Tradition asserts that he had been wounded in battle at Scamridge, and after taking refuge in a cave above Ebberston, still called Alfrid's hole, was taken to Driffield to die. (*Handbook of Yorkshire*, 145.) He married Cuthburh, the sister of Ina, king of Wessex, from whom he separated before his death. She was the founder of the abbey of Wimborne. His successor was Eadwulf, who, after a reign of two months, was expelled by Osred, son of Aldfrith. (Bede, *H. E.*, *Vita Abbatum*, cap. 8, 12, *Vita Cuthberti*, cap. 24; *Chron. Sax.* ad 685, 705.)

(2) ALFRITH or ATRITH, the 10th abbot of Glastonbury in Malmesbury's list; dated 709. [S.]

ALDHELM was the son of Kenten or Kenter, a member of the royal family of Wessex. William of Malmesbury, whose life of Aldhelm is a fair specimen of his critical power, rejects the statement of Faricius, his earlier biographer, that Kenten was a brother of Ina, on the grounds of chronology. He was born about the middle of the 7th century, and educated under Maildulf, an Irish scholar, who had settled on the spot afterwards called from him Maildulf Burgus or Malmesbury. From Malmesbury Aldhelm went to Canterbury, where he studied under Theodore and Adrian, and learned, according to his biographers, not only Greek, but Hebrew. On his return to Wessex, he received the tonsure, and spent the following fourteen years under Maildulf, with possibly an occasional visit to Canterbury. On Maildulf's death, Aldhelm was appointed his successor, and the establishment at Malmesbury was placed under his charge as abbot, by Leutherius, who was bishop in Wessex from 670 to 676. The dates of Aldhelm's life, which are given by William of Malmesbury from doubtful or forged charters, cannot be depended upon.

In this post of abbot, Aldhelm greatly promoted the spread of Christianity in the West of England; founded two monasteries at Frome and Bradford, and was the chief adviser of Ina in the restoration of Glastonbury. He is said to have paid a visit to Rome during the pontificate of Sergius I. 687-701, whom he cleared from an imputation of being father of a nun's child, obtaining from the child, nine days old, the denial of his paternity.

For this visit to Rome there is no authority in his extant writings. The verses on the church of S. Peter and S. Paul, which have been thought to imply it, refer to the church of Malmesbury; and the lines of Virgil, quoted by William of Malmesbury as applied by Alcuin to himself, "Primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit, Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas," are seen by their place in the context to mean no more than that he was the first Englishman who studied Latin metres (*Opp.* ed. Giles, p. 327).

Whilst he was abbot, he wrote, at the request of a synod of bishops, a letter to Gerontius, king of the Damnonian Britons, on the subject of the Paschal cycle, which had the effect of bringing that monarch and his people over to the Roman usage. During this time, probably, it was that he formed the acquaintance of S. Wilfrid, to whom one of his letters is addressed.

In the year 705 the great diocese of Wessex was divided, and Aldhelm was appointed to the Western division of it, with his see at Sherborn, in Dorsetshire. He lived four years after his consecration, and died on the 25th of May, 709, at Dulting, in Somersetshire.

Aldhelm occupies a very important position in the history of English literature. He was the first Englishman who cultivated classical learning with any success, and the first of whom any literary remains are preserved. His extant writings by no means justify his claim to the character of a great scholar, but they show that he possessed considerable knowledge of books and great facility in writing very involved and elaborate Latin. His works, by both their style and subject, convey an idea of quaint and fantas-

tic elaboration, which he derived, perhaps, from his Irish teaching.

His great merit must have been his exertion in the work of education, which made Wessex during the first half of the 8th century a rival of Northumbria, filling it with monastic schools, such as produced Boniface and his companions in the work of enlightening Germany. The success of these establishments was due, no doubt, in great measure, to bishop Daniel, who sat at Winchester from 705 to 745; but Aldhelm's character as a scholar has won for him the larger share of credit.

Although Aldhelm had himself been taught by an Irishman, his sympathies were clearly with the Kentish school, in which he had also studied; and in one of his letters (*Opp.* ed. Giles, p. 94) he expresses himself with some jealousy on the popularity of the Irish schools compared with those of Canterbury, although the latter were favoured by the presence of Theodore and Adrian. This jealousy of the Irish school, which was felt less strongly in the Northumbrian church, is a mark of the subsequent character of the West Saxon missions in Germany as distinguished from the Northumbrian.

William of Malmesbury has preserved a saying of king Alfred, that Aldhelm wrote a number of hymns in his native language, by which he tried to allure the country people to endure longer services in church, and to abstain from work on holy days. Some of these were still in common use in the days of Alfred, but none of the Anglo-Saxon poetry now in existence bears the name of Aldhelm. The extant works of Aldhelm are—

1. *De laudibus Virginitatis*, mentioned by Bede as written in imitation of Sedulius in both prose and verse. The prose version is addressed to Hildelida, abbess of Barking, and was a popular work in the middle ages. It was printed as early as 1512 at Deventer. It contains sixty chapters of stories in illustration of the subject.

2. The metrical treatise, *De laudibus virginum*, is a poetical treatment of the same stories, addressed "Ad Maximam Abbatissam," in hexameters.

3. *Epistola ad Acircium, sive Liber de Septenario et de Metris, Aenigmatibus ac pedum regulis*, an elaborate work on the Latin metres. Acircius is Aldfrith, king of Northumbria, whom Aldhelm had known probably in his exile. William of Malmesbury mentions a Scottish prince, Arcuilus, whom Aldhelm had instructed at Malmesbury, and whose name is not improbably a corruption of Acircius, although Ussher believed him to be a Scot. This work contains a quantity of enigmas, which were printed by Delrio in 1601. The body of the work was first published by Cardinal Mai in the fifth volume of the *Auctores Classici*.

4. The letter to Gerontius on the Paschal cycle, first printed among the letters of Boniface.

5. A few letters of singularly little interest, printed generally with those of Boniface, and a few others preserved by William of Malmesbury in his life of Aldhelm.

6. Some short poems, chiefly inscriptions for altars and churches.

The works of Aldhelm, which had appeared in

the collections of Canisius, Del Rio, Wharton, and others, were collected and edited with his letters first by Dr. Giles, Oxford, 1844; and reprinted by Migne in his *Patrologia*, vol. lxxxix.

The life of Aldhelm was said to have been written first by S. Egwin, and after him by S. Osmund, and Eadmer (Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Ben.* sec. iii. p. 1, page 220). But the earliest existing biography is that by Faricius, printed in the *Act. SS. Boll.* May iv. pp. 84, &c., and also in Dr. Giles's edition of his works. This was superseded at an early date by William of Malmesbury, whose life of Aldhelm, illustrated by the records and traditions of his monastery, forms the fifth book of his *Gesta Pontificum*. Mr. Wright's account of Aldhelm in the *Biograph. Brit. Litt.* is full and good. [S.]

ALDHUN, an abbot in Wessex, who wrote a letter to St. Boniface (Ep. 160, ed. Würdtwein), proposing mutual intercession in prayer. Mabillon (Ann. O. S. B. ii. 10) supposes him to have been abbot of Wimborne. [S.]

ALDULF. (1) Son of Ethelhere, succeeded Ethelwald as king of the East Angles in 664. His mother, Hereswitha, was sister of St. Hilda, and of the royal family of Northumbria. He is mentioned by Bede as a contemporary, and as remembering the temple in which king Redwald had worshipped Christ, with his other gods, "more Samaritanorum." He was in the 17th year of his reign when the council of Hatfield (680) was held, and his name appears in a letter addressed by Pope Sergius to the kings of England on the election of archbishop Brihtwald in 692. His brother, Alfwold, succeeded him, but the date of his death is unknown (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 15).

(2) (Ealdwulf), the tenth bishop of Rochester, consecrated by archbishop Brihtwald in 726. He was one of the consecrators of archbishop Tatwine in 731, and is mentioned as bishop by Bede in his closing chapter. He attests a charter of Oshere in 736 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 99), and an act of his own dated in 738 is still extant, requesting confirmation of a gift of land made to his church by Eadberht, king of Kent. He also had a grant from Ethelbald of the toll of one ship annually in the port of London, in 734. His death is placed by Simeon of Durham in 739, by Florence of Worcester in 741; but as it is mentioned in connexion with that of archbishop Nothelm in both places, it probably occurred in 739 (Bede, *H. E.*; Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.*; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.*; Kemble, *C. D.* i.).

(3) A bishop whose consecration is recorded by Simeon of Durham to have taken place in 786 at Corbridge. Wharton, following a mistake of William of Malmesbury, supposes him to have been archbishop of Lichfield; but Aldulf of Lichfield was not bishop until after 800. He may, however, safely be identified with the bishop of Mayo in Ireland, "Aldulphus Myiensis Ecclesiae episcopus," who attended the Legatine council of the North in 787 (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 666; Wharton, *Ang. Sacr.* i. 430; Spelman, *Conc.* i. 301).

(4) [EADULF.]

[S.]

ALDWIN. (1) Aldevini, brother of Ethelwin, bishop of Lindsey, and of abbess Ethelhild. He was abbot of Partney, in Lincolnshire, about

the beginning of the 8th century (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 11).

(2) Ealdwine, also called Worr; was bishop of Lichfield at the time at which Bede finished his history. His name is found in charters as early as 727, so that he probably succeeded in 721 bishop Hedda, who died in that year (*Ang. Sacr.* i. 428); but if the act of the Council of Clovesho in 716 is genuine (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300), he must have been a bishop five years earlier. He assisted at the consecration of archbishop Tatwine in 731, and signs charters of Ethelbald, king of Mercia, as late as 736. His death is placed by Simeon of Durham in 737. The diocese which he had held was divided at his death (Bede, *H. E.* v. 23; Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 659; *Anglia Sacra*, i. 428; Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* i.). [S.]

ALETHEIA (Iren. 5 ff., 15, 52 f.; Epiph. *Haer.* 165-170) [VALENTINUS]: (Iren. 57) [PTOL-EMAEUS]: (Iren. 69 f., 73 f., 78) [MARCUS]: (Iren. 108) [OPHITES.] [H.]

ALEXANDER (St.), archbishop of ALEXANDRIA, appears to have come to that see in 313, after the short episcopate of Achillas. He was an elderly man, of a kindly and attractive disposition; "gentle and quiet," as Rufinus says (i. 1), but also capable of acting with vigour and persistency. Accusations were laid against him by the malcontent Meletian faction, "before the emperor" Constantine (Athanas. *Apol. c. Ar.* 11: ad *Ep. Aeg.* 23), but apparently without result. He was involved in a controversy with one Crescentius as to the proper time for keeping Easter (Epiph. *Haer.* 70. 9). But in 319 he was called upon to confront a far more formidable adversary. Arius, the parish priest, as he may be described, of the church of Baucalis, the oldest and the most important of the churches of Alexandria, situated "in the head of the mercantile part of the city" (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 116), was a man whose personal abilities enhanced the influence which he might gain from his official position; he had been thought of, to say the least, for the episcopal dignity at the last vacancy of the "Evangelical Throne," and may have consequently entertained unfriendly feelings towards its actual occupant. But it would be unreasonable to ascribe the opinions associated with his name to any motive of private resentment. It would seem rather that the habits of his mind, and a "temperament devoid of reverence" (Bright, *Hist. Ch.*, p. 11), prepared him to adopt and carry out to their consequences, with a peculiar boldness of logic, such views as he now began to disseminate in Alexandrian society; that the Son of God could not be co-eternal with His Father; that He must therefore have come into existence at a very remote period, by the creative fiat of the Father, so that it might be truly said of Him that "once He was not;" that, therefore, He must be regarded as external to the Divine essence, and only a creature, although of all creatures the most ancient and august. [ARIUS.] The bishop, after hearing of these statements as current in Alexandria, tried at first to check the evil by remonstrance at an interview, but with no real success. Arius resumed the dissemination of his opinions, and expressed them with greater boldness than before. The agitation increasing, Alexander sum-

moned a conference of his clergy; free discussion of the subject was allowed; and Sozomen's statement, that Alexander seemed to waver between the Arian and anti-Arian positions, is probably an exaggeration of the fact that he was anxious to secure for Arius and his adherents a fair and patient hearing. Ultimately, however, he spoke out, and asserted in strong terms the coequality of the Son; whereupon Arius took occasion to criticize his language^a as savouring of that Sabellian error [SABELLIUS] which had "confounded the Persons," and had been so repugnant to the mind of the church of Egypt. The conference, after another sitting, broke up. It was, perhaps, on one of these occasions that Arius presented (if St. Basil was rightly informed, *adv. Eunom.* i. 4) a doctrinal statement, couched in such simple language as might have sufficed before the discussion of the question, but was, under existing circumstances, disingenuously reticent. The movement increased, and Alexander himself was charged by impatient zealots with irresolution and excessive forbearance, or even with some inclination towards the new errors. It was then, apparently, that Colluthus, one of the city presbyters, went so far as to separate from his bishop's communion, and, on the plea of the necessities of the crisis, to "ordain" some of his followers as clergy. (See Valesius on *Theod.*, i. 4, and Neale, i. 116. This ordination, as performed by a mere presbyter, was soon afterwards pronounced by the Egyptian episcopate to be null.) Alexander's next step was to write to Arius and his supporters, including two bishops, five priests, and six deacons, exhorting them to renounce their "impiety"; and the majority of the clergy of Alexandria and the Mareotis, at his request, subscribed his letter. The exhortation was in vain; and the archbishop felt himself obliged to bring the case formally before the synod of his suffragans, who were in number nearly a hundred. The Arians were summoned to appear: they stated their opinions; the Son, they held, was not eternal, but was created by the impersonal "Word," or Wisdom of the Father; foreign, therefore, to the Father's essence, imperfectly cognizant of Him, and, in fact, called into existence to be His instrument in the creation of man. "And can He then," asked one of the bishops, "change from good to evil, as Satan did?" They did not shrink from answering, "Since He is a creature, such a change is not impossible";^b and the council instantly pronounced them to be "anathema." Such was the excommunication of Arius, apparently in 320. It was as far as possible from arresting the great movement of rationalistic thought (for this, in truth, was the character of Arianism) which had now so determinedly set in. The

^a It is not easy to harmonize the accounts given by Socrates, i. 5, and Sozomen, i. 15; but, on the whole, the latter appears more full and satisfactory, and may be considered as narrating the facts from an earlier starting point than the one taken by the former. It is not likely that Arius would have suddenly attacked the bishop's discourse without having previously secured himself a following, nor that Alexander would have addressed his clergy on this mysterious subject without being constrained to do so by the spread of heterodox speculations.

^b They afterwards drew a distinction: "He was by nature capable of such change, but in fact He is incapable of it."

new opinions became extraordinarily popular; Alexandrian society was flooded with colloquial irreverence. But Arius ere long found that he could not maintain his position in the city when under the ban of the archbishop; it may be that Alexander had power actually to banish him; and he repaired to Palestine, where, as he expected, he found that his representations of the case made a favourable impression on several bishops including Eusebius of Caesarea. Some wrote in his favour to Alexander, who, on his part, was most indefatigable in writing to various bishops in order to prevent them from being deceived by Arius; Epiphanius tells us that seventy such letters were preserved in his time (*Haer.* 69, 4). Of these, some were sufficiently effectual in Palestine to constrain Arius to seek an abode at Nicomedia. He had secured the support of the bishop of that city, the able but unprincipled Eusebius (Theodoret, i. 5; *Ath. de Syn.* 17); and he now wrote (*Ath. de Syn.* 16) in the name of "the presbyters and deacons" who had been excommunicated, to Alexander, giving a statement of their views, and professing that they had been learned from Alexander himself; the fact being, probably, as Möhler thinks, that Alexander had formerly used vague language in an anti-Sabellian direction. He was now repeatedly urged by Eusebius to readmit Arius to communion; and the other bishops of Bithynia, in synod (*Soz.* i. 15), authorized their chief to send circular letters in his favour to various prelates. A Cilician bishop, Athanasius of Anazarbus, wrote to Alexander, openly declaring that Christ was "one of the hundred sheep"; George, an Alexandrian presbyter, then staying at Antioch, had the boldness to write to his bishop to the effect that the Son once "was not," just as Isaiah "was not" before he was born to Amoz (*Ath. de Syn.* 17), for which he was deposed by Alexander from the priesthood. Arius now returned into Palestine, and three bishops of that country, one of whom was Eusebius of Caesarea, permitted him to hold religious assemblies within their dioceses. This permission naturally gave great offence to Alexander. He had hitherto written only to individual bishops, as hoping that the controversy might be prevented from becoming an affair of the whole Church. But he now drew up (perhaps by the help of his secretary and "arch-deacon," Athanasius) his famous Encyclic to all his fellow-ministers, *i.e.*, to the whole Christian Episcopate, giving an account of the opinions for which the Egyptian synod had excommunicated the original Arians, adducing Scriptural texts in refutation, and warning his brethren against the intrigues of Eusebius (*Soc.* i. 6). This letter, which he caused his clergy to sign, probably preceded the "Tome" or confession of faith which he referred to, as having been signed by some bishops, when he wrote to Alexander bishop of Byzantium the long and elaborate letter preserved by Theodoret, i. 4; in which, while using some language which in strictness must be called inaccurate, he gives an exposition of texts which became watchwords of the orthodox in the struggle (A.D. 323).

Another correspondent now appears on the

^c A comparatively late date for this encyclic appears necessary, on account of its allusions to Eusebius. See Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 127. Some identify the encyclic with the Tome.

scene. Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had a strong influence over the Emperor Constantine, persuaded him to write, or perhaps to adopt and sign, a letter to Alexander and Arius, in which the controversy was treated as a logomachy, and the disputants were blamed for disturbing the peace of the Christian community (of which the emperor, although unbaptized, regarded himself as a member), by wrangling about minute points of no real and vital importance (Euseb. *Vit. Con.* ii. 64 sq.; *Soc.* i. 7). The imperial epistle was entrusted to a prelate of very high position, Hosius of Cordova, whose steadfastness had been proved under Pagan persecution, but was destined long afterwards to give way under a different kind of pressure. He can have had but little sympathy with the tone assumed by the emperor; but he was charged not only to present the letter to Alexander, but also, as it seems, to inquire into the other troubles of the Egyptian church, caused by the Meletian schism and the new party of Colluthus, and to promote an agreement as to the Paschal controversy. The council held at Alexandria on his arrival decided one point very unequivocally; the ordinations performed by Colluthus, he being only a presbyter, were pronounced to be absolutely null. (*Ath. Apol.* 76.) And Hosius apparently took back with him from Egypt such stronger evidence of the magnitude of the dogmatic question at issue, and of the impossibility of establishing peace on the basis of indifferentism, that Constantine was induced to summon a general assembly of bishops to meet at Nicaea, in June 325. The proceedings of the First Œcumenical Council need not here be narrated. [NICAËA, COUNCIL OF.] It is enough to say that the Arians were condemned, and the Nicene Creed, in its original form, was drawn up. The Paschal question was dealt with by ruling that the Quartodeciman practice should be everywhere abandoned, and that the Alexandrian bishop should every year (by aid of Egyptian science) ascertain the Sunday on which Easter would rightly fall, and take steps for giving the necessary information to the whole Church (*Leo, Ep.* 121).

The Meletian schismatics were leniently dealt with: Meletius himself was allowed to retain the nominal dignity of a bishop; the bishops whom he had consecrated were to take rank after the regular prelates, and were even made capable of succeeding to vacant sees. The synodal letter which announced these resolutions to the Egyptian Church (*Soc.* i. 9), spoke of Alexander in the most respectful and cordial language. On his return to Alexandria, Meletius, as he was ordered to do, made out and presented a catalogue of his adherents (*Athas. Apol. c. Ari.* 71). The story told by Epiphanius, of severities used by Alexander towards the Meletians, and of a consequent petition addressed by them to Constantine, appears to be one of several misstatements which he adopted from some Meletian sources. Athanasius tells us expressly that Alexander died within five months after the reception of the Meletians into church communion in the Council of Nicaea (*Apol. c. Ari.* 59), and this, if strictly reckoned from the close of the Council, would place his death in January 326. It cannot be dated later than April 18 in that year. For the other circumstances connected with it, see ATHANASIUS.

CHRIST. BIOGR.

Athanasius mentions a circumstance of Alexander's local administration which furnished a precedent, on one occasion, for himself. Alexander was building the church of St. Theonas at Alexandria, which was to be on a larger scale than any of the existing churches; and he held congregations in it, for convenience sake, before it was completed. (*Ap. ad Const.* 15.) He is also said by tradition to have never read the Gospels in a sitting posture, and to have never eaten on fast days while the sun was in the sky. (*Bolland. Act. SS.*, Feb. 26.) Two short fragments of a letter addressed by him to a bishop named Aeglon, against the Arians, are quoted in the works of Maximus the Confessor (in the Monothelite controversy), vol. ii. p. 152.

But a statement made respecting Alexander by Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 933, in his "Contexture of Gems," or annals of the Alexandrian Church, deserves consideration. St. Mark, he affirms, appointed twelve presbyters to continue with the patriarch, and to fill up the vacant see by choosing one of their own body, on whose head the remaining eleven were to lay their hands, bless him, and appoint (or make) him patriarch; which custom lasted until the days of Alexander, who forbade any such appointment by presbyters for the future, and ordered that on the death of a patriarch the bishops should meet, and make a new one, who was not necessarily to be a member of the Alexandrian presbytery; "and so the old institution came to an end" (Eutychius, *Annal.* ed. Pocock, i. 331). On this we may observe (1) Eutychius was writing more than 600 years after the time referred to, and was capable of making the strangest blunders about the history of his own church.^d (2) The statement looks very like an altered and exaggerated form of one made by Jerome in his 146th letter, to Evagrius (or Evangelus), to the effect that at Alexandria, from St. Mark to Heraclas (bishop of Alexandria in 231) and his successor Dionysius, the presbyters used always to nominate as bishop one chosen out of themselves, and placed (by them) in a higher rank, just as an army might make an imperator, or deacons choose an archdeacon. Now (a) Jerome here dates the change of custom which he mentions, more than 60 years earlier than the date given by Eutychius. (b) He says nothing about ordination or consecration. One view of his meaning is, that there was actually no such rite in use at the appointment of Alexandrian bishops during that period; Morinus (*de Sacr. Ordin.* iii. p. 30) considers his words to imply this. Yet one, at least, of his two illustrations would suggest the subsequent action of a higher authority, to sanction the presbyters' act of choice. "If the deacons," says Bingham (b. ii. c. 21, § 2), "had any hand in

^d Bishop Pearson, *Vind. Ignat.* i. 294 (ed. Churton), quotes Eutychius as calling Origen a bishop in Justinian's time, and as building up a strange misstatement on a confusion between Achilles the patriarch and Achilles the Arian. Eutychius, indeed, has several absurd assertions about the two patriarchs, Alexander and Athanasius. No wonder that his authority has been called futile, or that he has been described as "remarkable for nothing so much as his credulity and the inconsistency of his narratives, not only with those of more authentic historians, but often with themselves." Skinner, *Prim. Truth and Order*, p. 298. See also Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ii. 97.

making the archdeacon, it must be understood to be under the direction of the bishop." And if he supposed a mere election to have sufficed for conferring the episcopate, he obviously differed from Eutychius,^e and, what is much more, it would be easier to think him in error than to believe so great an anomaly to have been the rule in so eminent a church.^f If he did not suppose that consecration was dispensed with, he must have supposed it to have been performed by bishops; as he himself asks in his next sentence, "Quid enim facit, *excepta ordinatione*, episcopus, quod presbyter non facit?" and a little further, "Omnes (episcopi) apostolorum successores sunt;" and the letter concludes with a parallelism between the three orders of high priest, priest, and Levite, and those of bishop, presbyter, and deacon. The probability is, therefore, that he was thinking simply of an old mode of choosing the Alexandrian prelates. (3) Nor is it certain, indeed, that Eutychius meant to ascribe the actual consecration to the twelve presbyters. His words have been understood of acts of voting, designation, or approbation (Echchellensis, *Euty. Vindic.*, p. 40, 19), or of the presbyters' action in procuring the consecration of the bishop-elect (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.*, i. 381). If, indeed, he really thought that the presbyter had ordained the bishop, it is not too much to say that the existence of so great an anomaly in such a place, and, as Selden understands Eutychius, up to the time of the Nicene Council, is more than can be believed on the warrant of such a writer,^g and would hardly have found credit in modern times unless it had served a particular controversial object. It is especially to be observed that the proceedings of the Alexandrian Council of 324 could not have taken place as they did, if an institution so ancient and so venerable as this peculiar usage, by the hypothesis, must have been in the Alexandrian Church, had sanctioned the ordination, by presbyteral hands, not simply of presbyters, but of prelates, of the actual patriarch himself. Nor can one fail to see that if that usage had been changed by Alexander himself (as Eutychius' words literally import, although Selden

^e The attempts of Selden to harmonize the chronological statement of Jerome with that of Eutychius, and "excepta ordinatione" with his own theory, are far from felicitous.

^f Observe how Eusebius records the early Alexandrian successions in his ordinary style, as if he knew of nothing peculiar about them.

^g Three statements have been quoted to support it:—(α) Hilary the Deacon, on Eph. iv. 11, "Apud Aegyptium presbyteri *consignant*, si praesens non sit episcopus." But Echchellensis challenges Selden to show a case in which "consignare" is used for "to ordain." The sense is, "to confirm" (Hooker, vii. 6, 4). (β) The author of some 'Quaestiones' on O. and N. T. (appended to tom. iii. of St. Augustine) qu. 101: "In Alexandria et per totum Aegyptum, si desit episcopus, *consecrat* (al. *consignat*) presbyter." This appears to refer to the hallowing of the chrism used for confirmation. And both these statements, if they did refer to ordination, would simply contradict Eutychius, as Selden and others understand him; for they would deny the abolition of the ordaining powers of presbyters in the time of Alexander. (γ) Cassian says (*Collat.* iv. 1) that a certain Daniel was "a beato Paphnutio ad diaconii praelatus officium, and Paphnutius "eum presbyteri honore provexit;" but this may well mean, procured his ordination. See Bingham, b. ii. c. 3, s. 7.

takes them as referring to the 4th Nicene canon, passed, as he supposes, under Alexander's influence), the enemies of Athanasius would have made the novel mode of his appointment an element in their charges against him, whereas the Athanasian history contains no trace of such a complaint, although an anecdote in the 'Sayings of the Fathers' (Coteler, *Monum.* i. 611) makes certain heretics say that he had been ordained by presbyters. (4) Severus, the biographer of the Alexandrian patriarchs, who wrote some 30 years after Eutychius, and is quoted by Le Quien and Sollerius (*Act. SS. Junii*, vol. v. p. 8, *seqq.*), Echchellensis, and Renaudot, asserts that (a) in some ante-Nicene elections of patriarchs, others beside the presbyters took part; (b) that the presbyters had electoral rights long after the time of Alexander; (c) that in two ante-Nicene cases (cf. Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 14, 16) the person elected was not one of the presbytery. (5) George Hormaidius, and the Mahometan writer Makrizi, both of whom wrote after Eutychius, are cited as understanding Eutychius' words *not* to imply an ordination by the presbytery. If, then, (6) it be asked how much of peculiar privilege was probably vested in the Alexandrian presbyters, we may suppose that by the ancient rule (which was not without exceptions) they alone were eligible to the bishopric of their own city,^h and that in such elections the presbytery took, as was natural, at least the prominent part. The supposition favoured by Le Quien, and to some extent by Neale (*Hist. Alex.* i. 11), that this early Alexandrian presbytery was an episcopal college, may be pronounced to be quite improbable. The statement of Eutychius that before the time of Demetrius (A.D. 189) the bishops of Alexandria were the only bishops in Egypt, is understood by Echchellensis and Renaudot to refer to Egypt proper, or the Delta; but it may well be that the diocesan system was of very gradual growth in the country. [W. B.]

ALEXANDER, bishop of ANTIOCH, succeeded Porphyrius, A.D. 413 (Clinton *Fast. Rom.*), as the 38th bishop of the see. Before he was raised to the episcopate he had lived an ascetic life in a monastery. Theodoret praises him (*H. E.* v. 35) for the holiness and austerity of his life, his contempt of riches, love of wisdom, and powerful eloquence. The influence of his mild words and winning character were effectual to heal the schism between the remaining partisans of the unjustly calumniated and banished Eustathius and the main body of the Church, which had lasted 85 years. He led the way to another act of tardy justice by restoring the name of Chrysostom to the ecclesiastical registers. With this object he visited Constantinople, and excited the people to demand the restitution of their archbishop's name of the intruder Atticus (Theodor. l. c.; Niceph. *H. E.* xiv. 26, 27). He was succeeded by Theodotus A.D. 421. [E. V.]

ALEXANDER, bishop of APAMEA, in Syria Secunda, and metropolitan. He accompanied his namesake and brother metropolitan, Alexander of Hierapolis, to the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and was associated with him in all the transac-

^h Hooker, vii. 5, 6. The rule of some chapters, to elect the bishop from their own body, has been quoted in illustration.

tions taking place there detailed in that article. Apringius of Chalcis, one of the eight deputies sent by the Oriental party to the Emperor Theodosius, was commissioned to act as his proxy (Baluz. 577). The same prelate was afterwards deputed to perform the duties of the see of Apamea, perhaps during Alexander's suspension. He was probably the Alexander despatched by the Oriental bishops to Alexandria with one of the many vain attempts to overcome the obstinacy of Cyril (*ib.* 908). Towards Easter, 434, he wrote to Alexander of Hierapolis expressing his great desire for a long time to visit him, and his regret at having been hindered by illness and official duties. His object is not assigned, but it is likely that it was to endeavour to induce Alexander to admit John and Cyril to communion (*ib.* § 132, p. 834). [E. V.]

ALEXANDER, bishop of BASILINOPOLIS, in Bithynia. He was of a senatorial family of Cyrene, who in early youth embraced the monastic life, and was deemed worthy of receiving holy orders. Business brought him to Constantinople, where he made Chrysostom's acquaintance, who thought so highly of him that before 403 he ordained him bishop of the city of Basilinopolis, erected in Bithynia by Julian the Apostate, and named after his mother. He warmly espoused the cause of Chrysostom, and shared in his fall. He retired to his native country, and settled at Ptolemais, where Synesius found him, when made bishop of that city in 410. The malign influence of Theophilus of Alexandria caused him to be ill-treated by the priests of the district, who refused him communion or even ordinary intercourse. Even Synesius was afraid to receive him into his church, or appear with him in public, though in private he showed him all brotherly respect. Synesius wrote to Theophilus, asking how he was to treat him, but he received no reply. On the publication of the amnesty after Chrysostom's death, Alexander refused to avail himself of it, or leave Ptolemais, deeming the peace a false one. (Synesius, *Epist.* lvi, lviii.) [E. V.]

ALEXANDER, (St.), presided over the see of BYZANTIUM, as the city was then called (Theod. *Hist.* i. 19) about 23 years, a stormy period owing to the Asian disturbances. His consecration is variously dated from 313 to 317 A.D. He was already 73 years old at the time (Soc. *Hist.* ii. 6; Soz. *Hist.* iii. 3). When Constantine after the defeat of Sicinius appointed a conference at Byzantium between the pagan philosophers and the bishop, Alexander is said to have silenced their spokesman by merely these words: "In the name of Jesus Christ I command thee to be silent" (Soz. i. 18). The anecdote is probably characteristic as indicating that Alexander was more eminent for goodness than for learning. He is highly praised by Gregory of Nazianzum (*Or.* 27), and by Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.* lxi. 10). Theodoret also calls him an "Apostolic" bishop (*Hist.* i. 3, cf. *Phil.* 12).

In the commencement of the Arian troubles the co-operation of Alexander was specially requested by his namesake of Alexandria (Theod. i. 4); and he was present at the Council of Nicaea (Soz. ii. 29). He opposed the Arians and Eusebians vigorously at Byzantium, although they had the influence of the court on their

side (Soc. ii. 6). Constantine, induced by the Eusebians (Ath. *Ep. ad Serap.* Ruff. *Hist.* i.) and deceived by the equivocations of Arius (Soc. i. 37), commanded that Arius should be received to communion. But Alexander, though threatened by the Eusebians with deposition and banishment, persisted in his determination not to admit the archheretic to communion, and shut himself up in the church of Irene for prayer in this extremity. The sudden death of Arius on the following morning, Sunday, as he was proceeding in triumph to the cathedral, was regarded by the orthodox as an answer to these prayers (Soc. i. 37, 38; Soz. ii. 29; Ath. *Ep. ad Serap.*). Alexander did not long survive him (Soc. ii. 6; Theod. i. 19). On his deathbed he is said to have designated Paulus as his successor, and to have warned his clergy against the speciousness of Macedonius (Soc. ii. 6). According to Sozomen he commended the piety of Paulus and the tact of Macedonius (iii. 3). Alexander is commemorated by the Greek Church on Aug. 30th, and on the 28th by the Latin. [I. G. S.]

ALEXANDER of CONSTANTINOPLE. [ALEXANDER of BYZANTIUM.]

ALEXANDER, bishop of HIERAPOLIS Ephratisensis, and metropolitan. He is known to us as the uncompromising opponent of Cyril of Alexandria, and the resolute advocate of Nestorius in the controversies that followed the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. His dignity as metropolitan gave him a leading place in the opposition of which John of Antioch was the head, and his influence was confirmed by his personal character. Holy in life, sweet in intercourse, grave in bearing, decided in action, firm in his adherence to what he felt to be the cause of truth and justice, resolute in carrying out the right at any cost of personal rank, comfort, or safety, dauntless in the face of danger, few of his age inspire a higher admiration and a deeper regret than Alexander of Hierapolis.

Alexander may have commenced his episcopate as early as A.D. 404, when his uncompromising zeal for the orthodox faith caused him to erase the name of one Julian, a man famous for the sanctity of his life, but accused of Apollinarianism, which had found its way into the diptychs of one of his churches (Baluz. *Nov. Coll. Conc.* p. 867).

Alexander arrived at Ephesus in company with his brother metropolitan, Alexander of Apamea, on or about June 20, 431. A misconception immediately arose between him and Cyril. The latter was only too ready to interpret some words of Alexander's as conveying a request from John of Antioch that the council might open at once without waiting for him any longer. But as soon as the Alexanders discovered Cyril's intentions, they used all their efforts to prevent the opening of the council before John's arrival, and, June 21, united with the other bishops of the East in signing the formal act demanding delay (Labbe, *Concil.* iii., 552, 660, 662; Baluz. 697, 699). The council heeded them not, opened their sittings the next day, June 22, and soon did the work for which it had been summoned, in the condemnation of Nestorius. When the eagerly-expected John at last arrived, June 27, Alexander joined him in the counter-council held by him and the prelates of his party in his

inn, and signed the acts cancelling the proceedings of the former council, deposing Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, and declaring Cyril's anathemas heretical. As a necessary consequence he was included in the sentence against John, and cut off from communion with Cyril and his party (Labbe, iii. 764; Baluz. 507). Correspondence passed between him and the venerated Acacius, the aged bishop of Beroea, in which Alexander informed him of all that had occurred at Ephesus, and received his advice (Baluz. 714, 763). When, in the August of the same year, deputies were despatched by both parties to lay the disputed points before the Emperor, he deputed Theodoret his attached friend, who had probably been ordained by him, to represent him at Constantinople, and was the first to sign the absolute power given to him and the other seven deputies. He added the characteristic condition, "that the acts of John's council should be ratified, and those of their adversaries, and Cyril's anathemas rejected" (Labbe, iii. 725). He then returned to his see, where he received Theodoret's report of the bad success of their mission (*ib.* 732, 733). Anxious for more definite information he wrote to one Parthenius, an abbot at Constantinople, who sent him a lamentable account of the sufferings of those who still adhered to "the martyr Nestorius," and the heresy openly preached (Baluz. 853, 866). Alexander flew to meet the deputies on their return from Chalcedon and joined the council immediately held by John at Tarsus, which pronounced a fresh sentence of deposition on Cyril and the bishops who had acted as his deputies at Chalcedon (Baluz. 840, 843, 874); and that at Antioch in the middle of December, ratifying the former acts and declaring their adherence to the Nicene faith. He also signed the letter to Theodosius, entreating him to enforce their condemnation of Cyril's anathemas (Socr. vii. 34; Baluz. 906). Theodosius deputed the tribune Aristolaus to visit Antioch and endeavour to heal the schism. A meeting was held at Antioch early in 432, attended by Alexander, in which six alternative articles were drawn up, one of which it was hoped Cyril would accept, and so afford a basis of reconciliation (Baluz. 764). One, approved by Aristolaus, is preserved. This declares a resolution to be content with the Nicene Creed and to reject *all* the documents that had caused the controversy. The decision of the council was conveyed to Acacius by Alexander. Another council was summoned at Beroea. Four more articles were added to the six, and the whole were despatched to Cyril. Cyril was well content to express his adherence to the Nicene Creed, but felt it unreasonable that he should be required to abandon all he had written on the Nestorian controversy (Labbe, iii. 114, 1151, 1157; *ib.* 666; Baluz. 786). Cyril's reply was accepted by Acacius and John of Antioch, and other bishops now sincerely anxious for peace, but not by Alexander or Theodoret (Baluz. 757, 782). The former renewed his charge of Apollinarianism and refused to sign the deposition of Nestorius (Baluz. 762-3). This defection of Acacius and John of Antioch was received with indignant sorrow by Alexander. It was the first breach in the hitherto compact opposition, which loosened the whole mass, and prepared for its gradual dissolution, leaving

Alexander in the almost solitary championship of what he felt to be the orthodox faith. He poured forth his feelings in a vehement letter to Andrew of Samosata. He forwarded him copies of all the documents he had received, and his answer to Acacius' letter; he bitterly complained of Acacius' fickleness, and protested that on the receipt of his letter he was ready to fly to the desert, and that he would rather resign his bishopric and cut off his right hand than recognise Cyril as a Catholic until he had recanted his errors (*ib.* 764-5). The month of April, 433, saw the reconciliation of John and the majority of the Oriental bishops with Cyril fully established (Labbe, iv. 659; Cyril *Al. Epist.* 31, 42, 44). Alexander was informed of this in a private letter from John, beseeching him no longer to hinder the peace of the Church. Alexander's indignation now knew no bounds. He wrote in furious terms to Andrew and Theodoret, denouncing John as "no true bishop," and cutting himself off from communion with him (Baluz. 799, 800). The efforts of Theodoret and Andrew to soften his determination were fruitless. He put aside their letters—those of Theodoret are models of Christian wisdom, mild, courteous, and reverential—with a fixed determination to listen to nothing that could alter his resolution. His language became more and more extravagant, "they might do as they pleased; betray the faith if they so minded; hold communion with the Egyptian;" he would never be polluted by "the abomination of Egypt;" "exile, violent death, the beasts, the fire, the precipice, were to be chosen before communion with a heretic" (*ib.* 768, 775, 799, 800, 809-10). Theodoret in vain besought the resolute old man to attend the council he summoned at Zeugma, A.D. 433, to deliberate on terms of peace. His personal entreaties, his assurance that all would recognize him as a father and master, and that no opposition should be offered to his wishes, were fruitless. The terms he named were impracticable. The council was held without him, and though it adhered to the refusal to condemn Nestorius, because it recognized the orthodoxy of Cyril, his exasperation was only increased. He rejected all efforts at accommodation, turned a deaf ear to the firm, manly letters of Andrew of Samosata, and cut him off from his communion (*ib.* 804, 810, 816). Strengthening himself in his resolution to die rather than betray the faith, he at last refused to hold intercourse with, or read letters from, any who regarded Cyril more leniently than himself. He thanked Theodoret for his well meant endeavours. (If we accept the letter, Baluz. 868, as genuine, Theodoret even called in the mediation of Nestorius to effect his object.) "The four journeys he had taken on behalf of his miserable soul proved that he had the heart of the good shepherd. But it was labour thrown away. If he came again he could not see him. He had made a vow to avoid the sight, hearing, or even the remembrance of all who in their hearts turned back again to Egypt" (*ib.* 865). The condemnation of Cyril and all who recognized his orthodoxy, by the council held at Anazarbus by the bishop Maximin, chiefly by Alexander's influence, was but an unsatisfactory compensation for the defection of John of Antioch, and the powerful band of bishops who

followed his lead, and the sanction received from Rome of all the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus. John's intrusion upon his privileges widened the alienation. Alexander's contumacy had been regarded as depriving him of his functions as metropolitan. John, as patriarch, stepped in, A.D. 434, and ordained bishops in the Euphratensian province. This act, of very doubtful legality, excited serious displeasure, and was appealed against by Alexander and six of his suffragans. "The crime of intrusion had been enhanced by culpable carelessness; some of the newly-ordained were known as men of infamous character; even branded for their offences" (*ib.* 830-833, 865). Another act of interference with his prerogatives was felt still more painfully by Alexander. A church had been built by him in honour of St. Sergius, at the cost of 300 lbs. of gold. To erect this he had impoverished his own see and burdened it with debt. A town had clustered round the church, called Sergiopolis. John, with reprehensible want of consideration, chose this time, A.D. 434, to place a bishop over the new church without any communication with the munificent founder. His choice was unlucky, the new bishop was accused, whether rightly or wrongly, of being one whose evil doings were known to all. An appeal to the Empress Pulcheria was despatched by the bishops of the province, but the issue is not known (*ib.* 837-8, 865). A formidable schism was thus created which was fomented by Alexander, and gained the adhesion of Theodoret, by whose conciliatory wisdom however it was healed, and, with some marked exceptions, the bishops returned to communion with John (*ib.* 859, 860, 865, 866).

The end was now near at hand. Pulcheria and Theodosius had been carefully supplied with representations, coloured by no friendly hand, of the evil to the faith resulting from the obstinate refusal of Alexander and the few who were left to support him, to communicate with those whose orthodoxy had been recognized by the Church. John had followed up the advantage gained, and had obtained imperial rescripts decreeing the expulsion and banishment of all bishops who still refused to communicate with him (Baluz. 876). This rescript was executed in the case of Dorotheus, Meletius of Mopsuestia, and other recusants. Alexander still remained. John expressed great unwillingness to take any steps towards the deprivation of his former friend and associate, the object of such well-merited veneration, now also weakened by age and gout. He commissioned Theodoret to use his influence with him. But he had again to report the impossibility of softening his inflexibility. But he begged John to be patient with the old man, "his obstinacy was caused by love of the truth. He taught nothing but what was orthodox, and held his peace on the subject of controversy both in speaking and writing. The consequences of severity might be disastrous. He was generally looked on as a champion of the truth; his courage was admired, his piety universally revered. A schism might ensue" (*ib.* 871). John, unwilling to resign all hope of bringing him to moderation, sent a deputation of prelates to confer with him. But the issue was equally ineffectual (*ib.* 883-886). John now, A.D. 435, felt it impossible to offer any further resistance

to the imperial decrees. Four rescripts had been neglected; the law must be suffered to take its course. The imperial officers, Dionysius, "Magister Militiæ per Orientem," and the Count Titus, his deputy, both wrote in terms of reverential courtesy, begging Alexander to save them the pain of executing the emperor's orders by acquiescing in his demands. His reply, filled with violent charges against John, finally closed the door of reconciliation. He simply begged that he might have timely private information of the execution of the rescript, that he might be able to leave without exciting public commotion (*ib.* 879, 880-1, 884). Titus issued to Libyanus, the President of the Euphratensian province, his order for Alexander's removal, promising that he would come himself and support him by force if necessary (*ib.* 881). But no compulsion was needed, the noble old man obeyed the order with calmness, and even with joy at laying aside the burdens and anxieties of the episcopate. He went forth in utter poverty, not taking with him a single penny of his episcopal revenue, or a book or paper belonging to the church. His sole outfit consisted of some necessary documents, and the funds contributed by friends for the hire of vehicles to the place of his banishment (*ib.* 868, 881-882).

The banishment of their beloved and revered bishop overwhelmed the people of Hierapolis with the deepest grief. Fear of the civil authorities deterred them from any open manifestation of their feelings. But they closed the churches, shut themselves up in their houses, and wept in private, dwelling with loving remembrance on the holiness of his life—the purity of his conduct—the sweetness of his manners—the excellence of his instructions. The aspect of the city was so alarming to Libyanus that he deemed it necessary to apprise Titus of it, who desired him to take measures to calm the excitement, using force if necessary to recall the people to their ordinary avocations (*ib.* 879, 881-2). John of Antioch also thought it requisite to write an apologetic letter to the clergy and people, assuring them that the course he had taken was not dictated by any personal pique at Alexander's behaviour towards him, but was rendered necessary by Alexander's opposition to reunion. Even now if he would enter into communion, he would restore him with joy (*ib.* 883). Such a change was not to be looked for from one so inflexible. Alexander's place of banishment was the mines of Phamuthin in Egypt, where he died, sternly adhering to his anathemas of Cyril to the last. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xiv. xv.; Labbe, *Concil.* vol. iii.; Baluz. *Nov. Collect.*) [E. V.]

ALEXANDER, bishop of JERUSALEM, was an early friend and fellow scholar of Origen at Alexandria, where they studied together under Pantaenus and Clemens Alex. (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 14). We know nothing more of his early life until we find him bishop of a city in Cappadocia (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 11); or, according to Valesius (*Not. ad Euseb.*) and Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* iii. p. 183), of Flaviopolis in Cilicia. He became a confessor in the persecution of Severus, A.D. 204, and was thrown into prison, where he continued some years. He was still a prisoner at the commencement of Caracalla's reign, A.D. 211, when he sent a letter by the hand of Clemens to

congratulate the Church of Antioch on the appointment of Asclepiades as their bishop in the room of Serapion (Euseb. vi. 11). The next year he was released from prison, and, in fulfilment of a vow, and warned by a dream, visited Jerusalem, where, in obedience to a divine intimation, he was chosen coadjutor to the aged Narcissus, then bishop of that see. This being the first occasion of the translation of a bishop, as well as of the appointment of a coadjutor bishop, in apparent violation of the canons of the Church which forbade the transference of a bishop from one see to another, and ordained that there should not be more than one bishop in a city, it was deemed essential to obtain the sanction of the whole episcopate of Palestine. A synod was summoned at Jerusalem, and the assembled bishops gave their unanimous consent to the step, A.D. 213 (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.*; Vales. *Not. in Euseb.* vi. 11; Socr. vii. 36; Bingham, *Origines*, bk. ii. § 4). On the death of Narcissus he succeeded him as sole bishop. Alexander's chief claim to celebrity rests on the library he formed at Jerusalem, and on the boldness with which he supported his former friend, Origen, against his bishop Demetrius of Alexandria. To the collection of ecclesiastical writings, especially the correspondence of the leading men of the Christian Church at the time, Eusebius expresses his grateful obligations in furnishing materials for his history (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 20).

The charge brought against Origen by Demetrius was, that though still a layman, he had ventured at Caesarea to expound the Scriptures and preach publicly in the presence of bishops, c. 216. This he had done at the invitation of Alexander and Theoctistus, the bishop of the city. Origen's special offence was not that he taught being a layman, but that he taught when bishops, the authorised expounders of the Holy Scriptures, were present. On his remonstrance the two prelates wrote a joint letter to Demetrius, of which a fragment is preserved by Eusebius, in which they defend themselves, not by a plea of ignorance or exceptional circumstances, but by an appeal to the usage of the Church Catholic. They knew the custom to prevail at Iconium and other Asiatic churches, and they believed it to prevail elsewhere (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19. See Epiphan. *Haeres.* lxiv. n. 2; Bingham, *Origines*, bk. xiv. c. 4). The cause of objection was finally removed by Origen's ordination as a presbyter by his friends Alexander and Theoctistus on his second visit to Palestine, c. 230. The friendship between Alexander and Origen was warm and lasting; and the latter bears public testimony to the remarkable gentleness and sweetness of character manifested in all Alexander's public instructions (Orig. *Homil. I. in Lib. Reg.* No. 1). Alexander was again thrown into prison at Caesarea in the Decian persecution, where he died A.D. 251 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46; Hieron. *Script. Eccl.*).

Eusebius has preserved some fragments of Alexander's letters; of that to the Antiochites, *H. E.* vi. 11, to the Church of Antioch, *ib.*; to Origen, *H. E.* vi. 14, and to Demetrius, *H. E.* vi. 19. These have been published by Galland, *Biblioth. Vet. Patrum*, vol. ii. p. 201 sq. Clemens Alex. dedicated his *Canon Ecclesiasticus* to him (Euseb. vi. 13). [E. V.]

ALEXANDER of LYCOPOLIS, who wrote a short treatise against the Manicheans, printed in Galland's *Biblioth. Veterum Patrum*, IV. pp. 73-87. Its title is 'Αλεξάνδρου Λυκοπολίτου ἐπιστρέψαντος ἐξ ἑθνῶν, α πρὸς τὰς Μανιχαίου δόξας. Photius, *Contra Man.* i. 11, calls him the Archbishop of Lycopolis (ὁ τε τῆς πόλεως Ἀρκων τοῦ ἀρχιερατικοῦ ἐγκεχειρισμένος νόμου). He must have flourished early in the fourth century, as he says (c. 2) that he derived his knowledge of Manes' doctrines ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν τοῦ ἀνδρός. The treatise is divided into 26 chapters. The author begins by stating that the philosophy of the Christians is simple and practical; leaving abstruse questions of ethics and metaphysics to those sciences, it endeavours with success (ὥς ἐκ τῆς πείρας ἐστὶ μαθεῖν) to make the mass of mankind virtuous. Its reticence had led to many heresies, as clever wits tried to push their inquiries further, each wishing to surpass his predecessor; and one of the most outrageous of these leaders was Manes. He gives in cc. 2-4 a sketch of the Manichean system; and then follows an interesting chapter (c. 5) on the difficulty of arguing with persons who had no fixed principle so of proof, but relied on unsupported assertions. The remainder of the book is devoted to an examination of the different Manichean tenets by the accepted principles of Greek philosophy, and he shows one by one how all their ideas are inexact and contradictory when analysed scientifically. The treatise is interesting, as a calm but vigorous protest of the trained scientific intellect against the vague dogmatism of the Oriental theosophies. In c. 5 he remarks that "these myths might well attract those who accept doctrines without examination, since they have even misled some who have studied philosophy with us." It has been much disputed whether he was a Christian when he wrote the book, or even became one afterwards (cf. Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* I. pp. 235-237; Fabric. *Bibl. Graeca*, VII. pp. 323, 324); but Photius' testimony seems to settle the latter point. The book itself is written from a distinctly ethnic point of view, but the author is evidently favourably disposed to Christianity (comp. c. 1, and his remarks in c. 24, on the plausibility of the orthodox view of the Crucifixion as contrasted with the Manichean explanation of it.) [E. B. C.]

ALEXANDER I., bishop of ROME, is stated by all the authorities to have been the successor of Evaristus. Eusebius in his History (iv. 4) makes him succeed in A.D. 109, in his Chronicle, A.D. 111 (f. 89). He assigns him in both works a reign of ten years. [G. H. M.]

ALEXANDER, a VALENTINIAN with whom Tertullian enters into controversy on the Incarnation (*De Carne Chr.* 16 f.). [VALENTINUS]. Tertullian implies that he made an ostentatious use of syllogisms, and quoted as an authority certain Psalms of Valentinus. It is impossible to say whether he is identical with "Alexander the old heretic," whom Jerome names as a commentator on the Epistle to the Galatians (*Praef. ad Gal.*). The writings of an Alexander of Libya, and other unknown authors are said by Porphyry

* This comma seems necessary, as the entire treatise refutes the idea that the author could have ever himself been a Manichean. See Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* (ed. Harles. vii. p. 323.

(*V. Plot.* 16) to have been used by the Gnostics contemporary with Plotinus, but there is nothing to show whether they were in any sense Christian productions. [H.]

ALFWOLD, or AELFUUOLD, or OSWALD, king of Northumbria, who succeeded Ethelred in 779, was present at the Legatine Northumbrian Council of 787, and was slain 789 (*Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, Flor. Wig., Sim. Dun.), is reckoned among martyrs with much the same right as King Aedwini. A church was built in honour of him at the place where he was slain, and where a miraculous light is said to have shown itself (*Sim. Dun.*), viz., at Scytlecester near the Wall. [A. W. H.]

ALHEARD (Ealheard, Alchardus, Algeward, Ealgeheard), a bishop of Elmham, omitted in Florence's list, unless Hunferth the seventh bishop has been substituted for him. He was present at the legatine council of 786, and at that of Clovesho in 803, the decree of which he signed with four priests and two deacons. He attests several charters drawn up in councils or Witenagmots, from 788 to 805, and he is doubtless the person called Alchbertus in the charter of Winchelcomb, granted at the consecration of that abbey in 811. Alcuin's 217th letter is addressed to him and Tidfrith of Dunwich, of whom he had heard from Lull, one of the abbots of the diocese of Dunwich (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 185, 187, 190, 193, 204, 226, 233, 247; Spelman, *Conc.* i. 301, 325; Alcuini *Opp.* i. 270). [S.]

ALHUN (Aelhun, Alfhun, Aelfhun) the eighth bishop of Dunwich: became bishop about 790. He subscribed several charters of Offa between that year and 793. He died in 797 at Sudbury, and was buried at Dunwich (F. Wig. *M. H. B.* 618; Kemble *C. D.* i. 193, 199; *Chron. Sax.* ad 797). [S.]

ALLOGENES.—I. Revelations of "Allogenes," as of Zoroaster and others, are mentioned by Porphyry (*V. Plot.* 16) as appealed to by the Gnostics contemporary with Plotinus. But it seems probable that he mistook for the name of an author the plural title of the following book.

II. An apocryphal book or series of books bearing this name (*Ἀλλογενεῖς*) is said by Epiphanius to have been used by the Sethians (*Haer.* 286c), Archontici (292c, 297d), and apparently the sect whom he calls "Gnostici" (ib.; cf. 89 b); all three being Ophite sects. Under this name were intended Seth and his seven sons (cf. Baur, *Chr. Gnos.* 201). The word is common in the Greek Bible to denote a "stranger," specially an alien, an inhabitant of Judea not being of Jewish birth. [SETHIANI; OPHITES.] [H.]

ALOGIANS, or ALOGI (from *ἀ* privative and *λόγος*, *deniers of the Logos*, or at least of the strongest witness for the Logos; not from *ἄλογος*, *unreasonable*), a heretical sect of disputed existence, who must be located in the latter half of the second century (about 170). Epiphanius invented the term (*Haeres.* l. 1, *adv. Alogos*, cap. 3) to characterize their rejection of the Divine Word preached by John (*ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν Λόγον οὐ δέχονται τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κекηρυγμένον, ἄλογος κληθήσονται*). He traces their origin to Theodotus of Byzantium (*Haer.* liv. c. 1). According to his representation they denied, in ardent opposition to the Gnosticism of

Cerinthus on the one hand, and to the Montanists on the other, that Jesus Christ was the eternal Logos, as taught in John i. 1-14; and rejected the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse as productions of Cerinthus.^a Heinichen supposes that the Alogi rejected only the Apocalypse, and not the fourth Gospel; but this is in direct opposition to the assertion of Epiphanius, who says (l. ch. 3) that if they had rejected the Apocalypse only, there might be some excuse in consideration of the obscurity of that book; but since they rejected all the writings of John, they showed clearly that they belonged to those Antichrists spoken of 1 John ii. 18. (Comp. *Haer.* l. iv. 1, where he likewise attributes to them the rejection of the Gospel as well as of the Apocalypse of John.) That they attributed these books to Cerinthus, the docetist and enemy of St. John, shows their utter want of critical judgment. They tried to refute the Gospel of St. John by the Synoptic Gospels, but with very poor arguments. In opposition to the Montanists, they also denied the continuance of the spiritual gifts in the Church. It is not clear from Epiphanius whether the Alogi rejected only St. John's doctrine of the Logos, or also the divinity of Christ in any form. He calls them in his violent way (l. cap. 3) *ἁλλότριον παντάπασιν τοῦ κηρύγματος τῆς ἀληθείας*; and says of their heresy (*Haer.* liv. c. 1) that it denied the Gospel of John and the God-Word taught therein (*τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντα θεὸν λόγον*). Yet he clearly distinguishes them from the Ebionites; and their opposition to Cerinthus implies that they believed in the real humanity of Christ. Dörner (*History of Christology*, i. p. 503, Germ. ed.) thinks it probable that they allowed no distinctions in the Godhead, and thought that the divinity of the Father dwelt in the man Jesus. But this would identify them with the Patripassians. Lardner (*Works*, iv. 190; viii. 627) doubts the existence of this sect, in consideration of the absence of other data, and the well-known tendency of Epiphanius to multiply and exaggerate heresies. But his testimony is essentially sustained by Irenaeus, who mentions persons who rejected both the Gospel of St. John and the prophetic Spirit (*simul et evangelium et propheticum repellunt Spiritum*; *Adv. Haer.* iii. c. 11, § 9).

Sources.—Epiphanius, *Haer.* 50, and especially 54; M. Merkel, *Historisch-kritische Aufklärung der Streitigkeit der Aloger über die Apokalypsis*, Frankf. and Leipz., 1782; F. A. Heinichen, *De Alogis, Theodotianis atque Artemonitis*, Leipz. 1829; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. ii. pp. 906, 1003; Dörner, l. c. vol. ii. pp. 500-503. [P. S.]

ALPHEIUS, or ALYPIUS, bishop of APAMEA in Syria Secunda, attended the Councils of Neocaesarea 315, Nicaea 325, and Antioch 341; and was one of the bishops by whom Eusebius of Caesarea was elected to the see of Antioch. (Labbe, *Concil.* i. 1518, ii. 56, 585; Euseb. *Vir. Const.* lib. iii. c. 62.) [E. V.]

ALRIC, son of Wihtred, king of Kent, left according to Bede, coheir with his brothers

^a This, it may be remarked, is an argument against the criticism of the Tübingen school, which would bring the composition of the Gospel of St. John down to the middle of the second century; for Cerinthus was a contemporary of the apostle. Had the Alogi had any idea of the recent origin of St. John, they would have made much account of it.

Ethelberht and Eadberht, in 725. His name is attached to the act of Wihtried in the Council of Bacanceld before the year 700. William of Malmesbury gives him a reign of 34 years, which computed from the death of Eadberht, who reigned twenty three, and Ethelberht who reigned eleven, would bring down his death to 791. But this is highly improbable. Florence of Worcester, who confounds Eadberht with Eadberht Pren, makes no mention of Alric, who is also omitted by Henry of Huntingdon in his list of the kings of Kent. But the condition of Kent during the second half of the century is obscure; and it appears from the charters that not less than five persons bore the royal title during the period ascribed to Alric, who is not mentioned in charters at all. William of Malmesbury ascribes to Alric the defeat inflicted by Offa on the Kentish king at Otford in 774; arguing probably from his chronology, for the authorities do not name him. It is, however, just possible that he lost his power at that time, and that some at least of the contemporary kings were Mercian viceroys. [S.]

ALTO, an Irish missionary of illustrious family, who arrived in Bavaria about the year A.D. 743. He lived for some time as a hermit in a forest about midway between Augsburg and Munich. His fame reaching the ears of Pepin, that monarch granted him a part of the forest for the purpose of erecting a monastery and a church. Alto undertook the work, and with the aid of the people of the neighbourhood cleared the ground, and erected the church which was dedicated by St. Boniface. The monastery he built was called from him *Alto-Munster*, which was afterwards corrupted into *Alt-Münster*. His memory was revered on the 9th of February, the anniversary of his death, the exact date of which is unknown. (Lanigan's *Ecol. History of Ireland*, iii. 189.) [G. F. M.]

ALUBERT. (1) Consecrated to the bishopric of the EAST SAXONS (*Chron. Dunelm.* MS.), or of the Old Saxons, in 767. Simeon of Durham calls him Aluberht, and makes him bishop of the Old Saxons of Germany. If this is true, he was the last bishop consecrated in England for Germany, and identical with the missionary Alubert. [ALUBERT.] But the authority of the MS. which was used by Hoveden and others is better. He is there called Alberht, and made bishop of Essex; he thus corresponds with Eadberht, the ninth bishop of London in the ancient lists, and with an Aldberht who signs various charters between 775 and 785. As however there were contemporary bishops, Aldberht at Hereford and Eadberht at Leicester, he cannot be identified with certainty; but is most probably the bishop Eadberchus, who attests the proceedings of the legatine council in 787 (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 663).

(2) The fifth bishop of the SOUTH SAXONS at Selsea. He is known only by the appearance of his name in the lists; his date must fall between 747, when his predecessor Sigga was at the council of Clovesho, and 765, when his successor Osa signs (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 618.) [S.]

ALUBERT, an eminent Anglo-Saxon missionary, who went over from England and joined GREGORY, the pupil of St. Boniface, in the superintendence of his school at Utrecht. Per-

ceiving his fitness for the episcopal office, Gregory persuaded him to return to England with two other pupils, Sigibodus and Liudger, and seek consecration. Alubert went, and during the year he spent in England enjoyed the society of the celebrated Alcuin, then superintending his famous school at York. Having received consecration he returned, and continued for some time to assist Gregory in training missionaries for labour amongst the Frisians, and ordaining them to that high office. See the life of St. Liudger, Pertz, *Mon. Germ.* ii. 407. [G. F. M.]

ALWIG (Aluic, Alwih, Alowiochus, Alwine, Alhuuig). The fifth bishop of the Lindisfari, or people of Lindsey; consecrated by Tatwine, archbishop of Canterbury, in 733. He subscribed several charters from 736-747; and in 747 attended the council of Clovesho. His death is placed by Simeon of Durham in 750 (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 625; Cont. Bedae, *M. H. B.* 288; Kemble, *C. D.* i. 99, 109; Will. Malmesb. *G. P. i.*) [S.]

ALYPIUS, bishop of CAESAREA in Cappadocia, one of the metropolitans to whom the Emperor Leo wrote respecting the Council of Chalcedon and the death of Proterius (A.D. 458). His answer is extant (Labb. *Conc.* iv. 1904 sq., ed. Coleti). He is also mentioned as assenting to the deposition of Lampetius, a Messalian, whom he had ordained and who was convicted of immorality (Phot. *Bibl.* 52). [L.]

ALYPIUS. [ALPHEIUS.]

AMANDUS, a native of Herbayne, in Aquitania, and of noble parentage, was at an early period of his life dedicated to the monastic calling. About the year A.D. 630 he was, at the command of Clothaire, consecrated a missionary bishop, and selecting the neighbourhood of Ghent and Antwerp as the scene of his operations, commenced his exhortations to the Frisian tribes to forsake the worship of trees and groves and adopt the Christian faith. Not contented, however, with exhortation, he obtained a commission from Dagobert, authorising him, if necessary, to baptise the pagans by force, and to call in the aid of the Frankish soldiers in carrying out the work. Such expedients naturally excited violent hostility, and the wild Frisians resolutely strove to thwart all his efforts.

At length, in a wiser spirit, he devoted himself to winning the affection of the rude warriors by redeeming and educating numerous captives. Before long a striking incident rendered easy what the edict of Dagobert had only retarded. A thief, who had been already cruelly scourged, was led forth to be hanged upon a gibbet. Amandus implored the chief of the district to spare his life, and when this was denied, took the body down from the gallows and conveyed it to his cell. There the man revived, and his restoration being regarded as a miracle, a considerable number of the Frisians came forward, offered to receive baptism, and voluntarily destroyed their temples, which Amandus diligently converted into churches and monasteries.

After an unsuccessful effort to attempt a mission among the savage Slaves of the Danube, he was appointed about the year A.D. 646 to the episcopate of Mästricht, and there devoted himself with unceasing energy to the visitation of all parts of his diocese and the work of evangelising the surrounding tribes. He died about the

year A.D. 679. (Mabillon, *Acta Bened. Saec.* ii. 681.) [G. F. M.]

AMBROSIASTER, or PSEUDO-AMBROSIUS, is the name generally employed to denote the unknown author of the *Commentaria in xiii Epistolas beati Pauli* formerly ascribed to St. Ambrose and usually printed along with his works. The commentary itself contains no definite indication of its authorship. An incidental remark, however, on 1 Tim. iii. 15: "Ecclesia . . . cujus hodie rector est Damasus" shows that it was written during the pontificate of Damasus (366–384). It has been suggested, indeed, that this clause, which is not necessary to the sense of the passage, may possibly be an interpolation; but it seems even more difficult to account for its having been inserted subsequently than for its introduction at first. Other marks, negative and positive, point to the same period. The text which the writer uses is not the Vulgate, but one of the forms of the Latin version prior to the revision of Jerome. The ecclesiastical authors to whom he refers—Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus—belong to an earlier date. Among the heresies which he mentions he applies himself more especially and expressly to the confutation of those which prevailed in the fourth century—e.g. the errors of Arius, Novatian, Photinus—while the absence of allusion to later forms of error leads us to suppose that these had not yet emerged. He speaks of the Marcionites as on the verge of extinction ("quamvis pene defecerint," in *Ep. ad Timoth.* i. iv. 1.) All these circumstances seem to show that the work may most fitly be assigned to the latter half of the fourth century; although, in that case, it is certainly somewhat surprising that Jerome in his treatise *De Scripturis Ecclesiasticis* should not mention any other Latin commentator on the Pauline Epistles than Victorinus.

It was the generally received opinion in the middle ages that this commentary was the work of Ambrose, the bishop of Milan; from the ninth century onward we find passages from it frequently quoted in his name, and in numerous instances the authorship is expressly assigned to him. But this belief, which Erasmus was among the first to call in question, is now universally admitted to rest on no sufficient grounds. Cassiodorus, no doubt, mentions a report that St. Ambrose had left an exposition of all the Epistles of St. Paul, but he states at the same time that he had been unable with all his diligence to find it (*Inst. Div. Litt.* c. 8: "Dicitur etiam et beatum Ambrosium subnotatum codicem epistolarum omnium sancti Pauli reliquisse, suavissima expositione completum; quem tamen adhuc invenire non potui, sed diligenti cura perquiri.") At any rate the very marked difference in style between this commentary and the acknowledged writings of St. Ambrose is of itself sufficient to show that it is not the work of the bishop of Milan. Moreover, the views expressed by the commentator are in various points inconsistent with the known opinions of Ambrose; and even where they occupy common ground in the defence of catholic truth against Arian objections, it is remarked that their methods and arguments materially differ. It would appear also that the author of the commentary had little or no knowledge of Greek (at least he speaks as if depen-

dent on others for information as to the readings of the Greek codices, in *Ep. ad Rom.* v. 14, "Ac si in Graeco non ita cautum dicatur; sic enim dicitur scriptum, xii. 11: *tempori servientes*. In Graeco dicitur habere sic: *Deo servientes*; quod nec loco ipsi competit"); whereas St. Ambrose was well acquainted with that language, and drew much of his theology from the Greek Fathers.

But, while there is a general consent among modern scholars in pronouncing the mediæval opinion to be unfounded, there is no such consent as to the probable author. Many conjectures have been hazarded on the subject. Some have regarded the work as wholly a compilation, the materials of which have been derived chiefly from Chrysostom and Jerome; but, as the Benedictine editors have observed, this view is not borne out by the facts of the case. While the commentary, as it has come down to us, presents many passages that seem to have been derived from these and similar sources (and the extant MSS., as well as quotations, exhibit its contents with considerable variety and discrepancy), its exegesis contains much that is independent and peculiar; and the amount of apparent agreement—where it is greater than might otherwise be expected in traversing the same ground—is explained by the circumstance that the work has been subjected in the course of its transmission to numerous and extensive interpolations. The hypothesis which ascribes it to Remigius is set aside by the fact that the portions of the commentary extant in his name are quite different from this one. From certain expressions which appear favourable to Pelagianism the work has been assigned by some to Julian of Aelclanum; but, as Richard Simon has naïvely remarked, "if the writer does not always appear orthodox to those who profess to follow the doctrine of St. Augustine, it must be taken into account that he wrote before that Father had published his opinions." The expressions in question were probably employed without reference to the Pelagian controversy, and previous to its emergence, so that it is unreasonable to construe them as embodying the definite doctrinal positions of a later epoch; and, besides, they are accompanied by others which are entirely incompatible with the supposition of a Pelagian authorship (e.g. the statement in *Ep. ad Rom.* v. 12, "Manifestum est in Adam omnes peccasse quasi in massâ"). More recently Tycho-nius, author of the *Liber de septem regulis*, has been suggested as the author, but without much probability.

The only positive statement as to the authorship is contained in the following passage of Augustine, *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, lib. iv. c. 7: "Nam et sic sanctus Hilarius intellexit quod scriptum est, in quo omnes peccaverunt: ait enim, 'In quo, id est, in Adam omnes peccaverunt.' Deinde addidit: 'Manifestum in Adam omnes peccasse quasi in massâ; ipse enim per peccatum corruptus, quos genuit, omnes nati sunt sub peccato.' Haec scribens Hilarius sine ambiguitate communuit, quomodo intelligendum esset, in quo omnes peccaverunt." As the words cited are found in this commentary, it may be reasonably assumed that the statement applies to it, and that Augustine reckoned Hilarius its author. But who was Hilarius? Of the persons of that name elsewhere mentioned by Augustine several, such as Hilarius of Syracuse to whom he writes in

414 (*Ep. clvi.*), Hilarius the bishop to whom he writes in 416 (*Ep. clxxviii.*), Hilarius apparently a layman whom he addresses *de reliquiis Pelagianae haereseos* (*Ep. ccxxvi.*), as well as Hilary of Arles, flourished considerably later than the time of Damasus; while Hilary of Poitiers on the other hand died almost immediately after Damasus' accession, and at any rate the diversity of style and of matter precludes the supposition of the work having proceeded from his pen. The only person otherwise known, to whom it can be assigned, is Hilarius the Sardinian, deacon of the Roman Church, who was sent by Pope Liberius in 354 (along with Lucifer of Cagliari and Pancratius) to the emperor Constantius after the Synod of Arles with a view to obtain the assembling of a fresh council and a reconsideration of the sentence on Athanasius, but, after suffering at this time stripes and banishment in the cause of orthodoxy, subsequently embraced the party of Lucifer and, on account of the zeal with which he urged the rebaptizing of converts from heresy, is sarcastically termed by Jerome "Deucalion orbis" (*Dial. adv. Luciferianos, ed. Martianay IV. ii. p. 305*). By the greater number of modern scholars, accordingly, Hilary the deacon has been without scruple accepted as the author of the work, and it is frequently quoted in his name. But Petavius and others have urged with considerable force as objections to this view, (1) that Augustine was not likely to apply the epithet *sanctus* to one whom he must have known to be guilty of schism; (2), that the deacon Hilary was not likely to own allegiance to Damasus; and (3) that the language of the commentary, which strongly censures those who insist on rebaptism as derogating from the honour of the Saviour (*in 1 Cor. i. 12*), is inconsistent with the fundamental principle of the Luciferian schism—the necessity of renewed baptism for heretics. To the latter objection it is replied that the Luciferians insisted on the rebaptism not of heretics in general so much as of the Arians in particular, who by their peculiar views as to the Trinity emptied the baptismal formula of its proper meaning. The two former objections are usually met by the suggestion that Hilary may have repented of his schism and become reconciled with the Church; but of this there is no evidence, and the language of Jerome (*l. c.*) seems to indicate the contrary. These difficulties as to Hilary the deacon have led the Benedictine editors to suggest as possibly the author Hilarius, bishop of Pavia, distinguished by his piety and zeal against the Arians (Ughelli, *Ital. sac. tom. ii. part 2, p. 6*); but this is, confessedly, a mere conjecture.

There can be little doubt that, whoever was the author of the work, it no longer retains its original form. The well-meaning zeal of copyists appears to have freely inserted comments from various sources, such as Augustine, Chrysostom, and Jerome; and in not a few passages there are literal coincidences with the language of the commentary which is printed at the end of the works of Jerome and is usually ascribed to Pelagius, so that the one work has evidently been supplemented from the other. These circumstances sufficiently account for the various forms of the text in MSS., and for the discrepancies and inequalities of treatment which are apparent in several parts.

There is, moreover, a marked affinity between this commentary and certain portions of the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* usually printed with the works of St. Augustine. The similarity of ideas and, in various cases, identity of language can only be explained by supposing either that they have had a common author, or that the writer of the one work has borrowed largely from the other. The note of time in the *Quaestiones*—300 years after the destruction of Jerusalem—and some references to contemporary events suit the period of Damasus, and have induced many to ascribe this work also to Hilary the deacon. But the authorship of this, as of the other, remains uncertain. As the matter which is common to the two generally appears in the *Quaestiones* under a more amplified and diffuse form, it seems probable that the composition of the *Quaestiones* was subsequent to that of the commentary.

The commentary on the Pauline Epistles, notwithstanding its inequalities of treatment, is of great value, and is well characterized by Sixtus Senensis as "brief in words, but weighty in matter." Its expositions are generally concise and clear; and, although the writer is frequently carried away by his zeal into controversial discussion or exhortation, he seldom loses sight of the text from which he started, and speedily returns to the proper work of exegesis. In consequence of his use of the old Latin version and frequent reference to various readings his work affords important materials for the criticism of the text.

The commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which accompanies the others in some editions, but is omitted by the Benedictine editors, is now generally admitted to have no claim to such a place. It is a compilation from various Patristic sources, principally from Chrysostom.

The work of the Ambrosiaster is usually inserted in the editions of the works of Ambrose. [AMBROSIUS.] The commentary was also issued separately at Cologne in 1530 and 1532. [W. P. D.]

AMBROSIUS (Ἀμβρόσιος). (1) of ALEXANDRIA, a deacon according to Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.* 56), the disciple and friend of Origen, died c. 250.

It is not certain whether Ambrose was a Christian by birth; but he was of a noble and wealthy family (Orig. *Echort. ad Mart.* 14, f; 49; Hieron *l. c.*), and probably occupied some office under the imperial government (Epiph. *Haer.* 64, 3: comp. Orig. *l. c. c. 36*). Endowed with an active and critical mind he at first neglected the simple teaching of the Gospel for the more philosophic systems of heresy (Orig. *in Johann. Tom. v.*). Some say that he attached himself to the Valentinians (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 18), others to the Marcionites (Epiph. *l. c.*), others that he passed from the one sect to the other (Suidas, *s. v.*). However, when he met Origen he recognized his true teacher, and embraced the orthodox faith (Epiph. *l. c.*). From that time to his death Ambrose devoted his whole energy to encouraging his great master in his labours on Holy Scripture, and used his fortune to further them (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 23). Origen in a fragment of a letter has drawn a striking picture of his devotion (*Ep. l. Suidas s. v. Ὠριγένους*. Jerome, however, refers the words to Ambrose of Origen, *Ep.* 43, 1): "He left no leisure, he writes, for meals

or rest. Of the space from dawn to the ninth or tenth hour I say nothing. All students give that time to the investigation of the Divine oracles and reading." Thus we owe generally, it is said (Hieron. l. c.; *Schol. ad Comm. in Johann. T. v.*) nearly all the exegetic works of Origen to Ambrose's influence; and especially the commentary on St. John (*in Johann. T. ii., init.*). It was at his request, too, that Origen composed his greatest work, the answer to Celsus (*In Cels. Praef.*); and to him and Tatiana (perhaps his sister) he addressed the beautiful treatise on Prayer. In the persecution of Maximinus I., 236, his friendship for Origen, who had withdrawn to Cappadocia, exposed him in company with Protocletus, a presbyter of Caesarea, to severe sufferings (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28), and Origen expressed his sympathy with the two confessors, who seem to have been taken in confinement to "Germany" (Orig. *Exhort. ad Mart.* 41; Comp. Tillemont, *Mémoires* iii. 119), in his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, which is made up almost entirely of passages of Holy Scripture with brief applications to their special position. "We the poor," he writes, with strange pathos, "must yield in the glory of such a trial to those who sacrifice glory, property, and love of children" (c. 15), for Ambrose was married, and had a family (Orig. *Ep. ad Afric. s. f.*). Of the later details of Ambrose's life little is known. After the death of Maximinus, 238, he was at Nicomedia (Orig. *Ep. ad Afric. s. f.*) with his wife (Marcella) and children, and Origen met him there. He is mentioned again in the dedication and close of the answer to Celsus, c. 249, and this is the last notice which remains of him. He died before Origen (Hieron. l. c.) and therefore he cannot have lived more than one or two years longer. The reproach which Jerome makes (l. c.) that he neglected to leave any provision for Origen is probably unjust. It is at least as likely that Origen was unwilling to receive anything. Ambrose left no writings of his own except some letters, but it is evident that he exercised a powerful influence upon Origen, who called him his "taskmaster," ἐργασίας (in *Johann. T. v.*), and it may have been through his zeal in "collation" (Orig. *Ep. l.*) that Origen undertook his critical labours. The one charge justly brought against him is a proof of mistaken devotion: he indiscreetly permitted the publication of some treatises of Origen which were unrevised and intended only for his own use (Hieron. *Ep.* 84, 10).

(2) "A chief man of Greece," and a "senator," "who became a Christian," and, according to the title of the Syriac translation, wrote the "Address to the Greeks" (Ἀδύος πρὸς Ἑλλήνας), which is published with the works of Justin Martyr (Cureton, *Spicil. Syr.* pp. xi. 61). There is no other trace of this tradition, nor is there the least ground for identifying him with Ambrose of Alexandria. [B. F. W.]

AMBROSIUS, bishop of MEDIOLANUM, from A.D. 374 to A.D. 397.

The chief materials for a life of St. Ambrose are to be found in his own works, which consist in great part of sermons, expository and special, and include an important collection of letters. Another source of information which promises to be of first-rate authority and value disappoints the reader's just expectations. This is a *Life* by

Paulinus, his *notarius* or secretary, who had been with him at his death, and who wrote this work at the suggestion of St. Augustine. Paulinus begins by laying down the rules of the most modern historical criticism, declaring that he will relate nothing but what he has seen or heard himself, or what has been communicated to him by those who spoke from their own personal knowledge, amongst whom he names Ambrose's sister Marcellina; but the *Life* proves to be full of prodigies, and adds hardly anything to what we learn from the works. The letters have been reduced to a chronological order with great industry and care by the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose's works, who have also digested the various particulars supplied by himself into a useful biography of their author.

Ambrose was the son of a father who bore the same name. The father was a Roman of the highest rank, and at the time of St. Ambrose's birth he was Praefect of the Galliae, a province which included Britain and Spain, and constituted one of the four great Praetorian prefectures of the empire. It is not known in which of the principal cities of this province the Praefect was residing when his son Ambrose was born; it may have been at Arles or Trèves or Lyons. The only datum for determining the year of Ambrose's birth is a passage in one of his letters, in which, writing to Severus, a bishop of Southern Italy, he happens to mention that he is fifty-three years old, and at the same time contrasts the quiet of Campania with the commotions by which he was himself surrounded. *Nos autem*, he says, *objecti barbaricis motibus et bellorum procellis, in medio versamur omnium molestiarum freto* (*Ep.* lix. 3). There are two periods to which this description would apply. In A.D. 387 Maximus, who had usurped the imperial authority in Britain, and after causing the Emperor Gratian to be assassinated had exercised that authority in the Gallic provinces for some years, invaded Italy and occupied Milan. A few years later a similar usurpation took place, followed by a similar invasion. Arbogastes, a count of the empire but a barbarian by birth, having killed Valentinian II., raised an obscure Roman named Eugenius to the imperial dignity, and in the year 393 the two crossed the Alps and entered Milan. On this occasion Ambrose left the city, and was absent for some time. In the following year, writing to Theodosius, he speaks of that emperor having rescued the Roman empire *a barbari latronis immanitate et ab usurpatoris indigni solio* (*Ep.* lxi. 1). This period would appear to agree rather better than the former with the passage in the letter to Severus. If we assume that Ambrose was fifty-three years old in A.D. 393, we shall place his birth in A.D. 340. On the other hand it might be thought desirable to make Ambrose an older man by seven years, especially as in letters ascribed to the year 389, when he would be forty-nine according to the one estimate and fifty-six according to the other, he speaks of himself as if he were an old man (*Epp.* 47, 48). This argument, however, has not weight enough to counterbalance the greater probability of the interpretation preferred above. The year 340 was the third after the death of Constantine, and Constans was the sovereign then acknowledged by the western part of the empire.

Paulinus begins his *Life* by relating how, when Ambrose was lying in his cradle, a swarm of bees came to his open mouth and flew in and out, as a prophecy of his future eloquence. The next incident he records is another prophecy, from his account of which a note of time has been extracted by the vigilance of the Benedictine editors. Afterwards, he says, when Ambrose was a youth and was living at Rome with his mother, now a widow, and his sister who was already a professed virgin, seeing his female relatives kiss the hands of priests, he offered them his hand to kiss, saying that he should one day be a bishop. In one of his books (*De Virginitas*, lib. iii. c. 1, 1), Ambrose happens to mention that Marcellina his sister had received the veil from the hands of Liberius Bishop of Rome on a Christmas-day. Liberius was made bishop in the middle of the year 352. It could not therefore be before the Christmas of that year that Marcellina became a professed virgin. In 353 Ambrose would either be thirteen or twenty years of age; and it cannot be doubted that a boy of thirteen would be more likely than a young man of twenty to do what Paulinus relates. If therefore Paulinus is here quite accurate, the later date for Ambrose's birth is strongly confirmed. Ambrose is said to have afterwards reminded his sister with a smile of this his boyish prophecy, an incident very likely to have been told by Marcellina to Paulinus.

After receiving a liberal education at Rome, Ambrose devoted himself to the profession of the law, which was then the usual path to the highest civil offices (see *Gibbon*, ch. xvii.). He practised at the court of the Praetorian Prefect of Italy, and so commended himself to Probus the prefect that he first advanced him in his court, and then gave him the appointment of "consular" ^a magistrate of the provinces of Liguria and Aemilia. There is again a prevision of the bishop in Ambrose's history: Probus, in dismissing him to his post, gave him the parting advice, *Vade, age non ut iudex, sed ut episcopus* (Paulinus, 8).

It does not appear from our authorities how long this civil appointment was held by Ambrose. But it is certain that he made an admirable magistrate, and became known to the people of Milan, where he held his court, as a high-minded and conscientious and religious man. Whilst he was discharging his office, there happened the death of Auxentius, whom the Arian party had succeeded in foisting into the see of Milan. The Catholic party had now grown stronger, and a vehement strife arose with regard to the appointment of a successor to Auxentius. The consular came down to the church to keep the peace between the contending parties, and was addressing the people in his character as a civil magistrate, when a cry was heard, "Ambrose for bishop!" The voice was said afterwards to have been that of a child. Whose ever cry it may have been, in a moment it struck the whole multitude that here was a solution in which both parties might acquiesce without the sense of defeat. By the Catholics Ambrose was no doubt well-known as an orthodox believer; but

the Arians also had respected him as a just and impartial man, and he had probably taken no active part in the great controversy of the age. The Catholics might reasonably hope that he would make a sound and good bishop; the Arians might think themselves better off with this layman than they had feared to be. His high rank went for something with all (see the letter of St. Basil written to Ambrose on his appointment as bishop, *Ep.* lv.). So there rose a unanimous shout, "We will have Ambrose for bishop!" It was a singular choice, even for those rougher and more tumultuous times, for Ambrose was not yet so much as baptized. But he was an earnest Christian in his belief, and had only been kept from seeking baptism by a religious awe, of which there were then many examples. He who had shrunk from being baptized naturally shrunk from being made bishop. With undoubted sincerity, Ambrose made all the resistance he could to this popular nomination.

If we could implicitly trust Paulinus, Ambrose used curious means to repel the honour thrust upon him. He mounted a loftier tribunal, and "contrary to his custom he caused torture to be applied to persons on their trial." But the people were not deceived, and cried "Your sin be upon us." Then he went home and desired to "profess philosophy," but was diverted from this purpose. Then he caused *publicae mulieres* to be publicly brought into his house, that this scandal might shock the people. But it was of no avail; they cried the more, "Your sin be upon us!" Then he resolved to escape by flight, and left Milan in the middle of the night to go to Ticinum; but he was again baffled, by finding himself in the morning after a long journey at another—the Roman—gate of Milan. Then the Milanese people took him into friendly custody, and sent a letter to the Emperor Valentinian to ask his judgment upon their election.

Whether these stories be literally true or not (and Paulinus's *Life*, as has been said, is full of prodigies), Ambrose himself frequently refers to the reluctance with which he had yielded to the call which made him a bishop. He was, he says, *raptus a tribunalibus ad sacerdotium* (*De Officiis*, i. 4.) What Paulinus next relates is probable enough. Whilst the messenger was gone to Valentinian, Ambrose again fled, and hid himself in the house of a friend named Leontius. When the answer of Valentinian was received, expressing his entire satisfaction with the people's choice, the *vicarius* or vice-prefect issued a notice calling upon any who knew where Ambrose was to give information. Leontius then gave up his friend, and Ambrose yielded. He was baptized, passed summarily through the intermediate ecclesiastical stages, and on the eighth day was consecrated Bishop of Milan. This was in the year 374 (a year after the death of Athanasius, and before the death of Valentinian I.), Ambrose being thirty-four years of age.

The *vox populi* was never more thoroughly justified. The consular magistrate was exactly fitted to become a great bishop. In any age he would have shone as a bishop, but that age was at least as favourable to the development of his episcopal qualities as any other could have been. The prophetic appreciation of the Milanese Christians was echoed, after a thorough expe-

^a The empire was divided into one hundred and sixteen provinces, of which three were governed by *proconsuls*, thirty-seven by *consulars*, five by *correctors*, and seventy-one by *presidents*.—*GIBBON*, *ubi sup.*

rience, by the Emperor Theodosius in the saying,^b "I have known no bishop, except Ambrose." The foundation of his excellence was laid in a singular and unsullied purity of character; he had a natural love of teaching and governing, warm sympathies, eminent practical abilities, an undaunted courage stimulated by the ambition of martyrdom, and a religious spirit so devout and eager that the only faults with which he can be charged may be attributed to an excess of episcopal zeal. In the see of Milan Ambrose had found precisely his place, and he laboured indefatigably in the work of a bishop for twenty-three years until his death.

One of his first cares after his ordination was to divest himself of the charge of private property. As a member of a wealthy family he appears to have possessed both money and lands. What he did not give away to the poor or the Church or reserve as an income for his sister, he placed entirely under the management of a dearly loved brother named Satyrus. He was thus free to devote his whole energies to the work of his calling. His writings enable us to follow him in both his ordinary and his extraordinary occupations. He was wont to "celebrate the sacrifice" every day (*Ep.* xx. 15). Every Lord's-day he preached in the Basilica. His extant works consist mainly of addresses and expositions which had been first spoken in the church and were afterwards revised for publication. They bear traces of this mode of composition, in their simplicity and naturalness, and also in their popular character and undigested form. Ambrose had to begin, as he ingenuously declares, to learn and to teach at the same time (*Discendum igitur mihi simul et docendum est, quoniam non vacavit ante discere. De Officiis*, lib. i. cap. i. 4). He studied in order to teach, and he taught with a constant eye to edification. One would say that he was always thinking how he could give the best instruction to the flock committed to his charge, from the emperor to the lowest of the people, so as to train them in soundness of faith and purity of life. His intellect was quick and unresting, fertile in illustration, in apophthegms, in replies. He had a reputation for eloquence; but his eloquence was that of readiness and earnestness, rather than of flowing and imaginative utterance. He was also consulted as an authority in theology; but he has no pretensions to genius either as a theologian or as a writer. In doctrine he followed reverently what was of best repute in the Church in his time, carefully guarding his own and his people's orthodoxy from all heresy, and urging, but with wholesome if not always consistent qualifications, the ascetic religious perfection which the best Christians were then pursuing. The sacred books, for which he had a profound reverence, were to him,—what pastoral and didactic theology has always tended to make them,—verbal materials for edification, which

was to be extracted from them by any and every kind of interpretation to which their letter could be subjected. His writings, therefore, or sermons, are chiefly of interest with reference to the history and character of their author; but they are lively and ingenious, full of good practical advice, and interspersed with gnomic sentences of much felicity.

One of the secrets of Ambrose's influence over the people was his admission of them into all his interests and cares. He had nothing private from the congregation in the Basilica. The sister Marcellina, and the brothers Satyrus and Ambrose (this was the order of their ages), were united together by a remarkable affection. The three loved one another too devotedly to think of marrying. Marcellina became early a consecrated virgin, but continued to feel the keenest and tenderest concern in her brothers' lives. When Ambrose became a bishop, Satyrus appears to have given up an important appointment in order to come and live with his brother, and take every secular care off his hands. These domestic virtues of Marcellina and Satyrus we learn from sermons of Ambrose. As soon as he became a bishop, he began to preach upon the excellence of virginity. His discourses on this subject became famous, and attracted virgins from distant parts to receive consecration at his hands. These discourses, in the third year after his ordination, he digested into three books, *De Virginitas*, which were addressed in their new form to his sister, and which contain, besides much praise of Marcellina, the address made to her at her consecration by the Bishop of Rome. A year or two later occurred the death of Satyrus, in the flower of his age. In the depth of his grief Ambrose pronounced a funeral discourse upon his brother (*De Excessu Satyri*), in which he made his hearers partners of his domestic sorrow, and laid bare to them without reserve the inner life of this exemplary family. The sermon preached over the body of Satyrus was followed up seven days after by another upon the hope of a future life (*De Fide Resurrectionis*).

The relations of St. Ambrose with the sovereigns who ruled over Italy during his episcopate are the best-known feature of his life. The Bishop of Milan, exercising the authority of a patriarchate, and presiding over a city which was frequently the residence of the emperor, was a great dignitary. But we cannot fail to recognize the high reputation which Ambrose had won for himself personally, and in a surprisingly short period, when we observe the deference paid to him by the emperors of his time. He was certainly fortunate in the sovereigns with whom he had to do. The youths Gratian and Valentinian II., and the great Theodosius, were singularly virtuous and religious princes. From such persons Ambrose was likely to receive the honour which he deserved. Gratian was a boy of sixteen when the death of his father placed him on the throne, and in the year 377, the third of Ambrose's episcopate, he was two years older. In that year he was preparing to go to the assistance of his uncle Valens against the barbarian invaders by whom he was hard pressed; and desiring to be fortified against the arguments of the Arians whom Valens was favouring at Constantinople, he wrote to Am-

^b Once when Theodosius, at a celebration of the Eucharist, after bringing his offering to the altar, had remained within the rails of the sanctuary, Ambrose sent him word that that was the place for the clergy only, and Theodosius retired. Not long after, in the Basilica at Constantinople, he was invited by the officiating bishop to enter the same sacred enclosure; and he then observed, *Episcopum, excepto Ambrosio, novi neminem.*—(Theodoret. l. 18.)

brose, and asked him to furnish him with a controversial treatise in support of the orthodox faith. Ambrose, premising in accordance with his real disposition that he would rather exhort than dispute, complied with the pious youth's request by writing two books *De Fide*. In the following year Gratian wrote a letter, preserved with those of Ambrose, in which he requests another copy of that work, together with an additional argument upon the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In this letter he calls Ambrose *parens*. In the answer of Ambrose, which is the first of his extant letters, he begs that he may defer writing on the subject^c proposed to him. In the mean time he amplified his former treatise by adding three more books to the two he had already composed. This work *De Fide* was reckoned an important defence of the orthodox faith.

The successes of the Goths which attended the defeat and death of Valens were the occasion of frightful calamities to the empire, and serve to bring out by a striking example the humanity of St. Ambrose. From Illyricum and Thrace, especially, an immense number of captives were carried off by the barbarians, and were exposed to sale by their captors. In ransoming these prisoners the whole available resources of the Church were exhausted by Ambrose; and when everything else had been taken, he did not scruple to break up and sell the sacramental vessels. He himself relates this fact with pride (*De Off.*, lib. ii. 136). It was not that he did not hold these vessels to be sacred; his sacramental views were very high. But he held human beings to be more sacred. "If the blood of Christ redeemed their souls, should not the vessels which hold that blood be used to redeem their bodies?" (*Ibid.* 138). The act thus justified gives us a measure by which we may infer how deeply St. Ambrose was penetrated by that comprehensive and truly episcopal spirit of humanity, which afterwards shone so splendidly in the other great Archbishop of Milan, S. Carlo Borromeo.

We now begin to see Ambrose taking a zealous part in the general affairs of the Church, and acting by universal consent as the leading ecclesiastic of his time. In the document which summoned the Council of Aquileia in the year 381, he is described by Gratian as *et vite merito et Dei dignatione conspicuus* (*Gesta Concilii Aquileiensis*, inserted amongst Ambrose's letters after *Ep.* viii.). He presides in that Council, and questions the two Arianizing prelates who were put on their trial before it. Several letters addressed to the emperor at this time in the name of the Council of Aquileia or of the Italian episcopate on the general government of the Church, are preserved amongst Ambrose's letters (*Epp.* ix.-xii.). When Acholius died—the Bishop of Thessalonica by whom Theodosius had been baptized—his death was formally announced to Ambrose by the clergy and people of his diocese; and we have two letters in reply, one written to the Church, the other to Anysius the new bishop. The next two letters of the collection (xvii. xviii.) are addressed to the Emperor Valentinian, after the death of Gratian, to exhort him not to comply with a request of Symmachus. This eminent man, who was prefect of the city,

had made an appeal to the boy-emperor in the name of the Senate, that he would replace the altar of Victory in the Senate house, and restore the funds for certain heathen ceremonies. Ambrose, whose influence was invoked by the Bishop of Rome, protested strongly against any such concessions to paganism; and Victory, as it was said, favoured in the result her enemy more than her champion.

The struggle between Ambrose and Justin the mother of Valentinian II., which afterward reached such a height at Milan, had been begun with a preliminary trial of strength about the appointment of a bishop at Sirmium. But when the usurpation of Maximus occurred (A.D. 383) and had been staid by the violent death of Gratian, Justina in her alarm had recourse to the great Catholic bishop, and persuaded him to go on an embassy to Maximus, to beg him to leave Italy untouched. Maximus had Theodosius to deal with behind the boy-emperor and his mother; and his first act, when Gaul had fallen into his hands, was to send to Theodosius and propose to him, instead of war, the partition of the empire. Theodosius was constrained by motives of policy to assent to the proposal; and Ambrose had the comfort of returning to Milan with the announcement that the new emperor would refrain from passing the boundary of the Alps. Allusions are made to this embassy in a letter of Ambrose (*Ep.* xxiv. 7), in which he reports the less successful issue of a later appeal to Maximus.

It has been one of the chief glories of Ambrose in the Church that St. Augustine ascribed to him his conversion, and sought Christian baptism at his hands. The circumstances of his intercourse with St. Ambrose (A.D. 383–387) are related by St. Augustine himself in his *Confessions* [AUGUSTINUS]. He tells us of the singularly eminent position of St. Ambrose (vi. 3) of his reputation for eloquence (v. 13), of the difficulty of getting an opportunity of conversing with him on account of his many engagements, and his habit of reading to himself when company was present (vi. 3), and of his method of expounding the Old Testament by finding under the letter a spiritual or mystical sense (vi. 4). As we pass from the one of these divines to the other, we cannot help wondering that the teaching of Ambrose should have been convincing and satisfying to Augustine; and we are inclined to attribute more to the previous internal history of the illustrious disciple, and to the Christian earnestness of the noble-minded pastor, than to the reasonings of the preacher's sermons. These sermons, with their profuse and arbitrary interpretations and their constant practical applications, seem more suited to interest and edify the staunch believer than to lead the doubter in his inquiries.

It was during this period, in the years 385–6, that Ambrose defended the churches of Milan so stoutly against the intrusion of Arian worship. Justina, who patronized the languishing Arian party, was bent on obtaining one of the churches at Milan for the use of her friends. Ambrose was not likely to make the concession. How in this matter he resisted the violent efforts of Justina, and the authority of her son (at this time 15 years of age), is described at length by Ambrose himself in letters to his sister Marcel-

^c The work *De Spiritu Sancto*, in 3 books, was written in the year 381

and to Valentinian, and in a sermon preached at the crisis of the struggle (*Epp.* xx. d., and the *Sermo de Basilicis Tradendis* which follows them.) There appear to have been two churches at Milan, the one without, the other within the walls. The former, as of less importance, was first asked for. This being refused, some persons of the court came to Ambrose, and begged him to concede—probably for partial use only—the newer and larger basilica, and to exert his influence to prevent any popular disturbance. But it is important to observe that throughout the struggle the people were on the Catholic side. Ambrose replied loftily that the temple of God could not be surrendered by His priest. The next day, which was Sunday, as Ambrose was officiating in the principal basilica, news came that police-agents had been sent from the palace, who were hanging on the Portian basilica the curtains^a which marked a building as claimed for the imperial treasury. A part of the multitude hastened thither; Ambrose remained to perform mass. Then he heard that the people had seized on a certain Arian presbyter, whom they met on the way. Ambrose began to pray with bitter tears that the cause of the Church might not be stained with blood; and sent presbyters and deacons, who succeeded in rescuing the prisoner unhurt. Justina, in her irritation, treated the rich men of the city as responsible for a tumult, and threw many of them into prison. The imperial authority was being dangerously strained. Politic officials came to Ambrose and entreated him to give way to the sovereign rights of the Emperor; Ambrose replied that the Emperor had no rights over what belonged to God. A body of troops were sent to take possession of the Basilica, and there was great fear of blood being shed; but after mutual appeals between their officers and Ambrose, the soldiers withdrew, and Ambrose remained all day in the church. At night he went home, and on coming out the next morning he found that the church (the Portian) was surrounded by soldiers. But the soldiers were in awe of Ambrose, and, fearing that he had threatened them with excommunication, they began to crowd in, protesting that they came to pray and not to fight. Ambrose took the lesson for the day as the subject of a sermon, and whilst he was preaching he was told that the imperial curtains were taken down. The Emperor was worsted by the Bishop, and was naturally angry. He sent a secretary to reproach Ambrose, and ask if he meant to make himself a tyrant. Soldiers continued to surround the church, and Ambrose remained there singing psalms with the faithful. The next day the soldiers were withdrawn, and the merchants who had been imprisoned were released. The struggle was over; but Ambrose heard that the Emperor had said bitterly to the soldiers, "If Ambrose orders you, you will give me up in chains." He records another saying, which drew from him a retort of characteristic felicity.

^a This is the interpretation given by Godefridus to the *vela* mentioned by Ambrose (*Epp.* xx. 4). Gibbon says, "the splendid canopy and hangings of the royal seat were arranged in a customary manner;" thus he adorns the two words "*vela suspenderent*." But it appears from the narrative that whilst Ambrose was inside the church, he was informed that the hangings were being taken down,—evidently on the outside.

The court chamberlain sent him a message: "Whilst I am alive, shall you despise Valentinian? I will take off your head." Ambrose answered: "May God grant you to fulfil what you threaten; for then my fate will be that of a bishop, your act will be that of a eunuch."

In the course of the following year the attempts of the Arian party, and of the Emperor as at this time governed by that party, were renewed. Ambrose was asked to hold a discussion with Auxentius, an Arian bishop, before chosen judges in the presence of the Court, or else to withdraw from Milan. He consulted such bishops and presbyters as were within reach, and in their name wrote a letter to the Emperor (*Ep.* xxi.), declining the discussion. An alarm was spread amongst the people that he was going to be taken away from Milan, and for some days, by night and by day, he was surrounded and watched by an immense concourse of his friends. He preached them a sermon (*De Basilicis Tradendis*), assuring them of his steadfastness, and encouraging them to confidence, and at the same time gave them hymns composed by himself to sing—hymns in honour of the Trinity—by which their fervour was greatly stimulated. Again the Court party found themselves worsted, and they appear to have given way without provoking a crisis.

The singing of hymns, by which this remarkable occupation of the Basilica was characterized, is described by St. Augustine as extremely moving (*Confess.* vi. 7), and is said by him to have been an imitation of Eastern customs, and to have been followed generally throughout the Church. Paulinus also observes that at this time "antiphons, hymns, and vigils, began to be performed in the Church of Milan, and had spread thence amongst all the Churches of the West (*Vita*, 13)." What was the precise mode of singing thus introduced is not known. But the reputation of St. Ambrose as a composer of hymns was such that many hymns certainly not his have been attributed to him, and amongst them the *Te Deum*. The Benedictine Edition gives twelve hymns, which there is some good authority for ascribing to Ambrose, the best known of which are those beginning *Aeternum conditor, Deus creator omnium, Veni, redemptor gentium*, and *O lux beata Trinitas*. They have a brightness and felicity which have reasonably made them favourites in the Church from their author's day to the present.

We ought to take into account the state of mind to which the bishop and his flock must have been wrought up together by that protracted vigil in the basilica, when we read of the miracles into which their triumph over heresy blazed forth at last. We have a narrative from St. Ambrose's own pen, in a letter to Marcellina (*Ep.* xxii.), of the wonderful discovery of the remains of two martyrs, and of the cures wrought by them. A basilica was to be dedicated, and Ambrose was longing to find some relics of martyrs. A presage suddenly struck him. (This "presagium" is called a vision by St. Augustine, *Conf.* lx. 7, *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8). He caused the ground to be opened in the church that was consecrated by the remains of St. Felix and St. Nabor. Two bodies were found, of wonderful size (*ut prisca aetas ferebat*), the heads severed from the shoulders, the tomb stained

with blood. This discovery, so precious to a Church "barren of martyrs," was welcomed with the wildest enthusiasm. Old men began to remember that they had heard formerly the names of these martyrs—Gervasius and Protasius—and had read the title on their grave. Miracles crowded thick upon one another. They were mostly cures of demoniacs, and of sickly persons; but one blind man received his sight. It is nothing that Paulinus reports this miracle; for he relates many more wonderful things, for which we have no other authority but his. But Ambrose himself, for once, eagerly and positively affirms the reality of the cure; and Augustine, who generally held that the age of miracles was past, also bears witness to the common acceptance of the fact at Milan. Gibbon has some excuse for his note, "I should recommend this miracle to our divines, if it did not prove the worship of relics, as well as the Nicene Creed." The Arians, as we learn from Ambrose and Paulinus, made light of the healing of demoniacs, and were sceptical about the blind man's history. The martyrs' bones were carried into the "Ambrosian" basilica (now the Church of S. Ambrogio), and deposited beneath the altar in a place which Ambrose had designed for his own remains.

The memory of this conflict did not restrain Justina and her son from asking help shortly after of Ambrose. It was evident that Maximus was preparing to invade Italy; and as Ambrose had apparently been successful in his former embassy, he was charged with another conciliatory appeal to the same ruler. The magnanimous bishop consented to go, but he was unfavourably received, and having given great offence by abstaining from communion with the bishops who were about Maximus, he was summarily ordered to return home. He reports the failure of his mission in a letter to Valentinian (*Ep.* xxiv.) It is worthy of remark that the punishment of heresy by death was so hateful to Ambrose that he declined communion with bishops who had been accomplices in it (*qui aliquos, devios licet a fide, ad necem petebant, Ibid.* 12). These bishops had prevailed on Maximus to put to death Priscillian—the first time that heresy was so punished. [PRISCILLIANUS.]

Maximus was not diverted from his project. He crossed the Alps, and Justina, with her son, fled to Theodosius. It was not long before the vigour and ability of Theodosius triumphed over Maximus, who perished in the conflict he had provoked. Ambrose, who withdrew from Milan when Maximus came to occupy it, appears to have been near Theodosius in the hour of victory, and used his influence with him in favour of moderation and clemency, which the Emperor, according to his usual habit, displayed in an eminent degree (*Ep.* xl. 32). But we have now to mention an instance in which Ambrose unhappily prevailed upon Theodosius to abandon a course which his stricter sense of his duty as a ruler had prompted him to take. In some obscure place in the East, the Christians had been guilty of outrages, from which it had often been their lot to suffer. With the support of their bishop, they had demolished a Jewish synagogue and a meeting-house of certain Gnostic heretics. Theodosius, hearing of this violence, had ordered that the bishop should rebuild the synagogue at his own expense, and that the rioters, who were

chiefly monks, should be punished at the discretion of the local governor. This order naturally affronted the party spirit of the Christians. Ambrose could not bear that his fellow-believers should be thus humiliated. He wrote a letter to the Emperor (who was at Milan, Ambrose being for the moment at Aquileia), entreating him most earnestly to revoke the order. With much that Ambrose says we can sympathize, but he lays down a principle fruitful in disastrous issues: *Cedat oportet censura* (the functions of the civil ruler) *devotioni* (*Ep.* xl. 11). Shortly after, he had the opportunity of preaching before the Emperor at Milan. In a letter to his sister he gives the sermon at length, with its conclusion, addressed directly to the Emperor, and begging of him the pardon of those who had been caught in a sin. When he came down from the pulpit, Theodosius said to him, *De nobis proposuisti*. "Only with a view to your advantage," replied Ambrose. "In truth," continued the Emperor, "the order that the bishop should rebuild the synagogue was too hard. But that is amended. The monks commit many crimes." Then he remained silent for a while. At last Ambrose said, "Enable me to offer the sacrifice for thee with a clear conscience." The Emperor sat down and nodded, but Ambrose would not be satisfied without extracting a solemn engagement that no further proceedings should be taken in the matter. After this he went up to the altar: "but I should not have gone," adds Ambrose, "unless he had given me his full promise" (*Ep.* xli. 28).

About two years later (A.D. 390), the lamentable massacre at Thessalonica gave occasion for a very grand act of spiritual discipline. The commander of the garrison at Thessalonica and several of his officers had been brutally murdered by a mob in that city. The indignation of the Emperor was extreme; and after appearing to yield to gentler counsels, he sent orders, which were executed by an indiscriminate slaughter of at least 7000 persons in Thessalonica. This frightful vengeance shocked the humanity of the Christians in general, and Ambrose felt bound to protest against it in the name of God and of the Church. He had always acted on the principle that "nothing was more dangerous before God or base amongst men than for a priest not to speak out his convictions freely," and his lofty disinterestedness (*non pro meis commodis faciebam, Ep.* lvii. 4) gave him great power over a religious and magnanimous mind like that of Theodosius. Ambrose now wrote him a letter (*Ep.* li.), which Gibbon most unjustly calls "a miserable rhapsody on a noble subject," but which most readers will feel to be worthy of its high purpose. With many protestations of respect and sympathy, Ambrose urges his Emperor to a genuine repentance for the dreadful deed to which in an access of passion he had given his sanction. He intimates that he could not celebrate the Eucharist in the presence of one so stained with blood. Historians have not failed to make the most of this striking act of discipline. Gibbon in particular represents the behaviour of Ambrose as marked by a prelatelical pomposity, of which there is no trace whatever in the only documents on which we can rely. In his own letter the bishop is most considerate and tender, though evidently resolute. He and

Paulinus record simply that the Emperor performed public penance, stripping himself of his royal insignia, and praying for pardon with groans and tears; and that he never passed a day afterwards without grieving for his error (Paulinus 24; Amb. *De Ob. Theod.* 34). Theodoret (v. 18) adds that the Emperor refrained from coming to church for eight months, that then on Christmas Day he sought to enter the church, but that Ambrose met him, reproved him sternly, and would not allow him to be present at the Eucharist until he had done penance openly, and had further promised to make a law enacting that no criminal should be put to death till 30 days after the sentence: but no dependence is to be placed on Theodoret's accuracy. Those who have become impressed by the profound and affectionate respect which each of these noble-minded men felt for the other, will be disposed to believe as to this matter what they learn from Ambrose himself, and not much more.

In the course of the following year (391), Theodosius having returned to the East, the weak authority of Valentinian II. was overthrown by Arbogastes and his puppet Eugenius, and the unfortunate youth perished by the same fate as his brother. He was in Gaul at the time of his death, and Ambrose was at that moment crossing the Alps to visit him there, partly by the desire of the Italian magistrates, who wished Valentinian to return to Italy, and partly at the request of the Emperor himself, who was anxious to be baptized by him. In the next year (392), a funeral oration was delivered at Milan by Ambrose (*De Obitu Valentiniani*), in which he praises the piety as well as the many virtues of the departed. It appears that under the influence of Theodosius, Valentinian had learnt to regard Ambrose with the same reverence as his brother had done before him (Letter to Theodosius, *Ep.* liii. 2). He had died unbaptized; but Ambrose assures his sorrowing sisters that his desire was equivalent to the act of baptism, and that he had been washed in his piety as the martyrs in their blood (*De Ob. Val.* 51-53).

Eugenius held the sovereign power in the West for two or three years, and made friendly overtures to the great Italian prelate. But Ambrose for a time returned no answer; and when Eugenius came to Milan, he retired from that city. Shortly after this withdrawal, he wrote a respectful letter to Eugenius, explaining that the reason why he had refused to hold intercourse with him was that he had given permission, though himself a Christian, that the altar of Victory should be restored—the boon which Symmachus had begged for in vain being yielded to the power of Arbogastes.

When the military genius and vigour of Theodosius had gained one more brilliant triumph by the rapid overthrow of Arbogastes and Eugenius, Ambrose, who had returned to Milan (August,

A.D. 394), received there a letter from Theodosius requesting him to offer a public thanksgiving for his victory. Ambrose replies (*Ep.* lxi.) with enthusiastic congratulations. But the happiness thus secured did not last long. In the following year the great Theodosius died at Milan (January, A.D. 395), asking for Ambrose with his last breath (*De Obitu Theod.* 35). The bishop had the satisfaction of paying a cordial tribute to his memory in the funeral oration he delivered over his remains.

Ambrose himself had only two more years to live. The time was filled with busy labours of exposition, correspondence, and episcopal government; and according to Paulinus, with various prodigies. Unhappily this biographer spoils with his childish miracles what is still a touching account of the good bishop's death. It became known that his strength was failing, and the Count Stilicho, saying that the death of such a man threatened death to Italy itself, induced a number of the chief men of the city to go to him, and entreat him to pray to God that his life might be spared. Ambrose replied, "I have not so lived amongst you, that I should be ashamed to live; and I do not fear to die, because we have a good Lord."^f As he lay on his death-bed, some of his deacons were speaking together in whispers about his successor, and mentioned the name of Simplicianus; to their distress, they found the bishop had overheard them, for he said three times, "An old man, but a good man." For some hours before his death, he lay with his hands crossed, praying; as Paulinus could see by the movement of his lips, though he heard no voice. When the last moment was at hand, Honoratus, the Bishop of Vercellae, who was lying down in another room, thought he heard himself thrice called, and came to Ambrose, and offered him the Body of the Lord; immediately after receiving which, he breathed his last breath;—a man, Paulinus says well, who for the fear of God had never feared to speak the truth to kings or any powers. He died on Good Friday night, 4th-5th April, 397, and was buried in the Ambrosian basilica, in the presence of an innumerable multitude of every rank and age; many Jews and Pagans joining with his flock to pay the last honours to the fearless and large-hearted bishop.

By the weight of his character St. Ambrose gave a powerful support to the tendencies which he favoured. But his influence upon opinion is not conspicuous except in one point—the growing exaltation of ecclesiastical over secular authority. He held without misgivings that the Church was the organ of God in the world, and that secular government had the choice of being either hostile or subservient to the Divine authority ruling in the Church. To passages already quoted which express this conviction may be added a remark let fall by Ambrose at the Council of Aquileia, "Sacerdotes de laicis judicare debent, non laici de sacerdotibus."—*Gesta Conc. Aqu.* 51. He was of strict Athanasian orthodoxy as against heresy of every colour.

writings, but by what feeling the omission was prompted it is not for me," says Paulinus, "to judge."—*Life*, § 28

^f St. Augustine was wont to express his peculiar admiration of this saying, with its *elimata ac librata verba*.—Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* c. xxvii.

* During his absence, as Paulinus relates, St. Ambrose raised a little boy to life. Paulinus gives all the details. The child's name was Pansophius, his father an eminent Christian at Florence, named Decens. Ambrose first cured the child of an unclean spirit, and when he died a few days after, imitating exactly the proceedings of Elisha with the child of the Shunammite widow, raised him to life again. To this Pansophius he afterwards addressed a book of instruction. "He has not mentioned the fact in his

His views of the work of Christ, in the Incarnation, the Passion, and the Resurrection, have in a marked degree the broad and universal character which belongs to the higher patristic theology on this subject. (For example, speaking of the resurrection of Christ, he says, "Resurrexit in eo mundus, resurrexit in eo coelum, resurrexit in eo terra," *De Fide Res.* 102.) With regard to religion and religious practices, he is emphatic in insisting that the worship of the heart is all-important (Deo enim velle pro facto est, *De Fide Res.* 115; Deus non sanguine sed pietate placatur, *ibid.* 98; non pecuniam Deus sed fidem quaerit, *De Poen.* ii. ix.); but at the same time his language concerning the two Sacraments is often undeniably that of materializing theology. Attempts have been made, chiefly on this account, to call in question the Ambrosian authorship of the treatises *De Mysteriorum* and *De Sacramentis*; but their expressions are supported by others to be found in undoubted works of Ambrose. He praises his brother Satyrus for having tied a portion of the consecrated elements in a napkin round his neck when he was shipwrecked, and adds, that having found the benefit of "the heavenly mystery" in this form, he was eager to receive it into his mouth—"quàm majus putabat fusum in viscera, quod tantum sibi tectum orario profuisset!"—*De Eec. Sat.* 43, 46. He argues for the daily reception of the Eucharist from the prayer, Give us this day our daily bread.—*De Sacr.* v. 25.

The strong commendations of virginity which are to be found throughout his works, but especially in several small treatises on this subject, are based, not on a theory of self-denial, but rather on one of detachment from the cares of the world and the troubles inseparable from matrimony and parentage. According to him, marriage is the more painful state, as well as the less favourable to spiritual devotion. Nevertheless, he did not expect or desire a large number to embrace the life which he so highly eulogised. "Dicet aliquis: Ergo dissuades nuptias? ego vero suadeo, et eos damno qui dissuadere consuerunt Paucarum quippe hoc munus (virginity) est, illud omnium."—*De Virginibus*, I. vii. He and his sister used to press Satyrus to marry, but Satyrus put it off through family affection—"ne a fratribus divelleretur."—*De Eec. Sat.* §§ 53, 59. Fasting is commended, not as self-torture pleasing to God, but as the means of making the body more wholesome and stronger. A keen sense of the restraints and temptations and annoyances which reside in the flesh is expressed in Ambrose's remarkable language concerning death. It is a great point with him that death is altogether to be desired. He argues this point very fully in the address *De Fide Resurrectionis*, and in the essay *De Bono Mortis*. There are three kinds of death, he says, the death of sin, death to sin, and the death of the body (*De B. M.* § 3). This last is the emancipation of the soul from the body. He appeals to the arguments of philosophers and to the analogies of nature, as well as to Scripture, to show not only that such a deliverance may be hoped for, but that it must be a thing to be desired by all. The terrors of the future state almost entirely disappear. He admits now and then that punishment must be looked for by the wicked; but he affirms that even to the wicked

death is a gain. "Non quia amara sit mors, sed quia impio amara; et tamen amarior vita quam mors. Gravius est enim ad peccatum vivere, quam in peccato mori: quia impius quandiu vivit peccatum auget; si moriatur, peccare desinit."—*De Bono Mortis*, § 28. There are two reasons why the foolish fear death: one, because they regard it as destruction; "altera, quod poenas reformident, poetarum scilicet fabulis terribi, latratu Cerberi, et Cocytii fluminis tristem voraginem, &c. &c. Haec plena sunt fabularum, nec tamen negaverim poenas esse post mortem."—*Ibid.* 33. "Qui infideles sunt, descendunt in infernum viventes; etsi nobiscum videntur vivere, sed in inferno sunt."—*Ibid.* 56.

The see of Milan was in no way dependent upon that of Rome; but Ambrose always delighted to pay respect to the Bishop of Rome, as representing more than any other the unity of the Church. His feeling towards Rome is expressed in the apology with which he defends the custom of washing the feet in baptism—a custom which prevailed at Milan but not at Rome. "In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam; sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus; ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos rectius custodimus. Ipsum sequimur apostolum Petrum, . . . qui sacerdos fuit Ecclesiae Romanae."—*De Sacramentis*, III. §§ 5, 6.

As a writer, St. Ambrose left a multitude of works behind him, the general character of which has already been described. They show competent learning, a familiar acquaintance with Plato, Cicero, Virgil, and other classics, and much intellectual liveliness and industry. Their want of originality did not hinder him from obtaining for their author, through their popular and practical qualities, a distinguished reputation as a sound and edifying teacher. He is often mentioned with respect by his contemporaries, St. Jerome and St. Augustine (see especially the latter, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, iv. 46, 48, 50). He came to be joined with them and Gregory the Great as one of the Four Latin Doctors of the Church. His writings may be classified under three heads, as (1) Expository, (2) Doctrinal or didactic, and (3) Occasional.

(1). The first class contains a long list of expositions, delivered first as sermons, of many books of Scripture. They begin with the *Hexaemeron*, or commentary on the Creation. Of this work St. Jerome says, *Nuper S. Ambrosius sic Hexaemeron illius [Origenis] compilavit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basilique sequeretur* (*Ep.* 41). It is in great part a literal translation from St. Basil. St. Augustine, as we have seen, was interested by the method of interpretation in which Ambrose followed Basil, Origen, and Philo Judaeus—the method of finding a spiritual or mystical meaning latent under the natural or historical. But the modern reader, who soon wearies of this method in Philo or Origen, is not likely to enjoy it in Ambrose. The *Hexaemeron* (6 books) is followed by *De Paradiso*, *De Cain et Abel* (2), *De Noe et Arca*, *De Abraham* (2), *De Isaac et Animâ*, *De Bono Mortis*, *De Fugâ Saeculi*, *De Jacob et Beatâ Vitâ* (2), *De Joseph Patriarchâ*, *De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum*, *De Eli et Jejunio*, *De Nabute Jezraelitâ*, *De Tobîâ*, *De Interpellatione Job et David* (4), *Apologia Prophetæ David*, *Apologia altera Prophetæ David*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (12), *Expositio in*

Psalmum cxviii., Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam (10).

(2). The second class contains *De Officiis Ministrorum* (3 books), *De Virginitas* (3), *De Viduis*, *De Virginitate*, *Exhortatio Virginitatis*, *De Lapsu Virginis Consecratae*, *De Mysteriis*, *De Sacramentis* (6), *De Poenitentia* (2), *De Fide* (5), *De Spiritu Sancto* (3), *De Incarnationis Domini-nice Sacramento*. Of these the books *De Officiis*, addressed to the clergy (imitated from Cicero), and those *De Fide*, mentioned above, are the most important.

(3). The occasional writings, which are biographically the most valuable, are the discourses *De Excessu Fratris sui Satyri* (2), *De Obitu Valentiniani Consolatio*, *De Obitu Theodosii Oratio*, and the *Epistles*, 91 in number, with the *Gesta Concilii Aquileiensis* inserted amongst them.

Various ecclesiastical writings have been attributed to Ambrose, which critical examination has determined to be spurious. [AMBROSIASTER.] Most of these are given in the Benedictine edition; in that of Migne there is an additional appendix, containing some other compositions which have borne Ambrose's name, but are either manifestly spurious, or have no sufficient title to be considered genuine. Some of his genuine works appear to have been lost, especially one mentioned with high praise by St. Augustine (*Ep.* xxxi. 8) as written against those who alleged that our Lord had learnt from Plato.

Of the connexion of St. Ambrose with the liturgical arrangement which bears his name, we know nothing more than what has been quoted above from Paulinus. [See *Dict. of Chr. Art.* LITURGIES; comp. AMBROSIAN MUSIC.]

There are three principal editions of Ambrose's works, that of Erasmus, the Roman, and the Benedictine. The first of these was preceded by some earlier tentative publications, between A.D. 1474 and 1506, the most considerable being that of Amerbach (Basle) in 1492. Erasmus's edition was also published at Basle, by Froben, in 1527. He divided the works into 4 tomes, with the titles, 1. *Ethica*, 2. *Polemica*, 3. *Orationes*, *Epistolae*, et *Conciones*, 4. *Explanationes Vet. et Novi Testamenti*. This edition was followed by that of Costerius (published by Episcopus at Basle), and that of Gillot (Merlin, Paris). The great Roman edition was the work of many years' labour, undertaken by the desire of Popes Pius IV. and Pius V., and begun by a monk who afterwards became Pope with the name of Sixtus V. It was published in 5 vols. at Rome, in the years 1580, 1, 2, 5. This edition superseded all others, until the publication of the excellent work of the Benedictines (du Frische and le Nourry) at Paris, A.D. 1686 and 1690. A small revised edition of the *De Officiis* and the *Hexameron* has been printed in the *Bibliotheca Pat. Ecol. Latin. Selecta* (Tauchnitz, Leipzig).

An elaborate life of St. Ambrose by Baronius, extracted from his *Annales*, is prefixed to the Roman edition. But this is improved upon by the more critical investigations of the Benedictine editors, who have laid the basis for all subsequent lives. [J. LI. D.]

AMBROSIUS AUTPERTUS. [AUTPERTUS.]

AMEN (Hippol. *Haer.* v. 26) [JUSTINUS, Gnostics]: (Iren. 67, 81) [MARCUS, Gnost.]. [H.]

AMETRITAE, the name given by 'Praedestinatatus' (i. 77) to a "sect" who according to Philastrius (*Haer.* 115) followed various philosophers in believing that "there are infinite and innumerable worlds," appealing to apocryphal books of (? heathen) prophets. See Oehler's notes. [H.]

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS. I. Authorities; II. Life; III. Works and style; IV. Character and relation to Christianity; V. Editions, &c.

I. *Authorities*.—The materials for the life of this historian are almost entirely supplied by himself. Of the epistles of Libanius, about 20 are addressed to persons bearing the names of Ammianus or Marcellinus, or mentioning one or other of them. Of these, all, except the first, of those addressed to Ammianus (nos. 215 (?), 230, 1090, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1543, ed. Wolf), though of very slight importance may be conjectured to belong to our subject, as one addressed to Marcellinus (no. 983) certainly is; and another to Apollinarius and Gemellus, which mentions Ammianus (no. 234 **Ἀμμιανὸς ὁ καλός*, cf. no. 1151), probably refers to him. Two laws in the Theodosian code of the same year 383 begin, one "Ad Ammianum Com. Rer. Priv." (*C. Th.* xi. 30, § 41), the other "Have Marcelline karissime nobis" (*Id.* ix. 27, § 5). Godefroy supposes the latter to be the historian. On the relation of Ammianus and Solinus, which has been variously regarded, the last edition of Solinus by Professor Mommsen (Berlin, 1864) may be consulted. The most striking parallels are *Amm.* xxii. 15 and 16, *Sol.* 32, 9-end and 34, 1, on Egypt; and *Amm.* xxiii. 6, § 85–88, *Sol.* 52, 23–28, on Pearls. Mommsen concludes that neither borrowed from the other, but both, as well as Apuleius, from a lost epitome of Pliny and Mela, with amplifications added by its unknown compiler. Hence no argument can be deduced as to their dates. Priscian quotes both (*De viii Partit. Orat.*), hence we conclude that they were read in the schools of his time (*Prisc.* lib. ix. Marcellinus rerum gestarum quarto decimo; tanquam licentia crudelitati indulta). The Marcellinus who wrote the life of Thucydides and the Illyrian Marcellinus mentioned by Suidas, are, the first probably, the second certainly, different persons.

II. *Life*.—Ammianus Marcellinus was a Greek of Antioch (as is gathered from *Lib. Ep.* 983), and of a good family (*ingenuus*, xix. 8, § 6). In the early part of his life he must have received a good education, but we know nothing of him further till as a young man of perhaps 20 years he was attached to the General Ursicinus by the order of Constantius. He was with him in A.D. 353 at Nisibis and Antioch (xiv. 9, § 1), where the cruelty of Gallus had caused a sedition, and in the next year at Milan (*xiv.* 11, § 5). In 355 he had become one of the imperial body guard (*protector domesticus*), and followed Ursicinus on the hazardous expedition to supersede Silvanus in Gaul (xv. 5, § 21, 22). In 357 they were summoned to Constantius at Sirmium, and despatched to the East (xvi. 10, § 21). When Ursicinus was recalled in 359, superseded, and suddenly ordered back again, Ammianus was still with him (xviii. 4, § 7, 6, § 5), and returned to Amida through Nisibis, where he nearly lost his life in saving that of a boy. He was then de-

tached on a mission to the satrap of Corduene, and had an opportunity of observing the whole barbarian force from a height (xviii. 6, § 20). He was present at the disgraceful rout near Amida, and was one of those who were shut up in the town. He describes with great vigour the siege and pestilence, and his own escape just after the capture to Antioch (xix. 1-8). We lose sight of him now at the disgrace of Ursicinus, till the time of Julian's invasion of Persia in 363, in which and in the retreat under Jovian he took part (xxiv., xxv., pass.). After the division of the empire in 364 he would seem to have remained in the East, perhaps in his native town, where his friend Libanius had taken up his permanent abode: at any rate he was present there in 371 at the punishment of the conspiracy of Theodorus under Valens (xxix. 1, § 24), and shared in the general terror so fatal to literature in the East, inasmuch as all books having the least suspicion of a relation to magic were destroyed by their owners for fear of delation (*id.* 2, § 4).

We do not know at what time he settled in Rome, nor whether he had any office there, as the identification of him with the "count of the private estate" is conjectural. One of the epistles of Libanius (no. 1150) addressed to Ammianus would make him governor of Syria Euphratensis, according to Sievers (*Leben des Libanius*, p. 272, app. BB), but this would be before his settlement in Rome. The rest are requests for favours, generally in behalf of his own pupils, or thanks for the same. From the same writer's letter to Marcellinus cited above (no. 983) we learn that he composed his history in the capital, and gave public recitations of it book by book with great applause. We know neither the date of his birth nor death. He was "adolescens" in 357 (xvi. 10, § 21, prob. under 28 years of age according to Isidore's definition), and mentions no event later than the consulship of Neoterius in 390 (xxvi. 5, § 14), while he speaks of the Serapeum as still standing (xxii. 16, § 12), which was destroyed in 391. From a mention of the famine which took place in 383 (xiv. 6, § 19) we are able to fix the composition or publication of books xiv.-xxii. between the years 383-391. The letter of Libanius (no. 983), written in 390 or 391, speaks of the work as still in progress, and this must refer to books xxiii.-xxxi., of which the date is uncertain, though it is probable that they were finished not many years later.

III. *Works and style.*—The histories of which we possess the most important part are the only works of this author that we know. They are in Latin, and were intended as a continuation of Tacitus from the reign of Nerva to the death of Valens, but the first 13 books are unfortunately lost. The 18 which remain contain the history of 25 years, 353-378, from the 17th year of Constantius. Though the narrative of the earlier books must have been on a much more contracted scale, we have cause to regret their loss, especially as the preface would doubtless have told us more of the author and of his general ideas of history; and an account of Constantine from his pen would have been only second in value to that of Julian. Those that remain, though not a complete record of events, are invaluable as the narratives of a man who was both an eye-witness and an actor in much that he relates, and a person of great cultivation. He claims to have

striven throughout to tell the truth (xxxi. ad fin.), and his account of Julian and his satirical description of Roman manners (so well known from Gibbon, chap. xxxi.) prove that he was deterred neither by admiration nor desire of praise. No Latin historian except Tacitus puts us so much on the level of the age in which he wrote, and Ammianus, though less personally interesting and less of a politician than Tacitus, is perhaps on that account a more faithful narrator. His style is that of the period, and is clearer than that of the Theodosian code, less exaggerated than that of the panegyrists. The fact that he looked to immediate recitation may be counted a source of gain as well as of loss. He is inflated and redundant in expression, harsh in construction, full of Græcisms and quotations from Greek authors (almost always expressed in Latin), as well as of verbal parallels, allusions to and quotations from Cicero, Virgil, Livy, Tacitus, etc. His use of "hae volucres" (xviii. 3, § 1; cf. Varro, *R. R.* iii. 16, *meum erat eas novisse volucres*) for bees is a striking instance of this habit. His knowledge of ancient history was considerable, and references occur not unfrequently, understood or expressed, to Herodotus and Thucydides, from the latter of whom he borrows a good deal (see Vales. on xxi. 16, § 12). His obligations to Pliny have already been mentioned: that he owes much to A. Gellius may also be noticed. The badness of his style does not, however, often produce obscurity, as soon as the reader is used to it, though many difficulties arise from the corruption of the text; nor are the references to other authors, the digressions, &c., altogether tedious. His epigrams are sometimes fortunate, as that one on the eunuch Eusebius "*apud quem si vere dici debeat multum Constantius potuit*" (xviii. 4, § 3); and generally there is no lack of liveliness or interest in the narrative. The reader must, however, be on his guard, as in the case of other writers of this period, against the tendency to exaggerate and to use vague rather than precise language, which must be counteracted in Ammianus as far as possible by the comparison of one passage with another.

IV. *Character and relations to Christianity.*—Ammianus is one of those ambiguous characters which are not uncommon on the battle-ground between an old and a new belief. We should be glad to think that both he and Claudian were Christians, but we are not able to do so. Speaking pretty constantly, and without any apparent reserve, about religious and theological questions, he would have made it plain if he had been a Christian. He seems to have been a respectable and respected man, living a happy and moral life in a time of much social misery and corruption, with a mind apt for details, and strongly imbued with the detached thoughts and feelings of the past, judging the external actions of his contemporaries according to a high moral standard, without comprehending the principles working in the age itself. His account of Julian shows both his merits and his defects. It is truthful and interesting in a high degree, but the author does not seem to have realised the critical importance of his subject in the religious history of the world. Libanius understood it better. The fact also that Ammianus chose Rome for his residence is significant, as it was the seat of hereditary non-philosophic but culti-

vated heathenism, and of a more tolerant Christianity. The poet Claudian was there in 388 (Fl. Dexter. *Chronol.* sub anno) and later: the historian Victor, who was probably an old acquaintance of Ammianus (xxi. 10, § 6), was prefect of the city under Theodosius. Of the other heathen prefects he mentions the elder Symmachus (prefect in 364, xxvii. 3, § 3), Praetextatus (pref. in 367, xxii. 7, § 6; xxvii. 9, § 8; see Macrobi., *Saturn.*) and Olybrius (pref. in 368, xxviii. 1, § 8, 4, § 1) with great commendation. Of the Christian prefects Hypatius, brother of the Empress Eusebia, seems to have been his friend (xxix. 2, § 9, 16, &c.; cf. Greg. Naz., *Ep.* 96, ed. Caillau). He does not speak of Gracculus, the predecessor of Hypatius in 378, who destroyed the Mithraeum, it would seem at the instigation of Damasus (Jerome, *Ep.* 107, vol. i. p. 678), nor of the younger Symmachus, the eloquent defender of paganism (pref. in 384). The direct mention which he makes of religious matters, heathen or Christian, coincides generally with our estimate of his character, as a practical man of literary tastes and common sense, without any strong religious convictions. The little that he seems to accept is on the authority of learned men, and is of a vague nature, such as the identification of Mercury with the soul of the world (*velocior sensus*, xvi. 5, 5; cf. xxv. 4, § 14), the assignment of a genius to each individual, for which various texts are quoted (xxi. 14, § 2), and the operations of Nemesis, to whom he gives the attributes of Fortune (xiv. 11, § 25; xxii. 3, § 10). He seems to have been a believer in an indefinite theism, under which he included, according to popular notions, a number of subordinate spirits (*substantiales potestates*, xxi. 1, § 8, cf. the first passage about Nemesis), by means of which he seeks to explain and to justify the arts of divination, which in other places he notes as open to criticism. He is content to accept auguries and oracles, and the interpretation of dreams as existing arts, supported by the authority of ancient names, and consistent with the benevolence of the divinity or the deserts of mankind, and no more to be despised because of misuse or failure than music or grammar. Hence he is not sparing in relating portents, such as appear in Livy or Tacitus, and though he condemns the recklessness of the prosecutions for magic, which were so frequent under Valens, he acknowledges in some cases the reality of the crime. The account already referred to of the trial of the conspirators at the beginning of Book xxix. is most interesting. He generally speaks of Christianity with respect, sometimes in order to criticise the inferiority of those who professed it to their faith. He says of Constantius "that he tainted the plainness and simplicity of the Christian religion by the admixture of anile superstition," and goes on to complain of the number of synods, the tumult of bishops hurrying to and fro, and the burden on the public service (xxi. 16, § 18). He speaks of George of Cappadocia as "forgetful of his profession, which counsels nothing but what is just and gentle, and turning aside to the atrocities of a delator" (xxii. 11, § 5), and a little further (ib., § 10), he defines martyrs as those "who, being urged by force to deviate from their religion, have borne torture and punishment, and passed with unsullied faith to a glorious death." He takes occasion, on describing the struggle of

Damasus and Ursinus, to contrast the pomp and luxury of the bishops of Rome with the poverty and humility of some provincial prelates, which "commend them as pure and reverend to the everlasting deity and his true worshippers" (xxvii. 3, § 12-15). While he recounts with seeming approval Julian's experience that no wild beasts are so fatal to men as most Christian sects are to one another (xxii. 5, § 4), he twice condemns in strong terms his law that Christian professors should not teach grammar or rhetoric (xxii. 10, § 7; xxv. 4, § 19), and he does not at all seem to have shared his predilection for the Jews (xxii. 5, § 5). The following references also may be consulted as bearing on the history of Christianity. Liberius and Athanasius (xv. 7, § 6-10), nuns near Amida (xviii. 10, § 4), Christians accused of burning the Temple of Apollo at Antioch (xxii. 13, § 2), Christian priests used as ambassadors (xxix. 5, § 15; xxxi. 12, § 8).

V. *Editions, &c.*—The editio princeps was issued at Rome 1478, die 7 Junii, per Georg. Sachselt et Barth. Golsch, and edited by A. Sabinus. It is faithfully printed from a very faulty MS., and contains only Books xiv.-xxvi. In 1533 appeared two critical editions, Accursius', with the last five books (Aug. Vindob. Otmar in May) and Gelenius' (Froben, Basel, in June), with all but the last book and the last page in Book xxx. Since then the most important have been, by Lindenberg, with notes (Hamb. 1609, 4); Henri Valois (Paris, Camusat, 1636, 4), the chief authority, in which the excerpts quoted as Anon. Valesii were first added; re-edited by his brother Adrian (Par. Dezallier, 1681, f); Jac. Gronovius, cum notis varr. (Lug. Bat. 1693, f); G. A. Ernesti, a text with glossary (Leipz. 1773, 8); and the most complete by J. A. Wagner and C. G. A. Erfurdt (Leipz. 1808, iii. 8), but wanting a revision of the text. A new edition of the text—which was much wanted—has been edited by Eyssenhardt, 1871. A new commentary is also to be desired. The appendix B B in Sievers' *Leben des Libanios* (Berlin, 1868, 8) may be consulted further with respect to the relations of Ammianus with him. [J. W.]

AMMON. (1) Bishop of ADRIANOPLE, in Thrace, was an Egyptian by birth. He attended the synod held at Constantinople A.D. 394 to settle the rival claims of Agapius and Bagadius to the see of Bostra (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 1151), and was again at Constantinople with Antoninus of Ephesus and other Asiatic prelates in Sept. 399. He was a warm friend of Chrysostom (Pallad. *Dial. de Chrys. Vita*).

(2) Bishop of LAODICEA *κεκαυμένη*, in Pisidia, who early in A.D. 404, took part in the council by which Chrysostom was deposed. He joined Leontius and his party in urging the application of the Antiochene canon, which deprived a deposed bishop returning without the authority of a synod, and, with Acacius of Beroea, demanded of the vacillating emperor that it should be put in force against Chrysostom (Pallad. p. 78; Soer. *H. E.* vi. 28).

(3) Bishop of PELUSIUM, an enemy of Chrysostom, charged by Palladius with having employed threats and bribes with the soldiers who were conducting Chrysostom's friends, Palladius, Demetrius, &c. into exile, to secure their maltreatment (Pallad. p. 200). Isidore of Pelusium, how-

ever, though a friend of Chrysostom, styles him *ὁ αἰδῖμος καὶ θείας σοφίας ἐμπλεὺς*. [E. V.]

AMMON (or AMON), Saint, the founder of the celebrated settlement of coenobites and hermits on and near Mons Nitria (Ruff. *de Mon.* 30); he is often styled the "father of Egyptian monasticism." He was contemporary with St. Antony, and filled the same place in Lower Egypt as Antony in the Thebaid. Being left an orphan by his parents, wealthy people near Alexandria, he was forced by his uncle to marry. But on the wedding-day he persuaded his bride to take a vow of celibacy, and for eighteen years they lived together as brother and sister: afterwards with her consent he withdrew to Nitria, and from that time only visited his wife twice a year (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 8). A great multitude of zealous disciples soon gathered round him; so that Palladius not many years later found about five thousand monks, some living quite alone, some with one or more companions; while six hundred "advanced in holiness" (τελείοι) dwelt apart from the rest in more complete isolation (Pall. 8). Several miracles are related of Ammon as of many other solitaries; and St. Antony, who died shortly after him, is said to have seen the soul of his aged brother in asceticism borne to heaven by angels (Socr. *Hist.* iv. 23; Soz. *Hist.* I. 14; Niceph. *Hist.* viii. 41). [I. G. S.]

AMMONIUS, a presbyter, said by 'Praedestinatius' to have written against the Eunomians. Probably not the Alexandrine writer of the 5th century, but an imaginary person. [H.]

AMMONIUS. (1) A disciple of Pambo, and one of the most celebrated of the monks of Nitria. Being of unusual stature, he and his brothers Dioscorus, Eusebius, and Euthymius were called the Tall Brothers (Soz. *Hist.* viii. 12). Ammonius himself was distinguished by the epithet *παρωής* (Niceph. *Hist.* xi. 37) in consequence of having cut off one of his ears to escape being made a bishop (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 12). In his youth he accompanied St. Athanasius to Rome, but could not be induced to visit any of the sights there, except the basilica of St. Peter and St. Paul (Soc. *Hist.* iv. 23; Pall. 12). He was a learned man, and could repeat, it is said, the Old and New Testament by heart, as well as passages from Origen and other fathers (Pall. 12). He never tasted cooked food (Pall. 12), and frequently gave up his cell to strangers, building himself another without a word (Ruff. 23). He was banished to Diocæsarea in the persecution under Valens (Pall. 117). After being for some time high in favour with Theophilus of Alexandria, he and his brothers were accused by him of Origenism. Sozomen and Nicephorus ascribe the accusation to personal animosity on the part of Theophilus; the former because they had interfered on behalf of Isidorus (*Hist.* viii. 12), the latter because they had reproved the bishop for being too secular (*Hist.* xiii. 10). Socrates explains the accusation as an attempt to divert from himself the odium which he had incurred as an Origenist (*Hist.* vi. 7). Jerome, however, considers the accusation merited (*Ep. ad Alex.*). Driven from Egypt the brothers took refuge first in Palestine (Niceph. *Hist.* xiii. 11) and afterwards at Constantinople, where they were well received by Chrysostom (viii. 13). There they

were protected also by the favour of the Empress Eudoxia (Soz. viii. 13), and even satisfied Epiphanius of Salamis, who came to Constantinople at the instigation of Theophilus to convict them of heresy (viii. 15). At the Synod "ad Quercum," which was held on the arrival of Theophilus, they were persuaded to submit to him, Ammonius being ill at the time. He died shortly afterwards. Theophilus is said to have wept on hearing of his death, and to have owned that Ammonius was one of the holiest monks of his time (viii. 17). Perhaps this Ammonius is the author of the *Institutiones Asceticæ*, of which twenty-two chapters are extant (Lambec. *Biblioth. Vindob.* iv. 155).

(2) An Egyptian bishop in the 4th century. At the age of 17 he was induced by hearing a sermon by Athanasius to become a monk, not having been as yet even baptized; and retired to Taberna. After passing two years there under Theodorus, and fourteen at Nitria (Gr. Inc. ap. Rosw. *V. P.* v. 7), he was as several other monks apparently made bishop by Athanasius (Ath. *ad Mon.* 306), and banished by George of Cappadocia (Ath. *de Fug.* 256). At the request of Theophilus he wrote an account of St. Theodorus (*Acta SS.* Maii 14; Cotel. *Ecc. Gr. Mon.* I.)

(3) Bishop of Pacnemunis, and in part of Elearchia, in the fourth century. Having been a monk he was made bishop by Alexander (Ath. *ad Drac.* 210, *ad Mon.* 305). He was sent with Serapion and other bishops on an embassy with Serapion from Athanasius to Constantius (Ath. *ad Drac.* 210; Soz. *Hist.* iv. 9); was banished shortly afterwards by the Arians (Ath. *ad Mon.* 305), and returned in 362, in which year he was present at the Councils of Alexandria (Ath. *ad Ant.* 615, 619), and of Sardica (Ath. c. Ar. 133).

(4) A solitary, near Canopus in the fourth century. In the persecution by Valens he fled to Palestine, and thence to Sinai. There he was an eye-witness of the devastation of the monasteries and hermitages by the Saracens. Combefis supposes him on returning to Egypt to have been ordained presbyter by Peter, and thus identifies him with the Ammonius martyred with that bishop (Eus. *Hist.* viii. 13). He thence escaped to Memphis, where he made himself a cell. His narrative, in which he mentions also a similar devastation at the same time at Raithi, is edited in Greek with Latin translation by Combefis (*Xti. Mart. Triumphi* p. 88). Cave and Tillemont give conclusive reasons against Combefis, who assigns an earlier date for supposing the Peter spoken of in this narrative to be the successor of Athanasius (cf. Soc. *Hist.* iv. 36; Soz. *Hist.* vi. 38). [I. G. S.]

AMMONIUS SACCAS. Next to nothing is known of this philosopher. That he obtained his name of Saccas (= *σακκοφόρος*) from having been a porter in his youth, is affirmed by Suidas (under *Origenes*) and Ammianus Marcellinus (xxii. 528). He was a native of Alexandria; Porphyry asserts that he was born of Christian parents, and returned to the heathen religion. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 19, 7) denies the latter statement, but it would appear most probable that Eusebius confounded him with another Ammonius, the author of a Diatessaron, still extant.

That the founder of the Alexandrian school of philosophy (for such Ammonius Saccas was) should have been at the same time a Christian, though not impossible, seems hardly likely. Moreover, the Ammonius of Eusebius wrote books; whereas, according to both Longinus and Porphyry, Ammonius Saccas wrote none. The most intimate pupils of Ammonius Saccas were Herennius, Origen, and Plotinus; according to Porphyry, he bound them by a promise not to reveal his doctrines. This promise was broken, first by Herennius, next by Origen. This story is regarded by Zeller (*Die Philosophie der Griechen*, v. 399) as apocryphal, and as invented to assimilate Ammonius to Pythagoras. The Origen above mentioned was a pagan; but the celebrated Christian of that name is also said to have listened to the lectures of Ammonius (Eusebius, *l. c.*). Plotinus is said to have been most strongly impressed with his first hearing of Ammonius, and to have cried out, "This is the man I was looking for!" (τοῦτον ἐξήκουν) after which he remained his constant friend till the death of the elder philosopher. Of the other disciples of Ammonius are mentioned the celebrated Longinus, Heracles the Christian, Olympius, and Antonius. It is possible, however, that the Christians Origen and Heracles may have been the disciples of that Ammonius whom Eusebius confounds with Ammonius Saccas, and who was himself a Christian; but this cannot be certainly known. We may guess something concerning the philosophy of Ammonius Saccas from the fact that Plotinus was his pupil. For the rest, Hierocles (*ap. Photius*) affirms that his aim was to reconcile the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. From this very probable account he would appear to have combined mysticism and eclecticism. Nemesius, a bishop and a Neoplatonist of the close of the 4th century, cites two passages, one of which he declares to contain the views of Numenius and Ammonius, the other he attributes to Ammonius alone. They concern the nature of the soul and its relation to the body. From Nemesius' words they appear to have been merely the traditional views of Ammonius, not any actual written words of his; and hence, as Zeller says, their authenticity must be considered doubtful, and not the less from their very close resemblance to the views of Plotinus; for it is hardly likely that Plotinus should have reproduced Ammonius with so little variation. The life and philosophy of Ammonius have been discussed by Vacherot, *Hist. de l'Ecole d'Alex.* i. 342; Jules Simon, *Hist. de l'Ecole d'Alex.* i. 204; Dehaut in his historical essay on the life and teaching of our philosopher, and Zeller in his *Philosophie der Griechen*, who also mentions other writers on Ammonius. [J. R. M.]

AMOENUS PRUDENTIUS, the supposed author of an Enchiridion or Manual of the Old and New Tests., called also Dittochaon or Ditychon, in 196 Latin hexameters, which are divided into 49 tetrastichs, descriptive of the principal events and characters of Scripture. Nothing is known of him except his name, which was formerly confused with that of Aur. Clemens Prudentius, among whose poems the Enchiridion is printed in the older editions, and of whom the above designation is considered by some to have been a complimentary epithet.

Sichard, who discovered the name Amoenus prefixed to the work in a Strasbourg MS., was the first to point out the error in his Scholia on Prudentius (Basil., 1537), and to assign an independent existence to Prudentius Amoenus. Although but little weight can be allowed to arguments derived from the supposed inferiority of the poem to the known works of Prudentius, or to the silence of that poet respecting it when enumerating his other works (*Praef.*), it would seem that Gennadius, on whose authority the manual was long attributed to Prudentius, is alluding to a different and more substantial work (*De Vir. Illustr.* c. 13). Amoenus is classed by Fabricius and similar writers among the poets of the 5th century, and is supposed by them to have been, like Clemens, a native of Spain. The Enchiridion was first printed as the work of Prudentius Amoenus, in the Fabrician Collection (Basil., 1562). Two other compositions are ascribed to the same author; a short hexameter fragment, entitled *Aegyptius Deum Martini invocans tempestatis periculum effugit*; and an acrostich ode, *In Leontium episcopum Burdigalensi ecclesiae redditum*, but upon what authority does not appear. (Migne, *Patrol.*, vol. lxi.) [E. M. Y.]

AMOS, bishop of JERUSALEM (called by Nicephorus NEAMUS), succeeded John III. as 57th bishop, A.D. 594. According to Baronius, *sub ann.*, who quotes Sophronius, *Prat. Spirit.* c. 149, he had previously been the abbot of a Syrian monastery. A letter of Gregory the Great to Amos is extant (*lib. vii. Ep. 7*, sub indict. i.), charging him to withhold communion with, and, if possible, to apprehend and send back to Rome a runaway acolyte named Peter. He was succeeded by Isaac A.D. 601. [E. V.]


AMPHILOCHIUS (ST.), archbishop of ICONIUM.

1. *Sources of information.* Of this great Catholic leader, who was regarded by his contemporaries as the foremost man in the Eastern Church after his friends Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus, very scanty information remains. The works ascribed to him are mostly spurious; and the life (Migne, *Patr. Graec.* xxxix. p. 14) is a later fiction, presenting the usual features of monkish hagiologies and wholly untrustworthy as a biographical record. The following references to the writings of his two great friends and contemporaries contain nearly all that is known of him and his family: *Greg. Naz. Epist.* 9, 13, 22-28, 62, 63, 171, 184, *Test. ii.* p. 203 sq., *Carm.* ii. pp. 1030, 1068, 1116-1120, 1148-1152; Basil, *Epist.* 150, 161, 163, 176, 188, 190, [191], 199-202, 217, 218, 231-236, 248, *de Spir. Sanct.* § 1 sq., § 79. The references here and throughout this article are to the Benedictine edition of Gregory completed by Caillau (Paris, 1840), and to Garnier's edition of Basil (Paris, 1730). Occasional notices which occur in other writers, such as Jerome, Theodoret, &c., will be given in their proper places. Of modern biographies Tillemont's alone deserves special mention (*Mémoires* ix. p. 617 sq., with the notes *ib.* p. 744 sq.). To this should be added the account of his family relations in the Benedictine life of Gregory, and the portions of Garnier's life of Basil relating to

him. On the works genuine or spurious which bear the name of Amphilocheus, see Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* viii. p. 373 sq., Tillemont, ix. p. 745 sq. They are included in Galland, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* vii. p. 457 sq., and in Migne's *Patr. Graec.* xxxix, with the exception of the *Iambics to Seleucus*

which appear in the editions of Gregory Nazianzen (e.g. Caillau, ii. p. 1088).

2. *Parentage and connexions.* Amphilocheus appears to have been a first cousin of Gregory Nazianzen, as the following genealogical table will show:—



This cousinship depends on the identification of Philtatius the maternal grandfather of Gregory (*Carm.* ii. p. 1146) with Philtatius the father of the elder Amphilocheus (*ib.* p. 1150). The identification is confirmed by the fact that the two Gorgonias are thus brought into connexion as grandmother and granddaughter; and though Gregory never distinctly calls Amphilocheus his cousin, yet the relationship seems to be implied in occasional expressions scattered through his writings (see Greg. *Op.* i. p. xlv sq.). Amphilocheus, the father, was a Cappadocian, a native of the small town of Diocaesarea (either identical with or close to Nazianzus), of which he was the pride. He was a forensic pleader and attained to high eminence in his profession. To his friends he afforded generous and ready help, and seems to have been as amiable in private life as he was famous at the bar. The Graces and the Muses,^a wrote his nephew, united in him. He lived to see his son a bishop, and died in advanced age. Among the poems of Gregory are several touching epitaphs on his uncle, from which these facts are gathered (ii. p. 1148–1150). He had himself learnt the use of language from his uncle, and in celebrating his memory he was fulfilling a debt of gratitude and returning like for like (*λόγῳ λόγον . . . ἀντιχαρίζμενος*). On the other hand Livia, the mother of Amphilocheus, died in the prime of life, “still bright with the bloom of youth.” Her gentleness and her wisdom were alike remarkable. At her death she left three children, two sons and a daughter, with their father Amphilocheus, to mourn her loss (*ib.* pp. 1116, 1118). The two sons, Euphemius and Amphilocheus, were devotedly attached to each other, “a holy pair, one soul, two bodies, in all things brothers, in blood, in renown, in wisdom . . . bright stars shining conspicuous among all the Cappadocians.” But “envy cast her fell glance on them both.” Death carried off Euphemius in the bloom of youth on the eve of his nuptials, and left but “half of Amphilocheus.” He appears from his cousin’s account to have been singularly handsome, amiable, and gifted in all ways. Gregory compares him to the lightning flash, dazzling with its brilliancy but quenched in a moment (*ib.* pp. 1118, 1120). The sister of Amphilocheus, whose name appears to have been Theodosia,^b survived many years,

and earned the gratitude of her generation as the instructress of the famous St. Olympias. [OLYMPIAS.] She was a living pattern to her pupil in every word and deed (*ib.* p. 1068).

3. *Early life.* Whether Amphilocheus, like his father, was a native of Diocaesarea, does not appear. The language of Basil (*Epist.* 161) might seem rather to imply that he was born and lived in Basil’s own town, Caesarea. At all events, whether owing to distance or from other reasons, Gregory expresses regret that he did not see much of Amphilocheus during his earlier years (*Epist.* 13). Their intimate friendship commenced at a later date. Amphilocheus, like many other eminent Christian fathers, was educated for the bar. The letters of his cousin imply that he carried on his profession at Constantinople. It was apparently during his residence there that Gregory writes to recommend two friends, Euthalius (*Epist.* 9) and Nicobulus (*Epist.* 13), to his care.^c The former letter seems to have been written not long after the year 362, and the latter about 365. What was the age of Amphilocheus at this time we do not know; but as Basil and Gregory, who were born about the year 329, both speak of him as their “son” (Basil. *Epist.* 176, Greg. Naz. *Epist.* 22, 23, 184), he must have been somewhat younger than either, and therefore still a very young man. This agrees with the next incident recorded of him. About the year 369 he appears to have got into trouble about money matters, having allied himself to a knave through his inexperience and confiding disposition. What the nature of the transaction was does not appear; but Gregory writes on his cousin’s behalf to three persons of high station and influence at Constantinople, Sophronius, Caesarius, and Themistus, asking them to give him their advice and aid (*Epist.* 22, 23, 24). The last mentioned, the famous orator, though not a Christian, was a friend of the elder Amphilocheus; and on this ground Gregory appeals to him to protect the son, “my Amphilocheus,” as he calls him, adding that he is such as not to disgrace either his parentage or their friendship.

4. *Retirement and dedication to God.* It is not improbable that this trouble weaned Amphilocheus from his worldly pursuits and turned his thoughts inward. At all events we trace somewhere about this time a complete change in

^a Χάριτες Μούσαισι μεμυγμένα. There can be no doubt that the superscription of this poem (ii. p. 1150) ought to be read Εἰς Ἀμφιλόχιον ἄλλο (for ἄλλος).

^b Gregory calls her Θεοῦ δότις (p. 1068), the nearest approach to her name which his metre allows. The name Θεοδόσις occurs in Boeckh, *Inscr.* 9607.

^c It is not always clear whether a letter is addressed to the elder or the younger Amphilocheus. In such cases the view which seems the more probable has been silently adopted.

is mode of life. He has abandoned his profession, and is living in retirement at Ozizala, levoting himself apparently to religious exercises and to the care of his aged father. His cousin Gregory appears to have been mainly instrumental in bringing about this change. At least he says with honest pride, that "together with the pure Thecla"^a he had "sent Amphilocheus to God" (*Op.* ii. p. 1068); an expression which seems to refer rather to this retirement and self-dedication of Amphilocheus than to his later elevation to the episcopate. And now his closer friendship with Basil and Gregory begins. Ozizala was situated not far from Nazianzus, for Gregory's correspondence implies that they were near neighbours. On one occasion Gregory, who is expecting a visit from Basil, writes playfully to Amphilocheus asking him to send a stock of herbs in which Ozizala, otherwise barren, abounded, to regale their common friend; and on receiving what he affects to consider a very niggardly quantity, threatens to cut off his supply of corn (*Epist.* 25, 26, 27). A letter of Basil, apparently belonging to this period, is of a graver cast. He writes in the name of one Heraclidas, who, like Amphilocheus, had renounced the profession of the bar and devoted himself to a religious life. Heraclidas excuses himself from joining Amphilocheus, being lodged in a large hospital (πρωχοτροφείον) recently erected by Basil near Caesarea, where he enjoys the constant instructions of the bishop. He urges Amphilocheus to obtain leave from his father to visit Caesarea and profit by the teaching and example of the same instructor. Basil's great topic, he says, is the abandonment of all worldly riches (*Epist.* 150). This letter was written in the year 372 or 373 (see Garnier's Basil. *Op.* iii. p. cxxxiv).

5. *Episcopate.* This invitation to Caesarea appears to have been promptly accepted, and was fraught with immediate and important consequences. It does not appear that at the time of Basil's letter Amphilocheus was even ordained; yet at the very beginning of the year 374 we find him occupying the important see of Iconium. This sudden elevation has a parallel in his contemporary, Ambrose of Milan, who was nominated to the see while only a catechumen. Yet at this time Amphilocheus can hardly have been more than about 35 years of age. It is no surprise therefore to find that he undertook this important office with great reluctance. Amphilocheus had fled from him, writes Basil in a congratulatory letter, but had been caught in the inevitable meshes of grace and dragged into the heart of Pisidia. He might well say with David, "Whither shall I flee then from Thy presence?" His native country had lost him, but a neighbouring province had found him (*Epist.* 161). It would thus appear that Basil had destined him for some office in the Cappadocian Church. But however this may be, it was evidently the writer's influence, exerted in some way or other, which secured him for the more important position. The elder Amphilocheus, thus de-

prived of his son's care in his old age, complained of the cruelty of Gregory, through whom he had been taken away. Gregory, who at this moment was mourning the death of his own father, writes in reply to defend himself (*Epist.* 63). The loss of Amphilocheus, his good counsellor, the stay and the partner of his religious life, would be felt by no one, he says, more than by himself: nor indeed was he the offender; but, to tell the truth, he had himself been overpowered by the strong will of a common friend (ἡμᾶς τοὺς οὐδὲν ἀδικούντας ἀλλ', εἰ δεῖ τὰ ληθὲς εἰπεῖν, τὰ ἴσα τυραννηθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν κοινῶν φίλων). When we remember the circumstances of Gregory's own life, we can hardly doubt that he here alludes to the iron will of his friend Basil, to whose fatal influence he himself was forced to succumb at a great crisis. And we learn from one of Basil's own letters that he did not lack the opportunity which this appointment implies. A few months before this time Faustinus, bishop of Iconium, had died, and the Iconians applied to the bishop of Caesarea to recommend them a successor (Basil. *Epist.* 138). Why there should have been this delay we do not know; but it is impossible not to connect this application to Basil with the ultimate appointment of Amphilocheus, the allusion in Gregory's letter forming a connecting-link between the two.

From this time forward till his death, which happened about five years afterwards, Basil holds close and affectionate intercourse with Amphilocheus, communicating with him again and again by letter, and receiving from him frequent visits. The first of these visits took place soon after his consecration, about Easter 374, and was somewhat protracted. His ministrations on this occasion made a deep impression on the people of Caesarea, who after his departure longed to see and to hear him again (*Epist.* 163, 176).

This, however, was not usually the season which he preferred for his visits. The great annual festival at Caesarea was the celebration of Eupsychius and other martyrs in September. A few days earlier was the anniversary of Basil's poor-hospital (*Epist.* 94), which had a special interest for Amphilocheus as the place where he, with his friend Heraclidas, had lodged at the most momentous crisis of their lives, and which was connected with their most solemn thoughts. For this reason he seems to have chosen the autumn for his visits to his spiritual father. It was probably on the earliest of these annual visits, A.D. 374 (see Garnier, *Op.* iii. p. cxi.), that Amphilocheus urged Basil to clear up all doubt respecting his doctrine of the Holy Spirit by writing a treatise on the subject. This was the occasion of Basil's extant work, *de Spiritu Sancto* (see § 1), which, when completed, was dedicated to the petitioner himself and sent to him engrossed on vellum (*Epist.* 231). During this and the following year Basil likewise addresses to Amphilocheus his three *Canonical Letters* (*Epist.* 188, 199, 217), to solve some questions relating to ecclesiastical order, which the bishop of Iconium had propounded to him. At this same period also we find Amphilocheus arranging the ecclesiastical affairs of Isauria (*Epist.* 190), Lycania (*Epist.* 200), and Lycia (*Epist.* 218), under the direction of Basil. He is also invited

^a This seems to be the same Thecla with whom Gregory elsewhere corresponds. The interpretation which refers the expression to the monastery of S. Thecla, whither Gregory retired, has less to recommend it.

by Basil to assist in the administration of his own diocese of Caesarea, which has become too great a burden for him, prostrated as he now is by a succession of maladies (*Epist.* 200, 201). The affectionate confidence which the great man—strong as ever in the strength of an unbending will, but weak through physical infirmity—reposes in his younger friend, is a powerful testimony to the character and influence of Amphilocheus, of whom otherwise so little is known.

After the death of Basil, the slender thread by which we trace the career of Amphilocheus is taken up in the correspondence of Gregory. Gregory writes with equal affection and esteem, and with more tenderness than Basil. He has been ill, and he speaks of Amphilocheus as having helped to work his cure. Sleeping and waking, he has him ever in his mind. He mentions the many letters which he had received from Amphilocheus (μυρίαις γράφαις), and which have called forth harmonies from his soul, as the plectrum strikes music out of the lyre (*Epist.* 171).

The last of Gregory's letters to Amphilocheus (*Epist.* 184) seems to have been written about the year 383. Not long before (A.D. 381) Amphilocheus had been present with his friend at the Council of Constantinople, and had subscribed to the creed there sanctioned, as chief pastor of the Lycaonian Church, at the head of twelve other bishops (Labb. *Conc.* ii. p. 1135, ed. Coleti). At this council a metropolitan authority was confirmed to, rather than conferred on, his see of Iconium; for we find it occupying this position even before his election to the episcopate. During this sojourn at Constantinople he signs his name as first witness to Gregory's will (Greg. *Op.* ii. p. 204), in which the testator leaves directions to restore to his most reverend son the bishop Amphilocheus the purchase-money of an estate at Canotala (*ib.* p. 203). It was probably on this occasion also that Amphilocheus fell in with Jerome and read to him a book which he had written on the Holy Spirit (Hieron. *de Vir.* iii. 133), as the great Latin father is known to have paid a visit to Gregory Nazianzen at this time (Hieron. *Op.* xi. 65 sq., ed. Vallarsi).

About two years later must be placed the well-known incident in which the zeal of Amphilocheus against the Arians appears (Theodt. *H. E.* v. 16).^{*} Obtaining an audience of Theodosius, he saluted the emperor himself with the usual marks of respect, but paid no attention to his son Arcadius, who had recently (*νεωστὶ*) been created Augustus and was present at the interview. Theodosius, indignant at this slight, demanded an explanation. "Sire," said the bishop, "any disrespect shown to your son arouses your displeasure. Be assured therefore, that the Lord of the universe abhorreth those who are ungrateful towards His Son, their Saviour and Benefactor." The emperor, adds Theodoret, immediately issued an edict prohibiting the meetings of the heretics. As Arcadius

was created Augustus in the beginning of the year 383 (Clinton *Fast. Rom.* i. p. 504), and as Theodosius issued his edict against the Eunomians, Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarians in September of the same year (*ib.* p. 507), the date is accurately ascertained (see Tillem. *Mém. Eccl.* vi. pp. 627 sq., 802).

In this same year (383) also we find Amphilocheus taking energetic measures against heretics of a different stamp. He presided over a synod of twenty-five bishops assembled at Sida in Pamphylia, in which the Messalians [MESSALIANS] were condemned, and his energy seems to have instigated the religious crusade which led to the extirpation of this heresy (Photius *Bibl.* 52, Theodt. *Eccl. Hist.* iv. 10; comp. Labb. *Conc.* ii. 1209, ed. Coleti).

The date of Amphilocheus' death is uncertain. When Jerome wrote the work quoted above, he was still living (A.D. 392); and two years later (A.D. 394) his name occurs among the bishops present at a synod held at Constantinople, when the new basilica of St. Peter and St. Paul was dedicated (Labb. *Conc.* ii. 1378, ed. Coleti). On the other hand he is not mentioned in connection with the troubles of St. Chrysostom (A.D. 403 sq.); and as so important a person could hardly have failed to take part in the controversy, it is a fairly safe assumption that he was no longer living. The martyrologies have made Amphilocheus survive to a very advanced age, but he probably died in middle life. His day is given as Nov. 23 in both Greek and Latin calendars.

6. *Works.* The genuine works of Amphilocheus, still extant, are very scanty.

(1) *Iambi ad Seleucum.* An iambic poem addressed to Seleucus, the grandson of Trajanus (Tillemont, ix. p. 747), and nephew of St. Olympias. Its object is to instruct the young man in a godly life and to deter him from the prevailing vices of the age. Its chief present value however consists in the list of Canonical Scriptures with which it closes (see Westcott, *Canon*, pp. 396, 497). On the strength of a note added by some scholiast (ταῦτα δοκεῖ μοι τοῦ Θεολόγου τυγχάνειν φρονέος, ὡς παρὰ Ἀμφιλοχίου γράφεται, i.e. they seem to accord with the mind of Gregory the Divine, and to have been written by him in the name of Amphilocheus) this poem has been assigned by many editors to Gregory Nazianzen and generally appears among his works. Internal and external evidence alike are against this hypothesis. It is attributed to Amphilocheus in the MSS., and referred to as his by Cosmas Indic. vii. (ii. p. 292, Montf.), and Zonaras in Can. xxvii. Conc. Carth. (Beve-reg. *Pand. Can.* ii. p. 549); while it betrays another hand than Gregory's, as well in the style and versification as in the list of Canonical Scriptures (see Tillemont, ix. p. 746; Galland. *Bibl.* vii. p. xi). This poem is included in Combefis (p. 116 sq.), but not in Migne. It may be found in most editions of Gregory Nazianzen.

(2) *Epistola Synodica* (Migne, p. 94), on the Macedonian heresy. Its object is to explain why the Nicene fathers did not dwell on the doctrine of the Spirit, and to justify the ordinary form of the doxology. It is entitled Ἀμφιλοχίου Βασιλείου in one MS., but was certainly not written by Basil, who indeed is mentioned in the body of the letter. It was first published by Cotelier, *Mon. Eccl.* ii. p. 99 sq.

* Sozomen (vii. 6) tells the story, but without giving the name of the bishop. He describes him as "an old man, a priest of an obscure city, simple and inexperienced in affairs." This description is as unlike Amphilocheus as it could possibly be.

(3) *Fragments*, preserved in Theodoret, Darnasene, and others. These consist of extracts from (i) Discourses on various texts, chiefly Christological, e.g. Matt. xxiv. 36, Luke ii. 52, John v. 19, &c. A large number of these texts are taken from St. John. (ii) Letters to Seleucus the same to whom the lambics are addressed, to Pancharius deacon of Sida, to the people of Syedra, all on dogmatic subjects. (iii) Controversial and other treatises; e.g. *Against the Arians*, *On the Spurious Writings used by the Heretics*, *On Isaiah*, *On the Generation according to the Flesh*, *On the Son the Word*. It is strange that no fragment is quoted from the work *On the Holy Spirit*, which Amphilochius read to Jerome (see above).

Besides these genuine works, Combefis also published eight discourses bearing his name; but all or most of these seem to be spurious (see Tillemont, p. 747). Another, entitled *In Mesopentecosten* &c., was published by Matthaei (*Gregor. Thesal. Archiep. x. Orat. &c.*, Mosquae, 1776: see Migne, p. 119); but this also belongs probably to the same category. A *Life of Basil* and a *Life of Ephrem* also bear his name, but are clearly not his productions; and the same is true of other works which it is not necessary to enumerate. Some of these may have been written by Amphilochius of Sida (2) in the 5th, or Amphilochius of Cyzicus in the 9th century (see Fabric. viii. p. 382).

7. *Reputation and character*. Of his ability and character as a theologian and a writer the extant fragments are wholly inadequate as a criterion; but his reputation with his contemporaries and with the later Church leaves very little ground for doubt. His contemporary Jerome, an eminently competent judge, speaks of the Cappadocian triad, Basil, Gregory, and Amphilochius, as writers "who cram (refarciunt) their books with the lessons and sentences of the philosophers to such an extent that you cannot tell which you ought to admire most in them, their secular erudition or their Scriptural knowledge," *Epist.* 70 (i. p. 429). Theodoret, in the next generation, lavishes epithets on him, "the most famous" (πανεξένητος), "the most wise," "the wonderful" (*Eccl. Hist.* iv. 10, v. 16); and he is quoted by Cyril of Alexandria and by later fathers. In the Council of Chalcedon his authority is cited with respect (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1145). In the Quinisextine Council his canons are approved (*ib.* vii. 1346); and in the 2nd Council of Nicaea (A.D. 787) he is more than once quoted (viii. 1133, 1444).

Of his character his intimate friends are the best witnesses. The trust reposed in him by Basil and Gregory appears throughout their correspondence. The former more especially praises his love of learning and patient investigation, addressing him as his "brother Amphilochius, his dear friend most honoured of all" (*de Spir. Sanct.* § 1); while the latter speaks of him as "the blameless high-priest, the loud herald of truth, his pride" (*Carm.* ii. p. 1068). He seems to have united the genial sympathy which endears the friend, and the administrative energy which constitutes the ruler, with intellectual abilities and acquirements of no mean order.

(2) Bishop of SIDA in Pamphylia. Like his more famous namesake of Iconium, he appears as an antagonist of the Messalians. He was

urged, as one of the Pamphylian metropolitans, to take measures against them in encyclical letters written by two successive bishops of Constantinople, Atticus and Sisinnius (*Phot. Bibl.* 52), and seems to have prosecuted the matter with zeal. He brought forward the subject at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) in conjunction with Valerianus; and in consequence of their representations the council confirmed the decrees of former synods against these heretics (Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 1331 sq., ed. Coleti). At this same council we find him assenting to Cyril's letter, and subscribing in very strong language to the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius (*ib.* pp. 1012, 1046, 1077, 1133).

His conduct on a later occasion was marked by great vacillation, if not insincerity. It is sometimes stated that he was present at the "robber's synod" (A.D. 449), and there committed himself to the policy of Dioscorus and the heresy of Eutyches (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 998). His name, however, does not appear in the list of bishops assembled there (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 889 sq.), and the statement is quite unwarranted. At the Council of Chalcedon, however, (A.D. 451), he showed great tenderness for Dioscorus, and here his career of tergiversation began. He tried to defer the second citation of Dioscorus (iv. 1260); and when after three citations Dioscorus did not appear, he consented to his condemnation, though with evident reluctance (iv. 1310, 1337). At a later session too, he subscribed his assent to the Epistle of Pope Leo (iv. 1358, 1366); and we find his name also appended to the canons of the council (iv. 1715). Thus he committed himself fully to the principles of this council, and to the reversal of the proceedings of the *Latrocinium*. But a few years later (A.D. 458), when the emperor Leo wrote to the bishops to elicit their opinions, Amphilochius stated in reply, that, while he disapproved the appointment of Timotheus Aelurus, he did not acknowledge the authority of the Council of Chalcedon (Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 10). Yet, as if this were not enough, we are told that he shortly afterwards assented and subscribed to its decrees (Eulogius in *Phot. Bibl.* 230).

The possibility that some of the Homilies ascribed to Amphilochius of Iconium may have been written by his namesake of Sida, has been already mentioned. [L.]

AMPHION (or ALERION, or AMPHITRION), bishop of EPIPHANIA in Cilicia Secunda, a confessor in the persecution of Maximin, attended the Councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea, A.D. 314, and Nicaea, 325. (Labbe, *Concil.* i. 1505, 1518, ii. 56.) Athanasius mentions his having combated the Arian doctrines by his writings. (Athan. *Disput. prima cont. Arian.*) He is identified by Baronius with the Amphion translated to Nicomedia in place of Eusebius; but this is doubted by Tillemont. He appears in the Roman martyrology, June 12. [E. V.]

AMPULLIANUS, according to 'Praedestinatus' (i. 63), a "Bithynian heresiarch," who taught that all the wicked with the devil and evil spirits are purified by fire and restored to their primitive innocence; and when his doctrine was impugned by the Church, alleged the authority of Origen *De Principiis*. Possibly a fictitious person, as 'Praedestinatus' is fertile in

the invention of orthodox councils and writers. Ampullianus is his only heretic not otherwise known. [H.]

ANACLETUS. [CLETUS.]

ANASTASIA, an Illyrian matron, first tortured by her husband and then burned by the judge in the island of Palmaria (Baron. Dec. 25; and see Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 327, 717). "Reliquiae S. Anastasiae pharmaceutriae," were brought from Sirmium to Constantinople by Pulcheria, before A.D. 450 (Niceph. xiv. 10). See Suidas s. v. *χρυσόγονος*; and Theodorus Lector ii. [A. W. H.]

ANASTASIUS, bishop of ANCYRA, one of the metropolitans to whom the Emperor Leo writes concerning the death of Proterius, A.D. 458. His answer is extant (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1921 sq., ed. Coleti). He was also present at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 459 (*ib.* v. 49). [L.]

ANASTASIUS, a presbyter of ANTIOCH, celebrated in ecclesiastical history as the confidential friend and counsellor of Nestorius, who accompanied him on his elevation to the archiepiscopal seat of Constantinople, and by his bold uncompromising language aroused the storm which so long raged through the Christian world and swept Nestorius to destruction. Theophanes styles him the "Syncellus," or confidential secretary of Nestorius, who never took any step without consulting him, and being guided by his opinions. Nestorius having commenced a vexatious persecution against the Quartodecimans of Asia in 428, two presbyters, Antonius and Jacobus, were despatched to carry his designs into effect. They were furnished with letters commendatory from Anastasius and Photius, bearing witness to the soundness of their faith. These two emissaries of the Archbishop of Constantinople did not restrict themselves to their ostensible object, to set the Asiatics right as to the keeping of Easter, but endeavoured to tamper with their faith. At Philadelphia they persuaded some simple-minded clergy to sign a creed of doubtful orthodoxy, attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia. This was strongly opposed by Charisius, the oeconomus of the Church, who charged Jacobus with unsoundness in the faith. His opposition aroused the indignation of Anastasius and Photius, who despatched fresh letters, reasserting the orthodoxy of Jacobus, and requiring the deprivation of Charisius. (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 1202, sq., Socr. vii. 29.) It was in a sermon preached by Anastasius at Constantinople that the fatal words were uttered that destroyed the peace of the Church for so many years to come, and awoke the fiercest and most unchristian passions. "Let no one," said the fearless orator, "call Mary Θεοτόκος. She was but a human being. It is impossible for God to be born of a human being." These words were eagerly caught up by the enemies of Nestorius. They caused great excitement among clergy and laity, which was greatly increased when the archbishop by supporting and defending Anastasius adopted the language as his own. (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 32; Evag. *H. E.* i. 2.) [NESTORIUS.] In 430, when Cyril had sent a deputation to Constantinople with an address to the emperor, Anastasius seems to have made some attempt to bring about an accommodation be-

tween him and Nestorius. (Cyril, *Ep.* viii.; Mercator. vol. ii. p. 49.) We find him after the deposition of Nestorius still maintaining his cause and animating his party at Constantinople. (Lupus, *Ep.* 144.)

Tillemont identifies him with the Anastasius who in 434 wrote to Helladius, bishop of Tarsus, when he and the Oriental bishops were refusing to recognize Proclus as bishop of Constantinople bearing witness to his orthodoxy, and urging them to receive him into communion. (Baluz. § 144.) [E. V.]

ANASTASIUS, patriarch of CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 703. His predecessor Germanus, whose pupil and "syncellus" he had been, had predicted that he would be calamitous to the Church (Theoph. *Chron.* 341 *Par.*; Zonar. *Annal.* iii.). He was promoted by the influence of the Emperor Leo Isaurus, after the abdication or deposition of Germanus. According to one account force was employed by the emperor to intimidate those who opposed the election; and when the populace, headed by some nuns, rioted against the new Patriarch for removing an image of Christ from the palace, the ringleaders were executed (*Vit. Stephani Jun.* ap. *Analecta Gr. Bened.* I.). Certainly Anastasius favoured the iconoclasts, which led to his excommunication by Gregory III. (Theoph. 343), and this is not unreasonably imputed to his obsequiousness to Leo and his son Constantinus Copronymus; for he was equally complaisant to Artabasdas when he seized the throne for a time (Theoph. 348; Zonar. iii.). He was most ignominiously punished on the return to power of Constantinus, though allowed in mockery to retain his see (Theoph. 353), and died miserably of a loathsome disease, 753 A.D. By some chronologies he was made Patriarch in 728 A.D. [I. G. S.]

ANASTASIUS, bishop of NICAËA, present at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). At the earlier sessions he had not arrived, and was represented by two presbyters (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 852, 1196, 1358, 1378); but later he appears and subscribes in person (*ib.* 1443, 1521, 1713, 1730). At the 13th session he was charged by Eunomius of Nicomedia with invading his metropolitan rights over the churches of Bithynia. The session was taken up in discussing this question, and the decision was given against Anastasius. The bishop of Nicaea was henceforth to retain the title without exercising the jurisdiction of a metropolitan (*ib.* 1627 sq.). [L.]

ANASTASIUS, bishop of NICAËA. He was present at the Synod of Constantinople in 518, and signed the letter to the patriarch John, condemning Severus (Labbe, *Conc.* v. 1137). His name also appears attached to the letter of the Synod of 520 to Hormisdas on the appointment of Epiphanius (*ib.* 657). And he took part also in the proceedings of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 536 (*ib.* 1058, 1232). To this Anastasius of Nicaea is probably to be ascribed the Commentary on the Psalms, which is extant in MS. Bibl. Coisl. p. 389, and is quoted in the *Catenae*; see Fabric. *B. G.* x. p. 610, ed. Harles. Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* i. p. 644) postulates (for what reasons he does not state) a third and later Anastasius of Nicaea, to whom he assigns this commentary. [L.]

ANASTASIUS I., bishop of ROME, consecrated A.D. 398 ("Honorio IV. et Eutychiano coss." *resp. Aq. Chron.*), and died in April, A.D. 402 (*Anast. Bibl. vol. i. p. 62*). According to Anastasius Bibliothecarius, he put an end to an unseemly strife between the priests and deacons of his church, by enacting that priests as well as deacons should stand bowing ("curvi starent") at the reading of the Gospels. Jerome calls him a "vir insignis," who was taken from the evil to come, i.e. who died before the sack of Rome by Goths, A.D. 410.

There is one letter by Anastasius still extant. Rufinus wrote to him shortly after his consecration (not later than A.D. 400, *Constant. Epp. Pont. Romanorum*, p. 714) to defend himself against the charge of complicity in the heresy which was ascribed to Origen. Anastasius replies (see *Constant. loc. cit.*) in a tone which, dealing leniently with Rufinus, explicitly condemns Origen.

Besides this, nine other letters are referred to:—1-5. Correspondence with Paulinus, bishop of Nola (Paulinus Nolanus, *ep. 20*). 6. To Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, giving him jurisdiction over Illyria; referred to by Innocent I., in his 1st letter (*Constant.*). 7. To Johannes, bishop of Jerusalem. 8. To African bishops, who had sent him an embassy to complain of the low state of their clergy. 9. Contra Rufinum, an epistle sent ad Orientem. Hieron. (*Apolog. lib. 3*). [G. H. M.]

ANASTASIUS II., bishop of ROME, succeeded Gelasius I. in November, A.D. 496 (*Clinton's Fasti Romani*, pp. 536, 713). The next month after his accession Clovis [Chlodowig?] was baptized, and the new pope wrote him a letter, congratulating him on his conversion. Anastasius has left a name of ill-odour in the nostrils of the Western Church; but this is attributable to his having had the boldness to take a different line from his predecessors with regard to the Eastern Church. Pope Felix III. [FELIX III.] had excommunicated Acacius of Constantinople, professedly on account of his communicating with heretics, but really because Zeno's Henoticon, which he had sanctioned, gave the Church of Constantinople a primacy in the East which the see of Rome could not tolerate. Gelasius I. [GELASIUS I.] had followed closely in the steps of Felix. But we find Anastasius, in the year of his accession, sending two bishops (Germanus of Capua and Cresconius of Todi (Baronius) to Constantinople, with a proposal that Acacius' name, instead of being expunged from the roll of Patriarchs of Constantinople as Gelasius had proposed, should be left upon the diptychs, and no more should be said upon the subject. This proposal was in the very spirit of the Henoticon; and by this he gave lasting offence to the Western Church. After this it need excite no surprise to hear that he was charged with communicating secretly with Photinus, a deacon of Thessalonica who held with Acacius; and of wishing to heal the breach between the Eastern and Western Church;—for so it is that it seems best to interpret the words in the narrative of Anastasius Bibliothecarius—"voluit revocare Acacium" (*vol. i. p. 83*).

Anastasius died in November, A.D. 498, when he had almost completed the second year of his pontificate. But his memory did not die with

him, for he was still remembered as the traitor who would have reversed the excommunication of Acacius; and Dante finds him suffering in hell the punishment due to one whom "Fotino" seduced from the right way (*Dante, Inf. xi. 8, 9*).

Two epistles written by him are extant: one in which he informs the Emperor Anastasius of his accession (*Mansi, viii. p. 188*); the other to Clovis, mentioned above (*ib. p. 193*). [G. H. M.]

ANASTASIUS SINAITA (Ἀναστάσιος Σιναΐτης). Three of this name are mentioned by ecclesiastical writers, among whom some confusion exists. Two were patriarchs of Antioch, and it has been reasonably questioned whether they were ever monks of Mount Sinai, and whether the title "Sinaita" has not been erroneously given to them from their being confounded with the one who really was so.

(1) Bishop of ANTIOCH, succeeded Domnus III. A.D. 559 (*Clinton, Fasti Romani*). He is praised by Evagrius (*H. E. iv. 40*) for his theological learning, the strictness of his life, and his well-balanced character in intercourse with others. He resolutely opposed Justinian's edict in favour of the Aphthartodocetae, and encouraged the monastic bodies of Syria who had applied to him for advice to maintain their ground against it, A.D. 563 (*Evag. iv. 39, 40*). Justinian, in consequence, threatened him with deposition and exile, but his death in 565 hindered his design, which was however carried into effect five years later by his nephew Justin II., A.D. 570. Fresh charges were brought against Anastasius of profuse expenditure of the funds of his see, and of intemperate language and action in reference to the consecration of John, bishop of Alexandria, by John, bishop of Constantinople, in the lifetime of the former bishop, Eutychius (*Evag. v. 1*; Valesius' notes, *ibid.*; Theophan. *Chron.*; *Clinton, Fast. Rom.*). He was succeeded by Gregory, on whose death, in the middle of 593 (*Clinton*), he was restored to his episcopate. This was chiefly due to the influence of Gregory the Great, who had pleaded his cause with the Emperor Maurice and his son Theodosius, adding the request that if not reinstated he might be allowed to reside at Rome (*Evag. vi. 24*; *Gregor. Mag. Ep. i. 25, 27*; *Ind. ix.*). Gregory wrote him a congratulatory letter on his return to Antioch (*Ep. iv. 37*; *Ind. xiv.*); and several epistles are preserved in the collection of his letters, relating to the claim the bishop of Constantinople was then making to the title of "universal bishop," and remonstrating with him on the milder view he was inclined to take of the assumption (*Ep. iv. 36*, *Ind. xiii.*; *vi. 24, 31*, *Ind. xv.*). Anastasius defended the orthodox view of the Procession of the Holy Ghost (*Baron. Annal. Eccl. 593*), and died at the close of 598 (*Clinton, Fast. Rom.*).

Five sermons, "De Orthodoxa fide," and five others, printed in a Latin version by Migne and others, are ascribed by some to this Anastasius. Oudin, Dupin, and others, refer them more probably to a later Anastasius. For a catalogue and description of the works assigned to him, either existing or lost, see Fabricius *Bibl. Graec. vol. ix. pp. 332-336*, and Migne.

(2) Succeeded the elder Anastasius as bishop of Antioch in the beginning of 599. We have a letter of Gregory the Great to him (*Ep. vii. 48*,

Ind. ii.) acknowledging the receipt of one announcing his appointment, and declaring his adherence to the orthodox faith. Gregory had already written to him before 597 (*Ep.* vii. 3, Ind. i.), exhorting him to constancy under the persecutions of heretics. He translated Gregory's *De Curâ Pastoralis* into Greek (*ib.* x. 22, Ind. v.). His death occurred in an insurrection of the Jews, Sept. 610 (Clinton, *F. R.*), by whom his dead body was horribly mutilated and burnt. Nicephorus (*H. E.* xviii. 44) confounds him with his predecessor.

(3) A priest and monk of the monastery of Mount Sinai, to whom, from his contemplative life spent in the sacred mountain, the title of *Μωσῆς νέος*, was given in later times. He has been erroneously confounded by Nicephorus and many modern writers with the two bishops of Antioch of the same name, and his writings have been attributed to the earlier of them; but it is plain from his *Hodegos* that he lived late in the 7th century. This Anastasius is scarcely known to us except from his works, which, though voluminous, are of little value. He was a zealous champion of the orthodox faith against the Monophysites, and leaving his monastery traversed Syria and Egypt with the view to controverting their doctrines. He held public disputations with the chiefs of their party at Alexandria (*Hodegos*, c. x.), and, according to his own statement, confuted them thoroughly, and roused the popular indignation against them so as almost to lead to their being stoned. A full catalogue and description of his writings may be found in Fabricius *Bibl. Græc.* vol. ix. pp. 313-322, printed also in Migne's edition of his works. The most noteworthy are the following—(1) *Ὁδηγος*, or "Guide to the true way," written against the Monophysites, especially those known as the Acephali, entering fully upon the erroneous views of Severus, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch and his followers the "Phthartolatras" (cc. vi.-ix. xx.), as well as of their opponents, the Gajanitæ (Aphthartodocetæ, Phantasiastæ), the adherents of Julianus Gaianus, bishop of Halicarnassus (cc. x. xxiii.). This work is very deficient in order and method, but some of the disputations show considerable subtlety. It has been probably interpolated. (2) "Questions and Answers on Holy Scripture" (*Ἐρωτήσεις καὶ Ἀποκρίσεις*) 154 in number. In these, various difficulties—historical, theological, moral—are propounded and answered, chiefly from the writings of the fathers. This work also has been much interpolated. (3) Twelve books of Anagogical Contemplations on the Creation of the World and Fall of Man, "Anagogicæ Contemplationes in Hexæmeron ad Theophilum," of which the first eleven exist only in a Latin translation, the twelfth also in the original Greek. This work gives an allegorical interpretation of Gen. i.-iii. and only deserves reading for its ingenuity. Several sermons are given in Migne's edition, and a "Disputatio adversus Judæos." [E. V.]

ANASTASIUS, bishop of TENEDOS, a staunch supporter of Nestorius. At the Council of Ephesus he joined in the protest to Cyril against commencing proceedings before the arrival of John of Antioch (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 264). He also subscribed the synodical letter of the Oriental

bishops to the people of Hierapolis (*ib.* 271). After the council he resigned his see of his own accord, and spent his time in visiting the exiles (*ib.* p. 445). Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* i. 949) confidently identifies him with Anastasius, the presbyter who was the ally of Nestorius; but of this there is no evidence. [L.]

ANASTASIUS. (1) Abbot of the Monastery of St. Euthymius, in Palestine, whose error in referring the Trisagion to the Son alone led Jo. Damascenus to write his letter *De Trisagio*. There is great difference of opinion as to his date. Oudin places him c. 740, Adélung c. 875, and Fabricius also in the 9th cent. (Cf. Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* tom. ix. p. 336.) He wrote a treatise against Judaism, published in Latin, Canis. *Antiq. Lect.* iii. i. p. 123, and in the *Bibl. Patr.* tom. xiii. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 628.)

(2) Bishop of JERUSALEM, succeeded Juvenalis as 48th bishop A.D. 458. According to Cyril of Scythopolis (*Acta Sancti Euthymii Abbatis*), he had previously been a presbyter of the church of Jerusalem, and keeper of the sacred vessels of the church of the Resurrection, and a chorepiscopus. He was a disciple of St. Passarion, and emulated his virtues. Being led by a desire to become acquainted with one so famous for his holiness, to visit St. Euthymius at his Laura, he was saluted by him immediately on his arrival as "Patriarch of Jerusalem." Euthymius being apprised of his error, and his attention directed to the silk robes of Anastasius, replied that he had seen him in vision clad in the white robe of the patriarch, and that he would certainly attain that dignity (Baronius, *ad ann.* 458). [E. V.]

ANATOLIUS became bishop of CONSTANTINOPLE, 449 A.D., through the influence of Dioscorus of Alexandria with Theodosius II., after the deposition of Flavianus by the "Robber-Council," having previously been the "apocrisiarius" or representative of Dioscorus at Constantinople (*Zon. Ann.* iii.). After his consecration, being under suspicion of Eutychianism (Leo, *Epp. ad Theod.* 33 *ad Pulch.* 35), he publicly condemned the heresies both of Eutyches and Nestorius, signing the letters of Cyril against Nestorius and of Leo against Eutyches (Leo, *Epp.* 40, 41, 48). In conjunction with Leo of Rome, according to Zonaras (*Ann.* iii.), he requested the Emperor Marcianus to summon a general council against Dioscorus and the Eutychians; but the imperial letter directing Anatolius to make preparations for the Council at Chalcedon speaks only of Leo (Labbe, *Conc. Max.* Tom. iv.). Nicephorus adds a story (*Hist.* xv. 5) that after the council Anatolius suggested a miraculous ordeal, which proved successful, of the Eutychian heresy (cf. Zonar. *Ann.* iii.). In this Council Anatolius presided in conjunction with the Roman legates (Labbe, *Conc. Max.* iv.; Evagr. *Hist.* ii. 4, 18; Niceph. *Hist.* xv. 18). By the famous 28th canon, passed at the conclusion of the Council, equal dignity was ascribed to Constantinople with Rome (Labbe, iv. 796; Evagr. ii. 18). Hence arose the controversy between Anatolius and the Roman pontiff. Leo complained to Marcianus (*Ep.* 54) and to Pulcheria (*Ep.* 55) that Anatolius had overstepped his jurisdiction, by consecrating Maximus to the see of Antioch; and he remonstrated with Anatolius himself (*Ep.* 53). Though at first suspicious of Anatolius as a friend

of Dioscorus, Leo had subsequently expressed satisfaction at his formal disclaimer of heresy (*Ep. ad Pulch.* 45), but now he accuses him of antitudinarianism, and, in particular, of having removed Aetius, an adherent of Flavianus from the office of Archdeacon, in order to promote in his stead Andreas, a man of Eutychian sympathies (*Epp.* 56, 57). Anatolius reversed this arrangement (Leo. *Ep.* 71), but he naturally resented this interference, and these reiterated charges of ambition, especially from such a quarter (Leo. *Ep.* 78). Anatolius died in 458 A.D.

On the whole, if we except the consecration of Maximus, Anatolius seems to have acted with prudence and moderation under very trying circumstances, particularly at the Council. In the commencement of his episcopate he wrote to Leo, on behalf of some clergy who repented of the part which they had been forced into taking in the "Robber-Council" (Leo, *Epp.* 41, 44, 46). After the Council of Chalcedon some Egyptian bishops wrote to Anatolius, earnestly asking his assistance against Timotheus, who was usurping the episcopal throne at Alexandria (Labbe, *Conc. Max.* iv. iii. 23, p. 897). Anatolius wrote strongly to the Emperor Leo against Timotheus (Labbe, iii. 26, p. 905). The circular of the emperor requesting the advice of Anatolius on the turbulent state of Alexandria is given by Evagrius (*Hist.* ii. 9), and by Nicephorus (*Hist.* xv. 18). The crowning of Leo on his accession by Anatolius is said (Gibbon, iii. 313) to be the first instance of the kind on record (Theoph. *Chron.* 95 Par.). [I. G. S.]

ANATOLIUS, bishop of LAODICEA in Syria Prima, succeeded his fellow-countryman Eusebius A.D. 269, *διδοχος ἀγαθὸς ἀγαθὸν*. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32.) They were both from Alexandria, where Anatolius was in high repute for the wide extent of his knowledge of the liberal arts. Eusebius attributes to him excellence in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, dialectics, rhetoric, and physics. He was requested by his fellow-townsmen to open an Aristotelian school. Nor was his eminence confined to intellectual pursuits. His reputation for practical wisdom was so great that when the suburb of Bruchetium was besieged by the Romans during the revolt of Aemilianus, A.D. 262, the command of the place was assigned to him. Provisions having failed, and his proposition of making terms with the besiegers having been indignantly rejected, Anatolius obtained leave to relieve the garrison of all idle mouths, and by a clever deception marched out all the Christians, and the greater part of the rest, many disguised as women, and placed them under the protection of Eusebius. Having passed over to Palestine, he was ordained by Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea, as bishop-coadjutor, with the right of succession. But going to Antioch to attend the synod assembled against Paul of Samosata, on his way through Laodicea, which had just lost its bishop, his old friend Eusebius, he was detained and made bishop in his room, A.D. 269.

Eusebius speaks of him as not having written much, but enough to show at once his eloquence and manifold learning. He specially mentions a work on the Paschal question, published in a Latin version by Bucherius, *Doct. Temp.*, Antv. 1634. Some fragments of his mathematical

works were published at Paris, 1543, and by Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 462 (Hieron. *Sc. Ecol.* c. 73). [E. V.]

ANATOLIUS, patrician, Consul A.D. 440, and "Magister Militum" in the East, where his wise and just administration gained universal respect and esteem. His sympathies were with the orthodox portion of the Church, who owed much to his protection. During his residence in the East he was a frequent hearer of Theodoret, whom he regarded with sincere reverence, and with whom he formed a confidential intimacy. The mutual friendship that subsisted between Theodoret and Anatolius is evidenced by the letters of the former, after his powerful friend's removal to the seat of government. In any trouble affecting himself or his diocese, Theodoret at once invoked the aid of Anatolius, who on his part appears to have done his utmost to obtain what he desired. When, c. 444, through the false representations of a deprived bishop, perhaps Athanasius of Perrha, the taxes and imposts of some of the Eastern provinces, including Theodoret's own of Euphratensis, had been largely increased, to the great distress of the district, Theodoret wrote to Anatolius, testifying to the universal sorrow felt at his departure, and begging him still to watch over the interests of the province, and obtain a remission of their burdens. (Theodt. *Ep.* xlv.) When, early in 449, Theodoret received the emperor's prohibition to quit his diocese, he had immediate recourse to Anatolius to learn whether the rescript was an authentic document, and to entreat the emperor not to condemn him unheard. The calumnies circulated against him at Constantinople formed the subject of subsequent letters; and when his deposition by the Latrocinium had actually taken place, he sought leave through the same channel to visit Constantinople and lay his case before the bishops of the West. As an evidence of his own orthodoxy, he forwarded St. Leo's letters addressed to Flavian, then recently deceased. His restoration by Marcian in 451 called forth another grateful letter, acknowledging the share Anatolius had had in it, and requesting him to convey his thanks to the emperor and empress, and his request that they would summon a true Council. (Theodt. *Ep.* lxxix. cxi. cxix. cxxi. cxxxviii.) On the assembly of the Council of Chalcedon, Anatolius represented his imperial master, and took the lead in demanding the admission of Theodoret. (Labbe, *Concil.* 850, 874, 1443.) [E. V.]

ANDIBERIS, a layman of Cyrus, to whom Theodoret wrote during his banishment, begging him to endeavour to retain a certain Peter, presbyter and physician, whom he had induced to settle at Cyrus, but who was now proposing to quit the city on account of his exile. (Theodt. *Ep.* 114.) [E. V.]

ANDREAS CAESARIENSIS. [ARETAS.]

ANDREAS CRETENSIS, so called from having been archbishop of Crete, was born at Damascus, and passed some years at Jerusalem, from which he is known as *Ἱεροσολυμίτης, ὁ Ἱεροσόλυμον*, though there is no ground for the supposition that he was ever bishop of that see. Theodore, bishop of Jerusalem, deputed him to attend the 6th General Council, held at Constantinople A.D. 680, to support the orthodox faith

against the Monothelites. A copy of iambic verses is printed by Combefis, *Auctar.* Nov. ii. and by Migne, in which he thanks Agatho, the archdeacon and keeper of the archives, for having communicated to him the acts of that council. At Constantinople he was ordained deacon, and appointed guardian of orphans. He subsequently became archbishop of Crete, whence it has been maintained by some, from a confusion of two persons bearing the same name, that he was transferred to Caesarea in Cappadocia (Oudin *de Script. Eccl.* Suppl. p. 190). Oudin and Papebroch have advanced reasons for supposing that the date usually assigned to Andreas is incorrect, and that he should be placed A.D. 840-850. But it is probable that here also a similarity of name has misled them, and that some of the works on which their arguments are based were by later namesakes. (See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 453.)

The works which go under the name of Andreas Cretensis comprise Homilies and Canons, Triodia and other rhythmical compositions, from the latter of which he has derived his chief celebrity. He is famous in the Greek Church as the author of the *Magnus Canon* (of which Combefis says, "vix habuerunt Graeci augustius avitae pietatis monumentum"), still sung, "cum labore multo et pulmonum fatigatione," on the Thursday before Palm Sunday, known as "Festum τοῦ μεγάλου κανόνος." This ode, which is of prodigious length (occupying 28 columns in Migne) and considerable beauty, is of a deeply penitential character, in which the soul goes through a list of the chief sinners and saints of Holy Writ, likening itself to the one, and lamenting how far it falls short of the other. Migne's collection also contains a *Canon on Lazarus*, a *Triodion for Palm Sunday*, *Idiomela*, &c. Of his Homilies, 21 have been published; 19 still remain in MS. Among the former are four on the *Nativity of the B. V. Mary*, one on the *Annunciation* (the earliest notice of that Festival), and three on *The Sleep of the B. V. Mary*. These are of interest, as illustrating the growth of the cultus of the Virgin, and as forming one of the earliest authorities for the legendary history of her parents, Joachim and Anna, and her own childhood. In them we find some of the first examples of the flowery and turgid language with which later developments have made us so familiar. Mary is styled "The Diadem of Beauty," "The Rod of Aaron," "The Sceptre of David," "The Mediatrix of the Law and Grace," "The Common Refuge of all Christians." There are also Homilies on St. George, St. Nicolas of Myra, St. Patapius, &c., full of miraculous legends.

The works of Andreas were first published by Combefis, in conjunction with those of Amphilochius and Methodius (Paris, 1644); as well as in his *Auctarium Novum* (Par. 1648, pp. 1290 sq.); and by Galland (*Bibl. Patr.* xiii. 689) and by Migne (*Patrol.* vol. xcvi.). A *Computus Paschalis*, ascribed to him, was published by Petavius (*Doctr. Temp.* vol. iii. p. 393). There is great reason to question the genuineness of some of the works attributed to him. A commentary on the Apocalypse, printed by Combefis, probably belongs to his namesake of Caesarea. (Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* xi. 62; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 453; Oudin, ii. 174-188; Schröckh, xx. 135 sq.; Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* xiii. 6; Combefis, *Bibl. Concionat.* i. 4.)

[E. V.]

ANDREAS SAMOSATENSIS, so called from being bishop of Samosata at the time of the Council of Ephesus A.D. 431. Sickness prevented his attending the council (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 506); but he took a leading part in the controversies between Cyril and the Oriental bishops that succeeded it. Without identifying himself with the erroneous teaching ascribed to Nestorius, he showed himself his zealous defender, and remained firm to him when his cause had been deserted by almost all. For his zeal in the defence of an heresiarch he is styled by Anastasius Sinaita ὁ ὁρμηγός. The reputation of Andreas for learning and controversial skill caused John of Antioch to select him, together with his attached friend Theodoret, to answer Cyril's anathemas against Nestorius. (Labbe, iii. 1150; Liberatus, c. iv. p. 16.) Cyril replied and wrote in defence of his anathemas, which called forth a second treatise from Andreas (Labbe, iii. 827). When Rabulas, bishop of Edessa, had gone over to the ranks of Cyril's supporters, and published an anathematization of Nestorian writings, he included Andreas by name. Rabulas's clergy did not share in the changed views of their bishop, who, with all the zeal of a new convert, appears to have made their lives so bitter to them, that they seriously entertained the question of separating from his communion. The question was referred by them to Andreas, who laid the matter before his venerable metropolitan, Alexander of Hierapolis, by whom it was sent on to his patriarch, John of Antioch. Of his decision we are ignorant, (Baluz. *Nov. Collect. Concil.* 748, 749.) In 453 Andreas accompanied Alexander and Theodoret to the council summoned at Antioch by Aristolaus the tribune, in compliance with the commands of Theodosius, to consult how the breach with Cyril might be healed. (*Ib.* 764.) On the amicable reception by Acacius and John of Cyril's letter written in answer to the rescript of this council, Andreas fully sympathized with his aged metropolitan Alexander's distress and indignation. Alexander communicated to him copies of all the documents that had passed, and letters were interchanged in which Andreas laments the gradual weakening of the opposition. (*Ib.* 764, 765, 796.) These feelings were much heightened when peace was re-established between Cyril and the East. Andreas deplored the recognition of Cyril's orthodoxy by so many bishops, and desired to bury himself in some solitude where he might weep. (*Ib.* 784, 785, 796, 797.) This was before he had seen Cyril's letter. On perusing Cyril's own statement his opinions changed. What Cyril had written was orthodox. No prejudice against him ought to prevent his acknowledging it. The peace of the Church was superior to all private feelings. His alteration of sentiments exasperated Alexander, who refused to see or speak to his former friend. (*Ib.* 810, 811.) Andreas deeply felt this alienation of one he so much venerated, but it could not lead him to retrace his steps. He used his utmost endeavours in vain to persuade Alexander to attend the council at Zeugma, at which the orthodoxy of Cyril's letter was acknowledged. (*Ib.* 805.) Toward the end of the same year 453, Andreas undertook a journey to Edessa, partly to avoid the violent opposition raised against him in his own diocese as a traitor to the faith, by one Gemellinus, probably one of his clergy; partly to become recor-

led to Rabulas. On his way he was arrested by illness. From his sick-bed he wrote a wise and conciliatory letter to Alexander. The answer was as uncompromising as before. The reply of Andreas, manly but respectful, expresses his grief at Alexander's unchanged views. At the same time he wrote to the "Oeconomi" of Hierapolis declaring his faith, and his determination to adhere to the communion of Pope Sixtus, John of Antioch, and Rabulas. (*Ib.* 807-9.)

When Domnus assembled a council at Antioch, A.D. 444, to hear the cause of Athanasius of Arrha, Andreas was summoned to attend it; it was kept away by ill health. (*Labbe, Concil.* 739.) The date of his death is unknown, but must have been before 451, when Rufinus was bishop of Samosata. Theodoret speaks of Andreas with much affection and esteem, and praises his humility, and readiness to help the needy and distressed. (*Theodoret, Epist.* xxiv. p. 918.) His own letters give us a high idea of his sound, practical wisdom, his readiness to confess his error when convinced that he was in the wrong, and his firmness in maintaining what he believed to be right. [E. V.]

ANDREW THE APOSTLE, ACTS OF.
ACTS OF APOSTLES (Apocryphal), p. 30, a.]

ANENCLETUS. [CLETUS.]

ANGELICI. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxx. 505 f.) had heard of a sect bearing this name, but could obtain no further information. His conjectures do not deserve mention. For the name compare ARCHONTIC and ARCHON. [H.]

ANGELOLATRY. The tendency to pass from the feeling of reverence and love to that of adoration, is at once recognised, and rebuked in the well-known passages of Rev. xix. 10., xxii. 9. Col. ii. 18, the *θηροσέλεια τῶν ἀγγέλων* appears fully developed, and as connected with wild dreams and visions. And it is noticeable that when that worship became prominent enough to call for distinct condemnation, it is in the same region, and accompanied by the same remnants of a Jewish thaumaturgic theosophy. The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, forbids Christians (c. 35), to "leave the Church of God and go away and *ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν*," and hold secret communions (*συνάξεις*.) It stigmatises the practice as a "secret idolatry," passes on in its next canon to condemn priests who are magicians, or enchanters, or *mathematici*, or astrologers," or who make "phylacteries" and so on, in c. 37-38, warns men against taking part in Jewish feasts, or receiving from Jews or heretics the paschal *ἔσθια*. So, too, Theodoret (*Comm. in Col. ii.*) states that the heretics thus referred to, were Judaizers, who maintained that angels should be worshipped, as having been present in revealing the law on Sinai. These practices, he says, had infested Phrygia and Asia for a long time, and throughout the whole district were to be seen Oratories dedicated to St. Michael, to which, apparently, people gave preference over the usual places of assembly. The language of the earlier Fathers as to such practice is uniformly that of deprecation. An ambiguous passage in Justin (*Apol.* i. 6) seems intended to allow "worship and adoration," but

whatever degree of reverence is sanctioned, is always distinguished from that which is to be paid to God. Irenaeus (ii. 57) speaks of the Church as "doing nothing by the invocation of Angels." Origen (*c. Cels.* viii. 57-58) protests against worshipping them "instead of God." Augustine (*de Ver. Relig.* c. 55) defines the limits of reverence, "Honoramus eos caritate, non de virtute, nec eis templa construimus," and in his *Confessions* (x. 42) condemns the practice as leading to "visions and illusions." The second Council of Nicaea, dealing with the larger question of the cultus that might be paid to images, included those of angels as worthy of *προσκύνησις*, but not of the *λατρεία*, which was due to God alone. [E. H. P.]

ANGELS. It will be necessary briefly to recapitulate the belief which the Church inherited from the writings of the O. T., and yet more from those of the N. T. as to the nature and functions of Angels. To trace the growth of that belief itself belongs to an earlier stage of inquiry; but to know what it actually was when it started on its new course, is a necessary condition of our being able to estimate rightly what forces acted, and what new accretions supervened, on it.

Men found then in Scripture the recognition of an undefined multitude of beings, who bore the name of the 'Angels' or 'Messengers' of God. They were the "host of heaven," the "Army" of the Great King. They are reckoned, like the armies of earth, by "legions." It was in relation to them, prominently, if not exclusively, that He was spoken of as the Lord God of Sabaoth^a (2 Sam. vi. 2. *et al.*). They were known as "the Sons of God" (Job i. 6, ii. 1); they were *λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα*, worshipping in the Eternal Temple, with hymns of praise (Heb. i. 14; Is. vi. 3; Ps. cxlviii. 2 *et al.*), sent forth to minister for the heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14). They, even the highest who "behold the face" of God, watch over little children (Matt. xviii. 10). There is joy in their presence over "one sinner that repenteth" (Luke xv. 10). They had rejoiced in the work of creation (Job xxxviii. 7), they had appeared to Patriarchs, and Prophets, and Apostles. They watched over the unfolding of God's purpose in the events of the world's history (1 Kings xxii. 19; Dan. x. 12, 13). They were His agents in the work of pestilence and death; they were manifested on the night of the Nativity. One had brought the message of the Incarnation (Luke i. 26). They ministered to Our Lord after His Temptation and in His Agony (Matt. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 43). They announced the fact of the Resurrection to the sorrowing disciples (Matt. xxviii. 2; Luke xxiv. 4; Mark xvi. 5), and after the Ascension, told them that their Lord should come again as they had seen Him go (Acts i. 11). They were to come at that

^a The writer of this article is compelled to differ from Mr. Grove, who in his art. 'Sabaoth,' in the *Dict. of the Bible*, limits the meaning of the word to the "armies" of earth. But 1 Kings xxii. 19, Ps. ciii. 21, cxlvii. 2, are decisive against such a limitation. The word is, of course, an inclusive one, and is used again and again of sun, moon, and stars as "the host of heaven" (Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3; 2 Kings xvii. 16; Jer. xix. 15, *et al.*). It might, indeed, be legitimately contended that the meaning which Mr. Grove assigns as the only one is entirely subordinate. The God of the armies of Heaven is thought of by a natural analogy as the King who also commands the "armies" of His people.

^b The words manifestly refer to some practice analogous to that of the Essenes mentioned under ANGELS.
CHRIST, BIOGR.

second Advent in the train of the Son of Man (Matt. 25. 31), and were to be His agents in the work of judgment (Mark xiii. 27). The "trump of the Archangel" is to be the signal of the general resurrection (1 Thess. iv. 16). Meantime they "desire to look into" the mysteries of the coming glory (1 Pet. i. 12), and the day and the hour of the *παρουσία* itself are hidden from them (Mark xiii. 32). An angel delivered Peter (Acts xii. 7), and smote Herod (Acts xii. 23) and appeared to Cornelius at Caesarea (Acts x. 3), and stood by St. Paul during his shipwreck (Acts xxvii. 23). When they were visibly manifested to men, it was as young men in long white garments, after the pattern *i.e.* of the dress of the Priests and Levites of the Temple (Mark xvi. 5; Acts i. 11). Like those Priests, they blow the trumpet, and offer incense (Rev. viii. 2-4). And in this great "host of God" there were orders and degrees. Pre-eminence was indicated by names like "captain of the Lord's host" (Josh. v. 14), "Michael, one of the chief princes" (Dan. x. 13), the Angel of the presence (*i.e.* Heb., the *face*), of God (Isaiah lxiii. 9), those that "stand in the presence of God" (Luke i. 19), and "behold His face" (Matt. xviii. 10). There are Archangels (1 Thess. iv. 16; Jude v. 9), Cherubim, Seraphim (whatever had been the original connotation of the words, they had come to be identified with angels in the first days of Christendom), "thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers" (Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 21). The number of these Archangels had been given in one of the books of the Canon of the LXX. as "seven" (Tobit xii. 15). To two of them names had been given in the Canonical Books, Gabriel ("the hero of God"), and Michael ("Who is like unto God?"). Another, Raphael ("the healing of God") appeared in Tobit (l. c.). There were tendencies in the Apostolic Age to a "worshipping of angels" (Col. ii. 18). The Apocalypse had at once recognised that worship as so natural that even the beloved Apostle was infected by it, and represented the angel himself as deprecating it, and describing his position as being simply that of a "fellow slave" of the Apostles and Prophets of the Church (Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8). And there had also been angels that had not "kept their first estate" (Jude v. 6). They also had a captain of their host, a prince of demons (Matt. xii. 24). They too, while some were "kept in chains under darkness to the great day" (Jude l. c.) were, some of them, sent forth by their chief, the "prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii. 2) to work evil, moral and physical, among men, sometimes in that work, though against their will, carrying into effect the counsels of the Supreme God.

We have now to trace the after-growths of speculation that gathered round what had thus been received as of divine authority. It is obvious that it was precisely in this region, where there was no sharply defined test of truth, that imagination was likely to be most active. Probably the language of the N. T. itself, does but represent a part of the floating belief of the time. Those who passed from Judaism to Christianity, and they were almost everywhere the nucleus of the Church, brought with them a full, one might almost call it a monstrous, angelology. The Essenes, whose influence cannot be excluded from the history of Christian dogma, made it

one of the vows of their brotherhood, that those who were admitted to it should not disclose to others "the names of the Angels" (Joseph. B. J. ii. 8, § 7). And it is clear, so far as Christian speculations are traceable to an external source, that it is in this direction that we must look. The philosophy of Greece had nothing to contribute to them.^b It was only by insensible degrees that the superstitions of Polytheism crept into the Church, and attached themselves to ANGELOLATRY.

The love of dogmatic definiteness in all things, led men in this, as in other regions of thought, to ask manifold questions, and then to make answer to themselves—(1.) When were the Angels created? The silence of Gen. i., though they saw in it a wise reserve, guarding the Jews from the perils of creature-worship (Chrysost. Hom. i. in Gen. i. p. 81; Theodor. *Quaest. in Gen. ii.*; Pseudo-Athanas. *Quaest. ad Ant.* iv. vol. iii. p. 333), and therefore, confining the narrative to the creation of the *visible* universe (Chrys. in Ps. viii.), did not hinder them from "rushing" into the annals of the *invisible*. (a) Some held, with Origen, that their existence went far back "before the aeons," that even then they worshipped and obeyed (Origen. *Hom. i. in Gen.*; *Hom. iv. in Isaian. Tract. ix. in Matth. De Princip.* i. 5, 8). (b) Others, more moderately, were content to assert the priority of all the "unseen" creatures of God over the things that are "seen," and of the "spiritual" over the "material."^c Angels were created before the work of Gen. i. began. The LXX. translation of Job xxxviii. 7. *ὅτε ἐγένετο ἄστρα, ἦσαν με πάντες ἄγγελοι μου*, was naturally pressed into the service of this view (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxxviii. p. 617; Chrysost. *Orat. πρὸς τοὺς σκανδ.* c. 7). (c) Others, still seeking to satisfy the conditions of Job xxxviii. 7, placed this creation of angels on the first of the six days, as included in the word "heavens" (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxx. p. 264; Theodoret *Quaest. in Gen.*)

(2.) Then came the question: What was their nature? Had they bodies? Were they, with or without bodies, subject to the limitations of space? And here there were discordant answers. (a) They were *ἀσώματοι καὶ νοεραὶ* (Ignat. *ad Trall.*; Euseb. *Dem. Evang.* iv. p. 105; Chrysost. tom. vi. *Hom.* xvii., tom. v. *Hom.* cvii.). Their forms were but phenomenal. They assume any shape that God wills. (b) Others, baffled in their attempts to conceive individual existence, apart from material limitations, ascribe to them *σώματα λεπτά* (Macar. *Aegypt. Hom.* iv. p. 117), a body "sui generis" (Tertull. *de Carne Christi*, c. vi.), "like fire or air" (Caesarius *Dial. i. Interr.* 48). As the passage in Job was the battlefield of the first question, so here that which most occupied men's thoughts were the words of Gen. vi. 2, which state that "the sons of God"^d took to themselves wives of the daughters of men. Josephus, clearly expressing the prevalent

^b The question how far the angelology of Christendom is connected with that of the Zendavesta belongs to biblical, not ecclesiastical antiquity. If there were any such connection, it was clearly through Judaism as the intermediate link.

^c A touch of Platonism is perhaps traceable here.

^d It is clear from the quotations in the Fathers that many MSS. of the LXX. rendered the phrase by *οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ* (August. *De Civ. Dei*, xv. 23; Cyril. c. *Julian.* ix. p. 296).

relief of his countrymen, had identified them with the Angels (*Ant. i. iv.*). It kept its ground for the first four centuries, was asserted in the *Apolog.* of Justin (p. 130), and Athenagoras (*Legat. p. 26*), adopted by Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag. dii. p. 222; Strom. iii. p. 450*); Tertullian (*de Hab. Mulieb. ii. 17; de Cultu Femin. .*), and many others. Chrysostom (*Hom. xxii. 1 Gen.*) followed by Theodoret (*Qu. xlvii. in Gen.*), and the Pseudo-Athanasius (*Quaest. ad Ant. lvii.*), resolutely opposed it, on the ground that the angels, being incorporeal, could not know corporeal appetites, and gave currency to what has since been the more commonly received interpretation, which identifies "the sons of God" with the descendants of Seth, ascribing the evil of the antediluvian period, to their intermarriage with the daughters of Cain's progeny.

Then came the question,—(3). How and when was it that the evil Angels fell. The answer most commonly given was that it was through pride, and that they followed their great chief (as in Milton's *Paradise Lost*) in a rebellious struggle for supremacy. Those who interpreted Gen. i. 2, of "angels" made the fall of those there mentioned, the result of the admission of sensuous lust, following the apparent meaning of Jude iv. 6, 7, and, in that case, if they arranged events in a chronological order, must have looked on this as a second apostasy, adding to the number of the hosts of Satan.

(4). Men began to speculate even as to the statistics and polity of angel-life. The "twelve legions" of Matt. xxvi. 53, the "ten thousands" of the holy ones of Deut. xxxiii. 2, the "thousand thousands" ministering, the "ten thousand times ten thousand" standing, of Dan. vii. 10, the "innumerable company" of Heb. xii. 22, were taken as giving hints as to the number of the heavenly host. The parable of the lost sheep led Origen (iii. 21 and 39), Origen (*Hom. ii. in Gen.*), Ambrose (*Apol. Dav. c. 5*), and others, to make the proportion of Angels to men, as 99 to 1. It became a current belief, that the gap made by the apostasy of the rebels, would be filled up with numerical exactness, by the saints gathered from the redeemed human race* (*August. Enclous. 29*). And in this immense multitude there was a hierarchy of orders, each with its appointed functions. The existence of such a hierarchy was asserted by the second Council of Constantinople, 2 and 14 (so also 2 Nicaen. iii. c. 4), and appeared in its fully developed form, stamped, through it, upon mediæval theology, in the treatise *De Hierarchiâ*, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite. Here the orders are nine in number, each with a character of its own, though human language fails to express the conception of each distinctly. So we have—

- I. { 1. The Seraphim, the fiery ones, excelling in love.
2. The Cherubim, with their many eyes, beholding God, and so excelling in knowledge.
3. The Thrones, with their calm supremacy of will over desire.

* A trace of this belief lingers perhaps in the prayer that God would "shortly accomplish the number of His elect" in the Church of England Burial Service. The thought was familiar to the Schoolmen. Comp. Roger Bacon, *Comp. Studiâ*, c. 1; Pet. Lomb. ii. 9.

- II. { 4. The Dominations, seeking after likeness to the true Dominion.
5. The Powers, working the will of God with unresting energy.
6. The Authorities, enforcing obedience to the Supreme Authority.
- III. { 7. The Princedoms, who guide the destiny of nations.
8. The Archangels, employed in the higher ministrations to individual men.
9. The Angels, employed in the lower ministrations to individual men.

It will be seen, that in this classification (*Dion. de Coelest. Hierarch. vi. et al.*; comp. Mr. Westcott's article on 'Dionysius the Areopagite' in *Contemporary Review*, vol. v.), those that are strictly Angels—sent on the tasks which God gives them—are placed in the third or lowest group.

(5). The nature and extent of the guardianship exercised over individual men by Angels, was a region in which the imagination might wander freely. Reproducing, consciously or unconsciously, the thoughts and language of Jewish Rabbis (*Jalqut. Kadesh. t. 147*), Origen taught that the whole visible universe was in all its parts under their control. There were angels of the brute creation,[†] angels even of the plants (*Hom. xiv. in Num. : c. Cels. viii. p. 416*). He warns men not to lead such a life as will bring them under the brute angels, but by prayer, to come into fellowship with Michael, who offers the prayers of the Saints, or by healing souls, into that of Raphael (*de Princ. i. 8, iii. 3*). Every converted soul, he teaches, has ten thousand holy powers praying with him unbidden (*c. Cels. viii. p. 420*). So, in like manner the idea of angelic presence was connected specially with the two great Sacraments. The font, or tank, of Baptism was thought to receive its regenerating power in part through their agency, and was accordingly known as the *κολυμβήθρα* (the allusion to John v. 2, is obvious), and the form of an angel was accordingly sculptured in most baptisteries. The presence of the Ter-Sanctus in all Liturgies, implies that from the very first, they were thought of in connexion with the Supper of the Lord, the praises of the Church in its most solemn act ascending with those of "Angels and Archangels," and gives some countenance to the interpretation of 1 Cor. xi. 10, which makes St. Paul urge their presence in the *Ecclesia* as a reason for decency and order. Women are not to go unveiled "because of the Angels."

The Names of Angels.—Two only, it will be remembered, are named in the Canonical Books, both appearing for the first time in Daniel. Gabriel (Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21; Luke i. 19, 26), and Michael (Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1). The appearance of Raphael in Tobit (v. 4, 15), shews that that also was familiar during the Alexandrian period of Judaism. And these three names have kept throughout a pre-eminence, both in Jewish and Christian thought, over all others. They were looked on in the Talmud as the three that had appeared to Abraham in Gen. xviii. (*Joma. f. 37; Pesach. f. 113*). They only are recognised in the Liturgies of the Eastern and Western Churches. Uriel appears in 2 Esdras iv. i., x. 23, and was

[†] In this he had been anticipated by the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Dis. ii. c. 2.

thought of as the Angel of Light,* one of the chief Seven. To these, the Jews added Ruchael, the Angel of the Wind; Abdiel, the Servant of God; Sammael, the Angel of Death, and others: while the names of Jophiel, Chamuel, and Zadkiel appear in the more obscure Christian traditions. A full account of the development of Jewish angelology, may be found in Eisenmenger. *Entd. Judenth.* ii. c. 7; and in the art. *Engel*, by Böhmer in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*. But the three above-named are all that connect themselves with Christian archæology, and the facts, connected with them, will be found under their respective names. (For the full scholastic developments of Angelology see Pet. Lomb. ii. 2-12, and Aquin. *Summ. Theol.* i. qu. 50-65, 106-113. Comp. also the article 'Angels and Archangels,' in the *Dictionary of Christ. Ant.*) [E. H. P.]

ANIANUS (called also Adrianus by Sozomen), presbyter of Antioch, was ordained bishop of that church at the turbulent council of Seleucia, A.D. 359, in the room of Eudoxius, who, together with Acacius and others, had been deposed by the majority of the bishops present. The Acacian party immediately arrested the newly-made bishop, and delivered him into the hands of the civil authorities Leonas and Laurentius, by whom he was committed to a military guard, and then sent into exile. The consecrating bishops lodged a protest against these violent proceedings in the hands of the same authorities, and finding the step useless, proceeded to Constantinople to present their complaint to the Emperor Constantius. The subsequent fortunes of Anianus are not known. Nicephorus gives 4 years to his episcopate, but his numbers are not to be trusted (Soz. *H. E.* ii. 40; Soz. *H. E.* iv. 22; Clinton, *F. R.*). [E. V.]

ANICETUS, bishop of Rome, stated in Eusebius's History (iv. 11) to have succeeded Pius in A.D. 157, in his Chronicle a year earlier (f. 87). According however to Pearson and Dodwell's verification of the dates, the year of his accession would be A.D. 142. Anastasius Bibliothecarius singles him out as the pope who prescribed the tonsure for the clergy (Anast. vol. i. p. 13); and a forged letter upon this subject is given by Isidorus Mercator (Constant. p. 75). But the single reliable fact that is recorded of him has reference to the early Paschal Controversy (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 24). He, like his four predecessors, did not allow the Jewish or Quartodeciman usage within their own Church, but communicated as freely as before with other Churches which did allow it. In A.D. 159, Polycarp visited Rome, with the intention of persuading Anicetus to adopt the Quartodeciman practice. But Anicetus was firm, even against the age and saintliness of Polycarp. As a mark of personal respect, he allowed him to celebrate the Eucharist in Rome; but they parted without agreement on this point, though with mutual cordiality. We are told that Anicetus was buried in the Calixtine cemetery on April 20th; the year would be A.D. 168, if we trust Eusebius's dates (*H. E.* iv. 19): but Pearson fixes it A.D. 161, Dodwell A.D. 153. (Pearson, *De serie et successione primorum Romæ epp.* pp. 274-314; Dodwell, *de Pontt. Romano-rum primaevâ successione*, p. 221.) [G. H. M.]

* So Milton places him in the sun, as its guardian angel *Par. Lost*, lili. 648.

ANNA, king of the East Angles. He was the son of Eni, the brother of Redwald, and succeeded the kings Sigebert and Egrie, who were killed by Penda in 635. The conversion of the East Angles was carried out under Anna, by Fursey, whose monastery at Cnobhæresburg was greatly embellished by him, and by the bishops Felix, Thomas, and Berhtgils, in connexion with the Kentish mission. The piety of Anna and his family was very famous, and little else is known about him. In 645 he received Cænwalh, king of Wessex, at his court, and gave him an asylum for the three years of his exile. Bede mentions of Anna's children, Sexberga, the wife of Earconbert, king of Kent, afterwards abbess of Ely; Ethelberga, abbess of Farnoutier; and Etheldreda, abbess of Ely. To these Florence of Worcester adds Whithburga, a nun at Ely; and the *Liber Eliensis* two sons Aldulf and Jurminus. But the latter authority confounds the family of Anna with that of his brother Ethelhere. The close connexion of Anna with the Christian powers in Kent, Northumbria and Wessex, and perhaps some pretension to the position of his brother Redwald, seems to have drawn on him the enmity of Penda, who in 654 attacked, defeated, and slew him (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7, 8, 19; *Liber Eliensis*, ed. Stewart. p. 14, 15). [S.]

ANNE, ST. Anna (Heb. חַנָּה, *grace*, or *prayer*; Gr. Ἀννα), the wife of Joachim and mother of the Virgin Mary.

The story of her married life and the wondrous birth of her daughter is found in three of the Apocryphal Gospels.

The narrative in the *Evangelium de Nativitate S. Mariæ* (Thilo's *Codex Apocryphus*, pp. 319 ff.), and in the *Evang. de Nativ. Mariæ et Infantia Salvatoris* (Thilo. pp. 337 ff.), is as follows:—

The virgin was born at Nazareth, to which city her father Joachim belonged; while Anna, her mother, was a native of Bethlehem. Joachim and Anna were pious and faultless before men, and their lives were plain and right in the sight of the Lord, and in this manner they lived more than twenty years without any children. Every feast in the year they went to the temple of the Lord, vowing that if blessed with any issue they would devote it to the service of God. At the feast of the dedication, Joachim with others of his tribe presented himself with his offering, and was reproached by the high priest with his childless condition. Overcome with shame, he took refuge with the shepherds in the pastures, not daring to return home and meet the taunts of his neighbours. After he had been there some time the angel of the Lord appeared to him with a prodigious light, and exhorted him to "Fear not, for his prayers were heard, and his alms had ascended before God." Then after referring to Sarah, Rachel, and the mothers of Samson and Samuel, he added that Anna also, though barren and advanced in years, should bear a daughter, whose name should be called Mary, from whom while yet a virgin should be born the Son of the most High God, Jesus, the Saviour of all nations. In token whereof, Joachim, at the golden gate of Jerusalem, would meet Anna his wife coming forth to meet him, much troubled that he had not returned sooner. The angel afterwards appeared to Anna, to whom he

revealed himself as the angel who had offered up her prayers and alms unto God, and who was sent to tell her that a daughter should be born to her whose name was to be Mary; he also gave directions for the bringing up of the holy child, and foretold the glory reserved for her as the virgin mother of the Lord.

Anna was further instructed by the angel to go to the golden gate, where she would meet her husband, which she did accordingly, and they both praised the Lord "who exalts the humble." They then returned home, and "lived in a cheerful and assured expectation of the promise of God;" and in due time Anna brought forth a daughter, and "according to the angel's command the parents did call her Mary."

In the *Protevangelium Jacobi* (Thilo, pp. 161 ff.), the story of the Virgin's parents stands as follows:—

A certain man named Joachim, being very rich, made double offerings to the Lord, having resolved that his substance should be for the benefit of the whole people; that so he might obtain mercy, and the forgiveness of his sins. At one of the great feasts, when the children of Israel were presenting their offerings to the Lord, Joachim was repulsed by Reuben the high priest, who said it was not lawful for him to offer gifts who "had begotten no issue in Israel." In great distress of mind Joachim went to consult the registries of the twelve tribes, and found that all the righteous had raised up seed in Israel, and calling to mind that to Abraham in the end of his life Isaac had been born, he retired into the wilderness, where he pitched a tent, and fasted forty days and forty nights, resolving that prayer should be his meat and drink until the Lord should look down upon him.

In the mean time, Anna, his wife, was bewailing her widowhood and her barrenness. Troubled by the words of her maid Judith, who reproached her mistress with being under God's curse, in that she was not a mother in Israel, she went into her garden and sat under a laurel tree. While there she prayed unto God to regard her prayer and bless her, as He had blessed Sarah in giving her Isaac her son. Looking up she perceived a sparrow's nest in the laurel, and bemoaned her barrenness, which made her accused before the children of Israel, and caused her to be derided in the temple of God; nay, which placed her below the brutes,—the waters of the sea,—the very earth itself. Then an angel of the Lord stood by her, and told her that God had heard her prayer, that she should bring forth, and her progeny should be spoken of in all the world. Anna immediately vowed that her offspring, whether male or female, should be devoted to the Lord. Two angels then appeared, announcing the approach of Joachim with his shepherds. When Anna saw him coming, she ran and hung about his neck, giving thanks to God who had removed from her the double curse of widowhood and barrenness. Joachim abode the first day in his house, and on the morrow brought his offerings, praying that the plate on the priest's forehead might make it manifest that the Lord was propitious unto him. The desired token was granted, and he went down from the temple of the Lord justified, and he went to his own house. In

due time Anna was delivered of a child, and said to the midwife "What have I brought forth?" who answered, "A girl." Then Anna said, "The Lord hath this day magnified my soul"; and when the days of her purification were accomplished she gave suck to the child, and called her name Mary.

It is obvious that there are in this narrative traits derived from the histories of the births of Isaac and Samuel, of Samson and the Shunammite's son; a more exact parallel still is the birth of St. John the Baptist. The cultus of the Virgin (more especially the growing enthusiasm for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception) supplied the motive, and these instances of miraculous birth recorded with Divine authority supplied the ready pattern for the construction of such a legend.

Notwithstanding the wide currency of the legend in later times, no mention of the Virgin's parents occurs in the fathers of the first three centuries. Epiphanius, who was made Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, in 368, is the first to mention them, speaking of the Virgin Mary as "the daughter of Anna and Joachim" (*Haeres.* 78, 17, p. 1042), and they are also named by Gregory Nyssen. In the teeth of these authorities Pellicia (*Ecclcs. Politia*, iv. 11, § 6) asserts that the names of the Virgin's parents are not mentioned earlier than the 7th century, when they occur for the first time in the *Chronicon Paschale*.

John of Damascus, writing early in the 8th century, gives the story of her barrenness and of her prayer for a child; and when her prayer is granted, he says, "Itaque Gratia (= Anna) peperit Dominam," and he seems to hint his own faith in the story by calling her "lectissimam illam et summis laudibus dignam mulierem."

In the Bollandist account the author of the commentary on the *Hexameron*^a is quoted for assigning a supernatural character to the birth of the blessed Virgin; and it is implied, but not expressly stated, that her birth was not due to natural causes.

More than one church has claimed the distinction of possessing her head, and many have boasted of less important relics. About the time of Charlemagne, the legend of St. Anne, and the circulation of stories and extracts from the Apocryphal Gospels, made her name familiar to the churches of the West; and she soon attained a wide celebrity in the Latin Church, and, in Spain especially, became the patron saint of many churches.

It was not until the year 1584 that the observance of her festival was imposed by authority on the Western Church, but long before that time the feast of St. Anne had become general and popular; and her place in early and in later religious art corresponds very nearly with the date of this authoritative recognition of her as a saint, for up to the end of the 15th century the parents of the Virgin appear only as subordinate to the Virgin herself,^b that is, they form one group only of the series of figures associated with her life. Later on St. Anne appears in devotional art not merely as an historical personage but as occupying an indepen-

^a Published by Leo Allatius, under the name of St. Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch.

^b Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*.

dent position, and as herself the object of reverence or of worship. Kuper, the Bollandist, gives a long list of the miracles wrought in her name and by her relics, in a history of her life, her legends, her cultus, and her miracles, which occupies more than sixty folio pages of close print.

A story in curious contrast with the highly-wrought legend quoted above attaches to her name, and is embodied in five Latin lines quoted in a sermon on the Nativity by De Gerson (who was chancellor of Paris early in the 15th century), and their quaint suggestion makes it worth while to repeat them here.

"Anna tribus nupsit Joachim, Cleophae, Salomaeque,
Ex quibus ipsa viris peperit tres Anna Marias
Quas duxere Joseph, Alpheus, Zebedaesque,
Prima Jesum; Jacobum Joseph cum Simone Judam
Altera dat; Jacobum dat tertia datque Joannem."

The Bollandist writer (July, vol. vi. p. 250) answers the statements contained in these verses, and then proceeds to refute all objections which can be urged against her monogamy. [E. C. H.]

ANNIANUS (St.), the first bishop of ALEXANDRIA, 63–86, said to have been appointed by St. Mark, after he had wrought a miracle upon him (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 24, iii. 14, 21; *Const. Ap.* vii. 46; *Chron. Orient.* 89; Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* ii. 42, &c.). He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology with St. Mark on April 25. [W.]

ANOMOEANS (from *ἀνόμοιος*, dissimilar), one of the appellations of the radical Arians who, in opposition to the Athanasian or Nicene doctrine of the consubstantiality (*ὁμοουσία*), and the semi-Arian view of the likeness (*ὁμοιουσία*), of the Son to the Father, taught that the Son was dissimilar, and of a different substance (*ἑτεροούσιος*). [ARIANISM.] [P. S.]

ANONOMASTUS (Iren. 56: cf. 54). [VALENTINUS; EPIPHANES.] [H.]

ANSO, monk and abbat of Laube, or Lobbes, in Belgium, and author of the lives of SS. Ursmar and Erminius, his predecessors, succeeded the abbat Theodulfus in 776, and died in 800. He is described by one of his successors, Fulcuin, who died in 990, as a good and holy man, and a sincere and moderately elegant historian. The life of St. Ursmar, dedicated to Theodulfus, was compiled, as Anso states, from the metrical life of this saint, which St. Erminius, his immediate successor in 713, had written, with the addition of some miracles, detailed by eye-witnesses. It may be seen in Mabillon, *Act. SS. Ben.* iii. p. 1, 246; *Act. SS. Boll.* April ii. 560. It is interesting as containing evidence of certain points of ecclesiastical discipline, such as the use of holy water. The life of St. Erminius, or Erminio, who died in 737, was written before 768. It is marked by the same conciseness of detail and style as the preceding life, and is found in Mabillon, *ut supra*, p. 564; *Act. SS. Boll.* April iii. 375. (See *Histoire Lit. de la France*, iv. 203, 204; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 637.) [C. D.]

ANTENOR, a Gallican bishop about 720, is known only as the biographer of St. Silvius, bishop of Terouanne, who died probably in 717. His intimate friendship with the saint commended, while his bad style and method detracted from the value of his work. The defects induced an anonymous author of the 9th cen-

tury to retouch the work, "not altering the sense, but arranging with greater clearness passages which seemed confused and irregular." This interpolated edition only has survived, and may be seen, illustrated with notes and observations, in *Act. SS. Boll.* Febr. iii. 24–32; Mabillon, *Act. Ben.* iii. 1. 295–299. Baillet's criticism of this revised life (*Vies des Saints*, Février, col. 235) seems gratuitously severe. (See *Histoire Lit. de la France*, iv. p. 49; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* p. 622.) [C. D.]

ANTEROS, bishop of Rome; succeeded Bishop Pontianus November 21, A.D. 235 ("Ordinatus xi. Kal. Decembr. coss. Severo et Quintiano," catalogue quoted by Anast. Biblioth., vol. ii. p. 183), but only survived him one month, dying January 3rd, in the next year. ("Dormit iii. non. Januar. Maximino et Africano coss," *loc. cit.*) [G. H. M.]

ANTHEMIUS, a Byzantine official of high rank and character, one of the most celebrated and most highly commended magistrates of his day for his wisdom and administrative power. He regarded Chrysostom with the greatest respect, which was fully returned by the archbishop. At the time of the disturbances that accompanied Chrysostom's deposition, Easter, 404, Anthemius held the place of "magister officiorum." The saint's enemies demanded of him a troop of soldiers to disperse the crowd. At first he positively refused. Subsequently he yielded to their importunity, somewhat weakly throwing the responsibility of the consequences on them (Pallad. p. 83). In 405 Anthemius was made Consul, and very shortly afterwards Prefect of the East (*Cod. Theod. Chronol.* p. 148). Chrysostom wrote to him in warm terms (*Ep.* cxlvii.). The title of Patrician is given him in the law of Ap. 28, 406 (*Cod. Theod. Chron.* p. 149). He held his prefecture till A.D. 417, and was prime minister to Theodosius the younger (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 1). He was the grandfather of the Emperor Anthemius by his daughter married to Procopius. He assisted at the reception at Constantinople of the relics of the prophet Samuel (*Chron. Alex.* p. 714; *Theod. Lect.* ii. 64; Tillemont, *Empereurs*, vi. p. 2. [E. V.]

ANTHEMIUS, bishop of SALAMIS, or Constantia, in Cyprus, at the beginning of the Emperor Zeno's reign, c. 474. He successfully asserted the independence of his see of that of Antioch against Peter the Fuller, aided by the lucky discovery of the body of S. Barnabas buried under a carob-tree, proving the apostolical origin of the church. Theodorus Lector. lib. ii. *ad init.* [E. V.]

ANTHEMUS, bishop of Zorapassa (or Coropassus), on the borders of Isauria and Armenia Minor attended the Council of Nicaea. (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 58.) [E. V.]

ANTHEON, bishop of Arsinoe, fl. about A.D. 484, the author of a letter to Peter the Fuller, condemnatory of his additions to the Trisagion. (*Concil.* iv. p. 1112; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 457.) [E. V.]

ANTHIMUS (Trapezuntius) was raised from the see of Trapezus to the patriarchate of Constantinople, 535, A.D., through the influence of the Empress Theodora, who favoured the Monophysites (*Theoph. Chron.* 183 *Par.*; Niceph.

Hist. xvii. 7). In the next year, Agapetus arrived from Rome, and persuaded the emperor Justinian to cause the accusations which several archimandrites and others (Niceph. xvii. 9) brought against the orthodoxy of Anthimus to be submitted to a Synod at Constantinople (Theoph. 184). Agapetus died before the conclusion of the synod; but Anthimus was condemned as Eutychian, and as having been uncanonically translated (*Conc.* Colet. v. 974). Nicephorus adds (xvii. 9) that Anthimus, though repeatedly summoned, was afraid to present himself before the Council. According to Evagrius (iv. 11) he was induced by Severus of Antioch, the leader of the Monophysites, to resign the see for conscience's sake. There seems no authority for Baronius' statement, that Anthimus was deposed from the priesthood. The sentence of the synod was ratified by the emperor, and Anthimus was banished (*Conc.* v. 1239), his name being classed with those of Arius, Eutyches, and other notorious heretics. It seems, however, from Nicephorus (xvii. 9), as well as from the acts of the Council, that Anthimus professed to accept the Council of Chalcedon; but that he omitted (*Conc.* v. 1051) the name of Leo from the diplychs. He was deposed from the episcopate 536 A.D. [L. G. S.]

ANTHIMUS, bishop of TYANA, an ambitious and contentious prelate, a contemporary of St. Basil, with whom he appears first on friendly terms (Basil. *Ep.* 58). In the year 372 he joins with Basil in subscribing a circular letter addressed by the Oriental bishops to those of Italy and Gaul (*Ep.* 92). But immediately after discussions broke out between them. On two several occasions we find Anthimus in a position of antagonism to Basil. (1) When the province of Cappadocia was divided and Tyana became the capital of the second division, Anthimus insisted that the ecclesiastical arrangements should follow the civil, and claimed metropolitan rights over several of Basil's suffragans. Though a man of advanced age, he carried out his ambitious design with vigour and alacrity. At the same time he was assisted by the disaffection which prevailed in Basil's province. He coaxed some bishops into submission, threatened and overawed some, and expelled others who continued recalcitrant from their sees. He was even bold enough to attack Basil on a journey, and plunder a train of mules laden with supplies of money and provisions for the bishop of Caesarea. This quarrel led to the one act in Basil's life which his friend Gregory never forgave nor forgot. He consecrated Gregory bishop of Sasima, a see which lay not far from Tyana and over which Anthimus claimed metropolitan rights, thinking thus to establish an invincible outpost against his aggressive antagonist. So long as Gregory remained there, he staunchly resisted alike the enticements and the menaces of Anthimus; but he soon resigned the see which he had so unwillingly occupied, and which he could only have maintained by force [GREGORY NAZIANZEN]. A peace, however, was patched up between Basil and Anthimus, apparently by the intercession of Gregory. This happened in the year 372 (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xliii. i. p. 813 sq.; *Ep.* 47, 48, 49, 50, ii. p. 42 sq.; *Carm.* ii. p. 696 sq.) (2) Soon afterwards a

second feud broke out between the two, in which Anthimus was again the aggressor. A certain Faustus had applied to Basil to consecrate him to an Armenian see; but, as he did not produce the proper authority, the consecration was deferred. He immediately applied to Anthimus, who at once complied with his request, thus setting canonical rules at defiance (Basil. *Ep.* 120, 121, 122). A reconciliation, however, seems to have been effected, as we find Basil afterwards speaking of Anthimus in very friendly terms (*Ep.* 210, τὸν ἀδελφόν μου). Except in connexion with Basil and Gregory, nothing is known of this prelate. (See Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* ix. p. 174 sq., 196 sq.; Garnier Vit. Bas. *Op.* iii. p. cxi. sq., p. cxliii. sq. [L.]

ANTHROPIANI. This name occurs in three short lists of representative heresies in Latin authors (Cypr. *Ep.* 73 ad Juh. § 4; Lact. *Inst.* iv. 30; Crescon. ap. Aug. c. *Cresc. Don.* iv. 75 "in omnibus MSS." [Bened.]). Grabe supposes the heretics intended to be the section of Valentinians briefly noticed by Irenaeus (59), who called the First Principle of the universe "Man." Schliemann (*Die Clementinen* 475 f.) with better reason understands the Symmachians, i.e. the Ebionites of N. Africa, sometimes called *Homuncionitae*. They are probably also, as he suggests, the *Anthropolatrae* of the interpolated Ignatian epistle *Ad Trall.* 11, where the old Latin version adds *Hebionitas* to *illos Hominis Cultores*. [H.]

ANTHROPOLATRAE (Ἀνθρωπολάτραι), a nickname given by the Apollinarians (c. A.D. 371) to the Catholics, on the assumption that the union of "perfect God" with "perfect Man" necessarily involved two Persons in Christ, and therefore that the Catholic exposition of the doctrine implied the worship of a *man*: an inference assumed to be avoided by the special Apollinarian dogma. See APOLLINARIS (the Younger). The nickname in question is mentioned by St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* li, who retorts that in truth, if any one is to be called by a name of the kind, the Apollinarian ought to be called "σαρκολάτρης." [A. W. H.]

ANTHROPOMORPHITAE (ANTHROPOMORPHISM), (ἄνθρωπος, *man*, and μορφή, *form*). Terms applied to those who ascribe to God human shape and form. We must distinguish two kinds of anthropomorphism, a doctrinal and a symbolical. The former is heretical, the latter Scriptural, and necessarily arises from the imperfection of human language and human knowledge of God. The one takes the Scripture passages which speak of God's arm, hand, eye, ear, mouth, &c., literally; the other understands and uses them figuratively. Anthropomorphism is always connected with anthropopathism (from ἄνθρωπος and πάθος, *passion*), which ascribes to God human passions and affections, such as wrath, anger, envy, jealousy, pity, repentance. The latter, however, does not necessarily imply the former. All forms of idolatry, especially those of Greece and Rome, are essentially anthropomorphic and anthropopathic. The classical divinities are in character simply deified men and women. The Christian, Jewish, and Mohammedan religions teach that God is a Spirit, and thus elevate him above the reach of materialistic and sensual

conceptions and representations. But within the Christian Church anthropomorphism appeared from time to time as an isolated opinion or as the tenet of a party. Tertullian is often charged with it, because he ascribed to God a body. (*Adv. Prax.* c. 7 :—"Quis enim negabit, Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in effigie.") But he probably identified corporeality with substantiality, and hence he maintained that everything real had a body of some kind. (*De Carne Chr.* c. 11 :—"Omne quod est, corpus est sui generis, nihil est incorporeale, nisi quod non est.") The pseudo-Clementine Homilies (xvii. 2 sq.) teach that God, in order to be an object of love, must be the highest beauty, and, consequently, have a body, since there is no beauty without form; nor could we pray to a God who was mere spirit. (Comp. Baur, *Vorlesungen über die Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i. p. 412.) In the middle of the 4th century Audius, or Audaeus, of Syria, a bold censor of the luxury and vices of the clergy, and an irregularly consecrated bishop, founded a strictly ascetic sect, which were called *Audians* or *Anthropomorphites*, and maintained themselves, in spite of repeated persecution, till the close of the 5th century. He started from a literal interpretation of Gen. i. 28, and reasoned from the nature of man to the nature of God, whose image he was (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 70; Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 9; Walch, *Ketzzerhistorie*, iii. 300). During the Origenistic controversies towards the close of the 4th century, anthropomorphism was held independently by many Egyptian monks in the Scetic desert, who, with Pathomius at their head, were the most violent opponents of the spiritualistic theology of Origen, and were likewise called Anthropomorphites; they felt the need of sensual conceptions in their prayers and ascetic exercises. Theophilus of Alexandria, formerly an admirer of Origen, became his bitter opponent, and expelled the Origenists from Egypt, but nevertheless he rejected the Anthropomorphism of the anti-Origenistic monks (*Epist. Pastr.* for 399). In the present century Anthropomorphism has been revived by the Mormons, who conceive God as an intelligent material being, with body, members, and passions, and unable to occupy two distinct places at once. [P. S.]

ANTHUSA, mother of St. Chrysostom. [CHRYSOSTOM.]

ANTICHRIST.—1. The word (*Ἀντίχριστος*) appears for the first time in 1 John ii. 18, iv. 3. It must be noted, however, that the Apostle does not use it as a new word. Those who read his Epistle had already heard that "Antichrist should come." It is open, therefore, to conjecture, that it had been first uttered in the period of the great burst of Apocalyptic utterances, of which we find traces in St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, and in those of St. Peter, St. Jude, St. John, in the Apocalypse itself. The sharp precision with which St. Paul had pointed to "the man of sin," "the lawless one," "the adversary," "the son of perdition," led men to dwell on that thought rather than on the many *ψευδόχριστοι*, of whom Christ himself had spoken (Matt. xxiii. 24, Mark xiii. 22). All Jewish uses of the word, which appears in later Rabbinic writings in Hebrew characters *אנטיכריסט* (Abarbanel, in Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenth.* ii.

p. 747) are obviously derived from Christian writings.

2. The word, on this its first appearance on the stage of human thought, hovered between two meanings, possibly included both of them. The analogy of *ἀντίθεος* (Hom. *Il.* xxi. 594), *ἀντίλεων* (Aristoph. *Equit.* v. 1041), perhaps also *ἀντίλυτρον* (1 Tim. ii. 6) would lead us to the idea of substitution implied in the preposition, and so the Antichrist would be a "false Christ," claiming to be the true. But every such claim involves rivalry, and therefore antagonism; and the stress laid by St. Paul on his being *ὁ ἀντικείμενος* (2 Thess. ii. 4) might naturally blend that thought also with the other, and might, in course of time, come to supersede it. Speaking generally, the tradition of early patristic writings is in favour of the former, that of later schools of interpretation in favour of the latter view.

3. The exegesis of the passages which speak of Antichrist in the N. T. does not fall within the scope of this paper. But it is difficult to trace what does so fall—the successive phases of men's thoughts about Antichrist in the first eight centuries of the Church—without going back to the *origines* out of which they sprang. And these are to be found (a) in the prophecies of Daniel, of which all the Apocalyptic utterances of the N. T. are more or less reproductions. Whatever view we may take of the date and authorship of those predictions, they led men in the first century to think not only of the "fourth beast," which might symbolise, like the other beasts, a kingdom, but of the "little horn" with "the eyes of a man," and a "mouth speaking great things" (Dan. vii. 8, 20, viii. 9), "making war against the saints," which could hardly be understood of other than an individual ruler. The more detailed prophecies of Dan. viii. 23, xi. 36–39, which spoke of the king of "fierce countenance" who should "destroy the mighty and holy people," and "stand up against the Prince of princes," who should "exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god," and "speak marvellous things against the God of Gods," pointed in the same direction. In the time of the Maccabees they seemed to find a fulfilment in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes, but the words remained in their dim, dark awfulness, as if still waiting for one who should embody them more completely. The sayings in which Our Lord claimed for Himself the name of the Son of Man, and spoke of His coming as such "in the clouds of Heaven," and referred to the "abomination of desolation" (Matt. xxvi. 64, xxiv. 15), drew men's thoughts to the passages of Daniel in which they were named (Dan. vii. 13, 14, ix. 27), and so to those others in which the enemy of the Messiah and the holy people had been portrayed. (b) Partly in the recorded prophecies of the N. T. already referred to, partly in the unrecorded utterances of the prophets who in every Church were telling their true or false visions of things to come, the thought of a personal Antichrist, the rival and enemy of the true Messiah, took shape and grew. Men either identified or connected him with the "man of sin," the "lawless one" of 2 Thess. ii., with the "beast" of Rev. xiii., with the "false prophet" of Rev. xvi. 13, xix. 10, xx. 10. There was enough in all this at once to excite and to

affle curiosity. We cannot wonder that it should have been fruitful in hot thoughts and fevered dreams. (c) The influence of Jewish traditions about Antichrist on the current belief of the Christian Church must be looked on as infinitesimally small. The wild and obscene legends cited by Eisenmenger (ii. p. 707 *et. seq.*), about an Armillus who is to present himself to the Edomites (=Romans=Christians), and be received by them as a Messiah, who is to be a terrible monster, with red hair and green feet, twelve ells in height and the same in breadth, first slaying the true Christ, and then slain by Him on His return from Heaven, does not go further back than the 15th century, and even if it be supposed to embody traditions of an earlier date, the total absence of any reference to such views in patristic literature may be accepted as a proof that the Christian conjectures, however fanciful, were not derived from Judaism.

4. Three ways of dealing with the name of Antichrist are traceable in patristic literature. (1) As St. John, while pointing to the Antichrist, had yet spoken of "many" who might so be called, and had given, as a characteristic note of Antichrist, the denial of "the Father and the Son," the denial, also, that "Jesus Christ was come in the flesh" (1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3), so later writers did not shrink from applying the term to the heretical teacher with whom they happened for the time being to be in controversy. So Tertullian applies it to Marcion (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 8), Athanasius to Constantius (*Epist. ad Solit. Vit. Agent.* pp. 842, 852). Gregory the Great sees at least the "forerunner of Antichrist" in John the Faster, the Patriarch of Constantinople, because he claimed, as others had done before him, the title of "Universal (ὁικουμενικός) Bishop" (*Epist.* vii. 33). This was, of course, more or less rhetorical, as men talk now of the "footfalls of the coming Antichrist," and did not tie those who used it to any definite identification. We shall find (*infra*) the same writers speaking of the Antichrist as still future. (2) The two great writers of the Alexandrian School seem to turn away altogether from this and other regions of apocalyptic study. Clement makes no mention of the Antichrist at all; Origen, after his fashion, passes into the region of generalizing allegory. The Antichrist, the "adversary," is "false doctrine," the temple of God in which he sits and exalts himself, is the written Word; men are to flee when he comes, to "the mountains of truth" (*Hom.* 29 in *Matt.*). Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat.* xi. c. *Eunom.*) follows in the same track. So far as this showed more than a general shrinking from the whole question, it involved the assumption that what others had spoken rhetorically was in fact the application of a true exegesis to a particular instance.

5. Neither of these methods however, was calculated to satisfy those who looked to the Apocalyptic language of the N. T. as a real unveiling of the future, and we have to note accordingly (3) the various conjectures that appeared from time to time as to the origin and characteristic features of the individual Antichrist. (a) Foremost among these is that which identified him with Nero. Many elements of thought probably entered into this conjecture. The attempt of Caligula to set up his statue in the Temple of Jerusalem, the tendency to the deifi-

cation of dead and even of living Emperors, had led men to look in that quarter for the appearance of the last great rivalry with the living God. Even the very title of Augustus in its Greek form Σεβαστὸς, would suggest that it implied an exaltation of him who claimed it over every other σέβασμα. And the impression left by Nero's monstrous vices, as well as by his persecution of the Christians, on the minds of men, led them, as they read of one who "was, and is not, and yet is," of one who was "wounded to death," but whose "deadly wound was healed" (Rev. xvii. 8, xiii. 3), to expect his return from the grave, armed with a mightier power for evil. Incompatible as the notion was with any systematic interpretation of the Apocalypse, it took root, and only slowly died out. It appears in its fullest form in the commentary on the Apocalypse ascribed to Victorinus of Pettau (A.D. 290). Nero was to rise from the dead, was to be accepted by the Jews as the Messiah ("Christum qualem meruerunt"), was to try to lead the saints, "non ad idola colenda, sed ad circumcisionem" (*Bibl. Max.* iii. p. 420). The uncertainty which hung over the burial-place of Nero, the Sibylline verses which had spoken of the coming of a "matricide" tyrant and persecutor, tended to deepen the impression (Lactant. *De Mortib. Persecut.* c. 2). Perhaps the belief that St. John, the Seer of the Apocalypse, was himself not dead but sleeping, reserved to rise again as one of the two prophets of his own vision, or in addition to the two that were identified with Enoch and Elijah (Rev. xi.), in order that he might bear his witness against the risen Nero, risen with mightier power and more monstrous claims, fell in with the popular belief. Such a belief could not, of course, be a lasting one. Lactantius speaks of it as held only by "deliri quidam" (*l. c.*). Jerome (*Comm. in Dan.*, xi. 17) and Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 13) mention it as still held by "many." Other interpretations were, however, scarcely less fantastic. (b) Starting partly from the omission of the tribe of Dan from the list of the tribes of Israel "sealed" in the Apocalypse (Rev. vii.), partly from the words which spoke of him as an "adder" and a "serpent" (Gen. xlix. 17), men came to dream that the Antichrist would be born of that tribe (Hippolytus, p. 7 ed. Lagarde; Arethas, *Cat. in Rev. vii.*; Pseudo-Athanas. *Quaest. ad Antioch.* 108; Theodoret, *Qu. iii. in Num.* p. 142). Cyril of Jerusalem, who gives the greater part of one of his *Catecheses* (xv.) to the subject, though seeing, after the fashion of his time, "forerunners of Antichrist" in the Arian teachers, declares, as speaking in the name of the Church, (giving, *i. e.*, the accepted interpretation of his time), that the Antichrist himself will be a magician, who, starting with being one of eleven claimants to it, should, by his enchantments, seize on the Roman Empire, take the title of Christ, deceive the Jews, assume a tone of philanthropy, and finally show himself murderous and cruel towards all men, and especially towards the Christians. He is to come when Jerusalem shall be utterly destroyed, and is to present himself as the son of David who is to rebuild it, and in that Temple will he sit claiming and receiving the worship which is due to God. This shall go on for the appointed time of three years and a half, and then he shall be slain by the Sou

of God, on His second advent from Heaven (*Catech.* xv.). The Pseudo-Athanasius (*Quaest. ad Antioch.* 108), while adopting the notion that the Antichrist would come from Dan (quoting, as a proof, Deut. xxxiii. 22), and identifying "Bashan" there spoken of with Scythopolis, and therefore looking to Galilee as the place of his appearing, mentions, as an "old wife's tale," which he thinks it worth while refuting, the belief that he would appear in Egypt, and have but one hand and one eye, and with them work miracles, the one miracle of raising the dead excepted. (c) The line taken by Chrysostom and the commentators who follow in his track, is, on the whole, less wild. As they interpret Scripture, the Antichrist is not to lead men either to idolatry or Judaism, but to simple Atheism. He will claim homage as the mightiest man, will sit, not in the temple at Jerusalem nor in any local building, but in the whole Ecclesia, as demanding worship (Chrysost. and Theophylact. in 2 *Thess.* ii.). (d) Theodoret, however, goes a step further, and sees in Antichrist an absolute incarnation of $\delta \alpha \nu \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \omega \varsigma \delta \alpha \iota \mu \omega \nu$, born as man in the tribe of Dan, and calling himself the Christ (*Epit. Divin. Decret.* c. xxiii. p. 300, *Qu.* iii. in *Num.* p. 142). [E. H. P.]

ANTIDIKOMARIANITAE (Ἀντιδικομαριανῖται) = Adversaries of Mary, *Ephraim. Haer.* lxxix.). The name given to those in Arabia in the latter part of the 4th century, who (in opposition to the Κολλοριδιανίδες) maintained the novel supposition advanced at that time by Bonosus of Sadica, and by Helvidius, that "our Lord's Brethren" were children born by the Blessed Virgin to Joseph after our Lord's birth. The controversy arose out of the then prevailing reverence for virginity, which in its extreme form had led certain women, originally from Thrace, but dwelling in Arabia, to celebrate an idolatrous festival in honour of the Virgin, by taking certain cakes (κολλύριδες) about in chariots, and then solemnly offering them to her and consuming them, in imitation of the Lord's Supper, or (more probably) of the pagan worship of Ceres. The reaction from this superstition led to the existence of the sect spoken of in this article, which, contemporaneously with the controversy carried on by St. Jerome and by others against Helvidius and Bonosus, the literary supporters of the hypothesis, was led to endeavour to cut away all pretence for the Collyridian superstition by adopting their view and so denying its very groundwork. The question respecting that controversy itself is discussed in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, under BROTHERS and JAMES. And for its literary history, see under BONOSUS, HELVIDIUS, HIERONYMUS. [A. W. H.]

ANTIOCHUS. (1) Bishop of PTOLEMAIS, flourished c. 401 A.D. The reputation he gained as a preacher in his provincial city awoke in him the desire of displaying his oratorical powers in a wider field. He accordingly left Ptolemais and settled at Constantinople, where his fine voice and appropriate action, together with the eloquent and perspicuous character of his discourses, soon attracted large auditories, by whom, like his great contemporary John, he was surnamed "The Golden-mouthed." Having amassed considerable wealth, he returned to his deserted see, where he employed his leisure in composing

a long treatise "against avarice." He took a zealous part in the proceedings against Chrysostom, and is reckoned by Palladius among his bitterest enemies. He died in the reign of Arcadius, before A.D. 408, and, according to Nicephorus, his end, in common with all the enemies of Chrysostom, was miserable. Besides the treatise "against avarice," already mentioned, a homily on "*The Cure of the Blind Man*" is mentioned. With the exception of a sentence quoted by Theodoret, *Dial.* 2, and a longer fragment given in the *Catena on St. John* xix. p. 443, his works have perished (*Socr.* vi. 11; *Soz.* viii. 10; *Niceph.* xiii. 26; *Gennadius in Catalog.*; *Pallad. Dialog.* p. 49; *Fabr. Bibl. Graec.* ix. 259).

(2) A monk of the monastery of St. Saba; born at Medosaga, 20 miles from Ancyra in Galatia (*Lambec.* iii. p. 140). He flourished in the reign of the Emperor Heraclius, and witnessed the capture and sack of Jerusalem by Chosroes A.D. 614, when the true Cross was carried away into Persia as the noblest trophy of conquest (*Homil.* cvii.; *Exomolog.* sub fin.). There is still extant, "if what no one reads may be said to be extant" (*Gibbon*, c. xli.), a voluminous work of his entitled *πανδέκτης τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς*, divided into 130 homilies, each enforcing some definite moral duty confirmed by passages from Scripture and the writings of the fathers. The epistle dedicatory to Eustathius, provost of the monastery of Attalia, near his old home of Ancyra, contains an account of the sacking of the monastery of St. Saba, and the cruelties perpetrated by the Saracens on the monks. It closes with an Exomologesis or prayer that God would turn away his wrath from Jerusalem (*Fabric. Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 34. *Cave, Hist. Lit.* i. p. 572.) [E. V.]

ANTIPATER, governor of Cappadocia, a friend of St. Basil. When Antipater enters upon his province (A.D. 373), Basil writes to excuse his attendance on the ground of illness, and to recommend Palladia to his correspondent's protection (*Ep.* 137). At a later date some playful letters pass between them (*Ep.* 186, 187). [L.]

ANTIPATER (Ἀντίπατρος) flourished about 460 A.D. He succeeded Constantine, who was present at the council of Chalcedon 451, as bishop of Bostra in Arabia. He was the author of a *Refutation of Eusebius' Apology for Origen*, entitled *ἀντιρρήσις*. Some fragments of the first book of this are extant in the acts of the second Nicene council (Labbe, *Concil.* vii. 367), and more copiously in the *Ἱερά παράλλαλα* of Joannes Damascenus. This work was of such authority that it was ordered to be publicly read in churches, in the hope of checking the growth of Origen's doctrines (*Cotelerius Monument. Eccl. Graec.* vol. iii. p. 362). Sermons are attributed to him on the first chapter of St. Luke, of which a Latin translation is printed in *Combes Biblioth. Concion.* vol. vii. p. 106, on τὰ ἔγχα Θεοφάνεια, and on the woman with the issue of blood, which is also quoted in the acts of the same council (Labbe, *Concil.* vii. 208; *Cave, Hist. Lit.* i. p. 447; *Fabric. Bibl. Graec.* x. p. 274.) [E. V.]

ANTIPOPE, claimants to the popedom in opposition to the lawful popes. There were eight such during the first eight centuries, some owing their elevation to the existence of conflicting parties at Rome, others intruded into the

see by the civil power. A fuller account of them, with the authorities, is given under their respective names.

1. NOVATIANUS, elected and consecrated in the middle of the 3rd century, after the Decian persecution, in opposition to Cornelius, by the party called Cathari (the opponents of the re-admission of the lapsi into the Church), and through the influence of Novatus of Carthage, who was then at Rome. Hence originated the sect of the Novatians. [CORNELIUS; NOVATIANUS.]

2. FELIX, intruded into the see of Rome by the Emperor Constantius, after the banishment of Liberius, A.D. 355, and apparently retaining his position as a rival bishop, supported by his party, after the return of the latter. Though appearing in the Roman Calendar as a lawful pope, a saint and martyr, his place, according to all ancient historical evidence, is properly among the antipopes. [LIBERIUS; FELIX.]

3. URSINUS (or Ursicinus), a deacon of Rome, elected and ordained as Pope, on the death of Liberius, A.D. 366, probably by the party who had supported that Pope, in opposition to Damasus, elected and ordained by the party of Felix. After much riot and bloodshed, the party of Damasus prevailed, though Ursinus, banished by Juventus, the prefect of the city, in 366, recalled and again banished by the Emperor Valentinian in 367, continued to agitate Rome through his partisans during the life of his rival, whom he survived. The claim of Damasus to be the true Pope rests upon the supposed priority of his election and consecration, which is asserted by the contemporary Jerome and Rufinus, and by Socrates, his claim being recognized also by St. Ambrose, by councils held twelve years afterwards at Rome and in 381 at Aquileia, and by the general subsequent consent of the Church. It should be observed, however, that the two noted contemporary Luciferian presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, in their detailed account of these events, represent Ursinus as having been elected first, and hence Damasus as the antipope, as well as responsible for the ensuing tumult and bloodshed. But their testimony, due possibly to party feeling against Damasus (of persecution under whom they complained) is greatly outweighed by that on the other side. [DAMASUS; URSINUS.]

4. EULALIUS, elected and consecrated simultaneously with Boniface I. in December, A.D. 418, as successor to Pope Zozimus. The disputed election was eventually settled by a rescript of the Emperor Honorius in the April of the following year, banishing Eulalius, and putting Boniface in possession of the see. [BONIFACE; EULALIUS.]

5. LAURENTIUS, elected and consecrated on the same day with Symmachus, as successor to Anastasius II., Dec. 22, A.D. 499. The circumstances of the time in this case intensified the feuds usual on the election of a pope. It was the period of the forty years' schism between Rome and Constantinople due to the excommunication of Acacius by Pope Felix, in connexion with the Monophysite controversy. Laurentius was supported by the party, headed by Festus or Faustus Niger, the Patrician, which favoured the conciliatory attitude towards the East assumed by the deceased Pope; Symmachus was

supported by the party of rigid orthodoxy. Tumults and bloodshed, as was usual in such cases, followed the double election, till the matter was finally settled by the intervention of the Gothic King Theodoric, himself an Arian, who decided in favour of Symmachus, on the ground both of majority of votes and priority of election. [SYMMACHUS; LAURENTIUS.]

6. DIOSCORUS, a deacon of Rome, elected by his party and consecrated on the same day with Boniface II., as successor to Pope Felix III. (or IV.), Sept. 21, A.D. 530. Happily his death on the 14th of October prevented in this case the customary riots, leaving Boniface undisputed Pope, who excommunicated his deceased rival. The anathema was revoked by the next Pope Agapetus. [BONIFACE II.]

7. VIGILIUS, intruded by the imperial power into the see of Rome, while canonically full. Belisarius, having got possession of Rome, A.D. 537, was commissioned by the Empress Theodora to depose the reigning Pope Silverius, and put the deacon Vigilius, in his place; which was accordingly done. Silverius having lived nearly a year after his expulsion, thus uncanonically effected, Vigilius is properly regarded as a mere antipope during that period, whatever his claim to the lawful possession of the see afterwards. [SILVERIUS; VIGILIUS.]

8. EUGENIUS, elected and ordained Pope in September, A.D. 654, during the lifetime of Martin I., the reigning Pope (who had been in the previous year violently deposed by the Emperor Constans), and hence, like Vigilius, to be reckoned an antipope at the commencement of his reign. The reason of Martin's deposition was his resolute opposition to the Monothelite heresy, then dominant at Constantinople, and favoured by the emperors. His death in September, A.D. 655, left Eugenius in undisputed possession of the see, his acceptance by the clergy and people being considered to have supplied the place of a regular election. [MARTIN; EUGENIUS.]

[J. B.—Y.]

ANTITACTAE. This name is given by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 526–9) to an obscure libertine sect, apparently of Gnostic origin. God, the Creator of the universe, they said, is our Father by nature, and all things that He has made are good; but one of those who owed their existence to Him afterwards sowed the tares and engendered evil; and by entangling us all in evil he set us in opposition to God. For this reason, they declared, "in order to avenge the Father, we too oppose ourselves to the will of the second [maker]" (cf. *Ep. Plat.* ii. 312 E); and since he said "Thou shalt not commit adultery," we commit adultery in order to break his commandment." Other particulars may be gleaned from the refutation which follows. The Antitactae claimed to obey "the Saviour" alone. They strung together verses picked out of the prophets, interpreting, Clement says, in a literal manner what was written allegorically. The instance given is singular. They appropriated to themselves the words of the murmurers in Mal. iii. 15, "They opposed themselves to God and were saved," interpolating before "God" the epithet "shameless" (τῶ ἀναίδει; but? ἀνελεῖ, merciless.) Clement further accuses them of "perverting the Scriptures to their

own pleasures by the tone of their voice," "altering certain accents and stops."

The ascription of creation to the "good" "Father" would dissociate the Antitactae from all properly Gnostic sects, did not Clement twice give the name "Creator" (Demiurge) to the being to whom they professed to oppose themselves. This being somewhat resembles "the evil one" of the Clementine Homilies (ii. 38 ff.), at least in his relation to the Old Testament; but the libertine theory of morals recalls rather the Cainite section of the Ophites.

Clement begins his description with the words "Certain others whom we also call Antitactae;" and the name may have been extemporised to denote the favourite idea of the sect, "opposition." Clement himself uses the verb (*ἀντιτάσσομαι*) often in the preceding pages for the "opposition" to the Demiurge cultivated by the ascetic group of Gnostics. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 16: cf. v. 9, 17) chiefly copies Clement, and evidently had no other authority for his account of the Antitactae. [H.]

ANTITRINITARIANS. [MONARCHIANS.]

ANTONIANUS, a bishop who wrote, A.D. 252, to Cyprian, to assure him of his adherence to him and to Cornelius against Novatian; but who was afterwards much shaken by a letter from Novatian justifying the purity of his doctrine and accusing the laxity of the pope Cornelius. Cyprian (*Ep.* 55) takes great pains to show him the excellence of Cornelius's life and policy and the danger of Novatian's rigour, apparently with success, as Antonian appears in *Ep.* 70 as one of the Numidian bishops to whom that synodical letter (Conc. Carth. sub. Cyp. *de Bap.* 1) is addressed. [E. W. B.]

ANTONINUS, surnamed HONORATUS, by Gennadius (*De Script.* c. 95), a bishop of Constantia in Africa, fl. about A.D. 437, during the persecution of the orthodox by Genserich. He was the author of a *Consolatoria et Exhortatoria ad Labores pro Christo ferendos Epistola*, addressed to a certain Arcadius, who, having been previously a friend of Genserich's, had been banished for the faith, and was afterwards martyred. This letter breathes a truly Christian heroism, and deserves perusal. (*Bibl. Pat.* Colon. 1618, tom. v. p. 640; Baron. *Ad Ann.* 437; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 426.) [E. V.]

ANTONINUS, M. AURELIUS. [AURELIUS.]

ANTONINUS PIUS, Emperor, A.D. 138-161. The character of this prince as loving righteousness and mercy, choosing rather, in his own noble words, "to save the life of one citizen than to slay a thousand foes," showed itself, as in other things, so also in his treatment of the Christians of the empire. Hadrian had checked the tendency to persecution by imposing severe penalties on false accusers (Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. c. 68). In some way or other, Antoninus was led to adopt a policy which was even more favourable to them (Xiphilin., *Epit. Dion. Cass.* l. 70, p. 1173). Melito, writing his *Apologia* to Marcus Aurelius (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26), speaks of edicts which Antoninus had issued to the people of Larissa, Thessalonica, Athens, and to the Greeks at large, forbidding any new and violent measures (*μὴδὲν νεωτερίσειν*) against the Chris-

tians. A more memorable proof of his tolerance is found, if the document be genuine, in the decree addressed to the General Assembly of the proconsular province of Asia, at a time when the Christian Church was exposed to outrages of all kinds (*πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*). It speaks in admiring terms of the innocence of the Christians, declares the charges against them to be unproved, bids men admire the steadfastness and faith with which they met the earthquakes and other calamities that drove others to despair, ascribes the persecution to the jealousy which men felt against those who were truer worshippers of God than themselves. Unfortunately, however, the weight of evidence preponderates against the genuineness of the edict. The two texts which are found, one in Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 13), the other appended to the First *Apology* of Justin, differ in many points. Eusebius, who ascribes it to Antoninus Pius, gives a copy which purports to come from Marcus Aurelius, and that attached to the *Apology* is clearly an addition by a later hand. Melito, whom Eusebius represents as referring to this edict (*H. E.* iv. 26), in reality fails (as Neander observes) to quote it and falls back upon others far less directly to his purpose than this would have been, had he known it. And internal evidence, too, tends to the same conclusions. It is too good, too Christian, to have come from a heathen emperor. On the whole, therefore, we are compelled to follow Scaliger, and Reimar, and Dodwell and Thirlby, and Jortin and Mjlmán, and Neander and Gieseler, and a host of others, in rejecting it as the forgery of some Christian of the latter half of the 2nd century, trying to embody in his own high-coloured language the substance of decrees which had really been issued in favour of the Christians, rather than Tillemont and Lardner in accepting it as really coming from Antoninus, or Valesius, the editor of Eusebius, in assigning it to Marcus Aurelius. The last supposition is indeed the most improbable of all, as it is absolutely inconsistent with the general policy of that emperor [AURELIUS]. The fullest discussion of it is to be found in Lardner's *Works*, vol. vii. p. 383; *Testimonies of Ancient Heathens*, ch. xiv. In any case it is natural to connect the more lenient policy, which there is no doubt that Antoninus adopted, with the memorable *Apologia* which Justin addressed to him. Confining ourselves to its bearing on the character of the emperor, we note (1) that there had been at least the threat of persecution even unto death (c. 68); (2) that it is written throughout in a tone of manifest respect as to men not unworthy of the epithets that were attached to their names ("Pius" to Antoninus, "philosopher" to Verissimus and Lucius); (3) that the mere fact of the dedication and, apparently, presentation of such an address implies a tolerance which had not been often found in preceding emperors; (4) that even the forged document, if it be such, shows that there was a certain verisimilitude in the ascription of such a document to him. [E. H. P.]

ANTONINUS, 27th bishop of JERUSALEM, succeeded Maximus II. between A.D. 136 and A.D. 190. His name appears in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, and is given by Georgius Syncellus and Nicephorus; but though it is necessary to

complete the total number of bishops named by him, it is omitted in the History of Eusebius, v. 12, probably through an error of the transcribers (Clinton, *Fasti Romani*; Valesius, *ad Euseb. H. E. l. c.*) [E. V.]

ANTONIUS, bishop of GERMA in the province of the Hellespont. Instigated by Nestorius, he proceeded against the Macedonians with such severity, that, finding their position intolerable, they assassinated him. The emperors in consequence deprived them of their churches (Socr. vii. 31). [L.]

ANTONIUS, St. (Abbas), is termed by Athanasius "the founder of asceticism" and his life a "model for monks" (*Præf. Vit. St. Ant.*). In this aspect as typical of the eremitic life, his name deserves more than a passing mention, especially as we have a tolerably complete biography of him by Athanasius, derived in part from his own recollections, in part from others who had known him, as well as frequent mention of him by the ecclesiastical historians. The life by Athanasius is probably interpolated.

Antony, as he is commonly called in England, was born about 250 A.D., at Coma, on the borders of Upper Egypt (Soz. *Hist. i. 13*). By his parents, who were wealthy Christians, he was trained in pious habits; but though docile and diligent, he showed no taste either for learning or for boyish games (Ath. *Vit. S. Ant.*; Aug. *de Doct. in Prol.*). Six months after the death of his parents, being then 18 years of age, he chanced to hear in church the words "If thou wilt be perfect," &c., and resolved to obey the precept literally, reserving only a small portion for his sister. Returning into the church he heard, "Take no thought for the morrow." On this he resolved to commend her to the care of some devout woman, and gave away all his property, without exception, to the poor (Ath. *cf. Soz. i. 13*).

At that time cells of Anchorites (*μοναστήρια*) were very rare in Egypt, and none far from the habitations of men. Antony retired by degrees farther and farther from his native village, till he fixed his abode first in a tomb, afterwards in a ruined castle near the Nile. Here he remained some 20 years, shut up for months at a time with only bread and water (the bread of the country is said to be good for keeping), and issuing forth only to instruct the multitudes who flocked to see and hear him; at other times communication was prevented by a huge stone at the entrance. During the persecution of Maximianus (311 A.D.), in which their bishop had fallen, he went to comfort the Christians of Alexandria; and though the presence of monks at these trials was forbidden as encouraging the martyrs in their disobedience to the emperor's edict, he persisted in appearing in court. When the storm had ceased he withdrew, though now an old man, to a more complete isolation than ever, near the Red Sea; and here, to save his disciples the trouble of bringing him food, he made a small field of wheat, which he cultivated with his own hands, working also at making mats. From time to time he revisited his former disciples in the Thebaid, always, however, declining to preside over a convent. About 335 A. D. he revisited Alexandria at the urgent request of Athanasius to preach against the Arians (Theod. *Hist. iv.*

27), and there was followed by crowds as "the man of God." But he soon returned to the congenial seclusion of his cell, and there died, at the great age of 105, in the presence of the two disciples, Amathas and Macarius, who had ministered to his wants during the last 15 years. They describe him in his last moments as one who "saw and welcomed the approach of friends." He had always expressed a dread of being embalmed, as was still customary in Egypt; and the place of his sepulture was kept secret by the two eye-witnesses of his death. To them he bequeathed his hair-shirt; and the rest of his worldly goods, his two woollen tunics and the rough cloak on which he slept, to bishop Serapion and St. Athanasius (Ath. *Vit. S. Ant.*).

The fame of Antony spread rapidly through Christendom; and the effect of his example in inducing Christians, especially in the East, to embrace the monastic life is described by his biographers as incalculable. In the next century he began to be venerated as a Saint by the Greek Church, and in the ninth by the Latin. He is said to be the author of *Seven Epistles* to certain Eastern monasteries, which have been translated from the Egyptian into the Greek (Hieron. *de Script. 88*), and are now extant in Latin (Cave, *Hist. Lit.*). Though by all accounts far from being a learned man (Soz. *Hist. i. 13*; Niceph. *Hist. vii. 40*; Ath. *Vit. S. Ant.*), it is hardly consistent with the discourses ascribed to him to suppose that he was altogether illiterate. To a pagan philosopher, wondering at his want of books, he replied, "My book, oh philosopher! is Nature" (Socr. *Hist. iv. 23*). His influence was great even at the Court of the Emperor. Constantine the Great and his sons wrote to him as a father (Ath.), and when Athanasius was contending with the Meletians, Antony wrote from his cell to the Emperor in behalf of his friend (Soz. *ii. 31*). He wrote boldly also to Balacius, sub-prefect of Alexandria, a partisan of the Arians, remonstrating against the persecution of the orthodox, and the sudden death of Balacius soon afterwards when riding was considered a judgment for his disregard of this letter (Ath.). Persons of rank often sought in vain to allure him from his hermitage. His reply was, "As a fish dies out of water, so a monk out of his cell." The only chance of obtaining an interview with him was to claim his intervention for some one in distress. His austerities were extraordinary, his food was only bread and water; as a rule he fasted till sunset, sometimes for four days together. Of sleep he was equally sparing. His coarse rough shirt is said to have lasted him for a lifetime; and his only ablutions seem to have been involuntary in wading occasionally through a river. Yet he lived to an unusual age, robust, and in full possession of his faculties to the last. In fact nothing less than a constitution of iron could have endured such privations. He was not morose to others. He is described as invariably cheerful in look and manner; with something in his presence which, notwithstanding his low stature, attracted the attention of strangers even in a crowd; not like a wild man of the woods, but urbane and social (*πολιτικός οὐδ' ἄγριος*. Ath.). Only to heretics he was austere and repulsive; refusing to hold any intercourse with them even for a moment. He was careful always, though so universally revered, not to

arrogate to himself priestly function; showing, even in his old age, a marked and studious deference even to the youngest deacons (Ath.).

Antony was evidently a man, not merely of strong determination, but of ability, and the discourses, if indeed they are his, which his disciples record as addressed to themselves and to the pagan philosophers who disputed with him, show that if he read little he thought much. He met objections against the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Resurrection as mysterious by the retort that the pagan mythology, whether in its grossness as apprehended by the vulgar or as the mystical system of philosophers, was equally unreasonable. From their dialectical subtleties he appealed to facts; to a Christian's contempt of death and triumph over temptation; and contrasted the decay of pagan oracles and magic with the growth of Christianity in spite of persecutions. He is said also to have challenged his opponents to heal some demons who were standing by (Ath.). Similarly his exhortations to his disciples, if we may trust the account which Athanasius seems to have received from them, were rich in Scriptural texts, and show an acquaintance with Greek philosophy. The excellence of the soul, he taught, consists in its intelligence being in its state of nature; and this, he added, depends on the intention. He insisted on practical morality; and, in particular, on strictness of self-examination, with an especial injunction of charity and humility (Ath.): warning his hearers that austerity alone was worthless without discretion. But, as is usual with solitary ascetics, he fostered by his teaching and example a morbid self-consciousness, recommending that a diary should be kept even of secret thoughts; and the basis of his arguments for self-improvement is that eternal life is worth buying (*ἀγοράζεται*, Ath.) at any price. He taught also, that prayer to be perfect must be ecstatic (Cass. *Coll.* ix. 31). Mingled too with sound and practical advice are strange stories of his visions, in which he describes himself as engaged continually in deadly conflict with evil spirits manifesting themselves not infrequently in forms more ludicrous than terrible. Such narratives appear simply childish and preposterous to a less imaginative age; and may be imputed not without probability to the morbid action of a restless intellect in the silence and loneliness of the desert. Still they may fairly be taken as an expression, however grotesque, of latent truths, as an attempt to realise the insidious force of evil tendencies. In one passage Antony draws a striking and beautiful contrast between the uproar of the demons who assailed him and the awful stillness of the angel hovering over the host of Sennacherib by night (Ath.).

Beyond the personal encounters with demons, and a special faculty of exorcising them from others, it is not clear how far and in what manner Antony believed himself able to work miracles. To Martianus, a military prefect, who came praying for his assistance, he answered, "Ask not of me; ask of God in Christ, and thy child shall be healed." "Any pure heart," he said on another occasion, when addressed as a prophet, "can foretell things to come;" and he warned his disciples against paying any attention if evil spirits offered to predict the rising of the Nile. Miraculous powers, however, were ascribed to

him by his admirers, sometimes of a very puerile sort; as when he is said to have detected on board-ship a person possessed by an evil spirit through a bad smell. The water found in answer to his prayers by himself and his companions as they journeyed through the desert, need not be regarded as supernatural; and the voice which guided him in the Thebaid may only mean the voice of conscience. It would indeed be strange, if so lonely an existence did not breed many involuntary and unconscious illusions; still more strange if those whose eyes were dazzled by the almost more than human self-abnegation of the great eremite had not been almost irresistibly led to exaggerate his proportions viewed through a deceptive haze. Among the many in whom the marvellous experiences of Antony awoke a longing to renounce the world was Augustine himself (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 6, 12).

Such a life as this is no subject for indiscriminate eulogy, still less for supercilious sneers. There is much to regret; misdirected zeal, talents not made useful as they might have been, and a morbid dread of contact with the material world. But the single minded steadfastness with which Antony acted up to his sense of duty ought to command admiration; and the circumstances of his age had much to do in determining the course which his devout aspirations followed. He is commemorated on January 17th. The other writings attributed to him, beside the *Septem Epistolae* already mentioned are probably spurious. [I. G. S.]

ANUPH (St.) (Anub, or Nub), a monk of Scetis in the fourth century, brother of St. Poemen. (Tillemont, *Ecc. Hist.* vii. 192, distinguishes this Anuph from the brother of Poemen, apparently without cause.) When the monasteries there were devastated by the Mazici, a Moorish tribe, he retired with his brother to Terenuthi. As a proof of his asceticism, it is recorded that he and his brother refused to see even their own mother (Ruff. *de Mon.* 10, *de Verb.* Sen. 199; Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 58; Gr. Inc. ap. Rosw. *V. P.* v. 4, 15, vii. 42; Soz. *Hist.* iii. 14; Nic. *Hist.* ix. 14). [I. G. S.]

ANYSIUS, bishop of THESSALONICA, succeeded his master Ascholius, appointed his vicar in Illyria, by Pope Damasus, 383—an office continued to him by Popes Siricius, Anastasius, and Innocent (Holstenius, *Collect. Roman.* Romae, 1662, pp. 43, 45). On his appointment, Ambrose wrote both to him and the clergy of Macedonia, expressing his joy that there had not been a moment's doubt as to Ascholius' successor (Ambrose, *Ep.* xv. xvi.). On Chrysostom's condemnation, Anysius assembled the Macedonian bishops and drew up a synodical letter to Pope Innocent, detailing all that had been done, and declaring his resolution to abide by the decision of the Roman Church, *ἐμμένειν τῇ κρίσει τῶν Ῥωμαίων* (Pallad. 26). He wrote to Chrysostom early in 405, expressing his disapprobation of all the acts of his enemies. Chrysostom sent letters in return to him and to the orthodox bishops of Macedonia, early in 406, by Evethus, commending the vigour and courage with which he had acted (Chrys. *Ep.* cxii. cxlii.). Anysius was canonized, and stands in the Roman martyrology Dec. 30. [E. V.]

AORATUS (Iren. 55 f.; cf. 54). [VALENTINUS; EPIPHANES.] [H.]

APATOR (Iren. 24). [VALENTINUS.] [H.]

APELLES, a Gnostic, the most famous and original of Marcion's disciples. According to Tertullian (*De Praescr.* 30; cf. *De Carne Chr.* 1) he had to "withdraw from the presence of his most holy master," evidently at Rome, owing to an act of incontinence, and went to Alexandria. After some years, the statement proceeds, he returned and attached himself to a virgin named Philumene, who subsequently became a prostitute. Tertullian's avidity in accepting scandal, especially of an unclean kind, when the subject is a heretic or a pagan, must throw some doubt on this account; and it might be suspected that there is some confusion with the similar story of Marcion at Sinope [MARCION], with which Tertullian was not acquainted. On the other hand he had good opportunities of knowing the recent history of Roman Christianity; and there is a clear reference to the same occurrence in the anonymous [Ps. Tert.] *Libellus c. Omn. Haer.* 19, which is one of the authorities (17) for Marcion's misconduct. As nothing to the discredit of Apelles is recorded by Epiphanius or Philastrius, the author of this little treatise probably had no independent information; and there is sufficient evidence (cf. R. A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik d. Epiph.* 33 f.) that he was a Roman churchman contemporary with Tertullian. Yet the local tradition more than half a century after the event, though doubly attested, must be received with hesitation when it records a scandalous story unsupported by other evidence. Apelles' partial "desertion" of Marcion's doctrine ("Apelles discipulus et postea desertor ipsius," Tert. *De Carne Chr.* 1; "Apelli ceterisque desertoribus Marcionis," *Adv. Marc.* iii. 11) would help to build up the tradition, which may well have a base of fact, however distorted.

The imputation cast on Philumene and her relations with Apelles is set aside by abundant negative evidence. Rhodon, a younger contemporary of his own, and an antagonist of all branches of Marcionism, as quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 13) represents him merely as "following the utterances of a possessed virgin (ἀποφθέγμασι παρθένου δαιμονώσης), Philumene by name;" mentioning at the same time that he "presumed on his character and his old age" (τῇ πολιτείᾳ σεμνυνόμενος καὶ τῷ γήρᾳ); and Rhodon, though an Asiatic by birth, had spent some of his earlier years at Rome. At a later time Hippolytus, a Roman ecclesiastic, calls her "a certain Philumene, whom he [Apelles] deems a prophetess" (*adv. Haer.* x. 20): the *Lib. adv. Omn. Haer.* uses identical language. Other passages of Tertullian (*De Praescr.* 6; *De Carne Chr.* 6; cf. *adv. Marc.* iii. 11; *De Anima* 36) state more distinctly that Apelles believed her to be the bearer of revelations from an angel, and a worker of miracles:—"signs and conjuring tricks" (praestigii) he calls them, referring the agency to an evil spirit ("angelum seductionis" *De Praescr.* 6; "cuius energemate circumventus" ib. 31; cf. Rhod. *l. c.*). Jerome's similar report (*Com. in Gal.* i. 8; cf. *Ep.* cxxiii. 4) expressly refers to Tertullian. Bunsen (*Hippol.* i. 379) calls Philumene "a clairvoyante." The appropriateness of the term is well illustrated by

a curious passage printed in the early editions of Augustine's book *On Heresies* (24) as part of the article on the "Severians." It is wholly wanting in all the MSS. known to the Benedictine editors, and is evidently misplaced. The article on the Severians, which follows that on Apelles, owes its place and its information exclusively to Epiphanius. Whether Augustine be responsible for the doubtful paragraph or not, it can come only from an ancient author, and must refer to Apelles. The following is the passage:—"He moreover used to say that a certain girl named Philumene was divinely inspired to predict future events. He used to refer to her his dreams, and the perturbations (aestus) of his mind, and to forewarn himself secretly by her divinations or presages." [Here some words appear to be missing.] "The same phantom (phantasmate)," he said, "shewed itself to the same Philumene in the form of a boy. This seeming boy sometimes declared himself to be Christ, sometimes Paul. By questioning this phantom she used to supply the answers which she pronounced to her hearers (ea respondere quae . . . diceret)." He added that she was "accustomed to perform some miracles, of which the following was the chief: she used to make a large loaf enter a glass vase (ampullam) with a very small mouth, and to take it out (levare) uninjured with the tips of her fingers, and was content with that food alone, as if it had been given her from above (divinitus)."

Apelles lived to old age, as appears from the statement of Rhodon (*l. c.*), with whom he had an oral controversy. Rhodon is placed by Eusebius in the reign of Commodus, 180-193. The manhood of Apelles therefore probably began not many years before or after 130. About 146 Marcion had for some time been teaching at Rome (Just. Mart. *Ap.* i. 26).

Apelles attributed to a book of *Manifestations* (Φανερώσεις) of Philumene special authority (Hipp. *l. c.*), and even, it would seem, had lessons from it read publicly (Ps. Tert. *l. c.*: the passage is obscure). When Tertullian says that he wrote it (*de Praescr.* 30: cf. Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 25), the meaning probably is that Philumene dictated to him her oracles. He wrote in his own person a book or series of books called *Reasonings* (Συλλογισμοί), directed against the Mosaic theology (Ps. Tert.). To this work doubtless belonged three questions cited by Ambrose (*de Parad.* 5 § 28 f.), probably following Origen, from "his thirty-eighth tome," on subjects connected with Gen. ii. The numeral explains a statement of Eusebius (*l. c.*: cf. Hipp.) that Apelles "committed countless impieties against the law of Moses, blaspheming the divine words in a multitude of books" (διὰ πλείονων συγγραμμάτων). As we have seen, he was answered by Rhodon. Tertullian too appears himself to have devoted to some of his doctrines a special treatise (*de Carne Chr.* 8).

Whatever cloud may be thought to rest upon the youth of Apelles, the picture which Rhodon unwittingly furnishes of his old age is pleasant to look upon. We see a man unwearied in the pursuit of truth, diffident and tolerant, resting in beliefs which he could not reconcile, but studious to maintain the moral character of theology. Always a Marcionist, though consciously (Philast. 47) departing so widely from the

system of Marcion that he was said to have founded a new sect (Orig. *Hom. in Gen.* ii. 2; c. *Cels.* v. 54, &c.), he appears to have held a curiously intermediate position in the movements of the time. Origen, while constrained to pronounce him a heretic, yet singles him out from the other great Gnostics as a heretic only in a subordinate sense (on Tit. iii. 10, 11: not so Firmilianus in Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv. 5). The nature, however, of his approximation to the Church and his doctrines in general will be best considered with those of his master [MARCON]. [H.]

APELLES, a monk and priest near Acoris in the Heptanomis in the fourth century. He had been a smith; and a legend, similar to that of St. Dunstan, is related of his chasing the devil with a red-hot iron. He was famous for miracles (Ruff. *de Mon.* 15; Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 60; Soz. *Hist.* vi. 28; Niceph. *Hist.* xi. 34). [I. G. S.]

APHRAATES, a Persian martyr A.D. 345, but distinct from the writer and probably bishop of the same name, whose homilies Dr. Wright has edited in the original Syriac. See 'Syriac Martyrology' in *Journal of Sacred Literature* for Oct. 1865 and Jan. 1866; and the Preface to the *Homilies of Aphraates*, ed. W. Wright, Lond. 1869. [A. W. H.]

APHRODISIUS, an imaginary bishop of "Hellepont," referred to by "Praedestinatus" (i. 47). [H.]

APHTHARSIA (Iren. 107 f.). [OPHITES.] [H.]

APHTHARTODOCETAE (from ἀφάρτος, incorruptible, and δοκέω, to think), a sect of the Monophysites, which arose in the 6th century. They were also called *Phantasiastae*, because they appeared to acknowledge only a seeming body of Christ, and to border on Docetism, and *Julianists*, from their leader Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, and his contemporary Xenajas of Hierapolis. They argued, from the commingling (σύγχυσις), of the two natures of Christ, that the body of our Lord, from the very beginning, became partaker of the incorruptibility of the Logos, and was subject to corruptibility merely κατ' οἰκονομίαν. They appealed in proof especially to Christ's walking on the sea during his earthly life. Their opponents among the Monophysites, the *Severians* (from Severus, Patriarch of Antioch), maintained that the body of Christ before the resurrection was corruptible, and were hence called *Phthartolatrae* (φθορολάτραι, from φθορῶς and λατρεία), or *Corrupticolae*, i. e. Worshipers of the Corruptible. Both parties admitted the incorruptibility of Christ's body after the resurrection. The word φθορά was generally taken in the sense of corruptibility, but sometimes in the sense of mere frailty. This whole question is rather one of scholastic subtlety, though not wholly idle, and may be solved in this way: that the body of Christ, before the resurrection, was similar in its constitution to the body of Adam before the fall, containing the germ or possibility of immortality and incorruptibility, but subject to the influence of the elements, and was actually put to death by external violence, but through the indwelling power of the sinless spirit was preserved from corruption and raised again to an imperishable life, when—to use an ingenious distinction of

St. Augustine—the *immortalitas minor* became *immortalitas major*, or the *posse non mori* a *non posse mori*.

The Aphthartodocetae were subdivided into *Ktistolatrae*, or, from their founder, *Gajanitae*, who taught that the body of Christ was created (κτιστόν), and *Aktistetae*, who asserted that the body of Christ, although in itself created, yet by its union with the eternal Logos became *increate*, and therefore incorruptible. The most consistent Monophysite in this direction was the rhetorician Stephanus Niobes (about 550), who declared that every attempt to distinguish between the divine and the human in Christ was improper and useless, since they had become absolutely one in him. An Abbot of Edessa, Bar Sudaili, extended this principle even to the creation, which he thought would at last be wholly absorbed in God.

Besides the sources and literature on the Monophysites [MONOPHYSITES], comp. the dissertations of Gieseler, *Monophysitarum variae de Christi Persona Opiniones*, 1835 and 1838; the remarks of Dörner, *History of Christology*, ii. 159, ff. (Germ. ed.); Ebrard, *Church and Doctrine History*, i. 268; and Schaff, *Church History*, iii. 766 ff. [P. S.]

APHTHONIUS. (1) Bishop of Zeugma at the close of the 4th century. He passed his early years as a monk in the monastery of St. Publius, on whose death he received the abbacy in conjunction with his brother monk Theoctenus, who ruled over the Greek-speaking monks, Aphthonius taking the oversight of the Syrians. After governing the monastery for 40 years, he was chosen Bishop of Zeugma, but made no difference in his dress or ascetic mode of life. In the earlier part of his residence at Zeugma he became acquainted with S. Chrysostom, who wrote to him, together with his brother monks, Chaearea and Theodotus, from Arabissus, A.D. 405, 406 (Chrys. *Ep.* lxx. xciii.; Theod. *Rel. Hist.* c. 5).

(2, 3) There were two leading laymen of this name at Zeugma, to whom Theodoret wrote commending their zeal for the true faith. (Theod. *Ep.* 125, p. 997.) [E. V.]

APHTHONIUS (Ἀφθόνιος), one of Manes' twelve disciples. The Greek form of abjuration (ap. Cotelier's *Patres Apost.* i. p. 544), Petrus Siculus (*Hist. Man.* xvi.), and Photius (*Contra Man.* i. 14), name Aphthonius, Hierax, and Heraclides as the three interpreters and commentators of Manes' works (τοὺς ὑπομνηματιστάς καὶ ἐξηγητὰς τῶν τούτου συγγραμμάτων). Philostorgius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 15) relates that Aphthonius was the leader of the Manicheans (τῆς τῶν Μανιχαίων λῃσεως προεστὰς), in Alexandria, and enjoyed a great reputation for wisdom and eloquence, until Aetius came from Antioch to oppose him. Aphthonius was defeated in the discussion, and died a week afterwards. [E. B. C.]

APION. The name is properly Egyptian (see Procop. *Pers.* i. 8; Ross. *Inscr.* fasc. 2, p. 62) and derived from the god Apis, after the analogy of Anubion, Serapion, etc. Thus the form Apion seems to be more correct than Apion (as often written), and it is also better supported (Cotelier on *Clem. Recogn.* x. 52; see however Otto on Justin (?) *Coh. ad Gent.* § 9).

(1) The son of Poseidonius (Justin (?) *Coh. ad*

Genet. § 9; Africanus in Euseb. *Pr. Ev.* x. 10, p. 490), a grammarian of Alexandria in the first century. Though a native of the Oasis, he concealed his Egyptian origin (Clem. *Strom.* i. 21) and affected Greek descent (Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 3). By his great diligence he acquired the sobriquet *μόχθος* (Suidas s. v.; cf. Africanus *l. c.*), while his many literary triumphs won for him the epithet *πλειστονίκης*^a (Plin. *N. H.* xxxvii. 19; A. Gell. v. 14; Clem. *Hom.* iv. 6, xx. 11; Clem. *Strom.* i. 21, p. 378). Owing to his somewhat noisy celebrity the emperor Tiberius named him "cymbalum mundi" (Plin. *N. H.* 1 praef.), though as Pliny adds, the inordinate and unblushing vanity for which he was noted (Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 12; A. Gell. *l. c.*) would have better entitled him to be called "propriae famae tympanum." He appears to have been profligate, unscrupulous, and sophistical (Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 1, 13; Clem. *Hom.* v. 3 sq.); and his lying stories surpass the inventions of the most mendacious fabulists (A. Gell. vi. 8; Plin. *N. H.* xxx. 6; Aelian, *H. A.* x. 29; xi. 40, *ἐὶ μὴ τεραπεύεται*). The pretty tale of Androclus and the lion rests on his authority, or, perhaps we should say, on his invention (A. Gell. v. 14). The great reputation which he enjoyed (*ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος*, Tatian, *ad Graec.* 38) was chiefly due to his critical labours on Homer, which gained for him a most triumphant reception in Greece (Senec. *Ep.* 88; see Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* i. 503 sq.). These however do not fall within the scope of the present work, nor would he have been entitled to a place here, if he had not been found in conflict with Jews and Jewish Christians.

1. His hostility to Judaism was deep, persistent, and unscrupulous (Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 1-13; Clem. *Hom.* iv. 24, v. 2, *πάνν Ἰουδαίους δι' ἀπεχθείας ἔχοντα*, v. 27, 29 *δ' ἀλόγως μισῶν τὸ Ἰουδαίων κ. τ. λ.*; Clem. *Strom.* i. 21). As Josephus has preserved direct extracts from his writings, besides giving the substance of much more, we are in a position to say that these descriptions of his attacks are not overcharged. These attacks were contained in two works especially; in his *Egyptian History* (*Αἰγυπτιακά*) comprised in five books (A. Gell. v. 14; Tatian, *ad Graec.* 38), of which the third (Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 2) and fourth (Tatian *l. c.*; Clem. *Strom.* i. 21; Justin (?) *Coh.* 9; Africanus *l. c.*) contained misrepresentations respecting the origin of the race and the circumstances of the exodus; and in a separate treatise *Against the Jews* (*κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλος*, Justin. (?) *l. c.*; Africanus *l. c.*).^b According to Josephus the grounds of his attack were threefold: (1) That the Jews were of Egyptian origin and were expelled under highly discreditable circumstances; (2) that they were the great disturbers of the peace at Alexandria; and (3) that their

rites were bloodthirsty and absurd. Under this last head he gave the story of the worship of the head of an ass in the temple at Jerusalem (ii. 7), which is repeated by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 4), and which by a not uncommon confusion in early times was transferred from Judaism to Christianity (Minuc. Felix, 9, 28), and thus suggested the famous graffito of the Palatine barracks. He also gave currency to the calumny that a Greek fattened up for sacrifice was discovered in the temple by Antiochus, when he took the city (ii. 8). In the first part of the second book of his treatise *On the Antiquity of the Jews* (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 9 *περὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιοτήτος*) Josephus, apologizing for taking any notice of attacks so scurrilous and base, exposes the ignorance, mendacity, and self-contradictions of Apion. The second title of this treatise, *Against Apion*, by which it is generally quoted, has inferior external authority (Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* v. 7, ed. Harles), and is obviously incorrect; for the refutation of Apion is only subsidiary to the main object of the work, though it occupies much space. This work is translated and annotated Frankel's *Monatschrift*, i. 7 sq., 41 sq., 81 sq., 121 sq.

Nor was the hostility of Apion confined to writing. It was he who headed the famous embassy of the Alexandrians to Rome, sent with the view of exasperating the emperor Caius against the Jews, as instigators of rebellion and as having refused to worship the imperial image (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 8, 1). Among the ambassadors sent by the Jews to counteract these machinations, was the famous writer Philo, who has left an account of the proceedings (*Legat. ad Cai.* ii. 545 M), though he does not mention his chief opponent by name.

2. It is not surprising that the spent wave of this antagonism should have overflowed on Judaic Christianity. Whether Apion actually came in contact with any members of the new brotherhood is more than questionable. His early date (for he flourished in the reigns of Tiberius, Caius, and Claudius) renders this improbable. But in the writings of the Petro-Clementine cycle he holds a prominent place as an antagonist of the Gospel. In the Clementine *Homilies* he appears in company with Anubion and Athenodorus among the satellites of Simon Magus, the arch-enemy of St. Peter and St. Peter's faith. True to the character which genuine history assigns to him, he figures there as the representative of philosophic or rather of sophistical Hellenism. Besides this he is portrayed as dealing in the magical arts of the Egyptians (v. 3-8). To this latter feature in the portrait Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 83) objects as unhistorical; but Pliny (*N. H.* xxx. 6) tells us distinctly that Apion boasted of having raised ghosts and conversed with them himself, and in his book *Περὶ Μάγαν* he seems to have professed an entire belief in the power of magic (see Müller *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* iii. 515). But though the character of the man as given in the Clementines is mainly historical, the incidents are fictitious. He is the friend of Clement's father (iv. 6 sq., xx. 11, 15), and Clement relates at length how at Rome Apion would have encouraged the worst passions of his youth, alleging as an example the profligacy of the gods of Olympus, but was outwitted and outargued by

^a Rufinus (*Clem. Recogn.* x. 52) erroneously translates *Ἀππιωνὲν Πλίστωνικενσεν*, as though it were the name of his country. Suidas calls him *ἰ Πλειστονίκου*, and accordingly some modern critics take it as a patronymic; but this seems to be incorrect.

^b Perhaps these two were parts of a more comprehensive work, *Ἱστορία κατ' ἔθνος*, mentioned by Suidas, but of otherwise quoted; see Ewald, *Gesch.* vii. 83. In Clem. *Hom.* v. 2, it is stated that he had written many books *πολλὰ βιβλία* against the Jews, but this is probably an exaggeration.

his more moral pupil who shows that they were no gods but tyrants (v. 3-30). When at a later date he falls in with Clement at Tyre, he takes up a different line. Undertaking the defence of the Hellenic mythology, he explains all the absurd and immoral stories of the deities, as allegories involving physical truths (iv. 24, 25, vi. 2-11). Thus Cronos is time, Rhea flowing water, &c. This tendency to *allegorizing* (the word occurs frequently) is in keeping with his Alexandrian education. Clement retorts that they are demons or magicians (vi. 18 sq.). The conversations with Apion thus occupy three books, iv, v, vi. At the close again (xx. 11 sq.) he reappears, but takes no prominent part. The Clementine *Recognitions* contain nothing corresponding to the disputes of Clement and Apion in the 4th, 5th, and 6th books of the *Homilies*; but at the close of this work (x. 52), as at the close of the *Homilies*, he is introduced as a subsidiary character in the plot. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 38; cf. Photius *Bibl.* 113) mentions yet another work (if it be another) belonging to the same cycle, in which he appears, "long and wordy compositions" purporting to have come from Clement, and "containing dialogues of Peter forsooth and Apion." This last expression, as generally interpreted, is taken to imply that Apion there disputed not with Clement but with Peter (e. g. Uhlhorn *Die Homil. u. Recogn.* p. 70, Lehmann *Die Clem. Schrift.* p. 470); but in the not very exact language of Eusebius it might well denote conversations which Clement held with Peter and with Apion severally, and thus refer to the extant *Homilies* or to some recension of them.

The fragments of Apion will be found in Müller's *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* ii. 506 sq., where there is also a notice of the man and his writings. But no reference is there made to the Clementines. For the part which Apion plays in the Clementines, the treatises on these writings by Schliemann, Uhlhorn, Hilgenfeld, Lehmann, and others may be consulted.

(2) A Christian author about the close of the 2nd century, who wrote a work on the *Hexameron* (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 27; Hieron. *Vir. Ill.* 49). [L.]

APOCALYPSES (APOCRYPHAL). Abundant as is the literature of apocryphal Gospels and Acts produced in the first centuries of the Christian Church, the more meagre appears that of apocryphal Apocalypses current under Apostolic names, and derived from the same periods of ecclesiastical history. Apocalyptic literature of a certain kind was indeed as familiar to primitive Christianity as it was to the later Judaism, but the traditional forms into which writings of that kind were cast, required the employment of Old Testament names of authorship, such as Moses, Enoch, Elias, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezra, Daniel, Eldad and Modad, &c., the custom being to assign the office of announcing the future fortunes of the Church not to Apostles of the New Testament but to prophets of the Old. The Revelation of the Apostle St. John is the solitary representative in the New Testament of this branch of literature; but when in the course of the 2nd century Montanism began to assert its new prophetic claims, and to demand for its utterances Divine authority, the prophets of the

sect such as Montanus, Prisca, Maximilla, Alexander, came forward each in his own name without deeming it necessary to seek to conceal themselves under any artificial pseudonym. An exception to this statement must be made in respect to the "Shepherd" an (orthodox) work produced about the middle of the 2nd century, and in the time of the Roman bishop Pius, which selected Hermas, a contemporary of Clemens Romanus (*Vis.* ii. 4), and therefore an apostolic man (cf. Rom. xvi. 4) for the recipient of its pretended revelations. But in this case there was a special motive furnished by the purpose for which the work was written for thus antedating its prophecies by some fifty years. That purpose was to announce a second term of repentance vouchsafed by the Divine mercy, out of indulgence to the infirmities of the faithful, and available for every one who should receive the revelation, but at the same time to cut off any future hope of pardon for sins into which the baptized might hereafter fall, by announcing the near approach of the Second Advent of Christ. A somewhat similar phenomenon meets us in another work of the latter half of the 2nd century (which, however, does not pretend to apostolic authorship), the Book of Elxai (Pseudorigenes, *Refut. omni. Haer.* ix. 15; Epiph. *Haer.* 19), likewise antedates its own composition, and assigns it to the third year of the emperor Trajan. Whether on the other hand the Judaistic Gnostic Cerinthus did really, as he is accused of doing by the Roman presbyter Caius (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28), publish his pretended revelations under a celebrated apostolic name, is more than doubtful. The reference is in all probability to the Revelation of St. John which Caius rejected, and on account of its Millenarianism attributed to Cerinthus. At any rate, all that Caius reports of the alleged work of Cerinthus may well apply to the Book of Revelation; and we may also gather from his own words *δὲ ἀποκαλύψαν ὡς ὑπὲρ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων* (and especially from the singular *ἀποστόλου*), that it is not to several books of revelations, but only to several revelations or visions (which might all be collected in one book), to which he is referring.

The only other Apocalypse claiming apostolic authorship which appears for any length of time to have obtained in the Church, and so in any measure to have rivalled in position the Revelation of St. John, was the "Apocalypse of Peter." Of this only a few fragments remain (ap. Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum*, fasc. iv. 74 sqq.). In the Muratorian Fragment it is enumerated along with the Revelation of St. John among the canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, the author of the fragment at the same time remarking that opinions varied in the Church as to its authority (*Apocalypses etiam Joannis et Petri tantum recipimus quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt*). Clemens Alexandrinus reckons it among the Antilegomena (*Clem. Hypotyp.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14); the *ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν ἐκλογαὶ* preserved among the works of Clemens, cite it without hesitation as a genuine Petrine work (*Eclog. ex Proph.* sectt. 41, 48, 49, p. 1000 sq. ed. Potter); Methodius of Tyre (cir. 312) likewise seems to have reckoned it among *θεόπνευστα γράμματα* (Methodius, *Sympos.* 11, 6, p. 16 ed. Jahn). So also the ancient Catalogue of the

Books of Scripture at the end of the Codex Claramontanus assigns it a place among the canonical writings and determines its length as extending to 270 στίχοι. Eusebius of Caesarea appears in one place (*H. E.* iii. 3) to deny it any degree of ecclesiastical recognition or authority, while in another (*H. E.* iii. 25) he reckons it among the so-called Antilegomena, or rather among spurious writings of the better class separated from them by a very uncertain line of demarcation (such as the *πράξεις Παύλου*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *διδασκαλί των αποστόλων*). Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 19), who together with St. Jerome (*Cat. Vir. Illustr.* c. 1) likewise pronounces it to be spurious, relates nevertheless that it was in his time publicly read once a year in some churches of Palestine (ὁὗτω γούν την καλουμένην ἀποκάλυψιν Πέτρου ὡς νόθον παντελῶς πρὸς τῶν ἀρχαίων δοκιμασθεῖσαν ἐν τισιν ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Παλαιστίνης εἰσέτι νῦν ἀπαξ ἐκάστον ἔτους ἀναγιγνωσκόμενην ἔγνωμεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Παρασκευῆς, ἣν εὐλαβῶς ἄγαν ὁ λαὸς νηστεύει ἐπὶ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους). Further, the Catalogue of Anastasius Sinaita contains it in the Appendix to the New Testament, and its title is found in the Stichometry of Nicephorus among the Antilegomena immediately after the Revelation of St. John. The long recognition of the book in orthodox circles, proves that it could not have had a Gnostic origin, nor otherwise contained what was offensive to Catholic Christians. The reference to it in the Muratorian Canon, proves that its production must fall within the 2nd century. As to its contents, the few fragments of it that remain are hardly sufficient to warrant any conjectures. According to Hilgenfeld (p. 75), it described the afflictions impending on the Church, and the same scholar conjectures (p. 77 sq.) that the prophetic passages cited by Hippolytus in his work *De Antichristo* (p. 8 l. 8 sqq. ed. Lagarde) including the prophetic quotation at Eph. v. 14, were taken from the Apocalypse of Peter.

Of Gnostic Apocalypses but few traces remain. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 38, 2) mentions as current among the Cainites (Καϊανοί), a sect of Ophites, and among the so-called "Gnostics" proper an *ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου* which seems to have been a fiction founded on 2 Cor. xii. 2 sqq. Whether this be the work to which Dionysius of Alexandria alludes with blame (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25) must remain uncertain. The notice of it in the Byzantine Chronicler, Michael Glykas (ap. *Fabric. Cod. Apocryph. N. T.* tom. ii. p. 944) is derived from Eusebius, and cannot therefore be regarded as independent testimony. St. Augustine and Sozomen likewise mention an Apocalypse of Paul, but having in view a much later work which is still in existence. It must therefore remain doubtful which book is referred to in the *Decretum Gelasii* (ap. Credner, *zur Geschichte des Kanons*, Halle, 1847, p. 219) as *Revelatio Pauli apocrypha*. Immediately after this Apocalypse of Paul, two other apocryphal Apocalypses are mentioned in the Decretum, one the Apocalypse of Thomas (*Revelatio quae appellatur Thomae apostoli apocrypha*), the other the Apocalypse of Stephen (*Revelatio quae appellatur Stephani apocrypha*). The close neighbourhood in which all three Apocalypses are brought to the Gnostic *transitus Mariae* makes the conjecture seem probable that assigns to them likewise a

Gnostic or heretical origin. In fact, according to the testimony of Sixtus Senensis (*Bibl. Sacr.* ii. 142), Serapion is said to have asserted in his book against the Manicheans that the Apocalypse of Stephen stood with that sect in high estimation. But meanwhile the citation has not again been verified (cf. Fabricius, *l. c.* p. 965).

Of much later origin is a series of Apocalypses, several of which have been recently printed by Tischendorf (*Apocalypses apocr.* Leipsic, 1866). First among these is the Apocalypse of Paul (Tisch. p. 34 sqq.) mentioned by St. Augustine (*Tractat. in Joann.* 98) and by Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 19), which must be carefully distinguished from the older *Ascensio Pauli* already spoken of. This Apocalypse was probably the fabrication of some monk of Palestine in the time of the emperor Theodosius the Great, and was according to Sozomen in much esteem with the monks of his day. Later ecclesiastical writers make frequent mention of it. (See the passages in Fabricius, *l. c.* p. 947 sq., and Tischendorf, *Proleg.* p. xv). Elie du Pin (*Prolegg. Bibl.* ii. 49) asserts that it still exists in a Coptic version: Arabic and Syriac MSS. containing versions of it were found by Assemani in the Vatican (*Catalog. Bibl. Orient. Clem. Vat.* tom. iii. pars 1, p. 282), and a Syriac MS. of the Nestorians in Urumija has been recently published with an English translation by Perkins (*Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, edited by B. H. Cowper. London, 1866, p. 372 sqq. *Reprinted from the Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. viii. 1864). For the history of the New Testament apocalyptic literature this late fabrication has no value whatever. The same may be said of the spurious "Apocalypse of John" (ap. Birch, *Auctarium Cod. apocr. Fabriciani*, 1804, and in a better text ap. Tischendorf, p. 70 sqq.). The first citation from it is found in the Scholia to the Grammar of Dionysius Thrax, which dates from the 9th century, and it is at any rate of still later origin than the last mentioned. There exist, further, in MS., and as yet unprinted, an "Apocalypse of Peter" (which appears to have nothing in common with the older celebrated Book bearing the same name) and an "Apocalypse of Bartholomew." The former, which introduces itself as written by St. Clement of Rome, and is also called *liber perfectionis*, now exists only in Arabic. It had been seen already by Jacobus à Vitriaco, as he himself reports in his epistle to Pope Honorius III., A.D. 1218. Some Vatican MSS. of this Apocalypse are mentioned by Assemani (*loc. cit.*) and Nicoll has published an abstract of it from a MS. preserved in the Bodleian (Catal. codd. MSS. Orient. bibl. Bodleian. 1821. P. II. i. 49 sqq.; cf. also Tischendorf, *prolegg.* p. xx sqq.).^a Finally, of the Apoca-

^a From the information thus given us of its contents the date at which this Apocalypse was written may be approximately determined, viz. some time during the reign of the Byzantine emperor Constantinus Copronymus (A.D. 741-775), who is alluded to, c. 46, as *Catulus Leonis* (son of Leo). The date of his accession is marked as being 72 great and 704 little weeks (= 504 + 246½ years) before Second Advent of Christ.

The narrative in this Apocalypse refers also to other contemporary events, such as the rise of Muhammed in the year 923 of Alexander the Great = A.D. 612; the

lyse of Bartholomew nothing has been discovered hitherto beyond a fragment of the Sahidic version, which Dulaurier has published with a French translation (*Fragment des révélations apocryphes de S. Barthélemi*, &c. Paris. 1835. The French text is also reproduced by Tischendorf in his *Apoc. Apoc.* prolegg. p. xxiv sqq.). [R. A. L.]

APOLLINARIS or **APOLLINARIUS** **CLAUDIUS** (Ἀπολλινάριος; so spelt in the most ancient manuscripts of the Greek writers who refer to him; Latin writers generally use the form Apollinaris), bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, A.D. 171 and onwards (Euseb. *Chron.*), one of the most active and esteemed Christian writers of the day. He is praised by Photius for his style (Phot. *Cod.* 14). Jerome enumerates him among the ecclesiastical writers who were acquainted with heathen literature, and who made use of this knowledge in the refutation of heresy (*Ep. ad Magnum*, iv. 83, p. 656). Theodoret also mentions his knowledge of heathen literature (Theod. *Haer. Fab. Compend.* iii. 2). Only a few fragments of his works have been preserved. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 27) gives the following list of those which had fallen into his hands; and his list is repeated by St. Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.* cap. 26) and Nicephorus (*H. E.* iv. 11). (1.) An apology addressed to Marcus Aurelius, probably written after A.D. 174, since it is likely that it contained the reference to the miracle of the Thundering Legion elsewhere quoted by Eusebius from Apollinaris (*H. E.* v. 5). (2.) Five books πρὸς Ἑλληνας written according to Nicephorus in the form of a dialogue. (3.) Two books περὶ ἀληθείας. (4.) Two books πρὸς Ἰουδαίους; these are not mentioned by St. Jerome, and the reference to them is absent from some copies of Eusebius. (5.) Writings against the Phrygian heresy, published when Montanus was making the first beginning of his heresy; that is to say, according to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, about A.D. 172. These writings which were probably in the form of letters, are appealed to by Serapion, bishop of Antioch (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 19); and Eusebius elsewhere (*H. E.* v. 16) describes Apollinaris as raised up as a strong and irresistible weapon against Montanism. The situation of his see sufficiently accounts for the prominent part taken by Apollinaris in this controversy. We are told indeed by an anonymous writer who probably wrote at the end of the 9th century (Auctor *Libelli Synodici* apud Labbe et Cossart, i. 599), that Apollinaris on this occasion assembled twenty-six other bishops in council, and excommunicated Montanus and Maximilla, as well as the shoemaker Theodotus. The same writer ascribes to Apollinaris a statement that Montanus and Maximilla committed suicide; probably supposing him to be the author of an anonymous work against Montanism [ASTERIUS URBANUS], fragments of which are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 16), and in which the suicide of these prophets is mentioned as a common rumour. But if Apollinaris had been the writer

founding of the dynasty of the Benû'l-Abbâs, successors of Muhammed, in the year 750 A.D. (cc. 47, 48); and the efforts of the emperor in the year 755 to frustrate the intervention of Pipin in Italy (c. 51).

For the indication of these historical references the writer is indebted to his friend Professor von Gutschmid.

it is likely he would have been able to speak more positively; and besides Apollinaris, who wrote (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 27) at the very beginning of the Montanist heresy, could scarcely have been the author of a work purporting to be written fourteen years after the death of Maximilla, whose prophesying there is every reason to believe continued for many years. Besides the works mentioned by Eusebius, who does not give his list as a complete one, Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* ii. 21) mentions (6) that Apollinaris wrote against the Encratites of the school of Severus (πρὸς τοὺς Σουηριανούς Ἐγκρατίτας). (7.) Photius (*Cod.* 14) makes mention of having read of Apollinaris his work πρὸς Ἑλληνας, καὶ περὶ ἀληθείας καὶ περὶ εὐσεβείας. It has been questioned whether (a) by this work περὶ εὐσεβείας we are to understand a new work of Apollinaris not mentioned by Eusebius; or (b) whether the words περὶ ἀληθείας καὶ περὶ εὐσεβείας describe a single work, the same as that described by Eusebius as περὶ ἀληθείας; against this Routh (*Rel. Sac.* ii. 171) urges the repetition of the περὶ; or (c) whether the work περὶ εὐσεβείας may not be identical with the apology addressed to Marcus Aurelius (λόγος ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως); or lastly (d) since it is the habit of Photius to give a separate paragraph to each work he reads, whether the whole description relates to the single work πρὸς Ἑλληνας which is further described by its subject καὶ περὶ ἀληθείας καὶ περὶ εὐσεβείας. So Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature* iii. 243. The works πρὸς Ἑλληνας and περὶ ἀληθείας, however, are plainly distinguished by Eusebius. (8.) In the preface to the Alexandrian Chronicle a work περὶ τοῦ πάσχα is attributed to Apollinaris, from which two extracts are furnished which have given rise to much controversy.

The main point of controversy is whether (assuming the fragments to be genuine) Apollinaris wrote on the side of the practice of the Roman Church, or on that of the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor. In support of the former view is urged the similarity of the language of these fragments with that of Clement of Alexandria and of Hippolytus, who advocated the Western practice; and again the fact that Apollinaris is not claimed as a Quartodeciman by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in his letter to Victor of Rome, in which he defends the use of his Church by the authority of some other less eminent men. On the other side it is urged that Apollinaris speaks of his antagonists as "some who raise contention through ignorance," language which would rather convey the impression that Apollinaris was writing against the opinions of some small sect than that he was combating the belief of the whole Church of Asia Minor to which he belonged; and it is further urged that if Apollinaris had been the first to defend in the East the practice which ultimately prevailed, it is incredible that Eusebius or some other early writer should make no mention of this early champion of the Catholic practice.

Socrates the historian (*H. E.* iii. 7) names Apollinaris, together with Irenaeus, Clement, and Serapion as holding the doctrine that our Lord when He became man had a human soul (ἐμψυχον τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα).

Apollinaris had been set down as a Chilist on St. Jerome's authority (*De Vir. Ill.* cap. 18);

but Routh (*Rel. Sac.* i. 174) has given good reason for thinking that the Apollinaris intended is the younger Apollinaris, of Laodicea; since Jerome speaks of Irenaeus and Apollinaris as the first and the last of the Greek Millenarians (lib. xi. *Comm. in Ezech.* cap. 36 iii. 952), and also states that Apollinaris answered Dionysius of Alexandria (*Proem.* in lib. xviii. *Comm. Esaiæ* iii. 478).

The martyrologies commemorate the death of Apollinaris on the 7th of February. Of the year, or of the place and manner of his death nothing is known. Only that it was before the end of the 2nd century may be inferred from the language in which he is described in the letter of Serapion written about that time (Κλαυδίου Ἀπολλινάριου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου γενομένου ἐν Ἱερὰ πόλει τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπισκόπου). [G. S.]

APOLLINARIANISM, APOLLINARIANS, APOLLINARISTS. [See APOLLINARIS THE YOUNGER.]

APOLLINARIS (St. and MART.), first bishop or archbishop of Ravenna, perhaps from 50-78. According to the life written by Agnellus in the 9th cent. (*Liber Pontificalis*, ap. Muratori, *Rer. It. Script.* ii. part i.), St. Apollinaris was a native of Antioch, well instructed in Greek and Latin literature, who followed St. Peter to Rome, and was sent by him to Ravenna. On his way he healed the son of Irenaeus who was blind, and did other miracles. At Ravenna he baptized in the river Bidentis, and raised the daughter of the patrician Rufus to life; he was imprisoned by the heathen near the capitol, and was there fed by angels. Afterwards being expelled from the city, he preached in Dalmatia, Pannonia, Thrace, and Corinth. After three years he returned and suffered new persecutions, and did new miracles, one of which was to destroy a statue and temple of Apollo by his prayers. He was martyred under Vespasian, after an episcopate of rather more than 28 years.

Other lives such as that in the *Acta Sanctorum* are more full of miracles, but do not add anything else of importance. The day of his death is agreed upon as July 23rd; the year is uncertain, but may have been 78. From a sermon of St. Peter Chrysologus in the 5th cent. (No. 128, p. 552 sq. ed. Migne), it appears that St. Apollinaris was the only bishop of Ravenna who suffered martyrdom, and that he, strictly speaking, can only be called a confessor. He did not die, it would seem, a violent death, though it may have been hastened by the persecutions he underwent. It is probable that like his successor Aderitus he died in the port-town Classis, where he was buried. A new church, still existing, was built about the same time as that of St. Vitale, and into this his body was translated by St. Maximianus about 552. The mosaic over the apse seems to realize the words of St. Peter Chrysologus (ut supra), "Ecce vivit, ecce ut bonus pastor suo medius assistit in grege." As early as 575 it was the custom to take solemn oaths upon his relics (St. Greg. Magn., *Ep.* vi. 61). His body was moved from place to place in the church at various times, and was taken to Ravenna in 1515 for the sake of safety, but restored to it in 1655 (see authorities in *Acta Sanctor.* for July 23). This most interesting basilica, with the vacant monastery adjoin-

ing, is now the only remnant of the town of Classis. [J. W.]

APOLLINARIS (or, according to Greek orthography, APOLLINARIUS) the ELDER, of Alexandria, was born about the beginning of the 4th century. After teaching grammar for some time at Berytus in Phoenicia, he removed, A.D. 335, to Laodicea, of which church he was made presbyter. Here he married and had a son, afterwards the bishop of Laodicea. [See foll. art.] Both father and son were on intimate terms with the heathen sophists Libanius and Epiphanius of Petra, frequenting the lecture-room of the latter, on which account they were admonished and, upon their venturing to sit out the recitation of a hymn to Bacchus, excommunicated by Theodotus, bishop of Laodicea. They were however restored upon their subsequent repentance (*Socr. Eccles. Hist.* iii. 16; *Sozom.* vi. 25).

The elder Apollinaris is chiefly noted for his literary labours. When the edict of Julian, A.D. 362, forbade the Christians to study Greek literature, he undertook with the help of his son to supply the void by reconstructing the Scriptures on the classical models. Thus the whole biblical history down to Saul's accession was turned into 24 books of Homeric hexameters, each superscribed, like those of the *Iliad*, by a letter of the alphabet. Lyrics, tragedies, and comedies, after the manner of Pindar, Euripides, and Menander, followed. Even the Gospels and Epistles of the New Test. were made to adapt themselves to the form of Socratic disputation. Two works alone remain to us as samples of their indomitable zeal; a tragedy entitled *Christus Patiens*, in 2601 lines, which has been edited among the works of Gregory Nazianzen; and a version of the Psalms, in Homeric hexameters. The opening of the tragedy, which is an obvious cento from the *Medea* of Euripides, goes far to betray the secret of their omni-representative energy. Throughout the work the virgin-mother is made to vent her sorrows, now in the fierce ravings of *Medea*, now in the hypocritical vauntings of Clytemnestra, and now in the dreariest of platitudes, which cannot be traced to their original. The Greek of the play, where it is the author's own, is no better than the sentiment. The most that can be said of the Homeric Psalter is that it is better than the tragedy, and that as a whole it fully bears out the reputation of the poet (*Basil. Ep.* 273, 406) that he was never at a loss for an expression. What share in the great reproduction was undertaken by each of the Apollinarii we cannot say. *Sozomen* (v. 18) speaks only of the son's poetic power, and that in terms which provoke a smile; but Socrates, who is the more trustworthy of the two historians, ascribes the Old Test. poems directly to the father (iii. 16), and adds that the son as the greater rhetorician devoted his energies to converting the Gospels and Epistles into Platonic dialogues. He likewise mentions a treatise on grammar compiled by the elder Apollinaris, *χριστιανικῶ τύπω*. The passage is worth reading for its quaint unconscious humour. For the different opinions which have been held as to the authorship of father and son, cf. *Vossius, de Hist. Graec.* ii. 18; *de Poet. Graec.* c. 9; *Duport, Praef. ad Metaph. Psalm.* Lond. 1674.

The *Metaphrasis Psalmorum* was published at Paris 1552; by Sylburg, at Heidelberg, 1596; and subsequently in various collections of the Fathers. The latest edition is that in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, xxiii. [E. M. Y.]

APOLLINARIS the YOUNGER, bishop of Laodicea, flourished in the latter half of the 4th century, and was at first highly esteemed, even by Athanasius and Basil, for his classical culture, piety, and adhesion to the Nicene Creed during the Arian controversy, until he brought out a Christological heresy which is called after him, and which in some respects prepared the way for Monophysitism. He assisted his father in composing the Christian works in imitation of the style of Homer, Menander, &c., mentioned in the preceding article. He also wrote in defence of Christianity against Julian and Porphyry; of orthodoxy against the Manichaeans, Arians, Marcellus, Eunomius, and other heretics; biblical commentaries, and other works, of which only fragments remain. Jerome enjoyed his instruction, A.D. 374. He did not secede from the communion of the Church and begin to form a sect of his own till 375. He died about 392. After his death his followers, who were not numerous, were divided into two parties, the Polemians and Valentiniens. His doctrine was condemned by a Synod of Alexandria (without naming him), by two Synods at Rome under Damasus (377 and 378), and by the second Oecumenical Council (381). Imperial decrees prohibited the public worship of the Apollinarians (388, 397, 428), until during the 5th century they were absorbed partly by the orthodox, partly by the Monophysites. But the peculiar Christology of Apollinaris has reappeared from time to time, in a modified shape, as an isolated theological opinion.

Apollinaris was the first to apply the results of the Nicene controversy to Christology proper, and to call the attention of the Church to the psychical and pneumatic element in the humanity of Christ; but in his zeal for the true deity of Christ, and fear of a double personality, he fell into the error of a partial denial of His true humanity. Adopting the psychological trichotomy of Plato (*σῶμα*, *ψυχή*, *πνεῦμα*), for which he quoted 1 Thess. v. 23 and Gal. v. 17, he attributed to Christ a human body (*σῶμα*) and a human soul (the *ψυχή λόγος*, the *anima animans* which man has in common with the animal), but not a rational spirit (*νοῦς*, *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχή λογική*, *anima rationalis*), and put in the place of the latter the divine Logos. In opposition to the idea of a mere connection of the Logos with the man Jesus, he wished to secure an organic unity of the two, and so a true incarnation; but he sought this at the expense of the most important constituent of man. He reached only a *θεὸς σαρκόφωρος*, as Nestorianism only an *ἄνθρωπος θεοφόρος*, instead of the proper *θεάνθρωπος*. He appealed to the fact that the Scripture says, "the Word was made *flesh*,"—not *spirit*; "God was manifest in the *flesh*," &c. To which Gregory Nazianzen justly replied that in these passages the term *σὰρξ* was used by synecdoche for the whole human nature. In this way Apollinaris established so close a connection of the Logos with human flesh, that all the divine attributes were transferred to the human nature, and all

the human attributes to the divine, and the two merged in *one* nature in Christ. Hence he could speak of a crucifixion of the Logos, and a worship of his flesh. He made Christ a middle being between God and man, in whom, as it were, one part divine and two parts human were fused in the unity of a new nature. He even ventured to adduce created analogies, such as the mule, midway between the horse and the ass; the grey colour, a mixture of white and black; and spring, in distinction from winter and summer. Christ, said he, is *οὔτε ἄνθρωπος ὅλος, οὔτε θεός, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου μίξις*. On the other hand, he regarded the orthodox view of a union of full humanity with a full divinity in one person—of two wholes in one whole—as an absurdity. He called the result of this construction *ἄνθρωπός-θεος*, a sort of monstrosity, which he put in the same category with the mythological figure of the Minotaur. But the Apollinarian idea of the union of the Logos with a truncated human nature might be itself more justly compared with this monster. Starting from the Nicene *homocousion* as to the Logos, but denying the completeness of Christ's humanity, he met Arianism half-way, which likewise put the divine Logos in the place of the human spirit in Christ. But he strongly asserted his unchangeableness, while Arians taught his changeableness (*τρέπ-τότης*).

The faith of the Church revolted against such a mutilated and stunted humanity of Christ, which necessarily involved also, a merely partial redemption. The incarnation is an assumption of the entire human nature, sin only excluded. The *ἐνσάρκωσις* is *ἐνανθρώπησις*. To be a full and complete Redeemer, Christ must be a perfect man (*τέλειος ἄνθρωπος*). The spirit or rational soul is the most important element in man, his crowning glory, the seat of intelligence and freedom, and needs redemption as well as the soul and the body; for sin has entered and corrupted all the faculties.

Athanasius, the two Gregories, Basil, and Epiphanius combated the Apollinarian error, but with a certain embarrassment, attacking it rather from behind and from the flank than in front, and were unprepared to answer duly its main point, that two integral persons cannot form one person. The later orthodox doctrine surmounted this difficulty by teaching the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, and by making the personality of Christ to reside wholly in the Logos.

Apollinarianism opened the long line of Christological controversies, which resulted in the Chalcedonian symbol.

LITERATURE.—Of the writings of Apollinaris, *περὶ σαρκώσεως, περὶ πίστεως, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, κατὰ κεφάλειον*, and other polemical and exegetical works and epistles, only fragments remain in the answers of Gregory of Nyssa and Theodoret, in Leontius Byzant., in the Catene, and in Angelo Mai's *Nova Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. vii. (Rom. 1854), pars ii. pp. 82–91. Against Apollinaris are directed Athanasius's *Contra Apollinarium*, or rather *περὶ σαρκώσεως τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.* (*Opera*, ed. Bened. tom. i. pars ii. pp. 921–955), written about 372 without naming Apollinaris; Gregory of Nyssa, *Δόγος ἀντιρρητικός πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολλινარიῶν*, first edited by Zaccagni, Rom. 1698, and then

by Gallandi, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* vi. 517-577; Bāsilius M., *Epist.* 265 (*Opera*, ed. Ben. iii. ii. 591 sqq.); Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxxvii.; Theodoret, *Fabulae Haer.* iv. 8, v. 9. Of the later literature, cf. especially Petavius, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, i. cap. 6; Walch, *History of Heresies*, iii. 119-229; Baur, *History of the Trinity*, i. 585-647; Dorner, *History of Christology*, i. 974-1080; Neander, *Doctrine History*, i. 334-338; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, iii. 708-714. [P. S.]

APOLLINARIUS. [APOLLINARIS.]

APOLLONIA, M., a virgin burned at Alexandria A.D. 249 (*Epist. S. Dion. Alex.* in Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 41). [A. W. H.]

APOLLONIUS of EPHEBUS, so called on the doubtful authority of the writer of *Prædestinatus*, edited by Sirmond, who styles him bishop of Ephesus, but the silence of Eusebius and all other earlier testimony makes it difficult to lay much stress on this statement. He wrote a work in five books against the Cataphrygian or Montanist heresy. Fragments of the first three books are extant in Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 18), and contain much that is curious and valuable with regard to the unsainly lives and characters of Montanus, the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla, and their followers. Jerome also devotes an article to Apollonius, *Vir. Illust.* c. 50, in which he calls him *ἄνθρωπος ἐλλογιμώτατος*, the author of a *μέγα καὶ ἐπίσημον τεύχος*, and quotes his authority for the statement that Montanus and his prophetesses put an end to their lives by hanging. The book professes to be written forty years after the commencement of Montanus' pretensions to prophesy. Taking for the rise of Montanism the date given in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius (A.D. 172) this would give about A.D. 210 for the date of this work. Eusebius mentions also that Apollonius cites the Revelation of St. John, that he relates the raising to life of a dead man at Ephesus by the same John, and that he makes mention of the tradition quoted also by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 5 sub finem) from the Apocryphal "Preaching of Peter" that our Lord commanded His Apostles not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years after His ascension. This work of Apollonius was thought sufficiently important by Tertullian to demand an answer. The seventh book of his lost work, *De Ecstasi*, was devoted to a refutation of his assertions. (Hieron. *De Vir. Ill.* c. 50; Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 86; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 426; Dupin, i.) [E. V.]

APOLLONIUS OF TYANA. The life of this philosopher, as related by Philostratus, is as follows. He was born at Tyana, a Greek city of Cappadocia. His birth was accompanied by wonderful signs; the god Proteus appeared to his mother when pregnant with him, and in answer to her question, "Whom shall I bring forth?" replied, "Thou shalt bring forth me." Again, she went out into a meadow, when near the time of her delivery (being warned to do so in a dream); while there, she fell asleep, and a flock of swans surrounded her, singing and flapping their wings, being roused by which she gave birth to her son. At the same time a thunderbolt which seemed about to fall rose into the air and disappeared.

Apollonius grew up beautiful, and of extraordinary intelligence. When fourteen years of age he was taken to Tarsus and placed under the charge of Euthydemus, a rhetorician; but disliking the idle and luxurious habits of the place, he removed with his master to the neighbouring town of Aegae, where was a temple of Aesculapius. Here he became the pupil of a philosopher of the name of Euxenus, who professed himself a Pythagorean, but was in reality a lover of good living, and, as Philostratus says, understood the precepts of Pythagoras no more than a parrot understands the words which it has been taught to repeat. Apollonius, however, respected Euxenus, and gave him a garden with fountains, saying, "Live you as you please, but I will live after the manner of Pythagoras." In accordance with this declaration, he began to abstain from animal food and wine (without, however, entirely condemning the use of the latter), and rejected all garments made from living creatures. He let his hair grow, and spent most of his time in the temple of Aesculapius, where he excited the wonder of all, and became famous through the whole country. The god himself favoured him conspicuously, giving him supernatural knowledge into the characters of those who came to the temple, whereby some were cured of their diseases, others being wicked were sent away without gaining their requests. When in his twentieth year, he returned to Tyana in consequence of his father's death, and divided the property with his brother who was three years his senior; but presently with the view of reforming his brother, who lived a dissipated life, he gave him half his own share, and partly by kindness, partly through his own example, led him to a better way of living. After this he gave away the greater part of what remained of his fortune, reserving only a small portion for himself. He then declared his intention of never marrying, and kept the five years term of silence which was required of the disciples of Pythagoras. His silence, however, did not exclude him from the use of signs to express his meaning, and on several occasions during this period he repressed popular tumults in the cities of Pamphylia and Cilicia by his dignity of manner, and a few written words. His style of speaking, when his term of silence had elapsed, was brief and simple.

During the next twenty years we hear nothing of Apollonius. But between his fortieth and fiftieth year he resolved to travel to India, and disclosed his intention to his disciples, who were seven in number. In spite of their remonstrance he persisted, and finally set out with only two attendants. At Nineveh he met with Damis, the biographer from whom Philostratus professes to have taken the greater part of his history, and who offered himself to Apollonius as a guide and interpreter; but upon Apollonius saying that he already knew the way and the languages of all the people who lived on it, and moreover even the thoughts of men before they were spoken, Damis was struck with awe, and considered him as a god. (In the sequel of the narrative it appears, not without inconsistency on the part of Philostratus, that Apollonius did not always despise the aid of an interpreter.) Damis still accompanied him, and put down all his sayings and doings, in a rude and inelegant style.

From Nineveh Apollonius goes to Babylon, which, contrary to all authentic history, he finds in its ancient state of imperial magnificence. Both on his way there, and while in the city, he gives numerous proofs of his supernatural knowledge, and gains a profound and instantaneous reverence from all whom he meets. From Babylon he crosses the Caucasus to India; though how this feat, that confounds all geography, is performed, Philostratus does not explain. The conversation which Apollonius has with Damis on the top of the Caucasus is more interesting than most of those recorded, as indicating the gradual change from a superstitious awe of the mountains into a real though slight knowledge of their phenomena. Damis ingenuously confesses that he expected to have come down the Caucasus wiser than he went up, considering it the dwelling of the gods; whereupon Apollonius replies, "The prospects from the mountains do indeed display the heavens of a deeper azure, the stars of a greater magnitude, the sun rising out of the darkness, sights familiar to the shepherds and goatherds; but neither Athos nor the famous Olympus will shew to those who climb them what care the Divine Being takes of men, nor how it pleases him to be worshipped by them; nor can these things be known but by the pure contemplation of the soul." In general, the conversations that Apollonius holds with Damis shew much more of the straining after point, eloquence, and wisdom, than the real presence of these qualities. Damis plays very much the part of a Simmias, and Apollonius that of a Socrates; and as in his descriptions of the countries one may conjecture Philostratus to have had Xenophon before his eyes, so in these dialogues he very probably imitated Plato—with not much success, it is to be admitted.

The adventures of Apollonius in India, though full of prodigies, are of slight interest till he meets with the wise men, the Brachmans; and here for the first time he confesses himself inferior to those whom he meets. He learns from them the doctrine of metempsychosis, and having learned it, presently remembers and narrates some of his own previous states of existence. He is extremely astonished at hearing from them a full account of himself and his parents; an astonishment that might have been mitigated had he not chanced to forget his own remarkable powers in this line. He asks them, what they think of themselves. Jarchas, their chief, answers, "We are gods." "And why gods," asks Apollonius. "Because," said Jarchas, "we are good men"; an answer not unworthy of being remembered. He finds these sages pay no special regard to the numbers esteemed by Pythagoras, and are not afflicted, though their own number is one so undistinguished in every way as eighteen. Jarchas expounds to Apollonius his cosmogony, which agrees with that of the Stoics in so far that the world is considered as endued with life, but differs from them in not identifying the Divine Being with the world; indeed, throughout the whole of this work a very pure monotheism is taught, though a place is also left for inferior deities. Jarchas after this both relates and performs numerous prodigies, which need not be recapitulated here.

Returning from India, Apollonius comes at length to Ephesus, where the plague was raging.

He discovers it to be due to a demon in the form of an old beggar, who winked in an extraordinary manner; and the beggar having (by his direction) been stoned, the plague is stayed. After the stoning, a large and wild dog appears where the body of the beggar ought to have been. At Pergamus Apollonius heals many sick people; at Athens he casts out a devil from a youth who was possessed, rebuking him, and commanding him to give some sign of his departure; the devil answers, "I will make that statue fall" (pointing to one in a royal portico), which accordingly happens. At Corinth he opens the eyes of a young man to an Empusa, or vampire, whom he is on the point of marrying, and causes the marriage feast to vanish. This, Philostratus says, was one of Apollonius's most celebrated performances; yet there was only a general tradition of it at Corinth. The "Lamia" of Keats will occur to every one. At Sparta, he rebukes the effeminate manners of the people, and recalls them to their ancient customs. At Rome, Apollonius delivers himself from a charge of treasonable language against Nero, by causing the writing of the indictment to vanish from the paper. He then raises from death a young girl who was being carried to burial. He next visits the pillars of Hercules, where he gives his explanation of the tides, which is, that the ocean is moved by subterranean winds; from thence he proceeds to Syracuse, where from the prodigy of a monstrous birth, he prophesies the events that happened at Rome after the death of Nero. He condemns the mythical account of Enceladus being buried under Aetna, and gives his own explanation of the eruptions. At Alexandria he meets with Vespasian, who receives him with honour, and begs him to make him emperor; Apollonius answers, "It is already done; I have just prayed to Heaven for an emperor upright, generous, wise, and venerable, and you are he." Hence came his quarrel with the Stoic philosopher Euphrates, who wished to restore the Roman republic. Philostratus says, Euphrates was jealous of him. Apollonius then gave Vespasian some good but rather commonplace advice on the duties of an emperor. But a misunderstanding took place between Apollonius and Vespasian, upon the latter depriving the Greeks of their liberty.

With the Gymnosophists of Ethiopia, whom he next visits, Apollonius does not altogether agree so well as he had done with the Indians. They (having previously been prejudiced against him through the machinations of Euphrates) do not treat him with equal respect; he on his part does not think them equally wise; and though after a time they endeavour to propitiate him by causing an elm-tree to salute and address him courteously, they do not escape without a long lecture from the philosopher. On his return from Ethiopia he receives a letter from Titus (who was then emperor) requesting him to come to Argos, and give him some advice. Apollonius readily embraces the opportunity, and is received with more than cordiality. But upon Domitian's accession, he falls under the suspicion of that tyrant; not, as appears, altogether without reason, for, according to Philostratus, he had in some degree joined in conspiracies against him. Be that as it may, he was imprisoned and fettered at Rome; whereupon he

gave Damis a proof of his miraculous power by taking his leg out of the fetter and putting it in again. When brought before Domitian, after some conversation and bandying of repartees with the emperor and the accusers, he vanished; and appeared the same day to Demetrius and Damis at Puteoli. Philostratus, however, gives a long speech that he had composed in his defence. After this he retired to Greece, where he was received in a most flattering manner; entered the cave of Trophonius; and being at Ephesus, announced the death of Domitian at the moment when it actually occurred. Of the death of Apollonius different accounts were given; some said he entered the temple of Minerva at Lindus, and disappeared; others that it was in the temple of Diana Dictynna, and that voices of young maidens were heard, singing, "Leave the earth, come up to heaven," after which he was not seen again. After death he is said to have appeared to a young man who was sceptical as to the immortality of the soul (and who had prayed to him for enlightenment), and to have assured him of it, at the same time bidding him to leave off curious discussions.

Such is a brief abstract of the life of Apollonius, by Philostratus. The entire fabulosity of it hardly needs to be pointed out. If any other proof were needed than the nature of the story itself, the prodigies, the anachronisms and geographical blunders, it would be found in the entire absence of authority for the facts stated. Philostratus does indeed profess to found what he writes on "the records of cities and temples, and his own (Apollonius') epistles to the Elleans, Delphians, Indians, and Egyptians;" but the cities and temples are nameless, and the genuineness of any collection of letters of those times, ill proved, must always be considered more than doubtful, from the great prevalence of forged letters and treatises in the first centuries after Christ. Assuredly Philostratus was not the man accurately to distinguish the genuine from the spurious. (Concerning the collection of letters attributed to Apollonius and now extant, undoubtedly not the same, though in some points coinciding, with that possessed by Philostratus, we shall have more to say presently.) Of the other authorities of Philostratus, Maximus of Aegae and Moeragenes may be accepted as real; but the former only related the doings of Apollonius at Aegae, and besides gave a transcript of his will: while the latter, as we know from Origen (*contra Cels.* vi. 41), represented Apollonius as a magician, and in other ways gave soumble an account of him as moved Philostratus to shew considerable anger. If the account of Moeragenes had survived, we should probably know much more about Apollonius than we do now. On the other hand, Damis is manifestly a fictitious personage, and the book of which he is the reputed author, which (as Philostratus says) Damis gave to a relation, and which through his relation was introduced to the knowledge of the empress Julia, who handed it on to Philostratus to edit, cannot be held as of any historical value whatever.

What, then, can we really be said to know of Apollonius of Tyana? That he was born at Tyana, that he was educated at Aegae, that he professed Pythagoreanism, and that he was a very well known man of his day for what by the

common people were taken to be magical arts, are the only facts that rest on altogether unexceptionable authority. The account of his opposition to the Stoic Euphrates may perhaps also be taken as authentic. His reputation as a magician is confirmed by the double authority of Moeragenes and Lucian (*Pseudomantis*, ch. 5), and the great number of the pretenders to this kind of power in the first century, A.D., takes away all *à priori* improbability from the supposition that he belonged to the class. Yet we are not altogether without reasons for believing that he was more than a mere magician, and even a philosopher of some considerable insight. Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* p. 150 b) quotes a passage from his book "On sacrifices" (with the reservation "Apollonius is said to write as follows"), which if really his is certainly remarkable. The passage may be loosely translated as follows: "This, then, is the manner in which the Divine Power may best be revered and propitiated; to God, that God whom we first spoke of, who is one in himself and separate in nature from all, to whom all the rest (the other gods) must be reckoned subordinate; to him must neither sacrifice be offered, nor fire kindled, nor anything named of those things which are discerned by the senses; for of these things he has no need even at the hands of those who are greater than ourselves, nor is there any plant or animal that is not unclean before him; but he must be approached by that word which is best, the word which does not proceed through the lips; so must one entreat him. And the word I speak of is the reason, that needs no organ of communication." Both Kayser and Zeller are inclined to allow the authenticity of this extract, which is further corroborated by the fact that Plutarch (*Numa*, ch. 8) attributes a similar doctrine to Pythagoras; for Plutarch would naturally gain his ideas of the doctrine of Pythagoras from the neo-Pythagoreans of his time.

All the authorities after Philostratus that speak of Apollonius base their account of him on the life by Philostratus; except Origen, who quotes Moeragenes. Hierocles, indeed, mentions Maximus of Aegae and Damis, but it does not appear that he knew of them except through Philostratus. But we must now come to the consideration of the only other authority from which it is possible that we may learn anything about Apollonius; and that is, the collection of letters still extant which are attributed to him. Professor Jowett (in the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biogr.*) does not appear to consider it altogether impossible that these letters may be, at any rate in part, genuine; but Kayser and Zeller reject them in a summary manner, and by most writers on Apollonius they are barely mentioned. Zeller goes so far as to say, that they are obviously composed to suit the life by Philostratus. We do not think that this opinion can be held by any one who attentively compares the letters with the biography; and we think the probability is greatly in favour of the supposition, that the letters, whether genuine or not, were composed before the work of Philostratus, and hence from the earliest and best authority respecting Apollonius that we have. In the first place, if the letters were composed by one who had the work of Philostratus before him, how comes it that there is no trace in the collection

of such remarkable letters as that alluded to by Philostratus in v. 22, in which Apollonius is said to have rebuked the Athenians for their gladiatorial shows, and refused to attend them; or that in v. 2, where he explains the phenomena of the tides; or that to Nerva, in vi. 27? Again, there are in the collection several consecutive letters to Scopelianus, but there is not that given by Philostratus in i. 24. Again, Philostratus at the very outset of his work declares that Apollonius wrote many letters to the Eleans, Delphians, Indians, and Egyptians, on the subject of their deities, countries, morals, and laws: surely a most tempting subject for the composer of letters to dilate upon. Yet when we look at the collection, these four peoples have not much more than a letter a-piece, and those neither long nor important. The brother of Apollonius is mentioned in the biography as a dissolute man, who was brought to better ways by the influence of Apollonius, and to whom Apollonius is said to have given half his patrimony. Now in the collection there are several letters inscribed "To his brother Hestiaeus," and one "To his brother Apollonius," but in none of them is there the smallest hint at the events recorded by Philostratus, and from only one could it be at all inferred that Hestiaeus was inclined to luxury. On the contrary, it would appear from at least one of the letters to Hestiaeus, that Apollonius had been accused of quarrelling with his brother on money matters. Again, in the biography by Philostratus the Sardians are barely mentioned; in the collection there are many letters vehemently attacking them for their vices, and we are much mistaken if there is any mention at all in the biography of Lesbos, Crito, Gordius, Diotimus, Pherucianus, Valerius, or the magistrates of Caesarea and Seleucia, to all of whom letters are found addressed in the collection. But the most remarkable difference between the letters and the biography, is the almost entire absence of any miraculous element in the former. In one of the letters to Euphrates, Apollonius says that he "takes away pain, and heals diseases" (*σώζων δόνας ἀφαιρεί, καὶ πάθη παύει*); in another he says, "Some men think me a god;" but these are the only possible allusions to any supernatural power. Nor are there more than one or two of the letters from which it would be at all inferred that Apollonius was an extensive traveller. The great majority of them are addressed to Greeks or Greek communities. It should be added, that about nine of the letters are identical in the biography and in the collection; among them are the letters of Phrastes and Apollonius to Jarchas, and also those to Vespasian and Titus. It is, however, almost certain that Philostratus must have got these letters from some document prior to his own time; their brevity is in strong contrast to the longwinded talk which he himself puts into the mouth of his characters. Kayser, indeed, adduces the dry and abrupt style of the letters in the collection as a proof of their spuriousness. Apollonius, he thinks, would certainly have written better. But surely the inference is rather the other way, that a composer of forged letters would have written in a rhetorical style.

There are some among these letters that one would certainly wish to have been really written

by Apollonius. The most remarkable perhaps are these: one to Euphrates, describing the life of a Pythagorean philosopher; one to the magistrates of Seleucia, which begins with a remarkably Christian mode of expression, "Straton has departed from among men, having left all his mortal part here on earth. But it behoves us who are still in a state of punishment, that is who still live, to have some care of his affairs;" a third to his brother Apollonius, which ends in a very natural and affecting manner. It is to console him on the death of his wife, and after producing different topics of consolation, some of which sound rather strange to our ears, he adds, "I could not write more than this for my tears" (*ὅπῃ δακρύων οὐχ οἷός τε ἐγένετο πτελοῦν γράψαι*), "but these are the most pressing things I have to say." A fourth is to Valerius, on the death of a son, and is noticeable for its arguments on the immortality of the soul.

If one is to take any portion of these letters as genuine, one must conclude that Apollonius was a man of passionate and affectionate temperament, a real philosopher and religious reformer, and of extensive influence in Greek cities; but at the same time chargeable with arrogance and anger towards his opponents, with something of a mysterious and dogmatic air, and the beginning of a pretence towards supernatural power. And perhaps this is not altogether an improbable view of his character; and it is easy to see how, as time went on, the magical view of his history would gain greater predominance. If none of the letters be considered genuine (and some of them are to say the least very suspicious, though it should be noticed that those which are identical in this collection and in the biography do not of themselves imply the marvellous history which Philostratus tacks on to them) then the few bare facts mentioned above are all that can be considered certain about Apollonius; and it must in this case be left doubtful, in what proportion he was a philosopher, and in what proportion a magician. To call him *sans phrase* an impostor, as is done by many writers, is at any rate premature.

We must now come to the question, which is that which has attracted so much attention to the history of Apollonius,—what was the moving cause of Philostratus' biography? what was his aim? had he, more especially, any view of attacking Christianity by setting up a rival to Christ? Hierocles, at the end of the 3rd century, was the first person who actually applied the work of Philostratus to this purpose, as is said expressly by Eusebius, who replied to him. The Deists of the 18th century, both in France and England, renewed the argument in the same sense, but with this difference; that whereas Hierocles would have had no objection to admit the miracles both of Christ and of Apollonius, Voltaire and Lord Herbert had an equal disbelief in both. Naturally, none of these writers held that Philostratus wrote in direct imitation of the Gospels, as it would have marred their point to do so. But equally naturally the orthodox writers, beginning with Huet, bishop of Avranches, and coming down through Bishop Douglas and Paley to Dr. Réville in our own day, have considered Philostratus a direct though concealed antagonist of Christianity. This view has been opposed in Germany by Meiners, Neander, Buhle,

nd Jacobs, and in our own country by Mr. Watson (*Contemporary Review*, February 1867). An intermediate view is held by Baur in his *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus*, (Tübingen, 1832), which in its main outline will we think commend itself as by far the most probable account. According to this view Philostratus wrote with no strictly polemical reference to Christianity, but, in the eclectic spirit of his time, strove to accommodate Christianity to the heathen religion. It might indeed still be questioned, even if this view were granted, how far Philostratus directly aimed at such an accommodation, or whether it was an indirect endeavour, an object that insinuated itself into his work, rather than its immediate purpose. We are ourselves disposed to believe, that, without attributing to Philostratus any formal design either of opposing or assimilating Christianity, he was yet most strongly influenced by its ideas and history.

What is the central aim of this biography of Apollonius? Surely it is this: the setting forth, not merely of wise precepts in the abstract, but of an example of supreme wisdom or humanity to imitate. It is not implied by this that Philostratus considered Apollonius as entirely and necessarily unique among men; but it is implied that he considered him as more than a mere teacher of doctrine, as a pattern to men in his own person, as one in whom wisdom and truth were incorporate. He wished men to honour Apollonius himself, and not merely to study or believe certain truths delivered by Apollonius. This cannot, we think, be doubted by any one who reflects on the whole tone of the book. Apollonius is called "divine;" his disciples stand in an altogether different relation to him from that in which the disciples of Socrates stand to Socrates; they do not argue with him as equals with an equal; they follow him, listen to him, are rebuked by him. His miracles, again, do not result from his being in possession of any secret communicable to other men, but arise from his own nature and wisdom. Such a character must mind us, however different in some respects, of the Christ of the Gospels. But can it be seen that any character like this, or approaching to this, was drawn by any heathen writer before Christ, or in the 1st century after Christ? We think not. Philosophy and magic, the search for knowledge and the search after power, were familiar to men who had never heard of Christianity; but this ideal is different from either, and from both of them united. Those who affirm that Philostratus never thought of the Christian history in his work, say that he included Apollonius as a rival to Pythagoras. That he did connect Apollonius and Pythagoras, is certain, for he puts them together at the outset of his work. But this only puts the question a stage farther back. For by whom was Pythagoras portrayed, we do not say merely as the hero of a marvellous history (for this is a subordinate part of the matter), but as this superhuman ideal? Not certainly by any writer of the centuries before Christ. Even Plutarch (*Numa*, ch. viii.) only knows of marvellous events occurring to or connected with Pythagoras; he knows of no miracles actually performed by him, much less does he set him up as an ideal exemplar. Is it possible that the age

of Caracalla and Severus, so eclectic, so traditional, so unoriginal, can of its own mere motion have gone off into this new and unheard-of line? Unheard of, that is, unless we suppose it to have been borrowed from Christianity. We hold it certain, therefore, that it was borrowed from Christianity.

But of course it admits of a question, whether it was Philostratus himself, or the author whom he adapted and refined, that had the chief hand in this borrowing. But it seems to us probable, that Philostratus was at any rate conscious of the imitation. First, the Christians were not in those days by any means an unknown sect; so well known were they, that Alexander Severus (with a singular parallelism to the supposed conduct of Philostratus) placed Christ with Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius himself, among his household gods. Secondly, the resemblance to the Gospel histories is in particular instances very broad indeed. The miraculous birth of Proteus, and the circumstances attending it; the healing of demoniacal possessions, (was the idea of such possessions in any way familiar to the Greeks?) the raising of the dead; the appearance of Apollonius to two of his disciples after his deliverance from Domitian; his ascent to heaven, and appearance after his death; these are points of similarity that cannot be evaded: and taken together with the central idea of the book, they seem to imply that Philostratus was not an unconscious copyist of one who had taken the Gospels as his model, but was himself aware of the imitation.

It is, however, a question of quite subordinate importance, what was the intention of Philostratus personally in his book, what portion of his mental horizon was occupied by Christianity. And in order to dismiss him as soon as possible, we may remark, that if he had had any very direct purpose in relation to Christianity, the application of it could hardly have been deferred till the time of Hierocles and Eusebius. The analogy of Porphyry, at once the author of a marvellous life of Pythagoras and a vehement opponent of the Christians, might indeed suggest a similar combination in Philostratus; but this is not a suggestion that can stand in the place of proof, which here is entirely wanting; and Porphyry himself, vehement, fiery, and mystical, was an utterly different man from the easy, gentlemanly, courtierlike Philostratus, who, one may guess, would have thought it a lowering of his dignity to meddle with a class so distinctly belonging to the inferior classes of society as did the Christians of his time.

The real point of interest, however, lies in the inquiry whether the main idea and outline of these wonderful histories of Pythagoras and Apollonius were borrowed from the Christian records, or not. To this question we have already replied decidedly in the affirmative. It should be noticed, that the very striking resemblances between the biography of Apollonius and the Gospels are resemblances in externals; the inner spirit of the two is entirely different. It would take us too long here to enter upon a detailed comparison of them in this respect; it must be sufficient to remark, that in the one we find the temperate, self-contained philosophic spirit, striking even in its dilution, and amid all the rhetoric and tawdry marvels with which Philostratus

has dressed it; in the other, the spirit of the insufficiency of self.

Besides the collection of letters, and the treatise *Τελεταὶ ἢ περὶ θναιῶν*, mentioned above, there are ascribed to Apollonius the following works; a hymn to Memory, a life of Pythagoras (mentioned by Porphyry and Iamblichus as the work of "Apollonius," by Suidas as the work of "Apollonius of Tyana"), a book entitled *Πυθαγόρου δόξαι*, a treatise *περὶ μαντείας ἀστέρων* and *Χρησμοί*.

Those who wish to examine the whole question respecting Apollonius at length should consult Baur's *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus* (Tübingen 1832); Kayser's *Philostratus*, and Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen*. Other writers on the subject have been noticed in this article, or are to be found in the books above mentioned.

[I. R. M.]

APOLLONIUS, an Egyptian monk of the fourth century, famed for humility and as an exorcist. Several of his sayings are recorded (Ruff. *de Verb. Sen.* 25; Gr. Inc. ap. Rosw. *V. P.* v. 3, 4). Possibly this is the Apollos who, being one of the monks raised to the episcopacy by Athanasius, is spoken of by him as an Egyptian bishop, present at the Councils of Tyre and Sardica (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* 133, 154), who is mentioned below. [APOLLOS.]

[I. G. S.]

APOLLONIUS, a Roman senator, who being accused of being a Christian c. A.D. 186, wrote and delivered in full senate an apology for the faith, for which St. Jerome reckons him second in order of time among the Latin Fathers. He was nevertheless beheaded as one that persisted in the faith, although his accuser was put to death for accusing him (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 21; S. Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* 42; *Act. SS.* April 18, and Ruinart 73 sq.).

[A. W. H.]

APOLLONIUS. (1) An imaginary bishop of Corinth, referred to by "Praedestinatus" (i. 23). (2) An imaginary bishop of Ephesus (*ib.* 26-27) [See APOLLONIUS, p. 135.] (3) A "companion" of one of the Antonines, who vainly tried to persuade BARDEISAN to abjure Christianity (Epiph. *Haer.* 477).

[H.]

APOLLONIUS. (1) A correspondent of Theodoret's, probably not a Christian, to whom he wrote commending the excellence of his natural endowments, and urging an acknowledgment of the Giver. (Theodt. *Ep.* 73.)

(2) Count, Praefect of the East in 442, and great chamberlain, to whom Theodoret wrote with reference to the calumnies spread against him at Constantinople. (Theodt. *Ep.* 103.) He was in office at the Council of Chalcedon, 451. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 851, &c.)

[E. V.]

APOLLOS (or -onius), St., a famous Egyptian monk of the 4th century. He embraced the monastic life when only fifteen years old, and after many years of utter seclusion established himself in the Thebaid at the head of five hundred ascetics. By his reputation for sanctity and for miraculous powers he made many converts, and among others a notorious robber-chief, and had great influence with the pagans. Though most austere to himself, he was courteous and hospitable to others. He lived to a great age (Ruff. *de Mon.* 7; Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 52; Soz. *Hist.* iii. 14; Niceph. *Hist.* ix. 14.)

Perhaps this is the Apollos a disciple of Pachomius (*Vit. Pachom.* ap. Rosw. *V. P.* c. 18), and there are curious coincidences in detail which make it probable that this is also the Apollos (not the Apollonius) mentioned in Soz. (*Hist.* vi. 29) and in Niceph. (xi. 34). If, as is not unlikely, he was one of the monks consecrated by Athanasius, he may be identified with the Apollos (Ath. *ad Drac.* 210), Egyptian bishop, present at the councils of Tyre and Sardica (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* 133, 154), and exiled by George of Alexandria (Ath. *ad Mon.* 306). He is commemorated on Jan. 25. [I. G. S.]

APOLOGISTS. I. *General view of the Apologists and their work.* Under this name are included the earlier Christian writers against Paganism and Judaism, though it applies more properly to the former. Their work was rather the defence of Christians than of Christianity. A faith active and aggressive, zealous to overturn the religion with which the associations of the people and the institutions of the State were entwined, sparing neither popular vices nor popular amusements, provoked a hatred which at once justified and strengthened itself by blackening the character of the Christians. Refusing to sacrifice to the gods, they were thought a community of atheists, capable of any crime. All sorts of wickedness were therefore attributed to them; and out of distorted accounts of their fraternal love, secret assemblies, worship, and sacraments, were made up horrible tales of incest, child murder, and cannibalism. Influenced by these slanders, and regarding opposition to the state religion as seditious, the authorities, if they did not excite the violence of the populace, were little solicitous to check it; and though the calumnies against the Church were not the prime causes of persecution, yet since they were ever put forward as its reason and justification, the Christians could not but feel that, were these refuted, there would be some chance of that fair hearing and common justice, which were now denied them; and that, if the emperor could be once made conscious of the cruel wrongs perpetrated in his name, he might be induced to interfere. The first Apologies, therefore, are mainly intended as vindications of the Christians from the false accusations brought against them, but such a defence naturally passed into the offensive; especially when the worst deeds invented by the calumniators were told in the mythologies of the very gods, for rejection of whom the Christians were counted atheists. The Apologists were thus led to contrast their own and their persecutors' religion; the one holy and worthy of God, embodying and setting in order the noblest conceptions of all philosophy; enforcing every virtue, and forbidding even the thought of sin, and that under the most tremendous sanctions: the other so gross and senseless as to shock some amongst the heathens themselves; self-contradictory and degrading, ascribing to its divinities such immorality that it seemed only framed to countenance vice. The one offered a holy and reasonable service, the other a dark and cruel worship, stained with lust and blood. No less opposed were the fruits which each bore in its votaries; the slandered Christians leading lives of patience purity holiness and love, exalted courage, and heavenly

isdom; while the heathen neither truly feared their own gods, nor regarded man; living in alic and wickedness, hateful, and hating one another. Nor did Gentile philosophy pass unensured; its pretensions were great, its performances small, its doctrines mutually contradictory, and supported on no better evidence than the dicta of its respective schools: its mobility was often most defective, and its professors not unfrequently the wickedest of men. Whatever of truth it might contain was but taken at secondhand from Revelation, and might there be found in purity and fulness, built on the infallible authority of God Himself. That authority, with the Apologists, always the ultimate foundation of faith; the philosophical arguments which they use being but introductory and illustrative, or designed to remove prejudices and show that the Christian dogmas are not irrational.

II. *Apologetic writings against Paganism.* 1. Of these the earliest are appeals in behalf of the suffering Christians, addressed to the emperor, the senate, or other public authorities. The first recorded are those of Quadratus (of which but a single fragment remains) and Aristides (wholly lost, but described as referring largely to the Gentile philosophers), both of which are said to have been delivered to Hadrian during his stay in Greece, A.D. 131. Next come the *Apologies* of Justin Martyr, about A.D. 160 (according to Cave, *Life of Justin*, c. 8); an *Apology* addressed by Melito, bishop of Sardis, to M. Aurelius Antoninus, about A.D. 170 (on the *Oration of Meliton the Philosopher to Antoninus Caesar*, Cureton, *Spicileg. Syr.* p. 7; see ELIOT); and that of Athenagoras, A.D. 176-180. Amongst the Latins, we have Tertullian's *apologeticus adversus Nationes*, between A.D. 178 and 202, followed by his smaller treatise, *Ad nationes*: and Cyprian's *Letter to Demetrianus*, D. 246. This series may be not unfitly closed thus the thanks addressed by Lactantius, at the beginning of his *Institutiones Divinae* (A.D. 320) to Constantine, for the rest which his accession had brought to the Church.

2. Treatises apologetic or polemical, in the form of letters, explanations, or replies addressed to individuals. Of this sort are the *Letter to Octavius* (q. v.), and the three books of Theophilus *Ad Autolyicum*, about A.D. 181. The Latin dialogue of Minucius Felix (beginning of 3rd cent.), called *Octavius* from one of its interlocutors, may belong to this class of works, supposing it is Octavius to have been a real person, and the dialogue actually intended for his use. We may add Cyprian's short work *On the grace of God*, addressed to the neophyte Donatus (that *On the vanity of Idols* is closely connected with the *tavicus*, and with Tertullian's *Apologeticus*); and finally the poetical letter of Paulinus of Nola to his former friend Ausonius.

3. Polemical, hortatory, or didactic works intended for the educated public, with no special individual inscription. These may include the treatise of Athenagoras *On the Resurrection*, the four works of doubtful authorship, usually published with those of Justin, viz. *De Monarchia*, *Oratio ad Graecos*, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, and the fragmentary treatise *On the Resurrection*: Tan's *Oration to the Greeks*, probably written in the reign of Marcus Aurelius; the *Liber Adhori-*

tatorius ad Graecos of Clemens Alexandrinus, about A.D. 190; the *Irrisio Gentilium Philosophorum* of Hermias, about the same date; Hippolytus' *Philosophumena* (3rd cent.), and two apologetic works of Athanasius, supposed to date about A.D. 319, *Oratio contra Gentes*, and *De Incarnatione Verbi*.

4. Writings against individual defenders of heathenism. One of the first of this class is the vigorous work of Origen *Against Celsus*, published about A.D. 249, long posterior to Celsus' *True Account*, which called it forth. The 15 books of Porphyry against the Christians produced a great number of replies, according to Lucius Dexter at least 30; some of the most important of the writers being Methodius, bishop of Patara (whose work, according to Jerome, *Ep. ad Magnum*, was in verse); Eusebius of Caesarea; and Apollinaris of Laodicea, of whom only a small fragment remains (4th cent.). Philostorgius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, x. 10, mentions a work of his own against Porphyry. To these may be added the 8 books of Diodorus of Tarsus (died A.D. 394) *Against the Fatalists*, assailing Plato, Aristotle, and Porphyry, of which some fragments remain. The strange admissions found in Porphyry's own writings, concerning the character of some of the gods, the oracles, &c., furnished many arguments against his own cause; which have been used by Theodoret, *De Curandis Graecorum Affectibus*, Serm. 3; by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, iv. cc. 7, 16, and by Augustine, *De Civit. Dei*, x. cc. 26, 27. Eusebius also in his work *Against Hierocles* assails on external and internal grounds the parallel which that writer sought to draw between Christ and Apollonius Tyanaeus. The books of Julian, now lost, in defence of paganism, which occupied him till the Persian war, A.D. 363, had many answers; among which we may notice that of Cyril addressed to the emperor Theodosius, *On the pure Religion of the Christians* (end of 4th cent.), Gregory Nazianzen's *Invectives against the Emperor Julian*, about A.D. 363, and the Sermon of Chrysostom *On S. Babylas and against Julian*, preached about A.D. 383, consequently 20 years after Julian's death.

5. The course of apologetic and polemical writings in the Eastern Church closes with the work *De Curandis Graecorum Affectibus*, directed by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, (who died A.D. 457) against the false views of Christianity prevalent in the heathen world; summing up and arranging the argument of foregoing apologists. Several Latin works of like sort belong to the time when the Christian faith began to triumph; they justify the change that was coming over the Empire, and deal the last blows to heathenism, which, though no longer favoured, and at last actually opposed by the State, yet found some adherents and defenders. The seven books of Arnobius *Contra Gentes* fall in the period of the last persecution, preceding the accession of Constantine—probably between A.D. 297 and A.D. 303; and the *Institutiones Divinae* of Lactantius appear to have been published about A.D. 320. Both of these authors gather up and systematize what had been already said against the old superstition; the former commencing with an answer to the then common objection, that Christianity was the cause of all the calamities of the times. With these, on account of its similar scope, we

may place the greatly inferior work of Firmicus Maternus, *De Errone Profanarum Religionum*, addressed to the sons of Constantine about, or subsequently to, the year A.D. 350. Several minor pieces follow: as, the letter of Ambrose to Valentinian, against the restoration of an altar of Victory petitioned for by Symmachus, A.D. 380; that of Paulinus of Nola to Jovius, on *Providence*, against the philosophical theories of fate and of chance: besides a poem *Adversus Gentiles*, by one Antonius, of whom nothing seems to be known, but for whose name Fabricius appears to have read that of the poet Ausonius, whom he supposes to have embraced Christianity. The concluding name among the Western Apologists is that of Augustine, the bishop of Hippo, whose 22 books, *De Civitate Dei*, form a complete polemical treatise, opening like that of Arnobius with a reply to the pagans' favourite charge, that the Christians were ruining the State; and proceeding to contrast the Church, as the Divine commonwealth, with the kingdoms of this world, particularly with the Roman Empire.

III. *Writings against the Jews.* 1. *Greek.* The earliest of these is the so-called *Epistle of St. Barnabas* upon the types of the Law, of not later date than A.D. 110—probably of the time of Vespasian: next came a lost *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*, before the middle of the 2nd cent., mentioned by Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and by Maximus ascribed to Aristo Pellaëus; Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, probably written not long before his death; the *Demonstratio adversus Judæos* of Hippolytus (died A.D. 230), chiefly upon Ps. lxi.; Eusebius' *Demonstratio Evangelica*; of Gregory of Nyssa (died A.D. 395), *Testimonia adversus Judæos*; of Chrysostom (died A.D. 407), *Demonstratio adversus Judæos et Gentiles* (in proof of Christ's divinity), and seven *Homilies against the Jews*, in great measure against Judaizers within the Church. Of Philippus of Tida, contemporary of Chrysostom, there remains a *Narrative of a Disputation concerning Christ* held in Persia between Christians, Jews, and Heathens: and under the name of Cyril of Alexandria there passes a short piece *Against the Jews*, containing the solution of eight questions on supposed difficulties in the Law. It is extant only in the Latin. Gregentius, archbishop of Taphra (6th cent.) has left a *Disputation with Herbanus, a Jew*. Besides these more directly controversial works (to which we may add the answers of Origen in the two first of his books against Celsus, to the objections put by that writer into the mouth of a Jew), replies to various arguments and expositions of Scripture put forward by the Jews, are to be found in the Commentaries of Origen, Eusebius on the Psalms and Isaiah, Chrysostom, Theodoret on Daniel, and elsewhere.

2. *Latin writings.* Of Tertullian there is a work *Against the Jews*, composed on the occasion of a dispute between a Christian and a Jewish proselyte; of Cyprian, *Testimonia adversus Judæos*; with a work under his name, but of uncertain authorship, in answer to the Jewish attacks upon Christ. Novatian, whose schism dates from A.D. 251, has left a letter *On Jewish Meats*; and of Ambrose's *Letters*, the 72nd, 73rd, 74th, and 75th treat of the relation between the O. T. ordinances and the Gospel. Expositions of prophecy, &c., spe-

cially directed against the Jewish interpretations are to be found in Augustine, *de Civ. Dei*, and in the exegetical works of Jerome. We may include in this list such attacks upon Judaism as occur in the *Institt. Divin.* of Lactantius.

Of these writers, Greek and Latin, most have expounded or vindicated the Christian interpretation of prophecy and types. Justin, Tertullian, Irenæus, defended the supernatural birth of Christ; and Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, and Augustine His Divinity. The three first of these asserted the abolition of the Law; the pseudo-Barnabas, Justin, Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, Ambrose, Augustine, and Epiphanius treat of its spiritual import and interpretation.

IV. *The Apologists and the popular religion.* Various theories were extant, amongst the heathens, of the origin and right interpretation of their mythology. The Stoics taught that it was allegorical of truth, natural or moral: others, in accordance with the suggestion of Euhemerus, looked on its gods as men deified by their posterity, and sought an historical groundwork in its legends; which others, again, received as literally true, but descriptive of the acts of certain demons, intermediate between gods and men (cf. Plato, *Sympos.* c. 23, p. 202 D; Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, c. 25). The first of these views the Apologists reject, remarking by the way, that if the gods only represented the elements and powers of nature they were not proper objects of worship, nor was there any need to have expressed these in allegories so gross and immoral. The second and third they adopt either combined or as alternative solutions; inclining on the whole to the last. They were accustomed to hear the myth treated as realities by the people, and accepted the idea the more readily, as they identified these demons with the fallen angels of the Scriptures, or with the souls of the antediluvian giants, whom they conceived to have sprung from the union of the evil angels with human wives. These wicked spirits were the authors of all the prodigies and supernatural powers ascribed to the images of the gods; and the inventors and maintainers of the system of paganism; a system, with which the Apologists did not deny that some truth was mixed: remarkable coincidences were to be found, between certain legends and some parts of Christian teaching; but these had been introduced by the demons themselves to add suspiciousness to their lie, and, by forestalling, to lessen the effect of the truth. The poets themselves show at times a trace of the pure primitive faith in the one, holy, almighty God; the best amongst them, as well as amongst the philosophers had revolted at the character of some myths, which they denounced as slanders upon the Godhead. It was not the Christians, for following their example, but the heathen, for suffering such tales to be told of their gods, who were properly to be charged with impiety.

The grossness and folly of these fables supply the Apologists' chief weapon of offence; and they attack Polytheism as it appears in mythology, rather than in the abstract. The Unity of God is maintained by Athenagoras (*Apol.* c. 8) from the definition of the Deity as an Essence self-existent, simple, and perfect, the Maker and Container of the universe: by Origen (*Against Celsus* i. 23), Athanasius (*contra Gentes*, cc. 37-39) Lactantius (*Institt. Div.* i. 3), from the unity and

harmony of Creation; by Minucius Felix (*Octavius*, c. 8), and Cyprian (*De Idololorum Vanitate*, c. 5) from the necessity of an undivided supreme government; by Gregory of Nyssa (*Oratio Catechetica, Proem.*) upon the ground that perfection excludes plurality, since all perfect beings would be coincident or identical; and also by Magnes v. Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.* i. 308).

Another specially vulnerable point in Paganism was the nature of its worship—its images and sacrifices. To the Christian attacks upon idolatry the heathens gave the answer, common still, that the statue was not regarded as the god, but only his representation, and the proper way of access to him; but how, ask the Apologists, does this defence serve, when the statue is that of some man, not long deceased, to which you yet ascribe miracles? (Athenag. *Apol.* c. 18, c. 23 sq.). It must be here the *image* with which you connect the wonders; for dead men do no prodigies; and if these the real cause is Satanic power. Your idols, of necessity more modern than the art of statuary, are absurd innovations; and these you honour with a service no less absurd—the laughter of beasts,—whether for your gods' food or amusement does not appear. Fitter worship for a spiritual God is the Christian's self-dedication in holiness, his reasonable and unbloody sacrifice!

The persecutions suffered by the Christians in earlier times, and the disasters which befell the empire after its conversion were sometimes urged as objections to the truth of their religion, as if, and theirs been the true God, He must have protected his servants: to which it is usually replied, that the Christians' portion being in heaven, earthly troubles did not touch it, nor seriously harm them, but often the reverse. The calamities of that day had nothing which marked them as any more special tokens of divine wrath, than those of former times; besides, as earthly evils were to heathens far more terrible things than to Christians, why should the gods, provoked by the sins of the latter, punish them with visitations which fell most heavily on their own worshippers?

V. *The Apologists and the Philosophers.* Gentile philosophy was a subject that gave room for great differences of opinion among the Christians, of whom some, as Hermias (*Irisio Gent. Phil.*), Tertullian (*Apologet.* cc. 46, 47), and notably Origen (*Oration to the Greeks*, cc. 1-3), treated as a medley of folly contradictions and hypothesis; whilst others, e.g. Athenagoras (*Apol.* c. p. 8 A), and Justin (in reference to Plato, *Ap.* c. 59) well-nigh claim the best of the old ages as fellow champions for the truth. The slender view found perhaps most favour, at least with the more learned Christians; but none sought the light of philosophy really comparable to that of revelation, or the adherents of its opposing sects all equally honest seekers after truth. Like Socrates, some of our writers call attention to the contradictory schemes by which it sought to explain the phenomena of the outward world; and then proceed to its mutually destructive ethical theories, of which one selected the chief good what another denied to be a good at all:—pleasure, virtue, knowledge, consistency with nature, had all found assertors; and at last a sect arose which denied the possibility of knowledge, and so cut away the founda-

tions of philosophy altogether. If an ignorant man had to choose the right instructor amid all this strife, he needed, in order to make the choice, to be at starting wiser than all the philosophers themselves.

The Christian estimate of the comparative merits of the several schools—where any merit at all is acknowledged—seldom varies. The earlier natural philosophers, e.g. the Atomists, seem to be regarded as idle and atheistical speculators, whose disagreement showed them to have all missed the truth. Pythagoras does not find much favour, though sometimes adduced as a witness for the unity of God, and his fate taken as an instance of the persecution which the good have always suffered (Athenag. *Apol.* c. 31, p. 35 A); for his doctrine of the transmigration of souls into the bodies, it might be, of beasts, was revolting to those who looked for a resurrection to immortality. The Sophists are scarcely noticed, save in Tertullian's odd mistake of Hippias the tyrant for his philosophic namesake (*Apologet.* c. 45). But Socrates and still more Plato occupy a position of exceptional favour. The life and moral teaching of Socrates, his opposition to the popular religion, and his martyr-like death commanded the admiration of the Christians; but as they seem to have distinguished the real Socrates from the representation of him given by Plato, his great disciple attracted more of their attention. They were moreover offended by the “*δαμόνιον*” or “divine intimation” of which he speaks, and which they, like Apuleius, took to mean “familiar spirit;” and, singularly enough, so high was their estimate of the enlightenment which he possessed, that they almost censured his compliances with the state religion, as apostasy. The highest place amongst philosophers was accorded to Plato, in consequence of his teaching concerning God as the supreme and essential Good, the “*Logos*,” or divine intelligence seen in Creation, the distinction between objects of thought and of sense, the essence of the soul and other spiritual beings, and the nature of true happiness, unaffected by outward ills; and, perhaps most of all, for his emphatic condemnation of the mythology. In the Letters ascribed to him (*Platonic Æpp.* ii. 312 E) he was believed to express his faith in somewhat like a Trinity; his genuine works themselves being probably read in the light of Philo's philosophy, and, by the later Apologists, in that of New Platonism, which put upon its master's words a sense that brought them into still nearer accord with Christianity. The Christians, however, condemned his doctrines on the eternity of matter (as being moulded only, not created by God); and on the relation of the sexes, as brought out in the *Republic*. The Apologists, whose views we are considering, approve in great measure his account of the soul's nature, but utterly reject the idea of its pre-existence, which he regarded as essential to its immortality (on the principle that whatever has had a beginning must also have an end): and maintain on the contrary, that the power and will of God which gave the soul being at the first, still maintain it in existence; whence they have been represented as teaching that the soul is not naturally immortal. Their scanty mention of Aristotle is somewhat surprising. Amidst the Platonism of the eclectic Athenagoras, we recognise

the Aristotelian doctrine of the *mean* (*Resurr.* c. 21, p. 64 B), and by the same Apologist he is cited as holding the Unity of God; but he displeased the Christians by his views of providence, and by making the supreme good consist in happiness; happiness, too, for the attainment of which various outward advantages were indispensable. His philosophy was so strongly physical, as to lie in great part out of the Christians' range of thought; and the ethical systems with which they came most in contact were those of the later schools. The Peripatetics, doing little more than elaborate Aristotle's opinions, are also little noticed; and seldom but in reference to objectionable tenets ascribed to particular adherents of the school. The Academics are chiefly cited for their scepticism, as witnesses against all philosophy. The Epicureans were far more prominent, and receive unqualified condemnation, as subverters of all piety and morals; although the distinction between their view and that of the Cyrenaics, on pleasure as the chief good, is not overlooked (*Athen. Resurr.* c. 19, p. 62 B). The opposing sect of the Stoics, celebrated as it was amongst the ancients for its ethics, is not very favourably regarded by the Christians. Its pantheistic allegorizing of the myths, its denial of a particular providence and of any intelligible rewards and punishments in a future life, its sanction of suicide, and its cold proud spirit, conspired to produce an aversion which the high moral tone of individual Stoics could not remove. The definition of a virtuous life as "according to nature" was not always understood, being sometimes taken to mean an imitation of the beasts; and now and then we find doctrines charged on the Stoics which can hardly be reconciled with their known principles. It must be allowed that the high pretensions of this school, contrasted with the lives of some of its adherents, laid it open more than other sects to the charge of hypocrisy, alike from the satirist and the Christian.

We thus see that educated Christians did not regard Gentile philosophy as wholly in the wrong, but rather as having attained, in certain schools, to some measure of truth. This was partly attributed to Divine illumination—not indeed that the philosophers were thought to have had prophetic inspiration (though this was certainly believed of the Sibyl), but to have been more or less aided by the Holy Spirit's grace; and some Christians thought that use had been made of the Jewish Scriptures by Plato; whom they even supposed, by an anachronism which Augustine exposes, to have been a hearer of Jeremiah in Egypt. Satanic thefts and parodies of revelation were also surmised here, as in the mythology.

VI. *The Apologists and the Jews.* In reasoning with Jews, the first matter of importance was to show that the Christians had not forgotten the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For they were encountered at once with the objection, that while professing to serve Him, they had discarded all observance of His law. The Apologists' reply is, that the law was not of eternal obligation, but intended from the first as a temporary dispensation, preparatory to one more perfect—the type and shadow of those spiritual blessings, which were to be seen in their reality in the Christian Church. There

(*Aug. de Civit. Dei*) was to be found the true circumcision of the heart. The law had in all things ended in Christ, and the fleshly been replaced by the spiritual Israel—the new commonwealth antitypical to the former one, and foretold from the very first in the promise to Abraham, and Jacob's blessing upon Judah, besides many prophecies of the fruitfulness of the barren and the desolate; its relation to the old polity was symbolized in the histories of Sarah and Hagar, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Hannah and Peninnah, and the houses of Saul and David. The law had not been needed by the saints who lived before it was given (*Tertull. against the Jews*); and a new law, lawgiver, priesthood, and sacrifice were spoken of in the Scriptures (*Cyprian, Test. adv. Jud.*) as succeeding it.

In answer to the next Jewish objection, that the Christians worshipped other gods besides Jehovah, reference was made to such records of Divine words or acts as implied a plurality of Persons in the Godhead; or described the manifestations of One who was at once Jehovah and Jehovah's Messenger, *e.g.* to some of the visions, &c., mentioned in Genesis and Exodus. This is the favourite ground of the earlier writers, Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian; and it is also taken by Epiphanius. Augustine, however, abandons the idea that the Person seen in these visions was the Divine Son Himself, the views of the Alexandrian school having by this time been supplanted by the expositions of Jerome and others. Another argument was drawn from passages in the poetical and prophetic books of Scripture, which speak of the Word, Spirit, and Wisdom of God, of the Lord and Son of David, the Lord the Messenger of the Covenant, and the like. For such interpretations a way had been prepared in the Jewish mind by the speculations of Philo and the Alexandrians, in which is found some conception, if not of the divinity, yet of the personality and sonship of the Word (*Logos*), the "first begotten of the Father," the "archangel of many names," by whom was effected the work of creation. This idea, though far removed from the Christian doctrine, which at once made the Word the coeternal and coequal Son of the Father, and identified Him with the looked-for Messiah, yet approached nearly enough to admit of something like a common terminology, and doubtless much lessened the difficulties of the Apologists.

The Jews expected that the "Anointed One," for whom they looked, would be a mere man, and for their conceptions Jesus was at once too lowly and too exalted. The name "Son of God" was not unknown as a title of Messiah, but they had never thought of interpreting it so strictly as the Christians did. Hence the Apologists had the double task of shewing that the Messiah was to be a Divine and supernaturally-born Person, and also that of Him, great as He was, were prophesied not only the kingdom of glory but also a life of humiliation and suffering, and a death of shame, exactly like the life and the death of Jesus. For the former of these assertions they referred to the question of Isai. liii. 8, to the stone of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (*Dan. ii. 35*, compared with Isai. xxviii. 16), together with some passages of a typical nature; but laid most stress on the prophecy of the Virgin's Son, Isai. viii. 10-16 (*Justin and Irenaeus*), meeting the Jewish

rendering of "girl" for "virgin" by an appeal to the LXX. and to the context as implying that the birth, being called a "sign," must be an event of extraordinary nature. Irenaeus (*cont. Haer.* iii. 21) contends that the restitution of mankind when fallen could only have been effected through One whose body, like Adam's, was formed anew and of *virgin-earth*. Another mode of proving the divine personality of Messiah, was by shewing that the Scriptures identified Him with the Word, to Whom, as had already been argued, were given the incommunicable names of Jehovah, Lord, and God. That this Divine Messiah was to be despised and crucified, the Apologists maintained by applying to Him many passages which the Jews of earlier times would probably have allowed to be Messianic, wherein they pointed out His descent from David, 1 Chron. xviii. 4, 11, Isai. xi. 1; His birth in Bethlehem; His humiliation and sufferings, Isai. lxxv. 3, Jer. xi. 19, Deut. xxviii. 66, Zeph. i. 7, &c.; and His resurrection, Ps. xvi. 10 and Ps. xxi., Hos. vi. 2, Ex. xix. 10, &c.; besides which they adduced various types, *e.g.* the offering of Isaac, the sale of Joseph, the elevation of the brazen serpent (on a cross as they believed), and the sacrifices of the Law, specially those of the Day of Atonement. And further to reconcile the Jews to the idea of a crucified Messiah, they shewed that the curse on him "that hangeth on a tree" was upon Him for others' sins, not His own, besides being specially predictive of the rejection which it should procure Him from the people of Israel. Moreover, the lowliness of Jesus was no way contrary to the prophecies of His glorious kingdom, for these were to be fulfilled at His second advent; and His present exaltation to the right-hand of the Father was attested by the conquering progress of His Church, in spite of every effort for its destruction, and by the spiritual gifts and powers with which He continued to endow it; while not only had prophecy, once possessed by the Jews, ceased among them, but their temple and city were destroyed, their worship was at an end, and they were suffering the very judgments which had been threatened of old as the penalties of apostasy from God. The Apologists do not remain wholly in the defensive, but charge the Jews with carnal conceptions of God (*Just. Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 141, p. 341 D—so Origen, Eusebius, and Cyril), and of His worship; with trusting to the descent from Abraham and knowledge of the Law, or pardon of sin (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 141, p. 370 D); and with the allowance of polygamy by their teachers.

VII. *Evidences of Christianity adduced by the Apologists.* Of all these, most stress is laid upon the argument from prophecy: the Christians reclaimed certain facts and doctrines concerning the Lord Jesus and His Church, all which appeared to be the fulfilment and explanation of predictions uttered ages before by men of the Jewish nation. But God alone could thus foretell the future; it was He, therefore, who by His prophets had at once revealed and attested the mission of His Son. It was easy to shew that the predictions in question were really anterior to the event; as for this purpose it was only necessary to refer to the known date of the Septuagint translation. Some of the Apologists, however, go more fully into this subject, in CHRIST. BIOGR.

order, further, to meet the objection that Christianity was a novelty (Theophilus, *ad Autol.* iii. c. 16 sqq.; Tatian, *Or. ad Graec.* c. 31, p. 18 sqq.).

Modern readers are surprised to see how seemingly slight allusions are seized by the Apologists, and construed with the utmost confidence as types or prophecies of Christ. Accustomed to regard the purpose of God in Christ as the centre of all His dealings with men, they believed that every ray of divine revelation must converge upon it, or upon the truths concerning God and His nature made known by Christ. Hence they saw in every angel who spoke in the Lord's name a manifestation of the Angel of the Covenant, in every sacrifice that of Christ, in every mention of an anointed king a prediction of Messiah's reign. The extent of this belief is illustrated by the titles prefixed to the Psalms in the Syriac and other very early versions, which often assign without hesitation a Messianic import to psalms, wherein few would now see any such allusion. We may perhaps trace in all this a reminiscence of Apostolic days, when the light of Christian prophecy shone upon the ancient scriptures, revealing their typical and Messianic significance throughout; a light which even in the days of the earliest Apologists was almost quenched, and no longer sufficed for any accurate application of details. Yet what had once been seen by it could not soon be wholly forgotten; and hence may have originated some of the Apologists' general ideas on the reference of all the law and the prophets to Christ; although in particulars it is evident that little else than individual fancy can have been their guide.

Miracles, according to the Apologists, are not, alone, a sufficient evidence of Divine mission (*Justin, Apol. i. c. 30, p. 72 A*), but only in conjunction with the doctrine purpose and character of those who work them (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 7, p. 225 A). There is a very marked distinction between the use which ancient and modern writers make of the argument from miracles. The latter have to prove the *fact* of miraculous agency; the former, chiefly, its degree and character. The early writers, moreover, appeal, not only to the miracles wrought by the Lord himself when on earth (which they commonly adduce as fulfilments of prophecy), but also to miracles and supernatural gifts of various kinds, still remaining amongst believers.

The Apologists dwell much on the internal evidence of Christianity, comparing its view of God, and of the service which He would accept, with the conceptions of paganism, and the lives of Christians with those of heathens. Frequent reference is made to the power which the Gospel possessed of changing the life and character of those who received it, however ignorant and vicious they might have been before; whereas philosophy gave up such cases as hopeless, and never so much as attempted to influence the poor and unlettered masses, which Christianity was winning over by thousands to wisdom and holiness.

As the doctrine of a general resurrection was of all Christian tenets the most new and startling, several Apologists treat this subject by itself; meeting the objections that the scattered atoms of one human body might afterwards become parts of another (Athenagoras, *Resurr. cc.*

4-8), and that the body was essentially the clog and prison of the soul, which could only be perfect when freed from it. To the former they answered (*l.c.*) that everything once taken in as food was not necessarily assimilated and made a permanent constituent of the body; particularly if, like human flesh, it were a revolting and unnatural aliment; and to the latter, that the Creator's purpose in making man embraced his whole being, and could only be fulfilled by its permanence as a whole; and that it was only this mortal body that hindered the soul; that of the resurrection would be its apt instrument for good. By way of illustration we find allusions to the Stoic doctrine of the recurrence of all things in endless cycles (Tatian, *Or. ad Graec.* c. 6, p. 145 D), to the resuscitated heroes of mythology (Theophilus, *ad Autol.* c. 13, p. 77 C), and to various returnings, renewals, and alterations in natural things, *e.g.* of the seasons, day and night, waking and sleeping; also to the phenomena of birth and growth in animals and plants (Theophilus and Athenagoras; see also Just. *Fragm. de Resurr.* c. 2, p. 589 A).

VIII. *Doctrine, &c.* The doctrine of the Trinity is stated by the Apologists in its bearing on creation and redemption, and so guarded as not to appear a denial of the *unity* of God, a caution most needful in dealing with polytheists. Theophilus (*ad Autol.* i. c. 3, p. 71 A; ii. c. 15, p. 94 D) speaks of the Son as the Power and Word (or Reason), and the Holy Ghost as the Wisdom, of the Father; under which abstract terms a real Trinity of *Persons* is certainly intended, as appears from the enumeration of the Three, of Whom the First and the Second are necessarily Persons, in Theophilus (*l.c.*); cf. Athenag. *Apol.* c. 10, p. 10; where we are also told, that the assumption by the Son of the office of Word or Revealer of the Father was not His coming into existence, for that He had existed in God from eternity; and so, it is implied, did the Holy Spirit, the Wisdom of God; forasmuch as God was possessed of Wisdom from all eternity. In reference to God's dealings with His creatures, the Son is He who manifested Himself and the Father to men (Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.*), the Blessed Spirit, He Who inspired the prophets (*id.* c. 87 sqq.). Rightly to apprehend the Apologists' meaning, on this and other essential tenets of Christianity, it is important to study them in connection with the known ancient beliefs of the Church, and not in isolation, as if each had reasoned out for himself an independent creed.

The person born of the blessed Virgin is always, according to the Apologists, the Divine Word Himself (cf. the later term "Theotokos," or "Mother of God"); the divine and human natures, however, being distinguished; for when Jesus died on the cross, the Godhead died not (Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, c. 29; Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, i. 62). Of the purpose of the Incarnation, they say in general terms, that He came to raise up man from the Fall and put away sin; that salvation, for men of all generations, depended on Him, and on His death; that His Blood washed away sin (Just. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 111, p. 338 C), and was applied by faith (*ib.* c. 13, p. 229 D) and in baptism (*ib.* c. 14, p. 231 C; *Apol.* i. c. 61, p. 94 C; Theoph. *ad Autol.* ii. c. 16, p. 97 B). In this remission they include release from the guilt, power, and punishment of

sin; in justification, the imputing and the imparting of Christ's righteousness. The sacrificial character of Christ's death is directly stated by Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 40, p. 259 C), but more often indicated by its being made antitypical to the sacrifices of the law.

The hope of the second Advent is largely insisted on, sometimes with allusions to the Apocalyptic 1st and 2nd Resurrections and Millennium following it (Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 80, and Tertullian and Lactantius), and to the terrible sufferings to be endured previously by the Church, under Antichrist, who was not to appear so long as the Roman empire stood; a belief referred to by Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 32) as a reason why Christians could not be disloyal subjects.

Justin alone gives any details of Christian worship and observances. By him great prominence is given to Baptism and the holy Eucharist, the one as admitting believers to the benefits of the New Covenant, the other as the Church's spiritual sustenance and greatest act of worship. In the other writers such notices are incidental only; but, so far as they go, these indicate no dissimilarity of view. When baptism is spoken of, that of a convert is almost always intended; its administration to Christians' children is not mentioned. Eucharistic worship seems to be the only observance of the Lord's Day to which the Apologists allude.

The earlier Apologists assert the freedom of the will, both in angels and in men, as the only possible foundation of moral responsibility. Their view of man's natural condition we gather from their account of the degradation of heathenism, the helplessness of philosophy without revelation, and the power possessed by Satan over mankind: from this condition baptism frees us (Justin, *Apol.* i. c. 61, p. 94 C).

A growing asceticism is very apparent (vid. Heffele's *Leittrage*, vol. i. lect. 2): second marriages are strongly condemned; celibacy is highly commended, and often mentioned, by way of contrasting the Christians' real moderation, even in lawful things, with the excesses ascribed to them by their enemies. The horror, not only of gladiatorial shows, but of all bloodshed, expressed by Athenagoras, leads one to suppose that he would have thought the profession of arms unlawful; but this was not a universal scruple (Tertull. *Apolog.* c. 42). Slavery was not disallowed by the Christians of this period.

IX. *Remarks.* The Apologies properly so called, such, for instance, as those of Justin and Athenagoras, are mostly of Greek authorship, almost the only works of exactly similar character amongst the Latins being those of Tertullian. Of books against the Jews the East was naturally rather more prolific than the West; while the Latins contribute the larger portion of those treatises which were written near the time when Christianity became the faith of the Empire, and which collect and systematize the entire argument against paganism. In the Greek Apologists we seem to distinguish an earlier stage of Christian thought, with language as yet unfixed by the controversies with heretics, and sometimes nearly the phraseology of Scripture (*e.g.* Theophilus), sometimes that of the old philosophy (Athenagoras). The Greek is often still the philosopher, become Christian indeed,

but retaining the old garb and style; the Latin, often in the set style of the rhetorician, criticizes, favourably or otherwise, the Gentile philosophy as already become almost a thing of the past. The distinction which there had been between Grecian and Roman philosophy seems to hold, at least in some measure, between the Christian Apologetic of the East and that of the West.

Of the effect of these efforts to allay persecution very little is known. Jerome, indeed, represents those of Quadratus and Aristides as having concurred with a letter of Serenus Gracianus, in producing the rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus, which is given at the end of Justin's second *Apology*. The rescript, however, does not appear in any way more favourable to the Christians than was that of Trajan to Pliny. Tertullian's fierce attacks upon heathenism, far from bettering the condition of the Christians, would rather seem to have provoked the hostile edict of Septimius Severus, promulgated A.D. 202, just after their publication, by which conversion to Christianity was forbidden. Perhaps, though addressed to the authorities, the *Apologies* may have found more response from the people, and even when unsuccessful in averting persecution may have helped to swell the number of those who encountered it under the banner of the Cross.

The following writers may be consulted in reference to the Apologists: J. Alb. Fabricius, *De Veritate Reliq. Christianae*; K. Werner, *Apologetische Literatur*; J. A. Möhler, *Patrologie*; C. J. Hefele, *Beiträge*; Migne, *Patrologie*; H. Gottlieb Tschirner, *Apologetik und Fall des Heidenthums*; the Abbé Freppel, *Apologistes Chrétiens au II^e Siècle*; J. Ireland, *Paganism and Christianity compared*; Jeremie, *Hist. of the Christ. Church in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries*; J. Donaldson, *Hist. of Christ. Literature*. [S. M.]

APOSTLES. The history of the Apostles after the New Testament period is given under **ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, APOCRYPHAL.**

APOSTOLICAL CANONS AND CONSTITUTIONS. [See **DICT. OF CHRIST. ANT.** s. *vv.*]

APOSTOLIC FATHERS. 1. *Definition of the term.* The adjective *Apostolicus* (ἀποστολικός) is used to denote either morally or doctrinally accordance with the Apostles, or historically connexion with the Apostles. In this latter sense it is especially applied to Churches founded directly by Apostles, or to persons associated with and taught by Apostles. The former are *Apostolicae ecclesiae*; the latter *Apostolici viri*, or *Apostolici* simply. See especially Tertull. *de Praescr.* 32, "ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveravit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiae apostolicae census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Ioanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum itidem," with the whole context. Cf. also *Praescr.* 20, 21; *adv. Marc.* i. 21, v. 2; *de Carn. Chr.* 2; *de Pudic.* 21. Hence among the Evangelists, while St. Matthew and St. John are *Apostolici*, St. Mark and St. Luke are *Apostolici* (*adv. Marc.* iv. 2). In accordance with this usage the term *Apostolic*

Fathers is confined to those who are known, or may reasonably be presumed, to have associated with and derived their teaching directly from some Apostle.

Thus it has been used with more or less latitude, in accordance with the historical views of the writer who employs it. In its widest range it will, in the present state of criticism, include Barnabas, Hermas, Clemens, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, and the writer of the epistle to Diognetus. At an earlier stage the works of Dionysius the Areopagite would have claimed a place among the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, but these are now universally condemned as spurious. The same is the case with other Apocryphal works, which for the same reason may be neglected from our consideration. But though the writings ascribed to the persons whose names are included in the above list may all be accepted as genuine, yet in some instances they fail to satisfy other conditions, which alone entitle to a place among the works of the Apostolic Fathers. Thus the "Shepherd" of Hermas has been placed in this category, because it was supposed to have been written by the person of this name mentioned by St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 14; see Origen *ad loc. Op.* iv. 683); but a more authentic tradition ascribes it to the brother of Pius, who was bishop of Rome a little before the middle of the 2nd century (*Canon. Murat.* p. 58, ed. Tregelles; see pseudo-Tertull. *Poem. adv. Marc.* iii. 294, in Tertull. *Op.* ii. 792 ed. Oehler). Thus again the claim of Papias to be considered an Apostolic Father rests on the supposition that he was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, as Irenaeus apparently imagines (*Haer.* v. 33. 4); but Eusebius has pointed out that Irenaeus was mistaken, and that the teacher of Papias was not the Apostle St. John but the Presbyter of the same name (*H. E.* iii. 39). Again, there is some uncertainty about the *Epistle to Diognetus*. Its claim is founded on an expression which occurs in § 11, and which has been interpreted literally as implying that the writer was a personal disciple of one or other of the Apostles. But in the first place, the context shows that this literal interpretation is out of place, and the passage must be explained as follows: "I do not make any strange statements nor indulge in unreasonable questionings, but having learnt my lessons from the Apostles (lit. having become a disciple of Apostles), I stand forward as a teacher of the nations" (οὐ ξένα ὁμιλῶ οὐδὲ παραλόγως ζητῶ, ἀλλὰ ἀποστόλων γεγόμενος μαθητῆς γίνομαι διδασκαλος ἐθνῶν); and secondly, this is no part of the *Epistle to Diognetus* proper (§§ 1-10), but belongs to a later writing, which has been accidentally attached to the Epistle, owing to the loss of some leaves in the MS. This latter fact is conclusive. If therefore the Epistle has any title to a place among the Apostolic Fathers, it must be established by internal evidence; and, though the internal character suggests an early date, perhaps as early as about A.D. 117 (see Westcott, *Canon* p. 79), yet there is no hint of any historical connexion between the writer and the Apostles. Lastly, the so-called Epistle of Barnabas occupies an unique position. If the writer had been the companion of St. Paul, who bore that name, then he would more properly be styled, not an "apostolic man," as he is de-

signed by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 20, p. 489, δ ἀποστολικὸς Βαρνάβας), but an "apostle," as the same Clement elsewhere styles him (*Strom.* ii. 6, p. 445; ii. 7, p. 447) in accordance with St. Luke's language (Acts xiv. 14). But, if the writer be not the Apostle Barnabas, then we have no evidence of any personal relations with the Apostles, though such is not impossible, as the Epistle must have been written at some date between the age of Vespasian and that of Nerva.

After these deductions only three names remain, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; and in none of these cases is there reasonable ground for hesitation. Though the identification of this Clement with the person named by St. Paul (Phil. iv. 3) is less than probable, though the authority of the Clementine romance is worthless to establish his connexion with St. Peter, yet the tradition that he was a disciple of one or both of these Apostles is early, constant, and definite; and it is borne out by the character and contents of his genuine Epistle. See especially Irenæus (iii. 3. 3), who speaks very definitely to this point, and yet says nothing of his identification with the Clement of the Epistle to the Philippians. Again, the early date of Ignatius and his connexion with Antioch, a chief centre of Apostolic activity, render his personal connexion with the Apostles probable; and tradition more especially represents him as a disciple of St. John, though it were to be wished that we had some early authority for this statement less questionable than the doubtful Martyrdom of Ignatius (§§ 1, 3). Lastly, Polycarp's claim to the title seems indisputable, since his own pupil Irenæus states that he was a scholar of the beloved disciple, and that he himself had heard from his master many anecdotes of this Apostle, which he had carefully stored up in his memory (*Epist. ad Florin.* in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 20; cf. *Haer.* iii. 3, 4).

2. *Form of their writings.* All the genuine writings of these three Apostolic Fathers are epistolary in form, modelled more or less after the pattern of the Canonical Epistles, especially those of St. Paul, but called forth by pressing temporary needs. In no case is any literary motive prominent. A famous teacher writes in the name of the community over which he presides to quell the dissensions of a distant but friendly Church. An aged disciple on his way to martyrdom pours out a few parting words of exhortation to the Christian brotherhoods with whom he is brought in contact during his journey. A bishop of a leading Church, having occasion to send a parcel to another brotherhood at a distance, takes the opportunity of writing, in answer to their solicitations, a few plain words of advice and instruction. Such is the simple account of the letters of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp respectively.

And even if we extend the term "Apostolic Fathers," so as to include the two other writings which alone have any claim to this title, the same form is preserved. The Epistle of Barnabas and the Letter to Diognetus are no departure from the rule. But, though the form is preserved, the spirit is somewhat different. They no longer represent the natural outpouring of personal feeling, arising out of personal relations; but are rather treatises clothed in an epistolary

dress, the aim of the one being polemical, of the other apologetic. In this respect they resemble the Epistle to the Hebrews more than the letters of St. Paul.

3. *Their character.* "The Apostolic Fathers," says De Pressensé, "are not great writers, but great characters" (*Trois Premiers Siècles*, ii. 384). Their style is loose; there is a want of arrangement in the topics, and an absence of system in their teaching. On the one hand they present a marked contrast to the depth and clearness of conception with which the several Apostolic writers place before us different aspects of the Gospel, and by which their title to a special inspiration is established. On the other, they lack the scientific spirit which distinguished the Fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries, and which enabled them to formulate the doctrines of the faith as a bulwark against unbridled speculation. But though they are deficient in distinctness of conception and power of exposition, "this inferiority" to the later Fathers "is amply compensated by a certain naïveté and simplicity which forms the charm of their letters. If they have not the precision of the scientific spirit, they are free from its narrowness." There is a breadth of moral sympathy, an earnest sense of personal responsibility, a fervour of Christian devotion, which is the noblest testimony to the influence of the Gospel on characters obviously very diverse, and which will always command for their writings a respect to which their literary merits could lay no claim. The gentleness and serenity of Clement, whose whole spirit is absorbed in contemplating the harmonies of nature and of grace; the fiery zeal of Ignatius, in whom the one over-mastering desire of martyrdom has crushed all human passion; the unbroken constancy of Polycarp, whose protracted life is spent in maintaining the faith once delivered to the saints:—these are lessons which can never become antiquated or lose their value.

4. *Their relation to the Apostolic Teaching and to the Canonical Scriptures.* If we had to describe briefly the respective provinces of the Apostolic Fathers, we might say that it was the work of Clement to co-ordinate the different elements of Christian teaching as left by the Apostles; and of Ignatius to consolidate the structure of ecclesiastical polity, as sketched out by them; while for Polycarp, whose active career was just beginning as theirs ended, and who lived on for more than half a century after their deaths, was reserved the task of handing down unimpaired to a later generation the Apostolic doctrine and order thus co-ordinated and consolidated by his elder contemporaries—a task for which he was eminently fitted by his passive and receptive character.

The writings of all these three Fathers lie well within the main stream of Catholic teaching. They are the proper link between the Canonical Scriptures and the Church Fathers of the ages succeeding them. They recognise all the different elements of the Apostolic teaching, though they combine them in different proportions. "They prove that Christianity was Catholic from the very first, uniting a variety of forms in one faith. They show that the great facts of the Gospel narrative, and the substance of the Apostolic letters, formed the basis and moulded the expression of the common creed" (Westcott, *Canon* p. 55).

But when we turn to the other writings for which a place among the Apostolic Fathers has been claimed, the case is different. Though the writers are all apparently within the pale of the Church, yet there is a tendency to that one-sided exaggeration—either in the direction of Judaism, or the opposite—which stands on the very verge of heresy. In the Epistle of Barnabas and in the Letter to Diognetus, the repulsion to Judaism is so violent, that one step further would have carried the writers into Gnostic or Marcionite dualism. On the other hand, in the “Shepherd” of Hermas, and possibly in the “Expositions” of Papias (for in this instance the inferences drawn from a few scanty fragments must be precarious), the sympathy with the Old Dispensation is unduly strong, and the distinctive features of the Gospel are darkened by the shadow of the Law thus projected upon them. In Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, both extremes alike are avoided.

For the relation of these writers to the Canonical Scriptures the reader is referred to the thorough investigation in Westcott’s *History of the Canon*, pp. 19–55. It will be sufficient here to state the more important results to which we are led: (1) The Apostolic Fathers do not, as a rule, quote by name the Canonical writings of the New Testament. The exceptions however are just what we should expect to find. Clement, writing to the Corinthians, refers to St. Paul’s Epistle to that Church (§ 47); Ignatius, addressing the Ephesians (if the shorter Greek be accepted as genuine), speaks of their having been initiated in company with St. Paul, and refers to the letter (or letters) in which the Apostle mentions them (§ 12 ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, which has been differently interpreted); Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, in like manner calls attention to the instructions which St. Paul had given them by letter (§ 3 ἀπὸν ὑμῶν ἐγράψεν ἐπιστολάς κ. τ. λ.). But (2), though (with these exceptions) the books of the New Testament are not quoted by name, fragments of most of the Canonical Epistles lie imbedded in the writings of these Fathers, whose language is thoroughly leavened with the Apostolic diction. In like manner the facts of the Gospel history are referred to, and the words of our Lord given, though for the most part not as direct quotations. For (3) there is no decisive evidence that these Fathers recognised a Canon of the New Testament, as a distinctly defined body of writings; though Barnabas once introduces our Lord’s words as recorded in Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14, with the usual formula of Scriptural citation, “As it is written (ὡς γέγραπται)”. But (4) on the other hand they assign a special and pre-eminent authority to the Apostles which these distinctly disclaim for themselves. This is the case with Clement (§§ 5, 7) and Ignatius (Rom. 4), speaking of St. Peter and St. Paul; and with Polycarp (§ 3), speaking of St. Paul—the only Apostles that are mentioned by name in these writings. (5.) Lastly: though the language of the Canonical Gospels is frequently not quoted word for word, yet there is no distinct instance of an allusion to any Apocryphal narrative. The Apocryphal quotation in Barnabas, § 4, disappears in the Greek original (ὡς πρέπει νόμῳ Θεοῦ) and arises out of a corruption in the Latin text (“sicut dicit filius Dei” for “sicut

deceit filios Dei”); a second supposed instance in this same writer (§ 7) seems to be due to a misinterpretation of the formula φησὶν, “he saith,” which is intended to introduce, not a quotation, but an interpretation, according to its usage elsewhere in this same Epistle (§ 10, 11). If the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans were genuine, we should have a more probable example in Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 3); but this Epistle is not found in the Syriac, and even here, as has been suggested, we possibly have “a traditional form of the words recorded in Luke xxiv. 39.”

LITERATURE.—The following are the most important editions of the Apostolic Fathers: *SS. Patrum qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt, etc. Opera*, J. B. Cotelerius, Paris 1672 (Barn. Herm. Clem. Ign. Polyc.), reprinted with additional matter by J. Clericus, Antwerp 1698 and Amsterdam 1724; *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum Graeco-Latina*, L. T. Ittig, Leipsic 1699 (Clem. Ign. Polyc.); *Epistolae SS. Patrum Apostolicorum*, J. L. Frey (Clem. Ign. Polyc.), Basle 1742; *SS. Patrum Apostolicorum, etc. Opera Gemina, etc.*, R. Russel, London 1746 (Barn. Herm. Clem. Ign. Polyc.); *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, C. J. Hefele, Tübingen, 1st ed. 1839 4th ed. 1855 (Barn. Clem. Ign. Polyc. Herm.); *S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, Patrum Apostolicorum, quae supersunt*, W. Jacobson, Oxford, 1st ed. 1840, 4th ed. 1863 (Clem. Ign. Polyc.); *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, A. R. M. Dressel, Leipsic 1857 and 1863 (Barn. Clem. Ign. Polyc. Herm.). They may also be read in the principal Patrologies, more especially Galland. *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. i. Venice 1765, and Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca*, vols. i. ii. v. Paris 1857. Fuller information respecting the editions and their contents will be found in Jacobson’s *Patres Apostolici*, i. lxiv sq. An account of the editions of the several Apostolic Fathers singly will be found under their respective names.

Special works on the Apostolic Fathers are *Die Apostolischen Väter*, A. Hilgenfeld (1853), *The Apostolical Fathers*, J. Donaldson (1864), being the 1st vol. of *A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine*; but the student will also obtain much information from the standard works on Patristic Literature generally, e.g. Cave, Dupin, Fabricius, Lumper, Möhler, &c.; as also from works on Church History, and more especially on the history, institutions, and doctrine of the early centuries. From the last class, which is very numerous, we may single out De Pressensé, *Histoire des Trois Premiers Siècles de l’Église Chrétienne*; A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche*; R. Rothe, *Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*; E. Reuss, *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique*; J. A. Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*; B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. [L.]

APOSTOLICI, one of the names adopted by an ascetic sect in Phrygia, Cilicia, and Pamphylia. Their leading principle seems to have been the rejection of private property. They are also said to have resembled Tatian, the Encratites, and the “Cathari” (Novatians), in that they refused to admit offenders to communion, and condemned marriage. They appealed chiefly to

the apocryphal *Acts of Andrew and of Thomas*. They entitled themselves *Apotactici*, i. e. "Renuntians." What little is recorded about them beyond the name we owe to Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxi. 506-513), who apparently knew them only by vague oral report. Their place in his treatise would naturally assign them to the 3rd century; and they evidently had not ceased to exist in the 4th. "Encratites, Saccophori, and Apotactites," described together as "an offshoot of the Marcionites," are associated with Novatians by Basil in a letter answering queries from Amphilochoius of Iconium (cxcix. can. 47: cf. clxxxviii. can. 1), written in 375, when Epiphanius had begun and not completed his work. A law of Theodosius against the Manicheans in 381 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. v. 7; cf. 11 an. 383) alleges that some of these heretics endeavoured to evade the existing severe legislation by calling themselves "Encratites, Apotactites, Hydroparastatae, or Saccophori." Any true historical connexion however between the Apostolici and either the Marcionists or the Manicheans is highly improbable. [H.]

APOSTOLORUM ACTA. [ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.]

APOTACTICI. [APOSTOLICI.]

APOTACTITAE. [MANES.]

APPHIANUS, or APPIANUS, or AMPHIANUS, M., a son of rich parents at "Pagae" (probably Araxas) in Lycia, educated in the schools of Berytus, who being not 20 years old interrupted the governor at Caesarea when sacrificing, by an exhortation to desist from idolatry, and who was accordingly, after horrible tortures—among others by his feet being wrapped in a *tunica molesta* of flax steeped in oil and set on fire—finally martyred by drowning, April 11, A.D. 306 (*Euseb. de Mart. Palaest.* iv.; *Syriac Acta* in Assemani, *Act. Mart.* ii. 189 sq.). He was brother of AEDESIUS. [A. W. H.]

APPION. [APION.]

APRINGIUS, bishop of CHALCIS in Syria Prima, a leading member of the Eastern party at the Council of Ephesus, 431, who supported John of Antioch in the deposition of Cyril, &c., and was deputed as one of the commissioners to the emperor at Constantinople as proxy for the metropolitan, Alexander of Apamea. He shared in the ultimate reconciliation between Cyril and the East. (*Labbe, Concil.* iii. 1127, 1183; *Baluz. Coll. Nov. Concil.* 497, 507, 577, 714, 720.) [E. V.]

AQUILA (Ἀκύλας), the author of a translation of the Old Testament into Greek, which was held in much esteem by the Jews and was reproduced by Origen in the third column of the Hexapla, seems to have belonged to the earlier half of the 2nd century. Little is known regarding his personal history beyond the fact that he was, like the Aquila associated with St. Paul, a native of Pontus, and probably, according to the more definite tradition, of Sinope. We learn also from Irenaeus, in whom we find the earliest mention of him (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 24), that he was a proselyte to the Jewish faith—a statement confirmed by Eusebius (*Demonst. Evang.* vii. 1: προσήλυτος δὲ ὁ Ἀκύλας ἦν, οὐ φύσει Ἰουδαῖος), Jerome (*Ep. ad Pam-mach.* Opp. iv. 2, p. 255), and other Fathers, as

well as by the Jerusalem Talmud (*Megill.* f. 71, c. 3; *Kiddush.* f. 59, c. 1, where there can be little doubt that the Akilas referred to is to be identified with Aquila). From this circumstance he is frequently called "Aquila the proselyte."

Epiphanius, in one of the curious digressions that form the greater part of his treatise *De Pond. et Mens.* (c. 14, 15), furnishes a more detailed account. He states that Aquila was a relative (the exact nature of the relationship denoted by the otherwise unknown form *πενθε-ρῖδης* is doubtful) of the emperor Hadrian, and was appointed by him to superintend the rebuilding of Jerusalem under the new name of Aelia Capitolina; that, impressed by the miracles of healing and other wonders performed by the disciples of the Apostles who had returned from Pella to the nascent city, he embraced Christianity and at his own request was baptized; that, in consequence of his continued devotion to practices of astrology which he refused to abandon even when reproved by the disciples, he was expelled from the Church; and that, embittered by this treatment, he was induced through his zeal against Christianity to become a Jew, to study the Hebrew language, and to render the Scriptures afresh into Greek with the view of setting aside those testimonies to Christ which were drawn from the current version on the Septuagint. No writer prior to Epiphanius makes any reference to the circumstance of Aquila having been a Christian, which, had it been true, would doubtless have obtained prominent notice as bearing on the object and spirit of his work; and the other portions of the narrative of Epiphanius, which are without confirmation, are now generally set aside as of little historical value. There appears, however, no just reason to doubt that Aquila may have lived in the reign of Hadrian (117-138); the attempt to rebuild Jerusalem took place A.D. 130; and, as a considerable period must have been occupied in the preparations for the translation and in the execution of the work, it may not have been completed much before the middle of the 2nd century. By some, indeed, it has been placed even later, on the ground that Irenaeus seems to speak of him as a contemporary (*l. c.* ὡς ἐνίοι φασὶ τῶν νῦν μεθερμηνεύειν τοιμάντων τὴν γραφὴν); but the use of the present tense, followed as it is immediately by the aorist *ἠρμήνευσεν*, can hardly be construed so strictly, and the *νῦν* may, perhaps, imply nothing more than the *recent* or *modern* date of those attempts to supersede the Septuagint version which had the sanction of antiquity and of general acceptance. It has been supposed, on the other hand, that Justin Martyr must have had the version of Aquila before him, when he refers to the substitution of the word *νεάνις* for *παρθένος*, as the rendering of *עַלְמָה* in Is. vii. 14 (*Dial. cum Tryph.* 71); but the words of Justin do not necessarily point to a written translation.

The object of Aquila was to furnish a translation on which the Jews could rely as a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew than that of the Septuagint, which not only was in many instances loose and incorrect from the first, but had also in the course of four centuries undergone change and corruption. With this view he made

his version strictly literal, striving to provide a Greek equivalent for every Hebrew word and particle in frequent disregard of the rules of grammar and of idiom, and with the result of often rendering his meaning hardly intelligible to those who were not acquainted with Hebrew (as in Job xxx. 1: *καὶ νῦν ἐγέλασαν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ βραχεῖς παρ' ἐμὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις*; Psalm xlix. 21, *ὅπελαβες ἐσόμενος ἱσομαι θυμοῖς σοι*; Psalm cxlix. 6; *καὶ μάχαισα στομάτων ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν*). He carefully endeavoured even to reproduce Hebrew etymologies in Greek, and for that purpose freely coined new forms (as in Psalm xxi. 13, *δυνάσται Βαβὰν διεδηματίσαντό με*; Psalm cxviii. 10, *μὴ ἀγνοημάτισθς με*). Origen accordingly characterizes him as *δουλεύων τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ λέξει* (*Ep. ad Afric.*), and the fragments of the version which have been preserved amply bear out the truth of the description. But the excessively literal character of the work, while impairing its value as a translation for those who were not Jews, renders it all the more valuable as a witness to the state of the Hebrew text from which it was made. (As to the nature and value of the version, see *Dict. Bib.* iii. 1622.)

It is alleged by several of the Fathers that Aquila not only prepared his translation for controversial purposes, but also, in special enmity to the Christians, made his version of the Messianic passages in particular designedly adverse to their views. But this charge seems to have had little or no foundation. For Jerome—whose expressions regarding Aquila, it must be allowed, are not quite self-consistent, since in one passage he speaks of him as “contentiosus interpres” (*Ep. ad Pamach.* l. c.), and in another as “non-contentiosus, ut quidam putant, sed studiosus” (*Ep.* 125 *ad Damasum*, ii. 567)—distinctly states that he compared the work of Aquila with the Hebrew copies, “ne quid forsitan propter odium Christi synagoga mutaverit,” and found in it, he candidly owns, various things tending to corroborate the faith (*Ep.* 74 *ad Marcell.*, *Opp.* iv. 2, 61). The version was received with much favour by the Jews on account of its fidelity; they preferred it to other translations (Augustin. *de Civ. Dei* xv. 23), and a law of Justinian (*Novell.* 146) permitted its use, as a substitute for the Septuagint or a vernacular version, in the synagogues. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is said that Akilas received praise for his interpretation of the Law in the language of the 45th Psalm (v. 3), “Thou art fairer than the sons of men.”

Jerome on several occasions quotes an *editio secunda* of Aquila's translation, and in his *Comm. in Ezech.* iii. 15, refers to it as “quam Hebraei κατ' ἀκριβείαν vocant.” By some this expression has been taken to mean, not that the second edition was more strictly literal than the first, but that it was more accurate in respect of conformity to Greek idiom; but this view is an improbable one, and there can be little doubt that the second edition was a revision in which Aquila endeavoured still more faithfully and closely to carry out the principle of literal exactness which he had adopted.

Several scholars of eminence have recently maintained that Aquila is to be identified not only with the Akilas of the Talmud, but also with Onkelos, whose name is associated with the

well-known Targum on the Pentateuch; holding that the latter is merely an altered form of the name, and that the Chaldaee version came to receive what is now its ordinary designation from its being drawn up on the model, or after the manner, of that of Aquila. The arguments in support of this view, which appear to have great weight, are set forth with much clearness and force by Mr. Deutsch in his article on Versions, Ancient (Targum), in *Dict. Bib.* iii. 1642–45.

The fragments of the version of Aquila—first collected by Morinus for the Sixtine edition of the Septuagint, Rome 1587, and subsequently by Drusius, in his *Veterum interp. Graec. in V. T. fragmenta*, Arnab. 1622—are more fully given in the edition of the Hexapla by Montfaucon, Paris 1714, and its abridgment by Bahrdt, 1769–70. An elaborate edition, which promises to be the most complete and valuable, is now in course of publication by Mr. Field (*Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro-Hexaplori, concinnavit, emendavit et multis partibus auxit Fredericus Field*, Oxon. 1867–70). The chief questions connected with Aquila are discussed by Montfaucon, and by Hody (*De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*. Oxon. 1705). [W. P. D.]

AQUILINUS, a Gnostic contemporary with Plotinus (*Porph. V. Plot.* 16), otherwise unknown. [H.]

AQUILIUS SEVERUS. [SEVERUS.]

ARA (ʾĀ), a Syrian author of unknown age, who wrote a book *against the Magians*, and another called *Scarabaei* against Bardeisan (Ebedjesu in Assemani, *B. O.* iii. 230: cf. Hahn, *Bardes.* 7). [H.]

ARABIANUS (Ἀραβιανὸς), a Christian writer, who lived at the end of the 2nd century. Eusebius has mentioned his name (*H. E.* v. 27), but has preserved no fragment of his writings, nor even stated on what subject he wrote. His date is inferred from the fact that Eusebius mentions him immediately after his relation of the accession of Severus (A.D. 193). Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.* cap. 51) adds nothing to what is told by Eusebius. [G. S.]

ARABIANUS, bishop of ANCYRA. He was present at the Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 394, held to decide between two claimants to the see of Bostra, when he raised the question whether a bishop could be deposed by two bishops only (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1377, ed. Coleti). He also took part in the Synod held by Chrysostom at the same place, A.D. 400, to consider the charges against Antoninus of Ephesus (Pallad. *Vit. Chrys.* 13; see Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1465). [L.]

ARABICI, the name given by Augustine (*Haer.* 83) to an “Arabian” sect of the 3rd century, described by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 37). They held that soul and body die together, and will hereafter be raised together. They were the occasion of a considerable synod, to which Origen was invited; and the force of his arguments induced them to recant. The date appears to be either the reign of Gordian (238–244), in which Origen held a similar and equally successful conference with Beryllus of Bostra in “Arabia” (Euseb. *ib.* 33) *i.e.* the country east of Jordan; or that of Philip (244–249), under

which Eusebius perhaps intended to place the occurrence. The doctrine closely resembles that of Tatian (*Or. ad Graec.* 13). Its other possible affinities are fully discussed by Redepenning (*Origenes*, ii. 105 ff.) There is a short special treatise *De Arabicoorum Haeresi* in the *Miscellanea Sacra* of J. F. Budde (Jena 1727, i. 538 ff.) [H.]

ARATOR, the author of a Latin hexameter poem in two books, entitled *Historia Apostolica e.e. Lucā expressa*, was a native of Liguria. From Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, who celebrates his childhood in four short epigrams (lib. ii. cv. cxiv. cxv. cxvi.), we learn that he was an orphan, and owed his education to Laurentius archbishop of Milan, in which city he frequented the school of one Deuterius (Ennod. *Dict.* ix.) In A.D. 526, he gained reputation as an advocate in a mission to Theodoric the Ostrogoth, on behalf of the Dalmatians; in consequence of which he was made private secretary and intendant of finance (*comes domesticorum et privatorum*) to Athalaric his successor. The rescript in which this appointment was conveyed is preserved by Cassiodorus (*Var.* l. 8, *Ep.* 12), in which the father of Arator is alluded to as a man of learning and eloquence, and the son is complimented as the Tullius of Liguria. Arator subsequently left the court, received ordination, and was elected a subdeacon of the Roman Church, A.D. 541. He appears to have been on intimate terms with Vigilius, to whom he dedicates his chief work in a short Elegiac preface, flattering enough to the character of that wretched pontiff. This must have been written soon after the first Gothic war of Belisarius, to which it is possible that he alludes (*Ep. ad Vigil.* l. 1). Such was the estimation in which the work was held that Vigilius directed it to be publicly recited by its author in the church now called San Pietro in Vincoli. This recitation took place thrice in the same year, A.D. 544 (P. H. Labbe, *Bibl. MSS.* vol. i. p. 668). The only other extant works of Arator are two epistles in the Elegiac metre, the one recommending his version of the Acts to the favourable notice of the Abbot Florianus, which is generally prefixed to the Epic along with the preface to Vigilius; the other addressed to his old schoolfellow Parthenius, the nephew of Ennodius (Ennod. *Dict.* x.), who first induced him to write poetry; and to whom he sends his work for distribution amongst the Gauls.

The *Historia Apostolica* is entirely devoid of poetic merit. The language is obscure, the treatment bald, the style vicious, and even where it is impossible for the author to help rising with his narrative, he does his best to quench its divinity by the introduction of undignified conceits, far-fetched metaphors, and long-winded digressions. The admiration accorded to him by his contemporaries is a mournful proof of the vitiated taste of the age. A truer criticism is constrained to endorse his modest self-estimate (*Ep. ad Flor.*):—

"Jejuno sermone quidem sed pinguis gesta
Scripsimus."

The Editio Princeps of the *Historia Apostolica* appeared at Milan, 8vo, 1469. The Epistle to Parthenius was first published in Sirmond's notes to Ennodius (lib. ix. *Ep.* i.) from a MS. in the

monastery of St. Remigius at Rheims. The latest edition of the poems is to be found in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. lxxiii., with the preface and notes of Arntzen, 1769. [E. M. Y.]

ARCAPH. [ATHANASIUS, p. 185, a.]

ARCHE (Iren. 55: cf. 54). [VALENTINUS; EPIPHANES.] [H.]

ARCHELAUS, a bishop of CARCHAR or CARCHAR in Mesopotamia, who is said to have held a disputation with the heresiarch Manes, during the reign of the emperor Probus (A.D. 277?). The Acts of this disputation are extant in a Latin translation made from a Greek text of which we possess some long fragments quoted by Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* lxi. 6, 25–31. Cyril's account of them, *Catech.* vi. 15, is full of interpolations (Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* i. 101; cf. i. 130, ii. 725, 748). Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* lxxii.) states that they were compiled by Archelaus himself "Syro sermone," and subsequently translated into Greek; but according to Photius (*Biblioth.* cod. 85), Heraclian, the bishop of Chalcedon, in his work against the Manicheans, written in the reign of Anastasius, attributed them to one Hegemonius; and the language of the Acts themselves (capp. xxxix. lv.) implies that Archelaus was not the author. The Acts relate that Manes, having escaped from his imprisonment in Persia, sent a disciple, one Turbo, to Carchar with a letter addressed to a Christian nobleman there, named Marcellus. The letter is brief and obscure, but Turbo, on being questioned, gives an important summary of his master's doctrines, which is one of the extracts preserved by Epiphanius. Manes soon afterwards himself arrives, and a disputation takes place between him and Archelaus before four heathen arbiters. Manes professes to be the promised Paraclete, and the discussion chiefly turns upon the doctrine of the two principles, the claim to be the Paraclete, and the authority of the Mosaic law and the Old Testament. Manes, on his defeat, retires to a village called Diodoris, where he endeavours to win over the presbyter Diodorus (or Trypho, as Epiphanius calls him), who is represented as a simple-minded man, little skilled in theological controversy. Archelaus, however, again appears on the scene, and a second time silences him, the main point in this second dispute being the Manichean form of Docetism. The next day, before a large assembly, Archelaus gives a sketch of the origin of Manes' doctrines, tracing them up to a Saracen named Scythianus and his disciple Terebinthus or Buddas. This account seems to be the earliest form of the Western, as opposed to the Eastern, version of Manes' history. The Acts conclude with a short notice of Manes' subsequent cruel death in Persia. Beausobre (*Histoire de Manich.* b. i. chh. xii. xiii.) has thrown grave doubts on the genuineness of these Acts, and would ascribe them to a Greek writer of the 4th century; he especially lays stress on the silence of Eusebius, and the passage in cap. xxvi., where Archelaus is represented as objecting to Manes that he could not be the Paraclete, since he would thus falsify Christ's words, "qui enim dixerat se non multo post missurum esse Paracletum, invenitur post trecentos et eo amplius annos hunc misisse." Their original compilation in Syriac is rendered doubtful by the fact that the first Oriental

author who shews any acquaintance with these Acts is Severus, the bishop of Asmonina, in Egypt, who wrote about 978; and the copy which he quotes differs in many respects from that which we possess. (Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. v. pp. 3-206; Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* b. i.; Baur, *Das Manichäische Religionssystem*, pp. 5-9, 413, 459.) [E. B. C.]

ARCHELAUS, bishop of CAESAREA in Cappadocia about the beginning of the 5th century, wrote two "Anathematisms" against the Messalians (Phot. *Bibl.* 52). Cave (*Script. Eccl.* i. p. 430) on good grounds places his date about A.D. 440. [L.]

ARCHON, *Ruler*, a term of frequent occurrence in Gnostic mythologies to denote various heavenly powers superior to angels. They give their name to the sect called ARCHONTICI. In the Valentinian system they are in a manner replaced by the Aeons. The N. T. several times mentions the "prince (ἄρχων) of the devils" (δαμονίων), or "of the (this) world," or "of the power of the air;" but never uses the word absolutely in any cognate sense. In Leviticus (LXX.) Ἀρχων (once of Ἀρχοντες, xx. 5) represents, or rather translates, *Molech*. The true biblical source of the usage however is Dan. x. 13, 20, 21 (six times Theodotus; once indistinctly LXX.), where the archon (ἄρχων, "prince" A. V.) is the patron angel of a nation, Persia, Greece, or Israel; a name (Michael) being given in the last case only. The phrase θεὸς ἄρχωντες in Plato (*Phaedr.* 247 A) is of no account here. The classical theology of Greece knew only gods, daemons, and heroes. Even Philo never alludes to archons: in a passage (*De Mon.* i. 1, p. 213) cited by Hilgenfeld (*Apost. Vater*, 252 q. v.) ἄρχοντες is merely correlative to ὑπάρχουσι. But the Book of Henoch (vi. 3, 7; viii. 1) names 20 "archons of the" 200 "watcher" angels who sinned with the "daughters of men," as appears from one of the Greek fragments. The title is not indeed used absolutely (τ. ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν, Σεμιαζὸς ὁ ἀρχων αὐτῶν, bis: cf. ὁ πρῶτος ταρχος αὐτῶν Σ.), except perhaps once (πρῶτος Ἀσὰλ ὁ δέκατος τῶν ἀρχόντων), where the Ethiopic has no corresponding words: but it has evidently almost become a true name, and may account for St. Jude's peculiar use of ἀρχή (v. 6). Christians soon followed the Jewish precedent. In the 2nd century the term appears in several writers alien to Gnosticism. The *Epistle to Diognetus* (7) speaks of God sending to men "a minister or angel or archon," &c. Justin (*Dial.* 36) understands the command in Ps. xxiv. 7, 9 (Ἀσπερ πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν LXX.) to open the heavenly gates as addressed to "the archons appointed by God in the heavens." The first spurious set of Ignatian epistles enumerates "the heavenly beings and the glory of the angels and the archons visible and invisible" (*Ad Smyrn.* 6), and again "the heavenly beings and the angelic collocations and the archontic constitutions" (i.e. order of provinces and of functions), "things both visible and invisible" (*Ad Trall.* 5); the meaning being lost by the time of the interpolator, who in one case drops the word out, and in the other gives it a political sense. The Clementine *Homilies* adopt and extend (xi. 10, ἐν ᾧ δὴ . . . ὁ ἐκεῖ καθεστὼς ἀρχων) the N. T. usage; and further call the two good and evil ("right and left") "powers," which control

the destiny of each man, "rulers" (archons, vii. 3), though more commonly "leaders" (ἡγεμόνες). Presently the syncreticism of the later Greek philosophy found room for archons. They are inserted by the author of the book *De Mysteriis* (ii. 3-9), and even it would seem by his questioner Porphyry, below gods, daemons, angels, and archangels, and above heroes (omitted by Porphyry) and departed "souls," in the scale of invisible beings whose presence may become manifest. It may be only an accidental coincidence that about the end of the 2nd century "Archon" was one of the names given by the Platonist Harpocration to the "Second God" of Numenius (Procl. in *Tim.* 93 c, cited by Zeller, *Philos. d. Griech.* v. 200). In any case the new term struck no deep root in either Christian or heathen soil. Probably "archangel" was found sufficient for every need. Even Origen (*C. Cels.* vi. 30 f.) has to introduce the archons of the early Ophites with the explanatory phrase "ruling daemons." The Manicheans, on the other hand, readily adopted the Gnostic usage; but their archons are invariably evil beings (cf. Flügel, *Mani seine Lehre*, u. s. w. 242 f.). [H.]

ARCHONTICI. Under this name Epiphanius (*Haer.* xl. 291-299; cf. 389 A) describes a sect of the 4th century, evidently a branch of the old Ophites. The name comes from the ARCHONS (292 CD), whom they, in common with various Gnostic bodies, supposed to rule over the several "heavens:" who gave it does not appear. The Archontici were in the first instance confined to the "province" (eparchy) of Palestine, whence the doctrine was carried into the Greater and the Lesser Armenia. The story told by Epiphanius is as follows. One Peter of Capharbaricha, a village to the south of Jerusalem, attached himself in his youth to various heresies. He was accused before the bishop Aetius of belonging to the sect called "Gnostici," and deprived of his office as presbyter. Being driven from home by Aetius, he took refuge at Cochabe in Bashan, where the remains of early Judaizing sects still lingered. Later in life he returned home, but carefully concealed his opinions. Some words however which he incautiously dropped in the ears of neighbours were reported to Epiphanius himself, who excommunicated him. He took refuge in a cave, where he lived the life of an anchorite, "distributing his goods to the poor, and giving alms daily." He gathered many followers about him, urging them (it was said, probably with truth) to a like renunciation (compare the name *Apotactici* adopted by the APOSTOLICI); and the veneration excited by his age and appearance procured for him the title of "Father."

Among his disciples was one Eutactus, of Satala in the Lesser Armenia, who after a sojourn in Palestine on his way from Egypt returned about 361 to his native land, where he soon died. Before his death however he had propagated Archontic doctrine with great success, especially among rich and eminent persons, including the wife of a Roman senator.

The Archontici used various apocryphal books, the chief being one called *Symphonia* (apparently there was a greater and a lesser *Symphonia*, but the passage is corrupt). Among the rest were the ALLOGENES, and the *Ascension of Isaiah* (cf.

Fabric. *Cod. Ps. V. T. i.* 1086 ff.) For the doctrines of the sect see OPHITES.

All later authorities are dependent on Epiphanius, who followed the *Symphonia* and probably oral information. [H.]

ARCULF, a Gallican bishop, distinguished for intelligence and accuracy among the travellers of the middle ages. Adamnan, abbot of Hy, to whom we owe our knowledge of him, does not record his see, and it has been thought (*Hist. Lit. de la France*) that he perhaps received episcopal ordination for the service of some monastery. About 690, in company with an old monk named Peter, a Burgundian, who acted as his guide and interpreter, he undertook an expedition to the Holy Places for the purposes of devotion. On his return, embarking at Rome for the shores of France, he was driven by contrary winds on the western coast of Britain; a strange miscarriage, unless we are to suppose that the vessel was bound for one of the western ports of France. After some adventures and hardships, he was received as a most welcome guest by Adamnan, who proceeded to commit to writing such fresh points of information as he could gather after frequent conversation with Arculf, omitting only the topics which were contained in extant treatises on the same subject. This compilation, which Dr. Reeves (preface to *Life of St. Columba*) considers to be "the better written and more flowing of the two principal works of St. Adamnan," was presented by its author to Aldfrid, king of Northumbria, in 698. It consists of three books, of which the first contains Arculf's description of Jerusalem. The topographical details are carefully and minutely described; and the measurements of the more important churches are given, with slight ground-plans copied, says Adamnan, from Arculf's wax tablets. Our traveller joined the zeal and observation of an antiquarian to the devotion of a pilgrim, and spent nine months* in the Holy City to good purpose. The second book gives his other travels in the Holy Land, including Bethany, Hebron, the Jordan, the Dead Sea, Damascus, Tyre, and Joppa, whence he sailed to Alexandria. He aims at giving a faithful description of what he saw without exaggeration. In his account of the Dead Sea, for instance, he says nothing of the traditional horrors of the place, but compares the salt which incrusts the shore with some rock-salt which he noticed in Sicily on his homeward voyage. The third book presents the wonders of Constantinople, where he stayed from Easter till the following Christmas.

Arculf's narrative, thus given to the world by Adamnan, soon became popular. Bede inserts some extracts from it in his *Ecclesiastical History* (bk. v. c. 15-17, iii. 225-233, ed. Giles), and founds upon it his own treatise, *De Locis sanctis* (iv. 402-443). It was first published, with prolegomena and notes, at Ingolstadt, in 1619, by Gretser, the Jesuit, not by Serasius, as Cave states. Mabillon's edition, in *Act. SS. Ben.* iv. 502-522, has a more accurate text.

See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, iii. 650-652; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 599, ed. Oxon. *Bibliographie Générale*. [C. D.]

* "He stopped two months at Jerusalem," Bed. *Opp.* iv. 443, ed. Giles. This is a mistake of the translator. The original has *aliquot mensibus*.

ARDESIANES (Hipp. *Haer.* vi. 35), evidently an error for the "Bardesanes" of vii. 31 and of other writers. [BARDESANES.] [H.]

ARETHAS, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and ANDREAS an earlier archbishop of the same see, are so intimately associated as commentators on the Book of Revelation, and so little known otherwise, that they may most fitly be noticed together. We have no direct information regarding either, beyond the bare fact of their common connection with the see of Caesarea. The dates at which they flourished can only be inferred approximately, and somewhat vaguely, from incidental notices of persons or of events in their writings. The question has been most fully discussed by Rettig (*Die Zeugnisse des Andreas und Arethas* . . . in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* for 1831, p. 734 sq.); and his conclusions, as to the period to which they may most probably be assigned, have been very generally accepted.

The only ancient authors who make mention of Andreas are his successor Arethas, whose own date is uncertain, and John patriarch of Antioch (about A.D. 1100), who in his *Eclogae asceticae* has preserved some fragments from a treatise of Andreas entitled *Θεραπευτική*. A reference in the commentary of Andreas (on Rev. xvii. 6) to the persecutions of the orthodox at Constantinople "in the times of the Arians" as matter of history precludes the supposition that it was written much earlier than the middle of the 5th century; and the mention of Antipater, bishop of Bostra (who flourished about 460 A.D.) as *μακάριος* (on Rev. xxi. 1), which shows that he was no longer living, suggests a date considerably later in the century, or subsequent at least to 460. On the other hand, the absence of any reference to persons or events of the 6th or subsequent centuries in a work handling the fulfilment of prophecy seems a clear indication that it cannot have been written much later than the year 500.

Arethas has been identified by Oudin (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* ii. p. 426) and others with a presbyter of that name belonging to Caesarea in the 10th century, the author of a treatise on the translation of St. Euthymius, patriarch of Constantinople, who died in A.D. 911. But—apart from the circumstance that the commentator is called a bishop, not a presbyter—the majority of scholars have assigned to him a considerably earlier period. In a passage of his commentary on the Apocalypse (viii. 6) he appears to speak of himself as having been contemporary with Andreas (*Ἀνδρέας ὁ τῆς κατ' ἐμὲ Καισαρίας τῆς Καππαδοκίας ἀγίως τὴν ἐφορέαν λαχών*);^a and it is not improbable that he may have been a disciple of Andreas and may have thereafter succeeded him in the see. Rettig has shewn by enumerating the succession of bishops in Caesarea that the last thirty or forty years of the 5th century may be assigned to Andreas and Arethas; and, just as in the case of Andreas, while certain historical allusions preclude the possibility of the work being written earlier, the absence of any reference to later events favours the belief that it was prepared towards the close of the 5th, or in the earlier part of the 6th, century.

^a The words *κατ' ἐμὲ*, however, do not occur in Cramer's Codex B.

Dr. Otto, however (in his *Corp. Apol.* iii. prol. p. xi, and more recently in his *Des Patriarchen Gennadios Confession. Nebst einem Excurs über Arethas* - Leitalter, Wien 1864), quotes a MS. which states that it was written by Baanes, *νοταριος* of Arethas, archbishop of Caesarea in the year of the world 6422 (914 A.D.)—a statement which goes far to settle the question in favour of the later date.

The commentary of Andreas on the Apocalypse (entitled *Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν*) seems to have been the earliest systematic exposition of the book in the Greek Church; for, although at times he quotes the interpretations of particular passages given by earlier Fathers—as he states in his Preface—he makes no reference to any previous formal exposition. Indeed, as Lücke points out in his *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis*, the repeated expression in the Preface of the timidity and hesitation with which Andreas set about the undertaking, and the contrast which he draws between the often trodden field of Old Testament prophecies dealing chiefly with matters already fulfilled and the mystical book which he now ventured to handle, appear to shew that he had almost no predecessor. The statement of R. Simon, Fabricius, Rosenmüller, and others, that the work belongs to the class of Catene, is not borne out either by its form or by the language of the Preface, which simply means that he made use of the materials which he found in the earlier writers whom he names, and occasionally quoted their expressions (*παρ' ὧν ἡμεῖς πολλὰς λαβόντες ἀφορμὰς . . . καθὼς ἐν τισὶ τόποις χρήσεις τούτων παρεθέμεθα*). He wrote, in compliance with the urgent request of persons who had a greater opinion of his judgment than he had himself, “to unfold the meaning of the Apocalypse, and to make the suitable application of its predictions to the times that followed it” (*ἀναπτύξει τὴν . . . Ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ τοῖς μετὰ τὴν αὐτῆς ὁπτασίαν χρόνοις ἐφαρμόσει τὰ προφητευθέντα*). His method rests on the distinction of a threefold sense in Scripture—the literal or outward historical (*τὸ γράμμα καὶ ἡ κατ' αἰσθησιν ἱστορία*), the tropological or moral (*ἡ τροπολογία ἐξ αἰσθητῶν ἐπὶ τὰ νοητὰ δηγοῦσα τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα*), and the mystical or speculative (*ἡ τῶν μελλόντων καὶ βήλοτέρων ἀναγωγή καὶ θεωρία*); the expositor of the Revelation is chiefly concerned with the latter. He divided the text into 24 *λόγοι* corresponding to the four-and-twenty elders, and 72 *κεφάλαια* according to the threefold distinction of body, soul, and spirit ($24 \times 3 = 72$). The exposition contains not a little that is of value, but it is full of the fanciful interpretations to which the method gave rise; and Lücke goes so far as to declare that what is good and correct in it is for the most part the result of accident rather than design. The paucity of MSS. of the Apocalypse renders the text which accompanies the commentary of great importance to criticism; and Bengel was of opinion that the work of Andreas, by directing fresh attention to the book, contributed in no small degree to its more frequent use and transcription. An interesting passage in the Preface, where the writer mentions Papias among the other Fathers whose testimony to the inspiration of the book rendered it superfluous for him to enlarge on that point, has given rise to much discussion.

The work of Arethas, again, professes to be a compilation. The title usually prefixed to it (*Συλλογὴ ἐξηγήσεων ἐκ διαφόρων ἁγίων ἀνδρῶν εἰς τὴν . . . Ἀποκάλυψιν*) is probably, as Retting observes, more recent than the work itself; but the second title which it bears (*Ἐκ τῶν Ἀνδρέα . . . εἰς τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν πεποιημένων θεαρέστων σύνοψιν σχολικῇ, παρατεθεισῇ ὑπὸ Ἀρέθα ἀναξίου ἐπισκόπου Καισαρείας*) may be regarded as genuine, for the epithet *ἀνάξιος* was not likely to have been used by any other than Arethas himself. While the writer thus modestly describes his work as a text-book based on the labours of Andreas, it has in reality a wider range and an independent value. It is no mere reproduction of the work of his predecessor, although it incorporates a large portion of the contents of that work, occasionally abridging or modifying the language of Andreas, and often specifying with more precision the sources of his quotations. But it contains much derived from other sources, or contributed by Arethas himself. Like other Catene, it has apparently been subjected in the course of transmission to various modifications both of omission and of addition.

The commentary of Andreas was first printed in the form of an imperfect and inaccurate Latin version by Peltanus in 1574. The Greek text was first edited by Sylburg from a collation of three MSS. in 1596, along with a reprint of the Latin version. It has been several times reissued in connection with the works of Chrysostom. The work of Arethas was first issued, by way of supplement to the Catena of Oecumenius, at Verona in 1532. A Latin translation by Hentenius appeared at Paris in 1547. The Greek text of the Verona edition, accompanied by this translation, was reissued by Morel at the end of his edition of Oecumenius, Paris 1631, but without, as Richard Simon complains (*Hist. Crit.* iv. 468), any use of the materials afforded by the MSS. of the Bibliothèque Royale or correction of the errors of the translation. The Greek text of Arethas is presented in its fullest and best form by Cramer (in his *Catene Græc. Patrum in N. T.*, Oxon. 1840); whose valuable additions, furnished chiefly by the Codex Baroccianus, exhibit the text in a shape so different from that previously printed as to make the latter appear in many passages a mere abridgment.

[W. P. D.]

ARIANISM, one of the most powerful and tenacious heresies in the history of the Church, so called from Arius (*Ἀρειος*), a presbyter of Alexandria, who first reduced the doctrine to a clear expression, and made it the subject of public agitation in Church and State. [ARIUS.] It involves the question of the divinity of Christ and his relation to the Father, and indirectly the whole dogma of the Trinity. It led to a series of violent controversies which, during the 4th century, shook the Roman empire, especially in the East, to its very base, but resulted in a priceless acquisition to the knowledge and symbolical statement of the doctrine of Christ's Divine nature. It was by no means a fruitless logomachy, revolving about a Greek iota (*δμοούσιος, ὁμοιούσιος, ἑτεροούσιος*), but enters into the very heart of the Christian religion. The Arian system was a refined form of paganism,

and substituted a created demi-god for the eternal uncreated Logos; it degraded Christianity to a merely relative value; it separated God and the world by an impassable gulf, and made a real reconciliation and atonement impossible; it represented the Erastian principle, and associated itself with the secular political power, without which it soon lost its vitality; its irresistible tendency is downward to Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Rationalism, until the untenable conception of a secondary God, who originated before the world out of nothing, gives way to the idea of Christ as a mere man. The cause of Christian civilization was bound up with the downfall of Arianism and the triumph of the Nicene doctrine of the Holy Trinity. (Comp. the remarkable concessions of Baur and Bancroft on the import and bearing of the Arian controversy, in Schaff's *Church History*, iii. 641 and 644.)

I. THE SYSTEM OF ARIANISM.—The Father alone is God; He alone is unbegotten, eternal, wise, good, unchangeable. He is separated by an infinite chasm from man, and there is no real mediation between them. God cannot create the world directly, but only through an agent, the Logos, who is himself created for the purpose of creating the world. The Son of God is pre-existent before time and the world (*πρὸ χρόνων καὶ αἰώνων*), and before all creatures (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*), a middle being between God and the world, the perfect image of the Father, the executor of His thoughts, yea even the creator of the world of matter, and of the spirit. In a secondary or metaphorical sense he may be called God, Logos, and Wisdom (*θεός, λόγος, σοφία*). But, on the other hand, Christ is himself a creature (*κτίσμα, ποίημα*), the first creature of God, through whom the Father called other creatures into existence; he is made, not of the essence of the Father (*ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*), but out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*)—hence the Arians were also called *Euxokontians*, or of the will of the Father before all conceivable time, yet in time; he is therefore not eternal, and there was a time when he was not (*ἢν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἥτοι κτισθῆναι*); neither is he unchangeable, but subject to the vicissitudes of a created being (*τρεπτός φύσει ὡς τὰ κτίσματα*). In the last point Arius changed, having first asserted the unchangeableness of the Son (*ἀναλλοίωτος, ἄτρεπτος ὁ υἱός*), unless we save his consistency by a distinction between moral and physical unchangeableness: the Son, it may be said, is changeable in his nature (*φύσει*), but remains morally good (*καλός*) by an act of his will. With the limitation of Christ's duration is necessarily connected a limitation of his power, wisdom, and knowledge. It was expressly asserted by the Arians that the Son does not perfectly know the Father, and therefore cannot perfectly reveal him. He is essentially different from the Father (*ἑτεροούσιος τῷ Πατρί*)—in opposition to the orthodox formula *ὁμοούσιος*, and the semi-Arian *ὁμοιούσιος* (hence also the name *Hetero-ousiasts*), and—as Aetius and Eunomius afterwards more strongly expressed it—*unlike the Father (ἀνόμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν*. [ANOMOEANS.] As to the humanity of Christ, Arius ascribed to him only a human body with an animal soul (*ψυχὴ ἄλογος*), not a rational soul (*νοῦς, πνεῦμα*); and on this point

he anticipated Apollinarius, who substituted the Divine Logos for the human reason, but from the opposite motive of saving the unity of the Divine personality of Christ. [APOLLINARIUS THE YOUNGER.]

The subsequent development of Arianism by Aetius [AETIUS] and Eunomius [EUNOMIUS], brought out no new features, except many inconsistencies and contradictions, and the negative and downward tendency of Christological error. The controversy degenerated into a heartless and barren metaphysical war. The eighteen or more creeds, which Arianism and semi-Arianism produced between the first and the second Oecumenical Councils (325–381), are leaves without blossoms and branches without fruit.

The Arians supported their doctrine from those passages of the Bible which seem to place Christ in any way on a par with the creature (especially Prov. viii. 22–25; Acts ii. 36; Col. i. 15, where *πρωτότοκος* must not be taken equivalent with *πρωτόκτιστος* or *πρωτόπλαστος*, but in the sense born, begotten of the essence of the Father before anything was made, i.e. from eternity), or which ascribe to the incarnate Christ (not the pre-existent Logos), in his state of humiliation, lack of knowledge, growth in knowledge, weariness, sorrow, and other changing affections and states of mind (Luke ii. 52; Mark xiii. 32; Heb. v. 8, 9; John xii. 27, 28; Matt. xxvi. 39), or which teach some kind of subordination of the Son to the Father (especially John xiv. 28, “the Father is greater than I,” which refers to the state of humiliation of the *λόγος ἐνσαρκος*, and implies his divinity, for in the mouth of a mere man, or even a created demi-god, such an assertion would be unmeaning and absurd). The dogmatic and philosophical arguments were chiefly negative and rationalistic, amounting to this:—The Nicene view of the essential deity, or the *ὁμο-ουσία* of Christ with the Father, is unreasonable, inconsistent with monotheism, with the dignity and absoluteness of the Father, and of necessity leads to Sabellianism or the Gnostic dreams of emanation.

On the other hand, Arianism was refuted by an array of Scripture passages, which teach directly or indirectly the divinity of Christ, and his equality with the Father. Its conception of a created Creator, who existed before the world, and yet himself began to exist, was shown to be self-contradictory and untenable. There can be no middle being between Creator and creature; no time before the world, as time is itself part of the world, or the form under which it exists successively; nor can the unchangeableness of the Father, on which Arius laid great stress, be maintained, except on the ground of the eternity of his Fatherhood, which, of course, implies the eternity of the Sonship. Athanasius charges Arianism with dualism and even polytheism, and with destroying the whole doctrine of salvation. For if the Son is a creature, man still remains separated, as before, from God; no creature can redeem other creatures, and unite them with God. If Christ is not divine, much less can we be partakers of the divine nature, and in any real sense children of God.

The philosophical relations of Arianism have been differently stated. Baur, Newman (*The Arians*, p. 17), and others, put it in connexion

with Aristotle, and Athanasianism with Plato; Petavius, Ritter, and Voigt, on the contrary, derive the Arian idea of God from Platonism and neo-Platonism. The empirical, rational, logical tendency of Arianism is certainly more Aristotelian than Platonic, and so far Baur and Newman are right; but all depends on making either revelation and faith, or philosophy and reason, the starting-point and ruling power of theology.

With faith for our guide, the Aristotelian logic and dialectics may be made a handmaid of orthodoxy, as they were in fact during the middle ages; without faith and the written Word, Platonism, with all its lofty ideal tendency, may lead into all kinds of Gnostic and mystic errors. Arianism started from human reason, and was predominantly intellectual or rationalistic in spirit and tendency; while the Nicene theology proceeded from the Scripture and the faith of the Church.

II. HISTORY OF ARIANISM.—The roots of the Arian conflict lie deep in the differences of the ante-Nicene doctrine of the Logos, especially in the contradictory elements of Origen's Christology, which was not without some good reason claimed by both parties. The great Origen, on the one hand, attributed to Christ eternity and other divine attributes, which lead, with logical necessity, to the Nicene doctrine of the identity of substance (*ὁμοουσία*); but, on the other hand, in his zeal for the personal distinctions in the Godhead, he taught with equal emphasis a separate essence and the subordination of the Son to the Father, calling him a secondary God, *δεύτερος θεός*, or *θεός* without the article, while the Father is *ὁ θεός*, or *αὐτόθεος*, *Deus per se*. He taught the eternal generation of the Son from the will of the Father, but represented it as the communication of a secondary divine substance. Athanasius laid stress on the first, Arius on the second element in the Christology of Origen.

1. *History of Arianism from 318 to the Council of Nicaea, 325.*—The controversy broke out at Alexandria about A.D. 318. According to the account of Socrates (l. c. 5), Alexander gave the first impulse by insisting, in a clerical meeting, on the eternity of the Son, whereupon Arius openly opposed and charged him with Sabellianism. He reasoned thus: if the Father begot the Son, he must be older than the Son, and there was a time when the Son was not; from this it further follows, that the Son has his substance (*ὕποστασις*) from nothing. The account of Sozomenus and Epiphanius differs in this, that they date the conflict from discussions among the presbyters and laymen, and Sozomenus represents Alexander as at first wavering between the two opinions. In 321 Alexander convened a council of about a hundred Egyptian and Libyan bishops at Alexandria, which excommunicated Arius and his followers for their open denial of the true deity of Christ. He also issued a number of circular letters against the heresy. But Arius spread his views all the more zealously in an entertaining half-poetic work, *Thalia*, the *Banquet*, of which only fragments remain in Athanasius. He found powerful friends in Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eusebius of Caesarea, and other bishops, who either shared his view, or at least considered it innocent. In a short time the whole Eastern Church was turned into a metaphysical battlefield. Constantine was at first inclined to look upon the controversy as a mere

logomachy, and never understood its deeper import. But for political considerations, and in the interest of the unity and peace of the empire, he called, probably at the suggestion of some bishops ("ex sacerdotum sententia," as Rufinus says), the first Œcumenical Synod of the Church, to settle the Arian controversy, together with the question of the time of celebrating Easter, and the Meletian schism in Egypt.

2. *The Council of Nicaea, 325.* (Comp. ATHANASIUS.)—The first Œcumenical Council, held at Nicaea, Bithynia (now a miserable Turkish village, Is-nik), consisting of 318 bishops (about one-sixth of all the bishops of the Graeco-Roman Empire) resulted in the formal condemnation of Arius, and the adoption of the Nicene Creed so called [CREEDS], which affirms in unequivocal terms the doctrine of the eternal deity of Christ in these words: "(We believe) in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, begotten of the Father [the only begotten, i. e. of the essence of the Father, *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς*, God of God], Light of Light, very God of very God (*Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ*), begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father (*γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί*); by whom all things were made [in heaven and on earth]; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man; he suffered, and the third day he rose again, ascended into heaven; from thence he cometh to judge the quick and the dead."^a) To the Creed is added the following anathema:—"And those who say: there was a time when he (the Son) was not; and: he was made out of nothing, or out of another substance or thing, or the Son of God is created, or changeable, or alterable;—they are condemned by the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church."

The Creed was signed by nearly all the bishops, Hosius at the head, even by Eusebius of Caesarea, the historian, who, before and afterwards, occupied a middle position between Athanasius and Arius. This is the first instance of such signing of a doctrinal symbol. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea signed the creed, but not the condemnatory formula appended; and for this they were deposed and banished for a short time. Only two Egyptian bishops, Theonas and Secundus, persistently refused to sign, and were banished, with Arius, to Illyria. This is the first example of the *civil* punishment of heresy, which, before the union of church and state, had been visited only with ecclesiastical censure and excommunication, and it opened the long era of persecutions for all departures from the Catholic faith. The books of Arius were burnt, and his followers branded as enemies of Christianity. The Nicene Creed has outlived all the subsequent storms, and in the improved form given to it at Constantinople in 381, it remains to this day the most generally received creed of Christendom, and—if we omit the later Latin insertion *filioque*—a bond of union between the Greek, the Roman, and the orthodox Protestant Churches.

3. *From the Council of Nicaea, 325, to the*

^a The passages enclosed in brackets were omitted or changed by the second Œcumenical Synod, 381, which made an important addition to the third article on the Holy Ghost, and gave the Nicene Creed its present shape. The appended anathema was likewise omitted.

Council of Constantinople, 381.—After the Nicene Council an Arian and semi-Arian reaction took place, and acquired for a time the ascendancy in the Roman empire. Arianism now entered the stage of its political power. This was a period of the greatest excitement in church and state: council was held against council; creed was set up against creed; anathema was hurled against anathema. "The highways," says the impartial heathen historian Ammianus Marcellinus, "were covered with galloping bishops." In intolerance and violence the Arians even exceeded the orthodox. The interference of emperors and their court only poured oil on the flame, and heightened the bitterness of contest by adding confiscation and exile to the spiritual punishment of synodical excommunication. The unflinching leader of the orthodox party was the pure and sublime character of Athanasius, who had figured at the Council of Nicaea as a youthful archdeacon, in company with Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, and after his death became his successor (328), but was again and again deposed by imperial despotism, and spent twenty years in exile. He was a theological character who sacrificed everything to his conviction, and had the courage to face the empire in arms against him (*Athanasius contra mundum*). He was a man of one idea and one passion—the true divinity of Christ—which he rightly considered as the corner-stone of the Christian system, and defended with superior intellect against all the attacks of the Arians and semi-Arians. [See **ATHANASIUS**, and Gibbon's remarkably favourable estimate of him.] The politico-ecclesiastical leader of the Arian party was Eusebius of Nicomedia, afterwards bishop of Constantinople, who baptized Constantine on his death-bed. Shortly before his death, Constantine was turned favourably to Arius; and on the ground of an artfully-constructed and evasive confession, accompanied by a solemn oath, he recalled him from exile, and ordered him to be solemnly restored to the communion of the Catholic Church at Constantinople. But on the day preceding his intended restoration the heretic died suddenly (336), in a manner that seemed to justify to the intolerant spirit of the age the inference of a direct judgment of God [**ARIUS**]. In the year following, Constantine himself died, and his son Constantine II. recalled Athanasius from his first exile, into which his father had sent him. But in the East, where Constantius, the second son of Constantine the Great, ruled, Arianism prevailed, and was maintained with fanatical zeal by the court, and by Eusebius of Nicomedia, now transferred to Constantinople (since 338). Athanasius was deposed a second time, and took refuge with Julius of Rome (340), who, with the great body of the Western Church, sided with the Nicene Creed, and gloried in Athanasius as a martyr of the Christian truth.^b

It is unnecessary to follow the varying fortunes of the two parties, and the history of Councils which neutralized one another, without materially advancing the points in dispute. The most important are the Synod of Antioch, A.D. 341, which set forth an orthodox creed,

but deposed Athanasius; the orthodox Council of Sardica, A.D. 343 (not 347, as formerly supposed, see Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 515 sqq.); and the Arian counter-synod of Philippopolis; the Councils of Sirmium, 351, Arles, 353, Milan, 355; the second Council at Sirmium, 357; the third, 358; at Antioch, 358; at Ancyra, 358; at Constantinople, 360. Aided by Constantius, Arianism, under the modified form represented by the term *homoi-ousion* (similar in essence, as distinct from the Nicene *homo-ousion* and the strictly Arian *hetero-ousion*), gained the power in the empire; and even the papal chair in Rome was for a while desecrated by heresy during the Arian interregnum of Felix II. But the death of Constantius in 361, the indifference of his successor, Julian the Apostate, to all theological disputes, the toleration of Jovian (d. 364), and especially the internal dissensions of the Arians, prepared the way for a new triumph of orthodoxy. The Eusebians or semi-Arians taught that the Son was similar in substance (*ὁμοιούσιος*) to the Father, while the Aëtians (from Aëtius, a deacon of Antioch), and the Eunomians (from Eunomius, Bishop of Cyzicus in Mysia) taught that he was of a different substance (*ἑτεροούσιος*) and unlike (*ἀνόμοιος*) to the Father (hence the names *Hetero-ousiasts* and *Anomoceans*). A number of synods and creeds of compromise were devoted to the healing of these dissensions, but without permanent effect. On the other hand, the defenders of the Nicene Creed, the great Athanasius, and after his death (373) the three Cappadocian bishops, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa, triumphantly vindicated the Catholic doctrine against all the arguments of the opposition. When Gregory of Nazianzum was called to Constantinople in 379, there was but one small congregation in the city which had not become Arian; but his able and eloquent sermons on the deity of Christ, which won him the title of the Theologian, contributed powerfully to the resurrection of the Catholic faith, and in two years afterwards he presided over the second Oecumenical Council. The rising influence of monasticism, especially in Egypt, was bound up with the cause of Athanasius, who had glorified the life of St. Antony, the patriarch of monks; and the more conservative portion of the semi-Arians gradually approached the orthodox in spite of the persecutions of the violent Arian emperor Valens.

4. *The final triumph of the Nicene orthodoxy under Theodosius the Great, 381.*—This emperor was a Spaniard by birth, and reared in the Nicene faith. During his long and powerful reign (379–395) he completed externally the spiritual and intellectual victory of orthodoxy already achieved. After conquering the Goths, he convened the second Oecumenical Council at Constantinople 381, which, after the exclusion of thirty-six semi-Arian Macedonians or Pneumatomachians, consisted of only one hundred and fifty bishops, and was presided over successively by Meletius, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Nectarius of Constantinople. The Council condemned the Pneumatomachian heresy, which denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, readopted, with some important additions, the Nicene Creed, and completed the orthodox dogma of the Holy Trinity. [**CREED, NICENE.**]

^b The most distinguished Western champions of orthodoxy during the fourth century are Hilary of Poitiers, and somewhat later Ambrose of Milan.

The Emperor gave legal effect to the doctrinal decisions and disciplinary canons, and in July 381 he enacted a law that all church property should be given up to those who believed in the equal divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Arianism, after forty years' reign, was forcibly driven out of all the churches of Constantinople, and generally forbidden throughout the empire. We meet the last traces of it in Constantinople under the emperor Anastasius, 491-518.

After Theodosius, Arianism ceased to exist as an organized moving force in theology and church history, but it reappeared from time to time as an isolated theological opinion, especially in England. (Emlyn, Whiston, Whitby, Samuel Clarke, Lardner, and many who are ranked among Socinians and Unitarians, held Arian sentiments; but Milton and Isaac Newton, though approaching the Arian view on the relation of the Son to the Father, differ widely from Arianism in spirit and aim.)

5. *Arianism among the Barbarians.*—The church legislation of Theodosius was confined, of course, to the limits of the Roman empire. Beyond it, among the barbarians of the West, especially in Gaul and Spain, who had received Christianity in the form of Arianism during the reign of the emperor Valens, it maintained itself for two centuries longer, though more as a matter of accident than of choice and conviction. The Ostrogoths remained Arians till 553; the Visigoths till the Synod of Toledo in 589; the Suevi in Spain till 560; the Vandals, who conquered North Africa in 429, and furiously persecuted the Catholics till 530, when they were expelled by Belisarius; the Burgundians till their incorporation in the Frank empire in 534; the Longobards in Italy till the middle of the 7th century. Alaric, the first conqueror of Rome, Genseric, the conqueror of North Africa, Theodoric the Great, king of Italy and hero of the *Nibelungenlied*, were Arians, and the first Teutonic translation of the Scriptures, of which important fragments remain, came from the Arian missionary Ulfilas (cf. Revillout, *De l'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques*: Paris, 1850).

III. LITERATURE.—(a). *The sources of the early history of Arianism are:* (aa) on the orthodox side, the church histories of Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret, and most of the Fathers of the 4th century, especially the dogmatic and polemic works of Athanasius (*Orationes contra Arianos*, *De Decretis Synodi Nicaenae*, *De Sententia Dionysii*, *Apologia c. Arianos*, *Apologia de Fuga sua*, *Historia Arianorum*, &c., all in tom. i. pars i. and ii. of the Bened. ed. of *Athan. Opera*); Basil (*Adv. Eunomium*); Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orationes Theologicae*), Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra Eunom.*), Epiphanius (*Ancoratus*), Hilary (*De Trinitate*), Ambrose (*De Fide*), Augustine (*De Trinitate*, and *Contra Maximinum Arianum*).—(bb). On the Arian side, fragments of the *Θάλεια*, and two Epistles of Arius, one addressed to Eusebius of Nicomedia, and one to Alexander of Alexandria, preserved in Athanasius, Epiphanius, Socrates, and Theodoret; the fragments of the church history of Philostorgius, 350-425; *Fragmenta Arianorum*, in Angelo Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, Rom. 1828, vol. iii.—(b). *The later literature on Arianism is very extensive.*

The respective sections in Petavius' *De Theologicis Dogmatibus* and Tillemont's *Mémoires*, Bull's *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*, and Waterland's very able defence of the Nicene dogma against the revived Arianism of Samuel Clarke and Whitby, are still very valuable for careful and accurate learning. Maimburg, *Histoire de l'Arianisme*, Paris 1875. Chr. W. F. Walch, *Vollständige Historie der Ketzerreien*, Leipz. 1762, ff., vols. 2nd and 3rd (exceedingly minute, but exceedingly dry). Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xxi. Möhler, *Athanasius*, Mainz, 2nd ed. 1844. J. H. Newman, *The Arians of the 4th Century*, 1838; 2nd ed. (unaltered) Lond. 1854. Baur, *Geschichte der Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung*, Tübingen, 1841-43, i. 306-825. Dörner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der L. v. d. Person Christi*, 2nd ed. Stutt. 1854, i. 773-1080 (Engl. transl. by Alexander and Simon, Edinburgh, 1861). Kaye, *Athanasius and the Council of Nicaea*, Lond. 1853. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, Freib. 1855, ff., i. 219 ff. Albert de Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au IV siècle*, Par. 1856-1866, 6 vols. (vols. i. and ii. contain the reign of Constantine; vols. iii. and iv. the reigns of Constans and Julian; vols. v. and vi. the reigns of Valentinian and Theodosius). H. Voigt, *Die Lehre des Athanasius*, Bremen 1861. Stanley, *Lectures on the H. of the Eastern Church*, 2nd ed. Lond. 1862, Lectures ii.-vii. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, New York, 1867, iii. 616-697. Also the relevant sections in the church histories of Fleury, Schroeckh, Neander, Gieseler; and in the doctrine histories of Münscher, Cölln, Neander, Hagenbach, Baur, Beck, Shedd. On English Arianism in the 17th and 18th centuries, see the works of Bull and Waterland, and Fairbairn's Appendix to the English translation of Dörner's *History of Christology*, vol. v. [P. S.]

ARIEL, in the Gnostic book *Pistis Sophia* (255 f., 380, 383 f.), presides over the fiery punishments of hell. The name (אֲרִיאֵל) means "hearth" (burning) "of God." It appears to have been sometimes applied to the fire-god Moloch (Movers, *Phoen.* i. 334 f.) In a Peratic (Ophite) book quoted by Hippolytus (*Haer.* v. 14) the "ruler of the winds" is called Ariel. [H.]

ARINTHAËUS, a general under Valens, with whom St. Basil corresponds, and from whom he seeks protection for a friend in difficulty (*Ep.* 179). On his death Basil writes a letter of consolation to his widow, in which he dwells on his remarkable endowments, his striking personal beauty and strength, as well as his lofty character and renown. Like many others in that age, Arinthaëus, though a devout Christian and a protector of the Church, deferred his baptism till at the point of death (*Ep.* 269). He was consul in the year 372, and must have died before Basil (A.D. 379). If the story told by Theodoret (*H. E.* iv. 30) be true, that he was present and seconded the rebuke administered to Valens by the general Trajan in 378 for his persecution of the Catholics, his death cannot have preceded his friend's by many months. For his military achievements see Tillemont, *Empereurs*, v. 100. [L.]

ARISTIAN, one of the "elders" from whom Papias [PAPIAS] professed to have derived tradi-

tional information (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39), and described by him as a personal follower of our Lord. Beyond the notice in the passage here referred to, there is no trustworthy information about him. The Roman martyrology (p. 102, Ven. 1630) apparently referring to the description just quoted, states on the authority of Papias that he was one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ. It commemorates his martyrdom at Salamis in Cyprus on the 22nd of February, the same day on which the martyrdom of Papias himself at Pergamus is also commemorated. Cotelier conjectures that he may be identical with the Aristio who is given as the first bishop of Smyrna (*Apost. Const.* vii. 45). [G. S.]

ARISTIDES, an early Christian writer, who, like his contemporary Quadratus, presented to the emperor Hadrian about A.D. 133 an Apology for the Christians, now lost. Such is the account of Eusebius, who states (*Hist. Eccles.* iv. c. 3, p. 143) that the work was extant, and in the hands of many, in his day. Whether he had himself read it does not appear. Jerome further states that Aristides was an Athenian philosopher of great eloquence, a disciple of Christ, yet retaining his old garb; and that the Apology, containing the principles of the faith, was still known amongst the learned, and afforded proof of his abilities (*Lib. de Viris Illust.* c. 20, p. 86); and again (*Epist.* 83, ad Magnum) that his book was interwoven with opinions of philosophers, and that he was subsequently imitated by Justin himself, also a philosopher. Both in Syncellus and in Jerome's version of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, the character of an Athenian philosopher is assigned to Aristides. Usuardus in his Martyrology, for Oct. 3 (St. Dionysius the Areopagite), cites our author "a man admirable for faith and wisdom" as giving an account of the sufferings and martyrdom of St. Dionysius, in his book on the Christian religion; which, we are told by Ado, of Vienna (who wrote in the 9th cent.), in his *Martyrology* (p. 169, ed. Rosweydi) on the authority of such as were skilled in Greek matters (*peritiores Graecorum*) that the work was treasured by the Athenians of his day, as a noble monument of antiquity. Lastly, the *Martyrologium Romanum* (August 31) adds to Jerome's account, that Aristides argued with great clearness, in the presence of the Emperor himself, that Jesus Christ alone was God. For "solus Deus" Nokter's *Martyrology* has "verus Deus;" but the former appears to be correct; meaning of course, that Jesus was God to the exclusion of the Gentile deities. The above notices supply all we know of Aristides. There is no improbability in the philosophical character assigned to him; but the story of his oration before Hadrian must in all likelihood be set down as an invention. An old French traveller, De la Guilletière, in a work *Athènes anciennes et nouvelles* (Paris 1672, p. 146), relates that a MS. of the *Apology of Aristides* was preserved in the monastery of Mount Pentelicus, six miles from Athens; but Spon (*Itinerary*) sought it there in vain. See Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae*, i. 74, 79. [S. M.]

ARISTO, mentioned by Lucianus (*Cyp. Ep.* 22), last of the group of martyrs imprisoned with him A.D. 250 at Carthage, and already dead of

hunger, thirst, heat, and crowding into two cells. They are Fortunio, Fortuna, Victorinus, Victor, Herenius, Credula, Herena, Donatus, Firmus, Venustus, Fructus, Julia, Martial, Aristo. Besides these, Mappalicus had died under torture, Bassus in *pejerario* (?) (v. l. Perario, pegrario: Rig. conj. *petrario* does not suit the circumstances) and Paulus (the most eminent, and the one in whose name the mischievous libelli were first executed) in consequence of his torture.

This group of martyrs seems to be the same commemorated in Africa on 17th April, the italicized names corresponding; viz. SS.MM. *Fortunati* (?), *Marciiani*, *Mappalici*, *Baruci* (= Bassi? Jewish), *Quincti*, *Victorici*, *Donati*, *Januarii*, *Macori*, *Galli*, *Theodora*, *Juliani* Presb. *Meceoni*, *Migini*, *Diomedis*, *Philippiani*, *Fortunionis*, *Credulæ*, *Firmi*, *Venti*, *Fructi*, *Martialis*, *Aristonis*. Except for the omissions, the roll looks as if made up from *Cyp. Ep.* xxiii. (cf. CELERINUS). [E. W. B.]

ARISTOBULUS, Martyr, made out of the (probably Jewish) Aristobulus of Rom. xvi. 10, and alleged to have been sent to preach in Britain by St. Paul (Pseudo-Dorothe. *Synops.*, *Menolog.* March 15), and to have been there martyred (*ib.*); turned into Arwystli, "a man of Italy," and connected with Bran and Caractacus, by Welsh Triads; a brother of St. Barnabas according to the *Menology*. [A. W. H.]

ARISTO PELLAEUS, the supposed author of a lost dialogue between Papiscus and Jason, is mentioned by three ancient authors, the first of whom is Eusebius; he writes, "The author of their (the Jews') madness (*i.e.* Barchochebas) having suffered his just punishment, the whole nation from that time has been absolutely forbidden even to tread upon the land around Jerusalem; Adrian having given command by the issuing of an edict, and by injunctions, that they might not so much as look upon their native soil from a distance; Aristo of Pella is the relater" (*Hist. Eccles.* iv. c. 6, pp. 145, 146). The next is Moses Chorenensis, who, in a history of Armenia edited by two sons of W. Whiston (book ii. c. 57), narrating the death of Artases, king of Armenia, soon after the insurrection of Barchochebas, represents the account as taken from Aristo Pellaëus. Since, however, there is no mention elsewhere of any work on Oriental history, and Moses elsewhere ascribes to Firmilian, the Cappadocian bishop, a history of some Oriental kings, containing an account of an event known to have happened forty years after Firmilian's death, Routh concludes (*Rel. Sacr.* i. 103) that he is not more to be trusted in the present instance, and that, in fact, he knew nothing more of Aristo than the notice in Eusebius. The third writer who mentions Aristo is Maximus, in his notes on the work *De Mystica Theol.* ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite (c. i. p. 17 ed. Corderii), in these words, "I have also read the expression 'seven heavens' in the dialogue of Papiscus and Jason, composed by Aristo of Pella, which Clemens of Alexandria in the 6th book of his Hypotyposes says was written by St. Luke." This testimony, the only one connecting the name of Aristo with the dialogue, would be by far the most important of the three, save that some doubt seems thrown on its trustworthiness by the strange assertion it

contains, that Clement attributed the work to St. Luke; an opinion which Grabiun thinks so unlikely, that he supposes either a false reading to have crept in, or Maximus to have mistaken the meaning of Clemens. Hence Donaldson (*Hist. of Christian Literature*) throws doubt on the authorship of the Dialogue, pointing out that in the preface (still remaining) to Celsus' lost translation of it nothing whatever is said of the writer. It should, however, be remembered, that Maximus is far less likely to be in error when simply giving the name of an author, than when repeating another's words. In the *Chronicon Paschale* or *Alexandrinum* (p. 477, ed. Dindorf.) under the year 134 A.D., we read, "In this year Apelles and Aristo, whom (ὧν) Eusebius, the son of Pamphilus, mentions in his ecclesiastical history, presents (ἐπιδιδάσκειν) apologies [so Donaldson, *op. cit.*; but better, "the draught of an apology," ἀπολογία σύνταξις] concerning our religion, to the emperor Adrian." Now there is no mention of Apelles in Eusebius; and the bad grammar of the passage suggests a corrupt reading. Ducange would omit the whole; but Fabricius (*de Verit. Christ. Rel.*, p. 153) for Ἀπελλῆς καὶ Ἀρίστων ὧν would read ὁ πελλαῖος Ἀρίστων οὗ. We should thus get another distinct reference to our author; but as it depends upon an emendation (though an ingenious one), it is not of very great value. It thus appears that our knowledge of Aristo is extremely small; but in default of more information we may accept the account of Maximus, and suppose him the author of the Dialogue of Papius and Jason.

Of that work we have the following further notices: "I remember to have found," says St. Jerome (lib. ii. *Comm. ad Galat.* c. iii. comm. 13) "in the dispute of Jason and Papius, which is written in the Greek language, this expression, Δοιδωρία Θεοῦ ὁ κρεμύμενος, i. e., He that is hanged is the curse of God" (iv. 259, ed. Benedictin.). And again (*Quaestio. Hebraic. in Genesin*, Op. ii. 507) Jerome writes, "In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth. Most persons suppose that, as is written in the Dispute of Jason and Papius, and as Tertullian argues in his book against Praxeas, as Hilary, too, affirms in his exposition of one of the Psalms, in the Hebrew the passage stands thus: 'In the Son God made the heaven and the earth.' That this is a mistake, the fact of the matter proves."

Origen (*contra Celsum*, lib. iv. c. 52, p. 544 ed. Delaruan., p. 199 ed. Spencer) says, of Celsus, "After this, from all works that contain allegories and relations, respectable in style and phraseology, he picks out the inferior parts, that might increase the grace of faith in the simple multitude but could not move the more intelligent, and then observes, 'of this sort is a disputation between one Papius and Jason, which I have met with, worthy not so much of laughter as of pity and indignation.' It is no part of my plan to refute things of this sort; any one can see what they are, especially if he has patience enough to listen to the books," &c. "Yet I would wish," continues Origen, "that any one who has heard the strong language of Celsus, and his assertion that the work in question, the disputation of Jason and Papius concerning Christ, deserves not laughter but indig-

nation, would take the work into his hands, and have patience enough to listen to its contents, that he might at once condemn Celsus, finding nothing in the book worthy of indignation; nor will one who reads impartially find the book move him to laughter. In it is described a Christian arguing with a Jew from the Jewish Scriptures, and showing that the prophecies concerning the Christ are applicable to Jesus; the other replying to the argument vigorously and in a way suitable to the character of a Jew."

In the words first quoted by Jerome, Δοιδωρία Θεοῦ ὁ κρεμύμενος, we have apparently, urged by Papius, the usual Jewish objection, that the Messiah would not have suffered the accursed death upon the tree. The next passage is important, since in the interpretation of the words "in the beginning" as equivalent to "in the Son," we find an exact parallel to Theophilus' application of the name ἀρχή, beginning, or origin, to the Word (*Ad Autol.* i. c. 3, 71 A); and the identical explanation is given (*Ad Autol.* ii. c. 10, p. 89 A), where λόγος and ἀρχή are assumed to be equivalent. Tertullian does not render the opening words of Genesis as Jerome represents, and Hilary only gives "in the Son" as one of three translations: we may therefore fairly suppose that we have, in the similar view of the passage ascribed to the author of our Dialogues, not a mistranslation, but a mystical interpretation of the Hebrew. From this example, taken along with the expressions of Origen and those of Celsus which he quotes, it seems that the method of Aristo was largely mystical and allegoric. What is implied by the mention of the seven heavens (in Maximus) we do not know. The general course of the Dialogue is thus described in the preface of the translator Celsus: "That noble, memorable, and glorious result of the discussion between Jason, a Hebrew Christian, and Papius, an Alexandrian Jew, comes into my mind; how the obstinate hardness of the Jewish heart was softened by Hebrew admonition and gentle chiding; and the teaching of Jason, on the giving of the Holy Ghost, was victorious in the heart of Papius. Papius, thereby brought to a knowledge of the truth, and fashioned to the fear of the Lord through the mercy of the Lord Himself, both believed in Jesus Christ the Son of God, and entreated Jason that he might receive the sign (of baptism). This is proved by the written account of their contest, which is described in the Greek language; they there encounter each other, Papius opposing the truth, Jason asserting and vindicating the commission [dispositionem] and fulness of Christ." We cannot determine the date of this work, except that it must have been written before the time of Celsus, i. e. before the middle of the 2nd century; and, if Aristo be its author, we see from the passage referred to by Eusebius, that he lived after the destruction of Jerusalem. Pella was then the seat of the bishop of Jerusalem, having been the refuge of the Jewish Christians. If Maximus' information be correct, Clement's belief that St. Luke was the writer of the Dialogue shews at least that it must have been commonly assigned to a very early date.

[S. M.]

ARISTOCRITUS, a Manichean author, of whom nothing is known except that he wrote a

book entitled *Theosophia*. His name is only mentioned in the Greek form of abjuration (*ap. Cotelier's Patres Apost. i. 544*), which states that he endeavoured in this work to prove that Judaism, Paganism, Christianity, and Manichæism were one and the same religion, and that, to deceive Christian readers, he occasionally attacked Manes with vehemence. (Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich. i. 435*.) [E. B. C.]

ARIUS (*Ἀρείος*), the father of Arianism, was born about the middle of the 3rd century (256) in Libya, according to other accounts in Alexandria,^a and ordained deacon by Peter, and presbyter by Achillas of Alexandria. Arius denied the eternity and essential divinity of Christ; but held that Christ was a secondary God, of a different substance, created by the Father before the world, by a free act and out of nothing, and that he created the world and became incarnate from the Virgin Mary. [See ARIANISM.] In 313 he was intrusted with the sole care of a church called Baukalis (Epiphanius, *Haer. 68, c. 4*), in which he was very popular; and after the death of Achillas he came near being elected patriarch of Alexandria over his rival Alexander (Theodoret, *H. E. i. c. 2*). About 318 began his controversy with Alexander concerning the divinity of Christ, which soon involved the whole Church, and agitated it for nearly a century. [ARIANISM.] He was excommunicated for heresy by a provincial synod of 100 Egyptian and Libyan bishops at Alexandria in 321, and by the Œcumenical Council of Nicaea in 325, which after a long debate adopted the famous Creed asserting in unequivocal terms the eternity of Christ and his coequality (*ὁμοουσία*) with the Father. [CREEDS.] Constantine banished the heretic to Illyria; but when, under the influence of his sister Constantia and bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, he became favourably inclined to Arius, and satisfied himself of his substantial orthodoxy on the ground of an artfully prepared creed confirmed by a solemn oath, he recalled him and ordered his public restoration in 331. Athanasius refused to receive Arius into the communion of the church of Alexandria (Athanas. *Apol. § 59*). In 336 Arius had a second interview with the emperor at Constantinople, who, in spite of the remonstrance of bishop Alexander, gave directions that on a Sunday Arius be received into full communion by a solemn procession from the imperial palace to the Church of the Apostles. But on the preceding Saturday,^b towards night, he died suddenly at the age of over eighty years, at a time and in a manner that seemed to the orthodox party to be a direct interposition of Providence

and a condemnation of his doctrine, while his friends attributed the death to poison. Athanasius relates the fact in a letter to Serapion, on the authority of a priest, Macarius of Constantinople (*De Morte Arii*, Opera, ed. Bened. tom. i. pp. i, 340), and ventures to interpret Providence in the uncharitable style of his age, yet not without some reluctance on the part of his better Christian feeling. Epiphanius (*Haer. 68, c. 7*) compares his death to that of Judas the traitor. Socrates (*Hist. Eccl. i. 38*) gives the following account:—"Going out of the imperial palace, attended by a crowd of Eusebian partisans like guards, Arius paraded proudly through the midst of the city, attracting the notice of all the people. On approaching the place called Constantine's Forum, where the column of porphyry is erected, a terror arising from the consciousness of his wickedness seized him, accompanied by a violent relaxation of the bowels. He therefore inquired whether there was a convenient place near, and being directed to the back of Constantine's Forum, he hastened thither. Soon after, a faintness came over him, and together with the evacuations his bowels protruded, followed by a copious hæmorrhage, and the descent of the smaller intestines: moreover portions of his spleen and liver were carried off in the effusion of blood, so that he almost immediately died." Sozomen (*H. E. ii. 30*) gives a similar account; and adds that for a long period everybody avoided with horror the spot on which Arius died, until a rich Arian bought the place of the public, and built a house on the site, that there might be no perpetual memorial of his death.

Arius is described as a *νῆαν* of tall stature, popular manners, considerable learning, serious, even austere character and ascetic habits, but unyielding pride and quarrelsome disposition (Epiph. *Haer. 69, c. 3*).^c Before the outbreak of the Arian controversy he had been twice excommunicated by Peter of Alexandria for defending the cause of the schismatic Meletius (Epiphanius, *Haer. 68, c. 4*). His mind was acute and well versed in the arts of debate, but destitute of depth. Neander (*Ch. Hist. iv. 685*) ascribes to him "a contracted intellect without the intuitive faculty." He seems to have been educated in the school of the presbyter Lucianus of Antioch (at least he addresses bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia as *συλλοικιστής*), which favoured a free grammatical and semi-rationalistic exegesis, in opposition to the allegorical and spiritualistic method of Alexandria. His principal work, called *Θάλεια*, *The Banquet*, which he wrote during his stay with Eusebius at Nicomedia, was a defence of his doctrine in an entertaining popular form, half poetry, half prose, in the effeminate style of Sotades and the so-called Sotadic metre; but, with the exception of a few fragments in the tracts of Athanasius, it is lost. A letter of his to Eusebius of Nicomedia, and one to Alexander of Alexandria, are still extant. (See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr. viii. p. 309*.) On the doctrines on

^a Epiphanius, *Haer. 69, c. 1* (p. 727 c, ed. Petav.), calls Arius a native of Libya, and this is followed by Tillemont and most historians. Cave (*Hist. Liter. Script. Eccles. p. 126*) quotes Photius as authority for the statement that Arius was born in Alexandria; but the reference cannot be verified. This view is probably merely an inference from Constantine's letter, where he gives Arius permission to return from his exile "to his own country," meaning Alexandria (Socrates, *H. E. i. 25*, ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα ἀφικέσθαι). But this, as Tillemont observes, may apply to the place of his long residence as well as to the place of his birth.

^b Not on Sunday during the public procession, as is wrongly stated by some. See the minute account of Tillemont, vol. v., *Histoire de l'Arianisme*, art. xxv.

^c Tillemont, following Epiphanius and the Greek historians, says of Arius that he had "toutes les qualités d'un serpent dangereux, et un extérieur si bien composé, qu'il étoit pour séduire toutes les personnes simples et crédules." The silence of his enemies is conclusive that, like Pelagius and Nestorius, he was free from vice, and that but for his heresy he would have been highly esteemed for his moral character.

the divinity of Christ and His relation to the Father, which have given him a notoriety far outstripping his talents and learning, see **ARIANISM** and **ATHANASIUS**.

LITERATURE.—The chief sources on the life and character of Arius are, besides the fragments of his own works, the writings of Athanasius, the 68th and 69th Hæreses of Epiphanius, the church histories of Socrates, Sozomenus, Theodoret, and Philostorgius. Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*; Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*; and the more recent works quoted under **ARIANISM**. [P. S.]

ARIUTH, in the Gnostic book *Pistis Sophia* (367 f.), a female "archon" presiding over the "second" place of punishment, in form an "Ethiopian" negro. [H.]

ARMAGIL, one of the potent names said by Jerome (*Ep. lxxv. 3*) to have been current among the "Basilidians" of Spain in the 4th century. [**MARCUS OF MEMPHIS**]. Probably identical with **ARMOGEN**. [H.]

ARMENIANS. The early history of Christianity in Armenia presents, in some respects, a remarkable parallel to that of our own country. The floating traditions of an apostolic origin of the Church, unauthenticated by any sufficient historical testimony; the certainty of the early evangelization of the country, in whole or in part; the ascertained existence of a large Christian community there at the commencement of the 4th century, immediately on the revival of the work of Christ by a new and more vigorous missionary effort,—all these phenomena have their counterpart in the annals of our own insular Church.

The curious and interesting narrative given by Eusebius of the correspondence between our Lord and Abgarus king of Edessa, which has so long exercised the critical acumen of students of ecclesiastical history, need not occupy our attention here; because, although it is recorded in fullest detail in the annals of the native Armenian historians, and the superscriptions of the letters of Abgarus describe him as king of Armenia, yet it is only by doing great violence to geography that the dominions of Abgarus can be brought within the limits of Armenia; and, in any case, the correspondence belongs rather to the personal history of the king than to the ecclesiastical history of his country. (Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13.) [**ABGARUS**.]

It is not so with the after consequences of that correspondence in the mission of Thaddæus, one of the seventy disciples, by St. Thomas the Apostle, which in its main features seems to rest on an historical basis, however overlaid by a later accumulation of legendary adornment. If his subsequent labours as the Apostle of Armenia were equally well authenticated, a sufficiently satisfactory view might be obtained of the first planting of Christianity in that country. But it must be admitted that, while any such records of the apostolic age escaped the laborious diligence of Eusebius, the language of the native annalists is not such as to command implicit confidence; so that the labours and martyrdom of St. Thaddæus and of his coadjutor St. Bartholomew the apostle, in Armenia, and the mission of St. Simon the Canaanite to Persia, may be best relegated to the nebulous region of ecclesiastical

history which we have not the power to resolve into clusters of facts, for lack, it may be, of more full and authentic records.

Certain, however, it is that, whatever progress had been made in the evangelization of Armenia in apostolic times, the opposition which the faith encountered from the followers of the ancient superstitions had checked its progress so effectually that few traces of Christianity remained in the country at the time when its great evangelist St. Gregory Lusavoritch, *i. e.* the Illuminator, commenced his apostolic labours there in the first year of the 4th century.

For the labours of that illustrious man, for his sufferings at the hands of his former friend and patron, King Tiridates, and for the progress he had made in the conversion of his adopted country prior to his elevation to the episcopate, the reader is referred to the biographical notice of him in this Dictionary. The rapid growth of Christianity in the country is strikingly marked by a fact mentioned by Eusebius, who, singularly enough, makes no mention of St. Gregory—as neither do Socrates nor Sozomen—nor puts on record any particulars of the conversion of Armenia to the faith. He tells us only that, among the natural and political convulsions that shortly preceded the overthrow of the persecutor Maximinus, the tyrant raised up war against the Armenians, who had been from old times friends and allies of the Romans; whom, being themselves also Christians, and zealously affected with piety towards God, he converted from friends and allies to enemies, by his endeavours to force them to idolatry and demon-worship. The historian adds that he and his army suffered severely in this war. (Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 8.)

The exact date of St. Gregory's consecration to the episcopate is not fixed by the native annalists; but, as the progress of conversion was so rapid after his release from the pit in A.D. 300, the date assigned to his consecration by Mr. Malan, in 302, does not appear too early; if we may suppose Leontius to have occupied the see of Caesarea of Cappadocia at that time; for there can be no question that it was he who consecrated the first primate of the Armenian Church. The earliest notice, however, which we have of Leontius as bishop of Caesarea is in A.D. 314, when he subscribed the disciplinary Canons of the Councils of Ancyra and of Neocaesarea. He was also present among the 318 fathers of Nicaea, and undertook to transmit the canons of that council to the churches, among others, of the Great and Little Armenia; a note, by the way, of the organized state of the Church in that country before the end of the first quarter of the 4th century.

This early connection of the Church of Armenia with the primal see of Cappadocia was continued for upwards of a century, when it was interrupted, as we shall see, by the kings of Persia.

The chief episcopal see of the Armenian Church was from the first fixed at or near the royal residence, Vagarshiabad, not far from Erivan, at the northern base of mount Ararat; its ancient name being superseded by that which it still retains, in honour of the vision which St. Gregory reported himself to have seen there: Etchmiazin signifying the Descent or Manifestation of the Only-begotten.

The title *Catholicos*, which came very early to be appropriated to the primate of the Armenian Church, is explained by Le Quien (*O. C. i.* col. 1355) to signify "Procurator" or "Vicar-General," and to have reference to the subordination of the bishop to the metropolitan see of Caesarea, which, it is asserted, was the result of a compact between Leontius and St. Gregory, to which also Tiridates was a consenting party.

The organization of the Armenian hierarchy is involved in great obscurity, but we have apparently authentic lists of the catholicos, with a few particulars of their acts, preserved by their native annalists. St. Gregory is said to have divided Armenia into ten episcopal sees, which were subsequently increased, but their names have not been preserved, and the list in the *Notitia* of Leo Sapiens given by Dr. Neale (Introduction, p. 76) can scarcely be taken to represent the ancient dioceses, as they certainly do not their original native names.

St. Gregory is said to have presided over the Armenian Church for 30 years. He was succeeded by his two sons, of whom Rostaces sat two, and Bartanes three years. Two other brothers, sons of Rostaces, followed in succession, of whom Gregory II. sat 11, Josec 6 years. The name and date of the latter are authenticated by his subscription to the decrees of the Synod of Antioch in 364, as Isaacis (*Ἰσακῆς*) of Great Armenia: but the duration of his episcopate must be corrected, if he be identical with the Iosacis (*Ἰωσάκῆς*), whose subscription is found to a letter of St. Basil and other Oriental bishops in 372.

It was probably during his bishopry that the emperor Julian (c. A.D. 363) addressed his insulting letter to Arsaces king of Armenia, filled with vain-glorious boasting of his own imperial virtues, with contumelious reproaches of his predecessor Constantius, and blasphemous invectives against the God whom Arsaces adored, as impotent to shield him from his imperial wrath if he refused compliance with his requests. (Sozomen, *H. E.* vi. c. 1.)

Josec was succeeded by Pharnesec for 4 years, and he by Norseses for 34 years. This eminent prelate is said to have been the son of Athenogenes and nephew of Hesychius, who was nephew of St. Gregory. He was present, according to the Armenian historians, at the 2nd General Council in Constantinople in 381, and was poisoned by Bab, or Para, king of Armenia during the reign of Theodosius the Great. [NORSESES.]

On his death, the ecclesiastical affairs of Armenia fell into great confusion, by reason of the metropolitan of Caesarea prohibiting the three succeeding catholicos from ordaining, in consequence of the murder of Norseses; and they are said to have been merely titular catholicos. They were Josec II., who sat 3 years, Zagenes 4 years, Aspuraces 7 years. He was succeeded by St. Isaac, who received licence to ordain, and ruled the Church for 40 years, when he was deposed, and another period of anarchy followed. The long presidency of St. Isaac was marked by political convulsions which terminated the reign of the native dynasty of the Arsacidae, and subjected Armenia to the tyranny of the Persian Sassanidae. It was equally notorious in the literary history of the Church and nation: for he it was who, with the aid of Mesrob, invented the Armenian character and translated the Scrip-

tures into the vernacular, the Syrian version having been in use up to his time. Then, too, the Armenian Liturgy, first translated from the Greek by St. Gregory, took its present form, and "the golden period" of native literature set in. [ISAAC, MESROB, MOSES of Chorene.]

St. Isaac was deposed about A.D. 440 by the king of Persia, who intruded Sormac into his office, only to replace him by two other intruders, Persicus for three, and Musulius for two years, Syrians by nation. During this time ordinations were again prohibited by the metropolitan of Caesarea, in consequence of the deposition of St. Isaac, who declined an invitation of the native princes of the Azati to return to his post, but appointed Mastentzes to administer the see in his stead; and from that time, by command of the kings of Persia, the catholicos and bishops of Armenia were consecrated within the country itself, and its dependence on the metropolitan see of Caesarea of Cappadocia virtually ceased.

The intestine troubles of the Armenian Church during this period, while they account for a remarkable anomaly in their national ecclesiastical observances, go far to justify their divergence from the creed of Catholic Christendom—in expression, at least, if not in doctrine. The former relates to the celebration of the festival of our Lord's Nativity, which is observed in the Armenian Church, concurrently with His Baptism, on the 6th of January; the other, of more serious import, is the rejection of decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), which has not unnaturally involved the Armenian Church in the suspicion of symbolizing with the Monophysite or Eutychian heresy condemned in that synod. This rejection is attributed to a misunderstanding of the effects of the decisions of the council, as though favouring the Nestorian heresy condemned at Ephesus (A.D. 431), a misunderstanding resulting partly from the misrepresentations of heretical teachers, partly from the questionable attempts of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius to reconcile the conflicting errors. There can be no doubt, however, that the mission of Samuel to Armenia by the Archimandrite Barsumas (cir. 460) was the main cause of the persistence of the nation in their—perhaps at first, involuntary—error. (Assemani, *Bib. Orient.* ii. 296.)

The schism was not consummated until A.D. 491, when the national Armenian Council, assembled at Vagarshabad, anathematized the Council of Chalcedon; since which time the Armenian Church has remained separated from the orthodox Church of the East, notwithstanding several attempts at reconciliation and reunion, one of which was partially and temporarily successful.

The first Catholicos of the Armenian Church after the subjection of the country to the Persians, was Joseph, a disciple of St. Mesrob, who after sitting two years was put to death, together with Leontius and his companions, by Isdegerdes king of Persia. He was succeeded by Citus or Kyut, who presided 15 years, during which time he transferred the seat of the Catholicos from Etchmiazin, reduced to ruin by the Persians, to Thevin or Tiben, supposed by some to be identical with Erivan.

To Kyut succeeded John I., surnamed Martacunes, for six years. He acquired by his writings the title of Philosopher. He re-arranged and amplified the service-books of the Church, and

composed and published various sermons, addresses, and hymns.

Apovipenes, or Papchen I. succeeded, and it was during his term of office, which lasted five years, that the National Council of Vagarshiabad completed the rupture with the orthodox Church, as above related. Then followed Samuel of Artasai for twelve years, according to one account, according to another for five only; Museles, or Moses, of Arperes, whose term is variously stated at six, and fifty years; Isaac of Arcan for seven (otherwise five) years. Christopher of Cubaritze succeeded, for five or six years; commemorated by Bar-Hebraeus in his *Chronicle* as a holy man, a native of Syria or Mesopotamia (Assemani, *B. O.* ii. 411). Leontius sat for two or three years, and was succeeded by Norseses II. of Asparax, who governed the Church for nine years. Under his rule the Armenian Church committed itself more completely and irrevocably to the errors which it had—inadvertently, perhaps, in the first instance—embraced; for in the Council of Tiben the Church synodically ruled the concurrent celebration of the Nativity and Epiphany or Baptism of our Lord, anathematized the orthodox Church of Jerusalem, and adopted into its Liturgy the heterodox interpolation into the Tersanctus of the words, “who was crucified for us,” applied to the Holy Trinity. The importance attached to this Council of Tiben by the Armenian nation is marked by the fact that it has ever since been regarded as an era in their history; which era, however, Le Quien has shown, commenced in A.D. 551, though the Council of Tiben sat in 535. (*Oriens Christ.* i. col. 1383.) After the death of Norseses II. Byaneses of Capelene sat 17 years, when he was succeeded by Moses II. of Elibaret, who occupied the throne of St. Gregory for 30 years. He is reported by some annalists to have held another council at Tiben to confirm the decrees of the former as to the addition in the Trisagion; and it is probably this council, not the former, that marks the epoch of the Armenians, as the annalists mention the introduction into the Armenian calendar of the computation of the Turcomans, by order of this Catholicsos.

During his long reign a schism, resulting from political causes and followed by permanent consequences, took place in the Armenian Church. In gratitude for the services of the emperor Maurice, to whose active intervention on his behalf he owed his throne, Chosroes II. made over to the Byzantine empire the Armenian provinces of the Persian dominions, as far as Tiben, then the seat of the Catholicsos. Maurice's attempts to convert Moses to the orthodox faith were ineffectual. He and the bishops beyond the river Azat, *i.e.* within the Shah's dominions, held fast to their heterodox creed, and to the unleavened bread and unmix'd chalice in the Holy Eucharist; while the prelates of the province of Taron, within the Roman empire, went to Constantinople, where, after long discussion, they gave in their written adhesion, under oath, to the orthodox faith. On the return of these conforming bishops to Armenia, Moses and the bishops of Persarmenia refused to communicate with them, whereupon the emperor appointed an orthodox Catholicsos of Taron, one John of Cocosta; so setting up a rival throne and perpetuating the theological differences among the Armenians, until the

government was again reunited under Chosroes II., about the time of the death of Moses.

He was succeeded by Abraham of Arastune, who sat 23 years. He summoned a council of bishops, presbyters, and abbots, in which it was decreed that all who refused to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon should be banished the country; upon which John, and those who held with him, including the Iberians and Colchians, separated from the Armenian Church, which thus recovered its unity at the expense of its orthodoxy and the sacrifice of its dependencies.

Cometas, the successor of Abraham, sat eight years; during which time he distinguished himself above all his predecessors for his zeal against the decrees of Chalcedon. He was followed by Christopher II., surnamed the Abrahamite, possibly as belonging to the family of the former Catholicsos of that name. He sat but three years, when he was deposed through the machinations of one John, whom Cometas had desired for his successor. John, however, was disappointed in his hope of occupying his rival's seat, which was filled for ten years by Esdras of Nica (called Jeser by the annalist), who had been educated in the patriarchal palace from his infancy.

It was at this epoch that the most serious, and for a time successful, attempt was made to reconcile the Armenian to the orthodox Eastern Church. A mixed council of Armenian and Greek theologians, including bishops, abbots, and doctors, was assembled by order of the emperor Heraclius, in the city of Charnum, *i.e.* Carana, or Theodosiopolis, the modern Erzeroum, for the discussion of the various questions at issue between the two churches. The result of a month's most careful consideration was the entire agreement of the Armenians with the Greeks. The Council of Tiben was anathematized; the festivals of the Nativity and Baptism of our Lord severed; the interpolation in the Tersanctus removed; and the decrees of Chalcedon admitted to the same place of authority as those of the first three councils. The date of this important Council of Carana is fixed to the 23rd year of Heraclius, the fourth after the death of Chosroes, coinciding with the year 632 A.D.

This settlement of the disputed questions was not, however, destined to be permanent. The old rival of Christopher and Esdras, John (Maracumensis or Maurocomita), who alone stood out against the decrees of the council, was condemned as a heretic and doomed to banishment. After a vain attempt to draw away other bishops from the communion of Esdras, and a third ineffectual endeavour to occupy the patriarchal throne, he was cited to another council summoned by Norseses III., where he was again condemned, and sent into exile, after having been branded in the forehead by the Prætor of Armenia with the figure of a fox. His place of banishment was Mount Caucasus, from whence he returned after the demise of Anastasius, the successor of Norseses, and died in extreme old age, leaving, however, behind him a generation of younger disciples, who succeeded in vindicating his principles, and again reducing the Armenian Church to its former state, in which it has continued ever since.

Norseses III. of Ischna occupied the patriarchal throne for twenty years, and is eulogized by the native annalists as the restorer of the ruined and

desolated nursery of the Armenian faith at Vagarshiabad or Etchmiazin, and for other like ecclesiastical works of pious munificence.

He was succeeded by Anastasius of Cora, who sat six years; Israel of Tmesu followed for ten years; then Isaac III. of Bazacastrium, to whom no years are assigned in the catalogue; which may be taken as a significant indication that it was compiled during his lifetime. This is true also of the narrative, which has been a trustworthy guide up to this period of the history. According to this authority, Isaac III. was summoned to Constantinople, with the bishops subject to his jurisdiction, in the fifth year of the emperor Justinus—probably Justinian II., which would correspond with A.D. 689: for as Justinian II., who had made himself master of Armenia in 685, remained in possession of that country until 690, when he was forced again to cede it to the Saracens, he was in a position to exercise thus much authority over the Armenian hierarchy. In this council they again gave in their adhesion to the decrees of Chalcedon; but, on their return to their country, this act of theirs was condemned by their fellow-countrymen, and the prelates, to avoid the threatened anathema, renounced the faith they had professed at Constantinople. As this repudiation of the orthodox faith synchronizes, as did their acceptance of it, with political convulsions and the transference of their civil allegiance, it was probably influenced by secular as much as by religious considerations; and as their Moslem masters, not less than their Persian oppressors before them, would not be displeased to raise a moral barrier between the subjected Armenians and the Greek empire, their influence would not be wanting to promote the rupture. Isaac is said, on doubtful authority, to have died at Haran, near Damascus.

Elias followed Isaac III. He occupied the patriarchal throne 24 years, and was succeeded by John III., whose rule of 11 years was signalized by a synod assembled at Manaschiertum, on the confines of Hyrcania, by command of Omar, the general of the Saracens, and, with the aid of the calif of Babylon, in which the schism from orthodoxy was finally consummated. Six Jacobite bishops of Assyria were present in this council, and a fusion of the two communions was the result. The Armenian Church accepted the definition of one nature, one will, and one operation in Christ; leaven was rejected from the bread, water from the wine in the Holy Eucharist, and divers ecclesiastical rules were subsequently introduced by the patriarch Elias, the effect of which was to bring about a closer agreement between the two communions; although, according to Gregory Bar-Hebraeus (*loc. sup. cit.* p. 296), many of the Armenians continued firm even to his time in the doctrine of Julian of Halicarnassus, whose peculiar notions concerning the nature of Christ were equally divergent from those of Severus of Antioch, the founder of the Jacobites, and from orthodoxy. This Julianist modification of Monophysite heresy had been propagated in Armenia soon after 545, by one of the ten pseudo-bishops ordained by Eutropius, who had himself received consecration only by the dead hand of the defunct Procopius, bishop of Ephesus, the sole episcopal representative of the extravagances of Julian (*Joannes Episc. Asiae apud Assemanum, B. O. ii. 87, 88*).

As this council forms an important epoch in the history of the Church of Armenia, it is fortunate that its date is accurately determined, being fixed by Bar-Hebraeus to the year of the Greeks 1037 (= A.D. 715), of the Armenians 135, which Assemani proposes to correct to 175—dating the era of Tiben in A.D. 551 (Assemani, *B. O. ii. 106, 296*, note, and p. 338; Le Quien, *O. C. i. col. 1392*, corrected in tom. ii. col. 1365, 6).

From this period until the latter half of the 9th century the annals of the Armenian Church are scanty in the extreme, the names only and periods of the catholics being preserved.

Here, then, the list of the patriarchs of the old Armenian Church, founded by St. Gregory the Illuminator, may be fitly brought to a close; and any attempt to investigate the sites and successions of the sees dependent on the Catholicos must be abandoned as unavailing, after the unsuccessful efforts of Le Quien. The migrations of the chief see were long subsequent to this period; as was also the erection of the titular sees of Constantinople and Jerusalem, which had a civil rather than an ecclesiastical origin and significance, and was necessitated by the wide diffusion of the Armenian race in Europe and Asia. The defection of a section of the Armenian Church to the ranks of Latin Christianity dates probably from the time of the Crusades, and therefore the consideration of it does not come within the scope of this volume.

A few words may be added concerning the literature of Armenian Christianity. This is for the most part accessible only in their ecclesiastical language and character, which have not found many students among the literati of Europe. There are doubtless treasures of great value among the manuscripts in the Patriarchal Library at Etchmiazin, which would well repay translation and publication; and as that library has been lately catalogued, by order of the late Catholicos, it may be hoped that its contents will become better known to the historiographers, not only of that nation but of the world at large.

M. Langlois has done excellent service to this branch of literature in his *Collection des Historiens Anciens et Modernes de l'Arménie*, issued under the auspices of Nubar Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Viceroy of Egypt. It is published in French, with the originals of the Greek and Latin authorities, in two volumes, of which the former, published at Paris in 1867, contains the Greek and Syrian authors which had been translated into Armenian; the second, the Armenian annalists of the 5th century, including Moses of Chorene. More will be said of the Rev. S. C. Malan's labours in the same field when we have to speak of the great founder of the Armenian Church, St. Gregory the Illuminator. [G. W.]

ARMOGEN.—In the system of the BARBELIOTAE [OPHITES], as expounded by Irenaeus (108 Mass.), the second "syzygy," consisting of "Christ" (the primal Light) and "Incorruption," brings into existence four luminaries or derivative lights to attend upon "Autogenes," the product of the first "syzygy." Of these "the first and great" luminary was "Soter" (Saviour), who was called Armogen. The name is variously written *Armogenes*, *Armoge*, and apparently also with the aspirate: see too

Vallarsi's note on Jerome, *Ep.* lxxv. 3 [ARMAGIL]. No satisfactory derivation is known: for conjectures see Harvey on Iren. l. c. [H.]

ARNOBIUS, an eminent Latin Apologist for Christianity. His name is occasionally cited as Arnobius Afer; but the latter word is a mere local description. No sign whatever remains to us that he possessed any other name than one. The Greek formation of his name suggests the conjecture (but no more) that he was a freed-man.

The records of his life are meagre and somewhat uncertain; consisting, indeed, wholly in a few brief notices by St. Jerome, and another by Trithemius, aided by his own few incidental allusions to himself. The result may be briefly summed up as follows:—

The outbreak of the last great persecution (303–313) found Arnobius a professor of rhetoric at Sicca, in Africa. His reputation was high, and his pupils numerous and distinguished; among them was LACTANTIUS. Arnobius was a sincere pagan; versed in schemes of philosophy; but none the less an unhesitating and even abject idolater. He was, moreover, active as a lecturer in attacks upon Christianity. The sight, however, of the martyrdoms which followed the edict of Nicomedia appears speedily to have touched him, and a dream or vision (says St. Jerome) warned him to submit to Christ. He presented himself to the church at Sicca; but “they were afraid of him,” and demanded from their late enemy some hostage for sincerity. The result was the composition of the *Disputations against the Pagans*; whether in their present form or not. He was thereupon baptized, and (according to Trithemius) attained the rank of presbyter. Of his subsequent history we know nothing.

Some doubt attaches to the *exact date* of the conversion of Arnobius, and publication of his treatise. St. Jerome, continuing the chronicle of Eusebius, which closes with the year 327, enters next the name and life of Arnobius. But elsewhere he places him under Diocletian (284–304). Arnobius himself incidentally notices that Christianity had existed (*fuimus Christiani*) 300 years at his date of writing (i. 13); and that the then age of Rome, according to the *Annals*, was 1050 or rather less. Again, throughout his work occur allusions to the *presence* of persecution; to the burning of the Scriptures and the destruction of the churches (*conventicula*); which Eusebius records as main features of Diocletian's persecution; to the sword, the flames, the rack, and the beasts; to the hostile answers of oracles (see i. 26; ii. 77; iii. 36; iv. 36, &c.).

On the whole this evidence points to some date between 303 and 313. St. Jerome's entry in the *Chronicle* appears to be irrespective of sequence. The express notes of time in the work of Arnobius are too cursory to be much insisted upon. The mention of the *Annals* of Rome leaves an ambiguity; for one era would fix the year 1050 to A.D. 296, another to A.D. 303. Thus there is nothing to invalidate the evidence of the frequent incidental allusions to the *present persecution* (Hieron. *de Scr. Eccl.* c. 79; id. in *Chronicon Eusebii*; Trithemius *de Scr. Eccl.* p. 10 a.).

The title of Arnobius's work usually appears as *Disputationes adversus Gentes*; occasionally, *adv. Nationes*, which last is sanctioned by the

inscription at the close of book ii. in the Parisian MS.

It is divided into seven books of unequal length. The first two are devoted to the defence of Christianity, the remainder to the exposure of paganism. A brief abstract is subjoined; the first two books demand the closer analysis.

Book I. The author opens with a statement of the perpetual charge against Christianity, that it was the cause of the heavy calamities of the empire. This is met by an appeal to the disasters of other ages (2–3); to the mild nature and influence of Christianity, already felt (6); to our human ignorance of the constitution of the universe (8–11); to the partial extent of the alleged disasters, whereas the Christians were ubiquitous (15); to the passionless nature of the Divinity (13–20). It is asked, what is the capital offence of the Christians (25); and the reply is a series of fine passages explaining their worship of the one Creator and King as revealed by Christ (26–34). To the charge however that they worship (*colere*) a *man*, Arnobius replies by a retort upon the heathen heroes; by an assertion that even were Christ a mere man, his beneficence merited divine honours (36–40); and, lastly, by an eloquent assertion of his deity and incarnation. The proof of this is centred in his *miracles*, which are enumerated with general correctness. Their *unique* character and circumstances are admirably enforced: their *publicity*; *simplicity* of performance; uniform *beneficence*; the *transmission* of the power to others; and, lastly, their abundant *historical proof* (40–55). The literary character of the Christian records (their rusticity and solecisms), is briefly but ably noticed as anything but a prejudice to their truth (57–58); and the book closes with remarks on the reasons of the Incarnation; the nature of the Lord's Death in regard to his Deity; and an apostrophe to his benign character.

Book II. Objections are met, drawn from the uncertainty of opinion (4). On the other hand, the extent of human ignorance (a favourite topic with Arnobius) and the consequent call for humility and faith are well stated (7–10). Parallels are found in Plato to the tenets of a Resurrection and a Gehenna (13–14); and the rest of the book is occupied mainly with the nature of the soul, which is concluded to be not immortal though in all cases to outlast the body; in the case of the saved to be gifted with immortality by God, with whom nothing is impossible; to draw its origin not from God himself, but perhaps from some unknown secondary power (36). Sin and imperfection (it is argued) forbid the thought of a direct generation or creation. Hence the argument passes to the origin of evil (54), which problem is firmly and eloquently dismissed as beyond our knowledge. In the same way other like questions are laid entirely aside; and the reader is pressed to leave such hopeless snares, in obedience (it is said) to a direct command of Christ, for the instant question of salvation (61–77). The objection that Christians are afflicted in spite of their creed is met by the assertion that they have no promise of temporal bliss.

Book III. The attack on paganism here begins. It is asked, whence the knowledge of the Gods is drawn? Their sexes, corporeity, mechanic attributes, &c., are considered and followed up

into their details and results as an argument *ex absurdo*. The contradictions of the legends are lastly noticed; and it is well shewn how fatal is the uncertainty they involve as to the reality of worship.

Book IV. The argument proceeds on the same plan, viz. the pursuit of the mythology into its details and results. To the plea that the *theologi* are to blame, it is replied that they are the only source of information. A rationalist explanation only leaves the dilemma that either gods or men are vile. It is worse to think thus of gods than to miss a step in ritual. Again, if the classical *poets* are the source of the evil, their writings should be visited by law, like an eloquent libel. The acted blasphemies of the theatres are lastly exposed.

Book V. This book is mainly engaged with the dissection of some of the legends, e.g. the colloquy of Jupiter and Numas, and the hideous fables of Aedestis and Baubo. To such a creed, to such rites, the Christian was to be driven at the sword's point! The book concludes with an exposure of the attempt to excuse all by a symbolical explanation. The theory (it is urged) fails to explain the *details* of the legend; and it is a strange process to convey, e.g., a lesson of purity through an allegory grossly impure.

Books VI.-VII. The charges against the Christians of their lack of temples, images, altars, incense, &c., are retorted by a discussion in detail of the total discord (in Arnobius's view) between all such tributes and the idea of a divine nature. Thus, *temples* are argued to imply a need of shelter, or a material locality, in the tutelar; *images* to be useless, unless it be held that the unseen being is imprisoned in them; *sacrifices*, to be a declaration that the Deity has appetite or a mutable will. Finally, it being fully granted that history presents instances of accepted and answered sacrifice, &c., it is boldly asserted that the worshipped beings are not gods; that is, answer no definition of the divine nature; but must be alien and evil powers, *daemones*.

The whole work closes somewhat hurriedly with a brief contrast between the Pagan and Christian belief as to beings divine (*genus divinum*), and with the question, *which party* are the atheists and blasphemers?

Such is the scheme and process of the *Disputationes*. We may supplement this abstract with a notice of some of the leading features in the opinions of Arnobius, and of the state of his Christian knowledge, indicated by his own words.

Of *God*, he speaks in the noblest and fullest language of adoration. His existence is assumed (i. 33) as a postulate in the argument. He is the first cause; the Father and Lord of things; foundation of all; author of only good; unborn; omnipresent; infinite, incorporeal; passionless; shrouded in light; to be known only as the Ineffable (see especially i. 31). Arnobius hesitates, however, over the details of creation; thinking apparently that alike the human soul and the lower animals—insects and reptiles—are the work of some intermediate creator (ii. 36, 47).

Of the *Lord Jesus Christ* he uses the most glowing language. As a *man* He is the supreme philosopher and teacher, both of nature and religion. But He is also *God*: "Deus re certâ: Deus, homo tamen natus; Deus interiorum potentiarum; Deus sublimis; radice ex intima; ab

incognitis regnis; sospitator, ab omnium principe missus;" His *pontificium* is to give salvation to the soul; He is the only path to light; His followers alone are saved; He is stronger than fate. Some doubt may, perhaps, be thrown over the extent of these ascriptions of deity by the vague language with which Arnobius speaks of the gods (see below). But with every deduction they are magnificent, and at least lie in the direction of the fullest orthodoxy. The allusions to the incarnation, life, and death of the Redeemer are numerous. The former is somewhat vaguely described as the assumption of a *man* to the *self*, the God; its motive was the presentation of the God to human senses, and the general performance of Christ's mission. His resurrection and the subsequent appearances are insisted upon; it is asserted (apparently) that He still appears to the faithful. To the Second Advent there is at most only a doubtful allusion (i. 39). (See generally, i. 36-65; ii. 60).

On the origin of the *Soul* he is far more speculative than is his wont. Its sin, imperfection, and inborn infirmity (he holds) forbid the belief that it comes direct from the supreme cause. It cannot for the like reasons be immortal (i.e. absolutely and *per se*); it outlives the body, but depends wholly on the gift of God for eternal duration. After death there awaits the evil, a second death, a Gehenna of unquenchable fire, in which gradually they are consumed and annihilated (see especially ii. 15-54).

The resurrection of the flesh is emphatically asserted, but in somewhat obscure terms (ii. 13).

Of the existence of *Gods* he speaks with much ambiguity. The actual objects of heathen worship he concludes from the nature of their mythology and ritual to be real but evil beings. But he nowhere denies that there exist also *dii boni*; only he views them (if *existent*) as mere reflexes of the supreme nature, and as in no sense distinct objects of worship and prayer. In worshipping the Supreme (he argues), we worship by implication—if to be worshipped they are—such gods as are gods indeed.

On the nature and efficacy of *prayer*, he uses perplexing language. His belief apparently is that in the present life all externals are fixed by an immoveable destiny (vii. 10); that prayer is useful only as a means of divine communion; but again describes the prayers of the Christian Church as petitions for peace and pardon for all classes of mankind; the emperor, the magistrate, the armies, &c. (iv. 36). Prayer is regarded as (in some sense not specified) efficacious for the dead (l.c.). Arnobius asserts the "freedom of the will;" God calls man "non vi sed gratiâ" (ii. 64).

In the latter books his arguments against heathen sacrifices are so managed as logically to exclude altogether the sacrifices both of the Jewish temple and of the Cross. Of idol-worship and incense he speaks in terms which prove that he can have known nothing of images, or incense, or a local presence, in the *conventicula* of the Christians.

Of the Holy Scriptures Arnobius appears to have known very little indeed as a reader. The acute remarks he makes (i. 58) on the rude style of the evangelists is the nearest approach to evidence that he had opened the N. T. One text alone (1 Cor. iii. 19) he quotes *verbatim*;

but even this is introduced as *illud vulgatum* (ii. 6). He enumerates more than one apocryphal miracle as evangelical (i. 46, 53); he knows nothing of any promise of temporal happiness (ii. 76); he confuses the Pharisees with the Sadducees (iii. 12). Of the O. T. he was apparently quite ignorant. In one passage (iii. 10) he even seems to speak of it with disrespect; though the passage has been explained of the Rabbinical books. In many places he shews by implication a total ignorance of the national election and the ritual of the Jews (to whom he scarcely alludes at all), and of the Scriptural prophecies and chronology. These phenomena are, of course, in great measure accounted for by the alleged circumstances of the composition of the work. We may observe that they render the more remarkable the faintness of that tinge of Gnosticism which appears in its pages. Obviously, however, the authority of Arnobius on points of Christian doctrine is reduced almost *ad nihilum* by these indications; and we can hardly wonder that in the 5th century he was banished by Pope Gelasius to the *apocryphal* Index.

Critical opinions on the merits of Arnobius have been very various. St. Jerome's verdict varies between praises of his *libri luculentissimi* and censure of his defects as *inaequalis, nimius, confusus*, in style, method, and doctrine. After the censure of Gelasius an almost total oblivion seems to have followed him till the revival of letters. Among his earlier subsequent critics, the Leyden editor (1051) speaks with enthusiasm of his eloquence, reasoning, and antiquarian treasures (quoted by Orellius, ap. Migne, v. 291). J. C. Orellius (*l.c.*) confirms this verdict. Cave (*Lives of the Fathers*) notices the fact (a most natural one) that his strength in defence is less than in attack; but bestows high praise upon his learning, ardour, method, and wit. Dr. Woodham (in his edition of Tertullian's *Apology*, preliminary Essays, ed. 1850) protests against the obscurity and neglect which have attended his name; holds that his "peculiar position and character invest his sentiments and reasoning with very singular interest and value;" pronounces him to be in some respects "the keenest of the Apologists;" and, above the rest, to be remarkably apposite on the whole to the popular arguments of modern times, and thus describes his style: "Arnobius has some resemblance to Apuleius, his descriptions are of the most astonishing luxuriance, they wander through page after page with all kinds of rhetorical embellishments, he has very frequent examples of a certain involution; but the general arrangement of his sentences and periods is remarkably constant, so that after an attentive perusal of a few chapters the reader may know exactly where to expect the epithets and the verbs, and precisely anticipate the rhythm and the cadence" (pp. 21, 29, 52, 53).

To the whole of this verdict we subscribe. Arnobius presents as a *man* a mind and character combining much ardour with much common sense. His sincerity is eminently manifest. He has apprehended to a degree nowhere and never common the great fact of human ignorance. As a *writer*, he appears as the practised and facile, but not very fanciful, rhetorician of his time and country; and is even a master and model

of that peculiar style of a declining age which consists in a subtle *medium* between the dictions of poetry and of prose.

As a storehouse of old Latinity and of allusions to points of antiquity—to heathen mythology and ceremonial; to law, education, and amusements—his work is of the greatest interest and importance.

Besides the extant work, he wrote also at least a treatise in one book, *De Rhetoricâ Institutione*, which is entirely lost. The *Commentarii in Psalmos*; *Annotaciones in quosdam Evangelistarum locos*; and *Conflictus Arnobii Catholici cum Serapione Aegyptio de Deo Trino et Uno*, belong to another author and later age.

The *Disputationes* themselves were long out of sight. Erasmus believed them to have perished. At present their text depends wholly upon two MSS., of which (I.) is in the Imperial Library at Paris (No. 1661). It belongs to the 9th or 10th century; was transcribed probably in Italy; and contains the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix as an 8th book, an error not discovered until the year 1582. The MS. appears to have been once the private property of Faustus Sabaeus Brixianus, librarian of the Vatican, and first editor of Arnobius; to have been obtained by him from some northern monastery, and to have been presented by him to Francis I. of France. This MS. is quoted as *Codex Regius or Parisinus*. (II.) Is known as *Codex Bruzelliensis*, once deposited at Brussels, now at Dijon (Burgundia) (No. D, 6851). It appears to be a transcript of (I.), executed in the 11th or 12th century. The text is imperfect and corrupt.

The text, thus in fact depending on one MS., is in detail uncertain. There are but few *main* passages, however, affected, of which the chief are ii. 1, and vi. 41; at which latter a large spurious section seems to have been inserted.

Of *Editions* of Arnobius the following may be enumerated: (1) Romae, 1543, ed. Faustus Sabaeus Brixianus (owner of Codex Regius, as is most probable). (2) Basileae, 1546, ed. Sigism. Gelenius. The editor deals much in ingenious emendation. (3) Antwerpiae, 1582, ed. The. Canterus. (4) Romae, 1583, editio posterior, a Fulvio Ursino. In this and (3) simultaneously appears the discovery of the true authorship of the *Octavius*. (5) Lugduni-Batav., 1651. A variorum edition; the text emended by Salmasius, who died before his commentary was ready. (6) Lipsiae, 1816, ed. J. C. Orellius. Excellent for a full and learned commentary. (7) Halis Saxonum, 1844, ed. G. F. Hildebrand. (8) Parisiis, 1844, in J. P. Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*. The most convenient of the editions, containing in its apparatus the long and brilliant *prolegomena* of the Benedictine Le Nourry. (9) Lipsiae, 1846, ed. F. Oehler, in Gersdorffii Biblioth. Patr. Eccl. Selecta. A wholly critical edition, with short but clear *prolegomena*. There is a *monograph* upon Arnobius's work, by P. K. Meyer, Hauniae, 1815.

An edition by *Ernstius*, Hauniae, 1726, may be specially mentioned, as said to contain corrections copied by the editor from a recension of an independent but unknown MS.

(Authorities: Arnobius, edd. Migne and Oehler; Cave, *Lives of the Fathers*; Bingham's *Antiquities*; Tertullian's *Apologia*, ed. Woodham.

[H. C. G. M.]

ARNOBIUS (commonly known as **ARNOBIUS JUNIOR**, to distinguish him from the preceding), a presbyter, or possibly bishop, of Gaul. The dates of his birth and death are unknown; but he is presumed, from internal evidence of his writings, to have lived at least as late as A.D. 460.

Authorities.—The only external notices seem to be those of Venerable Bede, who praises Arnobius's *Commentary on the Psalms*, and of Alcuin, the distinguished preceptor of Charlemagne, who makes favourable allusions to him as the author of the *Altercation with Serapion*, in a letter addressed to Flavius Merius, and in the sixth book of his treatise *Contra Felicem Urgelitanum*. The internal evidence is based upon the *Commentarium in Psalmos*, the notes on some passages of the Gospels, and the *Altercatio cum Serapione*. The *Commentary* and *Altercation* may both be found in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima* (tom. viii.), published at Lyons in 1677: but the contents of the two chief works render it very difficult to believe that the same person was author of both.


Works.—The *Commentary on the Psalms* is avowed by its author, who dedicates it to Leontius, bishop of Arles, and to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne. The comments are pointed, but brief, being frequently not much longer than the psalm commented upon. They are not critical, but interpret everything as referring to Christ and the Church. The tone is devout and practical. They are however accused of a semi-Pelagian tendency; and a very learned writer, whose *Historia Ecclesiastica* appeared about A.D. 1686, Natalis Alexander, invites special attention to remarks of Arnobius upon Psalms l. ciii. cviii. and cxxvi. (in the Hebrew and the A. V., li. civ. &c.). But Nat. Alexander was a Jansenist; and it is by no means clear that anti-Jansenist writers, such as the Bollandists, would not maintain that the majority of the above-named comments were capable of an orthodox interpretation. It must however be allowed that the author of the *Commentary* is anti-Augustinian; as on Ps. cviii. (cix.) 16, 17, he speaks of the *heresy*, "quae dicit Deum aliquos praeordinasse ad benedictionem, alios ad maledictionem." [Previous editions are those of Basel (1552), Cologne (1532), and Paris (1639). The last is reproduced in the *Bibl. Patr. Mac.* The Paris editor, Laurence de la Barre, had ascribed the work to the elder Arnobius; an evident anachronism, for the author must have lived after the rise and condemnation of the Eutychian heresy.]

The *Altercatio cum Serapione* (previously published at Cologne, 1595, under the editorship of Franciscus Feuardentius) is a dialogue, which is represented as having been held between Arnobius and Serapion, in the presence of two chosen judges, named Constantius and Ammonius. Serapion by turns plays the part of a Sabellian, an Arian, and a Pelagian, and is gradually driven from each position. Although the book gives the idea of either a fictitious contest, or else a very one-sided report of a real debate, yet considerable learning is displayed, and a clear apprehension of the points at issue, combined with much real ingenuity of argument. The circumstance of Arnobius being the chief speaker does not of course prove that the authorship is his, any more than the position of Socrates in certain of the Platonic dialogues would prove that

Socrates wrote them. Moreover, just as we cannot make Socrates responsible for all that Plato has put into his mouth, so neither can Arnobius *junior* be justly credited with the tenets here ascribed to him by some unknown author. Both the style and tone of the *Altercation* seem different from that of the *Commentary*: and though there is in both works a consentient rejection of the errors condemned in the first four general councils, yet it is hardly possible that an author of semi-Pelagian leanings, who had stigmatized predestinarian doctrine as a heresy, should declare, as Arnobius is made to do towards the conclusion of the *Altercatio cum Serapione*, that "he accepts and defends the *dicta* of St. Augustine concerning Pelagianism, as if they were the most hallowed writings of the Apostles (ac si sacratissima Apostolorum scripta)."

The Notes on some passages of the Gospels, which seem really to belong to Arnobius *junior*, are given in the edition of L. de la Barre, and separately in an earlier edition by G. Cognans (Basel, 1543). Of the events of our author's life we are wholly ignorant. [J. G. C.]

ARNULFUS, later, and less accurately, **ARNULPHUS** (Fr. *Arnoul*), St., bishop of Metz, and founder of the second or Carolingian race of kings, was born about 580, near Nancy. His parentage has been traced back to the stock of Clothaire I., but this only can be stated with certainty, that it was undoubtedly noble. His connexion with the Carolingians will be seen by the subjoined table:—



Arnulf was introduced to the court of Theodebert II. of Austrasia by Gundulf, Mayor of the Palace. He soon rose to high favour and positions of trust with the king. In his secular life he combined great exactness in duty with devotion and rigid self-discipline. In 609, under the pressure of his friends, he married Doda, a person recommended alike by nobility, wealth, and piety. Shortly after giving birth to her second son, she retired into a nunnery at Treves, where she ended her life. Arnulf remaining at court, became intimate with St. Romaric and had planned with him a seclusion at the monastery of Lerins, but they were detained by the war between Theodebert and Thierry of Burgundy, resulting in the defeat of the former, and when at length Clothaire of Neustria had united Austrasia under his single rule, he was too sensible of Arnulf's administrative power to allow him to prosecute his resolution. The date of his elevation to the bishopric of Metz, vacant by the death of Pappulus (610), has been disputed. Mabillon, whom Baillet follows, fixes it in 614, under Clothaire, but the best authorities (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. 693) assert that St. Arnulf was made bishop under Theodebert, who died in 612. It was forced upon him while

still a layman, but his virtues as a bishop did not yield to those which had made him conspicuous in earlier life. His liberality to the poor is especially noticed. It was so unbounded as often to impoverish him seriously. It is said that once to supply means for almsgiving he sold to a courtier named Hugh a heavy silver dish, the property of his church. On the sudden death of its new owner it was carried to the king, who returned it to Arnulf with a hundred gold pieces. His rigour towards himself was in proportion to this generosity. Though at times he retired to the solitudes near Dodigny, he longed for entire seclusion from the world. With this view he wrote to Clothaire, asking that another bishop might be appointed to his see; but the king, so far from accepting his resignation, compelled him, about 622, to act as chief minister and adviser to his son Dagobert, whom he had associated with himself in the government of Austrasia. In this capacity he succeeded in bringing to justice some offenders of high rank. In 625 St. Arnulf attended the Council of Rheims held under Sonnatius. In 626 Clothaire reluctantly gave the permission which he had hitherto withheld, but Dagobert, a hot-tempered youth, at first threatened the saint with personal violence. Arnulf's firmness, which was more than a match for the passion of a prince, was moved by the importunate tears of a crowd of suppliants who depended for their support on his alms. He commended them to the care of his successor and kinsman St. Goeric or Abbo, and retired with St. Romaric to his castle at Habend in the Vosges, the famous monastery of Remiremont. Hence he went with a few monks to a deep solitude called Horemberg, where he occupied himself till his death in performing the most menial offices for some lepers. He breathed his last with expressions of the deepest penitence on August 16, 640, according to Siebert of Gemblours, but the year is not quite certain (see *Boll.* p. 431, or *Gall. Chr.* p. 696). St. Romaric conveyed the body to Remiremont, whence scarcely a year later (on July 16) it was translated by St. Goeric and the bishops of Toul and Verdun (several miracles on the way bearing witness to its sanctity) to Metz, where it was laid in the suburban church of the Holy Apostles, made over in 941 to Benedictine monks, which being destroyed in 1553 during the siege of Metz by Charles V., the relics were transferred to the new monastery within the city, where they are enclosed in a silver case. For a full account of this monastery, see *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 893-898. St. Arnulf's *cultus* has always been widely spread in France. The Carolingians seem to have regarded him with the mixed veneration due to tutelar Saint and feudal Lord. The *Annales Mettenses* in Du Chesne, iii. 263, assert that he used to be held the principal patron of the Franks before God and man, while the "Poeta Saxo" (Pertz, i. 269), after describing with some vigour his principal acts, continues—

Nunc ovat in caelis, praebens miracula terris
Sublimis meriti signa decora sui:
Indeque nostrorum totam seriem dominorum
Stirpem nempe suam protegit atque fovet.

Charles, the greatest of his descendants, was the next person on whom by the general suffrage of the Franks, with greater claims to popular hero-worship, with far less to actual saintliness, this

patronage of the nation devolved. (See Bryce, *H. R. E.* p. 83.)

We are fortunate in possessing trustworthy materials for the history of St. Arnulf. By far the most valuable of the two lives given by the Bollandists (pp. 435-445) is the first, written by an anonymous contemporary author. A supplementary notice by Paul the Deacon (*ibid.* p. 446) gives, as he received it from the mouth of Charles, the anecdote of the saint's ring. While still a layman he was standing on a bridge which crossed the Moselle, when being struck with deep compunction for his past sins, he took a ring from his finger and threw it into the river, saying that if the ring should ever return to him he would accept it as a token that God had forgiven him. Some years after, when he was bishop, the ring was found in a fish which the cook was preparing for his evening meal. It is still preserved in St. Stephen's Church, says Mabillon, and shewn on his festival, August 16th, with some religious ceremonies (*Nouvelle Biog. Gén.*). The best authorities for St. Arnulf are Mabillon, *Act. SS. o. s. B.* ii. 149-157, ed. 1669; *Act. SS. Boll.* Jul. iv. 423-447; Bouquet, *Recueil*, iii. see Index, p. 763; *Gall. Chr.* xiii. 692-697; Baillet, *Vies d. Saints*, Août, 253-258 (with several inaccuracies); *Nouvelle Biog. Gén.* [C. D.]

ARRHENIUS (Ἀρρήνιος) appears in Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 45, as the bishop intruded into the see of Jerusalem after the second deposition of Cyril. The name is spelt 'Herennius'; *Epérvios*, by Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. 30; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, calls him Irenaeus. [E. V.]

ARRHETUS (Iren. 55 f.) [VALENTINUS]: (*ib.* 54) [EPIPHANES]: (*ib.* 74) [MARCUS, Gnostic.] [H.]

ARSACIUS, the intruding archbishop of Constantinople, after the violent expulsion of Chrysostom (A.D. 404). He was the brother of Nectarius, Chrysostom's predecessor, and had served as archpresbyter under Chrysostom (*Phot. C.* 59). In earlier life his brother had selected him for the bishopric of Tarsus, and had attributed his refusal to an ambitious design of becoming his successor at Constantinople. On this, Palladius asserts, he swore voluntarily that he would never accept the see of Constantinople; his intrusion into Chrysostom's chair being thus rendered still more culpable by the sin of perjury (*Pallad. c.* xi.). If Arsacius had really entertained the ambitious views attributed to him by his brother the day for their realization must have seemed long gone by, when, after he had passed his 80th year, the success of the base intrigue of Eudoxia and Theophilus against Chrysostom opened an unexpected way for his elevation to the archiepiscopal throne. Eudoxia and the party now triumphant wanted for their new archbishop a facile tool, who, without initiating any decided course of his own, would sanction any measures they might think necessary; whose name would give weight to their actions, and under whose authority they might shelter the violence of their proceedings. Such an instrument they had ready to their hand in Arsacius. His reputation for piety, and clerical virtues, rendered such an appointment sufficiently decorous; while the sweetness and gentleness of his disposition, and the acquiescent indolence of his

character secured for it a degree of popularity. Apathetic and taciturn—Palladius (*u. s.*) says he was “as mute as a fish, and as incapable of action as a frog”—neither the warmth of his feelings, nor the violence of his language were likely to lead him into trouble. Whatever he might have been in his youth, at his advanced age he was little more than a necessary ornamental appendage to be wheeled into such positions, and manœuvred in such a manner as might suit the tactics of the party which put him forward. His hostility to Chrysostom, which would have been soon awakened by the silent reproach cast on his brother Nectarius by the contrast between the private and official life of the two archbishops, and stimulated by the superior popularity testified by the new-comer, had been sufficiently grafted at the synod of the Oak, when he appeared as a witness against Chrysostom on the charge of illegally making away with the property of the Church, and other counts, and vehemently pressed his condemnation. All essential requirements seemed to centre in the old man, and Eudoxia’s all-powerful influence nominated him to the see to which he was consecrated June 27, 404. Chrysostom on hearing of it denounced him, “as a spiritual adulterer, and a wolf in sheep’s clothing” (*Ep. cxxv.*) Notwithstanding the influence of the court party, the diocese soon made it unmistakably plain that they regarded the new archbishop as an intruder, illegally usurping the place of their much-beloved spiritual father. The churches once so thronged became empty: with the exception of a few officials, the dependants of the court party, and the expectants of royal favour, the people of Constantinople refused to worship with the usurper, or to attend any religious assembly at which he might be expected to be present. Deserting the sacred edifices, they gathered together in the outskirts of the city, and held their religious assemblies in the open air. Stung by the desertion of his flock, Arsacius with petulant weakness appealed to the emperor. By his orders, or rather those of Eudoxia, by whom the weak Arcadius was completely governed, soldiers were sent to disperse the suburban assemblies. Brutal violence was employed, especially towards females, in the execution of their commission. Those who had taken a leading part in the assemblies were apprehended and tortured, and a fierce persecution commenced of the adherents of Chrysostom, rivalling in its horrors those which the Christians themselves had suffered at the hands of heathen rulers (see EUTROPIUS, OLYMPIAS). We learn from Sozomen (*H. E. viii. 23*) that Arsacius was not personally responsible for these foul and cruel deeds. But he lacked strength of character to offer any decided opposition to the proceedings of his clergy. They did what they pleased, and Arsacius bore the blame. So Arsacius’ position became more and more intolerable. It was in vain that all the bishops and clergy who embracing Chrysostom’s cause had refused to recognize him were driven out of the East (Nov. 18, 404). This only spread the evil more widely. The whole Western episcopate refused to acknowledge him, and with one consent abstained from writing to congratulate him on his appointment. Pope Innocent himself, who had warmly espoused Chrysostom’s interests, wrote to the clergy and laity of Constantinople strongly condemning the

intrusion of Arsacius, and exhorting them to persevere in their adhesion to their true archbishop (*Soz. H. E. vi. 22, 26*). It is no cause for surprise that Arsacius’ episcopate was a brief one, and that a feeble character worn out by old age should have soon given way before a storm of opposition so universal, and, he must have painfully felt, so deserved. He died Nov. 11, 405. (*Soz. H. E. vi. 19; Soz. H. E. viii. 23, 26; Photius, C. 59; Palladius, Dial. c. xi.; Chrys. Ep. cxxv.*) [E. V.]

ARSENIUS, called the Great, one of the most famous of the monks of Egypt. He was of high Roman family; born probably in 354. By one account, he was a deacon of the Roman Church; but this, on the whole, is not probable. He was deeply read in Greek literature. About 383, Theodosius the Great being desirous of finding a suitable instructor for his sons Arcadius and Honorius, the elder of whom was then about six years old, Arsenius was recommended to him, it is said, by the Roman bishop,^a and in this way came into the service of the best of the Christian Caesars. He is said to have been godfather, as well as tutor, of the young princes; hence he was sometimes spoken of as “Father of sovereigns,” as they “obtained from the tenderness of the father the title of Augustus” (*Gibbon, c. 27: cf. c. 29*). The story that on one occasion Theodosius expressed his displeasure at finding them seated while their teacher stood, has every appearance of truth; but that he thereupon deprived them of the imperial ornaments looks like a rhetorical amplification. The time that Arsenius spent at the court—enjoying high consideration, and surrounded by luxurious splendour, attended on by “slaves in silken garments and golden girdles”—came to an end when he was forty years old, in 394. It has been said that the immediate cause of his retirement was the boyish spite of Arcadius, whom he had had occasion to chastise, and who plotted against his life; but this may be considered doubtful. Arsenius may have cherished for some time the resolution to retire from the world, in order to “cleanse his soul,” as he himself expresses it, and the purpose was probably strengthened by the apparently incurable vices of the imperial court life. Theodosius was a prince to be admired and loved: but a thoughtful and high-souled Roman Christian, living under the ascendancy of Rufinus, might not unnaturally be impelled towards monastic seclusion by sheer disgust and despair as to the prospects of so-called Christian society. He gave up his charge, in obedience, as he said, to a voice which bade him “fly from men, if he would be safe.” It was one more instance of a choice, which we may now think ill-advised, which may seem to us little better than the abandonment of an appointed post, the withdrawal of gifts which might have contributed to the moral recovery of many, at least, in “Caesar’s household:” but the passion for solitary self-discipline was then at its height, and the corruptions of secular life were soon to

^a Gratian himself is said by Metaphrastes (whom Fleury follows) to have been applied to by Theodosius. But in that year (which seems to be required by the chronology of Arsenius’ life) Gratian was at Paris until his flight from Maximus, which was soon followed by his death.

task all Chrysostom's energies, and in a few years to work his overthrow.

Arsenius sailed for Egypt. Arriving at the monastic wilderness of Scetis, he begged the clergy there to put him in the way of salvation by making him a monk. His aspect and speech betrayed his high condition; but he represented himself as a poor humble stranger seeking to be saved. Then, the story proceeds—and it is characteristic of the time and the place—they took him to abbot John Colobus (the Dwarfish), who invited them to a meal: Arsenius was kept standing while they sat; a biscuit was flung to him, which he ate in a kneeling posture. "He will make a monk," said John; and Arsenius staid with him until he had learned enough of the monastic life from John's teaching, and then established himself, as a hermit, in Scetis, where he continued forty years. Arcadius is said to have granted him the tribute of all Egypt for the relief of the poor and of the monasteries: the answer ascribed to him was that one who was dead to the world could have no concern in the distribution of money, just as he rejected a senator's legacy with the remark, "I had died before him." Early in his sojourn, the Mazici, a tribe of barbarians, invaded Scetis for the first time: he passed, says the narrative of Metaphrastes, through their bands, unobserved and uninjured. About this time, also, when he was in the first ardour of monastic severities, two monks were received by him with absolute silence—by another eminent recluse, abbot Moses, with cordial welcome. A monk, perplexed at the dissimilar conduct of two holy men, was said to have seen, in a dream or vision, two great boats on the Nile: in one was Arsenius, with the Spirit of God—in another, Moses, fed with honey by angels. For a time he retained some little external habits foreign to the ways of a monk; they were laid aside in consequence of a delicately given intimation. His love of solitude became intense; the inward voice had seemed to bid him "be silent, be quiet," if he would keep innocency; one visitor he even drove away with stones; he discouraged the visits of Theophilus the archbishop: and one of the most curious anecdotes in his life is that of the high-born Roman lady who visited him during one of his occasional sojourns outside the desert, and whose request to be remembered in his prayers was met by the brusque expression of a hope that he might be able to forget her. She complained, in her distress, to Theophilus, who reminded her that she was "a woman;" but assured her that "the old man would pray for her soul." Whenever he came into a church,^b he hid himself behind a pillar: he even shrank at times from his brother-hermits, remarking that the ten thousands of angels had but one will, but men had many; to a monk who, as he could not fast or labour, thought of visiting the sick, he said, "Eat, drink, sleep, do no work—but stay in your cell." But with all his sternness—which was coupled with more than the usual monastic austerities in regard to poor and scanty food, and

a brief allowance of sleep, and also with what a mediaeval collect in his memory called his "ceaseless floods of tears" (his "sudarium" was ever at hand)—Arsenius could be cordial, and even tender. After once separating himself from two of his friends and disciples, he returned to them "as the dove to the ark." He would not see two kinsmen of the archbishop; but he afterwards told them that he had neither eaten nor drunk till he had heard of their safe return home. He took a monk of incurably thievish habits into his own cell, in the vain attempt to reclaim him. One story illustrates the feeling entertained in the monastic mind—especially at Scetis (see Fleury, b. 21, c. 1)—against the name of Origen. An old man comes to abbot Lot, is kindly treated, but begins to utter "sermones Origenis." Arsenius is consulted, and gives his advice: "Do not drive him away, but say to him, See, here are God's gifts—eat and drink as you will, only do not utter those words." Young monks, if they offended, he would never exclude from communion, lest they should be rendered obstinate. His humility was worthy of a follower of Antony: when he was ill, and lacked a shirt, he accepted money given him to purchase one, and thanked God that he was accounted worthy to receive alms in His name. He and another abbot are spoken of as conspicuous for their dislike of praise. He refrained even from expounding Scripture: his self-depreciation knew no bounds. He was heard to cry aloud in his cell, "Forsake me not, O God! I have done no good in Thy sight, but, in Thy goodness, grant me to make a beginning." (Compare Ignatius, "Now I begin to be a disciple.") There was a shrewdness in his judgments of character: he would not see some monks who asked admission; their real object, he said, was to go on to the Thebaid for flax. A very famous saying of his referred to faults of the tongue: "Often have I been sorry for having spoken—never for having been silent." The Exhortation to Monks, ascribed to him, and published in Greek by Combefis (*Gr. Patr. Auctarium*, i. 301—the Latin version had been published by Servius, and both are in Galland, *Biblioth.* vii. 427), exhibits the results of deep spiritual experience. It warns the monk not to forget that his great work is not the cleansing of the outer life, but of the inner man: spiritual sins, not carnal only, have to be conquered; many a good action has, through the temper's subtlety, become the door to unexpected evil; many who have thought their battle with sin accomplished have relapsed through the perilous hearing of other men's sin: in short, "we must keep guard all round." He could give very definite and practical counsel: "Seek God, and He will appear to you: hold Him fast, and He will abide with you." "Whenever a man has fallen into sin, if he will but say heartily, 'Lord God, I have sinned, forgive me!' the soul-wasting power of melancholy will cease." Of impure thoughts he said, "Do not parley with them: do not answer them, but rise up, pray, make an act of repentance, and say, 'Son of God, have mercy on me.'"

In 434, Arsenius left Scetis, driven forth by the second irruption of the Mazici. He staid at Troe, near Memphis, until 444; then spent three years at the little island (not the city) of Canopus; returned to Troe, and there spent the

^b The monastic anecdotes represent the holy solitaries as zealously devout towards all church ordinances. Arsenius is said to have told a story of a monk who did not believe in the real presence, until a vision (like that in the story of "St. Gregory's mass") convinced him. (Cotelier, l. 421.)

two remaining years of his long monastic life. When very near his end (A.D. 449-450) he was seen weeping. "Are you, then, Father, afraid?" asked the monks. "Truly," said the old man, "the fear that is with me in this hour has been with me ever since I became a monk."

The Greek Church honours him, as "our Father, Arsenius the Great," on May 8: the Latin, on July 19. See the Bollandists for that day. They consider the life of him by Metaphrastes (ap. Surium de probatis SS. historiis iv. 250) inferior in value and authority to an earlier one, which they give, and which is ascribed by them to Theodore of the Studium. Cotelierus (*Eccl. Gr. Monum.* i. 353) includes many sayings of his among the "Apophtegmata Patrum." (Fleury, l. c.; Tillemont, xiv. 676.) [W. B.]

ARSESIUS (Arsisius) a monk of Nitria, contemporary, but survivor of, St. Antony (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 7, 117). He is styled "great" by Sozomen (*Hist.* vi. 30) and by Nicephorus (*Hist.* xi. 37). [I. G. S.]

ARSINOUS. Near the end of the Muratorian fragment on the Canon we read *Arsinoi autem seu Valentini vel Mitiades* (Miltiadiis) nihil in totum recipimus (-imus). The whole passage is grievously corrupt. No other record exists of a heretic called Arsinoous. The name has been referred to Valentinus himself, an Egyptian by birth (so Simon de Magistris, quoted by Routh, *R. S. i.* 431), or to some other heretic supposed to be recognised in the 2nd century as "the Arsinoite" (δ 'Αρσινωίτης, δ 'Αρσινωεύς) from the Egyptian name of Arsinoe. Credner, who makes the latter suggestion (*Gesch. d. N. T. Kanon*, 166 f.), observes that an allusion in Hippolytus (*Haer.* v. 14) to Πτολεμαῖος δ 'Αρσινῶς would be available here if the Valentinian Ptolemaeus could be the Ptolemaeus intended. His editor Volkmar eagerly adopts as a certainty the unwillingly abandoned conjecture. Unfortunately the Peratae, as quoted by Hippolytus, certainly meant either Ptolemy Soter, son of Arsinoe Philip's concubine, or Ptolemy Philadelphus, brother and husband of a more famous Arsinoe: the other associated names are Didyme (evidently the Egyptian concubine of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Athen. xiii. 576 ε), Cleopatra, and Olympias. But indeed the personal designations *Valentini* and *Miltiadiis* sufficiently exclude a geographical interpretation of *Arsinoi*. In an earlier work (*Zur Gesch. d. Kanons*, 91) Credner had conjectured *Bardesanis*: but, according to the best authorities, the great Syrian lived after the probable date of the fragment, and in any case he was not likely to be known to its author. *Marcioni* (-nis) comes nearer to the letters of the MS. (compare 'Αρσινωίτης for Βαρδανωίτης, Hipp. *Haer.* vi. 35); and two lines later we find *Marcioni* apparently out of place, possibly a marginal correction taken up into the text. Yet the reference may conceivably be to some comparatively obscure Arsinoous; the Miltiades of the same sentence is equally obscure, if he be not the Montanist known only from a quotation in Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 16), where the reading is not free from doubt. [H.]

ARTEMIS, or ARTHEMIUS, Martyr, a 'Praefectus Augustalis,' put to death as a martyr by Julian the Apostate (*Menol.* Oct. 20), but

for other reasons according to Amnian. Marcell. xii. 11: see also Theodoret *H. E.* iii. 18; Niceph. x. 35; Baron. Oct. 20. [A. W. H.]

ARTEMON, ARTEMONITES, belong to that class of ante-Nicene Monarchians, or Antitrinitarians, who saw in Christ a mere man filled with divine power. Of Artemon, or Artemas, we know very little. He taught in Rome at the end of the second and beginning of the third century, and was excommunicated by Pope Zephyrinus (202-217), who, as we learn from the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus, favoured the opposite error of Patripassianism. He declared the doctrine of the divinity of Christ to be an innovation dating from the time of Zephyrinus, the successor of Victor, and a relapse into heathen polytheism. He asserted that Christ was a mere man, but born of a virgin, and superior in virtue to the prophets. The Artemonites were charged with placing Euclid above Christ, and abandoning the Scriptures for dialectics and mathematics. This indicates a critical or sceptical turn of mind. The views of Artemon were afterwards more fully developed by Paul of Samosata, who is sometimes counted with the Artemonites. The sources of our fragmentary information are Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 28; Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxx. i. 4; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* ii. 4; Photius, *Biblioth.* 48. Cf. Schleiermacher's essay on the Sabellian and Athanasian conceptions of the Trinity (*Works*, vol. ii.), and Dörner's *Entwicklungsgeschichte der L. v. d. Person Christi*, 2nd ed. i. 508 ff. [P. S.]

ARVALDUS, a king of the Isle of Wight, whose sons having been captured by the king of Wessex at a place called Ad Lapidem, probably Stoneham, were condemned to death. Cyneriht, abbot of Hrentford, begged leave to baptize them before they were executed; and this having been done, the sentence was carried out (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 16). [S.]

ASCLEPAS or AESCULAPIUS, bishop of GAZA, warmly advocated the Nicene faith in the council of Tyre, A.D. 335, and was deposed by the Arian majority on the charge of having overturned an altar, Quintianus being appointed in his room. (Soz. iii. 8; Theod. *H. E.* i. 29.) He joined Athanasius and Marcellus in their appeal to Julius, bishop of Rome, and was with them restored to his see by the decree of Julius, A.D. 341. (Soz. iii. 8; Socr. ii. 15.) He appeared at the council of Sardica, A.D. 343, and it is stated in the "Synodical Letter" drawn up by the orthodox bishops at that council, that he there produced a report of what had taken place at Antioch, where in the presence of his accusers and Eusebius of Caesarea, he had been acquitted by the verdict of the assembled bishops (Theod. ii. 8; Athanas. *Apol.* §§ 47, 49; *Apolog. de Fuga*, § 3). Mention is made of a church erected by him at Gaza (Bolland. Feb. 26, *Vita S. Porphyrii*, n. 20, p. 648.) His name appears among the seventy bishops to whom Alexander addressed an encyclical letter against those who had received Arius (Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxxix. 4). [E. V.]

ASCLEPIADES, succeeded Serapion as ninth bishop of Antioch, and sat from A.D. 203 to A.D. 218 (Clinton, *F. R.*). Eusebius mentions him (*H. E.* vi. 11) as "having become conspicuous in the confessions during the time of the

persecution" (of Severus); and quotes a letter of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, speaking of the comfort it has been to him in his imprisonment to hear that one so well qualified as regards his faith had been entrusted with the episcopate of Antioch (*ib.*). He was succeeded by Philetus, A.D. 218 (Niceph. *H. E.* iii. 19, v. 26; Baronius *sub ann.* 203, 218). [E. V.]

ASCLEPIADES, bishop of TRAIRES, the reputed author of a letter to Peter the Fuller on the Trisagion, about A.D. 483. The letter is contained in the collections of the Councils (*e.g.* Labbe, *Conc.* v. 241, ed. Coleti); but the authenticity of the letter and the existence of Asclepiades are disputed: see Vales. *Obs. Eccl.* ad *Evagr.* i. 4; Le Quien, *Damasc.* Op. i. 478 sq.; and on the other side Pagi *Baron.* ad Ann. 485, no. 15. [L.]

ASCLEPIUS, a Marcionist bishop, suffered martyrdom by fire at Caesarea in Palestine Jan. 11, 308 or 9, in the persecution begun by Diocletian (Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 10 Gr.=p. 35 f. Curet.) [H.]

ASCODRUGITAE.—Under this name Philastrius (*Haer.* 75) describes a sect in Galatia, who set up and "covered" (cooperiunt) an inflated wine-skin in their churches, and danced wildly round it in Bacchanalian fashion, "like pagans dancing to father Liber." Again Jerome (*Com. in Gal.* ii. praef.) depicts as from personal observation (*scit mecum qui vidit*) the distraction of Ancyra, the capital of Galatia, by a variety of sects and doctrines, not merely the familiar Cataphrygians, Ophites, Borborites, and Manicheans, but Passalorhynchites, *Ascodrobi* (so at least the edd.), and Artotyrites; monstrous names unheard in "the Roman world." The letter belongs to 387, but the knowledge must have been gained in Jerome's journey through Galatia in 372 or 3. The two other sects here named stand next to the Ascodrugites in Philastrius, Galatia being specified as the home of the Artotyrites.

On the other hand Epiphanius (*Haer.* 416) states that *Tascodrugitae* was a name for either the Cataphrygians (Montanists) or the "Quintilliani," i.e. the Cataphrygians again under another title (R. A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellengesch. d. Epiph.* 230 f.). Ταρκός, he says, meant in their language a peg (πάσσαλος), and δροῦγγος a nose or beak (μυκτήρ εἶν' οὐν ῥύγχος). Hence "from their placing their forefinger on the nose in praying, to make a show of humility and exceeding righteousness, they were called by one 'Tascodrugitae,' that is, 'Passalorhynchites.'"

Lipsius (10–32) has proved that Philastrius, though possibly writing (not more than six years) after Epiphanius, i.e. after 375 (p. 404 A), had no acquaintance with any part of his work. The three accounts are then almost certainly independent. Now we find Jerome and Philastrius alike grouping together three sects as Galatian (Philastrius gives no country for his third sect). Thus a presumption arises in favour of Philastrius where he differs from Epiphanius. Even the improbable supposition that the two peculiar names differing by a single letter represent different sects will not reconcile the two detailed accounts, for Epiphanius makes the third name in Philastrius to be a translation of the

second, and both to denote the Cataphrygians. He writes, it must be observed, with conscious vagueness, evidently from a confused recollection of an oral report. He has the three names (Artotyrites 417 D) in common with the two Latin authors, but his information concerns only the Passalorhynchites. His reference of all three to the Cataphrygians, which is unsupported by other evidence, is probably due only to the need of finding some place for them in his work, the bare knowledge that they belonged to the Phrygian region, and the consequent temptation to associate them with another Phrygian heresy. In spite therefore of the etymology by which he endeavours to identify two of the names, his testimony must here be set aside as of no value.

This conclusion would probably have been reached long ago but for the apparent absurdity of the account given by Philastrius of his Ascodrugites, which no doubt looks at first sight like the fictitious embodiment of a conjectural derivation (ἀσκός, a wine-skin). Yet the rite which he describes may with better reason be thought a curious relic of the earlier worship of central Asia Minor. In the market-place of Celaenae, the ancient capital of southern Phrygia, at the source of the river Marsyas, had once been hung up what was said to be the skin of Marsyas whom Apollo flayed alive (Herod. vii. 26; Xenoph. *Anab.* i. 2 § 8; Aelian, *V. H.* xiii. 21; Ps. *Plut. de Fluv.* 10; *Stat. Theb.* iv. 186). Marsyas is well known to have been a divinity ("daemon" C. O. Müller) of the primitive Phrygian religion, invaded but not destroyed by the worship of Apollo, as is indicated in a legend told by Aelian (l.c.). He is called a Silenus by Herodotus (l.c.), Pausanias (i. 24; ii. 7), and perhaps Euphorion (ap. Ath. iv. 184 A); and a Satyr by Plato (*Symp.* 215 B), Suidas (s.v. Ὀλυμπος), and Statius (l.c.). The Phrygian worship extended over the region which after the Gallic immigration was known as Galatia, and its influence is perceptible in quite late times (cf. Lightfoot, *Galat.* 8 ff.). The persistence of primeval rites under a Christian guise in the 4th century is therefore probable enough. That the supposed skin of Marsyas may well have played a part in the Phrygian cult is shewn by a statement quoted by Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 190, p. 149 a 6) from Ptolemaeus Chennas, who wrote early in the 2nd century, that on the birthday of Marsyas (which was the feast of Apollo) the skins of all the animals sacrificed were solemnly hung up. The confusion with a wine-skin is easily explained. The skin of Marsyas is called ἀσκός by Herodotus and Pseudo-Plutarch, and "to flay to a wine-skin" (ἀσκήν δέρειν) was a Greek proverbial expression (Solon ap. *Plut. V. Sol.* 14; Aristoph. *Nub.* 441; *Plat. Euthyd.* 285 c); probably, as Plato seems to say, in allusion to this legend (Herod. iii. 9 is ambiguous). C. O. Müller indeed (*Proleg. Myth.* 113 f.) supposes that the object of worship at Celaenae was itself a wine-skin, the natural symbol of a Silenus, and that the other account of it arose with the Greek myth. This must, to say the least, remain doubtful. Philastrius has been understood as saying that his Ascodrugites grounded their practice on Matt. ix. 17; but he alone is responsible for the reference.

Though however the name did not originate the description of the sect, the converse is pro-

bably true in part. Epiphanius seems to have preserved in "Tascodrugitae" the genuine form, naturally corrupted by a Greek ear when the subject was a sect who did homage to an *Ascus*. A further step is seen in Augustine (*Haer.* 62), who, abbreviating Philastrius, gets rid of the unintelligible second element and writes *Ascitae*. Various other corruptions may be found in a note of Cotelier, *Mon. Eccl. Gr.* i. 774. The true etymology is obscure. *Δρογγος*, Lat. *drungus*, a common Byzantine word, was already in use for a small compact body of men (= *globus*: see Casaubon and Saumaise on *Vopisc. Prob.* 19); but it has no obvious meaning here. After all the appellation may be local, like 'Pepuzitae': Tasc- begins two Gallic names. Were it not for the express statements about the Passalorhynchites, their name too might be thought a second Greek corruption of "Tascodrugitae:" there is but one superfluous letter and one unusual substitution; the other changes are slight and common in uncial writing.

A fresh element of confusion would be introduced by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 9 f.) if his statements on these matters carried greater weight. He says that from the Marcosians sprang many sects, among which were those called by some *Ascodruti*, by others *Ascodrupitae* (T or Π for Γ). His account of their doctrines relates only to the sacraments and "redemption," and is evidently a clumsy summary of part of what Irenaeus (93 ff.=*Epiph. Haer.* 254 ff.) had written about the Marcosians. The combination, though not now explicable, is doubtless erroneous. Later Greek compilers either mix the reports of Epiphanius and Theodoret (*Timoth. de Rec. Haer.* in *Cotel. Mon. Eccl. Gr.* iii. 377 f.), or preserve them separately under different names (*Nicet. Thes.* iv. 7, 20).

A law of Theodosius in 383 (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 10), addressed to the "vicarius" of the Pontic "diocesis" which included Galatia with 10 other provinces (Godefroi ad l.), directed that the "Tascodrogitae" should not be expelled, but should not be allowed to meet for worship. In a law of 428 (*ib.* 65) they occur between the Hydroparastatae and the Photinians in a long list of heretics on whom a similar restraint is laid. [H.]

ASENETH, HISTORY OF. *The Life and Confession of Aseneth daughter of Pentephres of Heliopolis* ('Potipherah . . . of On,' A. V. Gen. xli. 45, 50): *A Narrative* [of what happened] *when the beautiful Joseph took her to wife*: such is the full title of a short religious romance published by Fabricius. He gave at first (*Cod. Pseudep. V. T.* i. 774-784) a Latin text; afterwards (ii. 85-102) the much fuller Greek original of 8 out of the 19 chapters, from an imperfect MS. (Barocc. 48). The British Museum (Add. 17,202) possesses a Syriac version. The Latin abridgment was incorporated by Vincent of Beauvais (cent. xiii.) in his *Speculum Historiale*, i. 118-124.

The story is very simple. Aseneth was a proud beauty, disdaining all lovers but Pharaoh's eldest son, whose suit his father forbade, and worshipping innumerable Egyptian gods of silver and gold with her seven virgin attendants in the splendid upper storey of a tower in her father's house. She treated with scorn Potipherah's wish that she should marry Joseph, on the occasion

of his being expected to visit Heliopolis while journeying to collect corn in the first year or plenty: but when from her window she beheld him entering, she declared that by his beauty he must be a "son of God," and repented the bitter words she had spoken about his imprisonment and the occasion of it. Joseph, having seen her at the window, requested that she might be sent away, as he was weary of the advances made to him by the daughters of Egypt: but when he heard that she hated the sight of men, he asked to have her brought, that he might love her as a sister. She came down and greeted him, "Hail, my lord, blessed of the Most High God;" and at her father's bidding went forward to kiss him. But he repelled her, saying that it was not meet for one who "blessed with his mouth the living God, and ate the blessed bread of life, and drank the blessed cup of immortality, and was anointed with the blessed unction of incorruption," to kiss an idolatrous woman. Then seeing her tears he laid his hand on her head, and prayed God to "bless her, and quicken her, and renew her with the Holy Spirit that she might eat the bread of life and drink the cup of His blessing, and number her with His people whom He had chosen before the world was, and that she might enter into His rest which He had prepared for His elect, and live in His eternal life unto eternity." After this he departed. She returned to her chamber rejoicing at his blessing, but full of grief and fear. "Repenting of her idols," she flung them out of the window, cast "her royal feast" to the dogs, and sat in ashes weeping seven days. At dawn of the eighth day the sky was rent with a great light near the morning star, and an angel appeared before her, proclaiming himself to be "the prince of the house of God and the prince of the army of the Lord." He bade her cast off her garments of mourning and rejoice, "for thy name is written in the book of the living, and shall not be blotted out for ever: lo, from this day thou art renewed and quickened, and shalt eat the bread of blessing and drink the cup of incorruption, and be anointed with the holy unction: lo, I have given thee to-day as a spouse to Joseph, and thy name shall no more be called Aseneth, but 'of much refuge,' for Penitence hath for thee supplicated the Most High, [Penitence] who is a daughter of the Most High, a virgin mirthful, always smiling, and modest." Invited by Aseneth to eat, the angel caused a honeycomb to appear miraculously before her. "Blessed," he said, "are they that approach my Lord in repentance, for they shall eat of this comb made by the bees of the paradise of God from the dew of the roses in paradise, and all the angels of God eat of it; and whosoever shall eat of it, shall not die for ever." After they had eaten of the comb, he restored it as it was. Then he drew his finger along it from east to west, and again from north to south, and each time the track of his finger turned to blood. Out of the comb came white bees with purple wings, and made and ate of fresh comb in Aseneth's hands, till the angel bade them go to their place, when they all departed eastward to paradise. Once more the angel touched the comb, and fire came forth from the table and devoured the comb with a fragrant odour. As soon as the angel had departed, Joseph arrived. Aseneth met him, told him the words of the

angel, and washed his feet. Next day Joseph asked her of Pharaoh, and Pharaoh celebrated the marriage with great pomp.

The book ends with a strange story. When Jacob and his sons came into the land of Goshen, Joseph and Aseneth brought back home Levi and Simeon after a visit. Pharaoh's son, being enamoured of Aseneth, tried to bribe the two brothers to slay Joseph. Failing with them, he next tried Dan and Gad, assuring them that as sons of a handmaid they were to be disinherited. They agreed to the murder, while he himself set about slaying his own father. Being baffled by Pharaoh's guards, he joined the ambuscade of Dan and Gad with 50 armed men, and they succeeded in destroying all the retinue of Joseph except one man. From him Simeon and Levi heard the news, and gathering together all the force at hand they routed the assailants. Aseneth meanwhile fled in a chariot with Benjamin; and when Pharaoh's son drew near to carry her off, Benjamin caught up a stone from a torrent-bed and dashed him to the ground from his horse. On the arrival of Simeon and Levi the three brothers tended the wounded man and brought him to Pharaoh, who thanked them for sparing him; but on the third day he died. Pharaoh himself died of grief soon after, and Joseph became regent of Egypt for 48 years.

The purpose of this history is not very evident. The greater part of it has no distinctly religious character, and is verbose and wearisome; yet passages of some beauty occur now and then. The signs of Christian origin, if few in number, are not to be mistaken, though Jewish legend may have supplied materials. The bread and cup of blessing and the chrism are four times mentioned, and the bloody tracks upon the honeycomb evidently make up the cross. The full significance of this mysterious comb is not easy to discover, though various particulars connect it with the Eucharist. Its consumption by fire stands in broad contrast to the Jewish law (Lev. ii. 11), confirmed by all authorities except Theophrastus in Porphyry (*de Abst.* ii. 26): cf. Bernays, *Theophr. üb. Frömmigkeit*, 112. A peculiar kind of prominence is given to repentance.

In the Syriac catalogue of Ecclesiastical Books by Ebed Jesu at the end of the 13th century (Assemani, *B. O.* iii. 4) "the book of Asiatha the wife of Joseph the Just, the son of Jacob," stands before "the book of Tobias and Tobith the just Israelites" among writings partly belonging to our Apocrypha, partly of other origin. "Aseneth" likewise occurs between Judith and Esther in an Ethiopic list of canonical books (Brit. Mus. Add. 16,188; see Dillmann's Catalogue, cod. iv.), but it is wanting in another similar list (Add. 16,205, Dillmann's cod. xxxv.): no Ethiopic MS. containing the book appears to have reached Europe.

The Syriac version was made from the Greek by Moses of Agil (on Dr. Wright's authority), who lived about 550. How much earlier, and in what country, the book of Aseneth was written, there is apparently no evidence to shew. [H.]

ASPHALIUS, a presbyter of Antioch, and a zealous adherent of the heretic Aetius, who was deputed by Eudoxius, after he had taken forcible possession of the see of Antioch, A.D. 358, to proceed to Constantinople and obtain the recognition of Constantine.

He was just about to start for Antioch with the Emperor's letters of authorization when the deputies from the council of Ancyra arrived, and by their representations induced the weak Constantius to declare himself against the Anomoeans, and recall his letters. A document of a very different kind was substituted, denouncing the intrusion of Eudoxius, speaking of him in the most violent terms, and forbidding him to appear in the Christian assemblies (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 13, 14). [E. V.]

ASTAPHAÆUS, Adstaphæus, Astanphaeus, or Astaphus, a personage in the Ophite mythology (Iren. 109, 111; Orig. *cont. Cels.* vi. 31 f.). The name, like "Jaldabaoth" and "Oraeus," is said by Origen to come from the Magian religion. Various unsatisfactory etymologies have been given. The least unlikely is from אֶסְתָּא, *to watch as from a tower* (Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift* for 1862, p. 433). [H.]

ASTARTH or Astoriane, the legendary brother of Melchisedek according to "some" known to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 469 B). So the Venice MS.: the common text has Astaroth and Asteria. [H.]

ASTERIUS (1) A bishop of ARABIA (called bishop of Petra, *Tomus ad Antioch.* § 10) accompanied the Eusebians to the Council of Sardica, but separated himself from them in company with his brother bishop Arius or Macarius (who by some confusion is also called bishop of Petra), complaining of the menaces and violent treatment to which the deputies had been subjected, with the view of driving them into supporting the Eusebian faction (Theodt. ii. 8). The unscrupulous Eusebians soon had their revenge, and the two bishops were banished to Upper Libya, where they endured much suffering (Athanas. *Hist. Arian.* § 18; *Apolog.* § 48).

On the promulgation of the edict of Julian, recalling all the banished bishops, Asterius returned from his exile, and (A.D. 362) took part in the important council summoned by the newly restored Athanasius at Alexandria, for the purpose of promoting union between the orthodox and those who, without embracing the errors of Arius, had held communion with the Arian party. One of the chief subjects that came before this synod was the unhappy schism at Antioch between the Eustathians and the Meletians. Meletius and his adherents having renounced communion with the Arians, the way for the healing of this painful rupture appeared open, and a letter was addressed by the council to Lucifer of Cagliari, and the other bishops who were then at Antioch, of which Asterius and Eusebius of Vercelli were the bearers, recommending reunion, and stating the terms on which it might be sought (Athanas. *Ep. ad Antioch.* i. 575; Rufin. i. 29, p. 249; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, viii. 205-209). How this attempt at reunion failed, through the precipitation of Lucifer in consecrating Paulinus bishop of Antioch, may be read elsewhere. [LUCIFER, MELETIUS, PAULINUS.] On the singular fact that the name of Asterius, together with that of Eusebius of Vercelli, is found among those to whom this letter is addressed, as well as those

by whom it was written, of which it is difficult to give a satisfactory explanation, cf. Tillemont, u. s. p. 707; Baronius, *Ann.* sub ann. 362 § 219.

(2) The teacher of Acacius bishop of Beroea, whom he accompanied A.D. 372 to Edessa, to summon thence the famous solitary St. Julian Sabbas, whose pupil he had been, to support the orthodox faith at Antioch, during the persecution of the Catholics by Valens (Theodt. *Vit. Patr.* p. 780).

(3) A presbyter belonging to the Arian party at Antioch, c. 380. When the decree of Theodosius had left the Arian party at Antioch without a head by compelling Dorotheus to leave his see, Asterius took the lead in conjunction with some neighbouring bishops, in an application to the Eunomians to be received into communion with them. This negotiation broke down in consequence of the demands of the Eunomians that the condemnation of Aetius should be recalled, and all abuses reformed (Philost. *H. E.* x. 1).

(4) "Comes Orientis," A.D. 398, who carried out with prudence and tact the orders of the emperor Arcadius for the secret removal of Chrysostom from Antioch when elected to the see of Constantinople (Pallad. 43). See CHRYSOSTOM. [E. V.]

ASTERIUS, bishop of AMASEA in Pontus, a contemporary of St. Chrysostom. He himself tells us, that his teacher was a certain Scythian (i.e. Goth), who, having been sold in his youth to a citizen of Antioch, a schoolmaster, had made marvellous progress under his owner's instructions and won himself a great name among Greeks and Romans (Phot. *Bibl.* 271, p. 1500). Beyond this not a single incident in his life is recorded. His date however is fixed by allusions to contemporary events in his Homilies. He speaks of the apostasy of Julian as having happened within his memory (Aster. *Or.* 3, p. 56, ed. Combefis); and in his sermon on the Festival of the Calends (*Or.* 4, p. 76) he mentions the consulate and fall of Eutropius as an event of the preceding year. This sermon therefore must have been delivered on New Year's Day A.D. 400. Elsewhere he spoke of himself as a man of very advanced age (Phot. *Amphil.* 125 [312]).

The extant works of Asterius consist almost solely of sermons or homilies. Of these we possess twenty-two perfect; twelve on various subjects included in the edition of Combefis (Paris 1648); eight on the Psalms, of which one is found among the works of St. Chrysostom and the remaining seven were published by Cotelier, *Mon. Eccl. Graec.* ii. (Paris 1688); and two again on other subjects, which are published among the works of Gregory Nyssen, but must be assigned to Asterius on the authority of Photius. Besides these Photius (*Bibl.* 271) gives extracts from several others. In addition to these homilies, a life of his predecessor, St. Basil of Amasea, printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April 26, is ascribed to him. A complete collection of his works will be found in Migne's *Patrol. Graec.* xl.; a complete list in Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* ix. 513 sq. ed. Harles. An account of their contents is given by Tillemont, x. 409 sq.

Asterius was a student of Demosthenes (*Or.* 11, p. 207), and himself no mean orator. His best sermons (for they are somewhat uneven)

display no inconsiderable skill in rhetoric, great power of expression, and great earnestness of moral conviction; and some passages are even strikingly eloquent. His orthodoxy was unquestioned. Photius (*Amphil.* l. c.) contrasts him with his Arian namesake, as staunch in the faith, devoting himself to the care of his flock, and setting an example of a virtuous and godly life. His authority was quoted with great respect in later ages, more especially during the Iconoclastic controversy at the 2nd Council of Nicaea, when with an innocent play on his name he was referred to as "a bright star (astrum) illumining the minds of all" (Labbe, *Conc.* viii. 1385, 1387, ed. Coleti). [L.]

ASTERIUS, Martyr, a Roman senator of high rank and favour with the emperor, whom Rufinus makes to have been a martyr at Caesarea in Palestine in 262 (*H. E.* vii. 13); but Eusebius, while mentioning his faith and charity in burying the martyr Theotecnus (*H. E.* vii. 15), says nothing of his martyrdom. He is also called ASTURIUS (see also *Martyrol.* March 3). [A. W. H.]

ASTERIUS URBANUS, a writer in the Montanist controversy of the 2nd century. He is only known by a reference to a *λόγος κατὰ Ἀστέριον Οὐρβανόν* which occurs in an anonymous work against Montanism, fragments of which are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 16, 17). On the supposition that this reference was a note by Eusebius or by some ancient scholiast, Valesius, Tillemont, Cave and others have ascribed to Asterius the authorship of the work in question. But it would seem from the context that Eusebius was ignorant of the author's name; Rufinus, against internal evidence, ascribes the work to Apollinaris; Jerome, with less improbability, to Rhodo. And since, according to the most obvious interpretation, the reference to Asterius forms part of the quotation, Asterius was probably a Montanist replied to by the writer. [G. S.]

ASTORIANE. [ASTARTH.]

ASUAM. [AVAN.]

ATARBIUS, bishop of NEOCAESAREA. He was apparently a relation of St. Basil (*Ep.* 210), but there had been an estrangement between them, and Basil writes to him urging him to break his long silence and to resume friendly relations for the sake of the Church (*Ep.* 61). He does not appear to have responded to this appeal. At a later date we find him calumniating Basil and alleging as authority for his calumnies a special revelation which had been vouchsafed to him in dreams. At the same time he himself was betrayed into the errors of Sabellianism. To correct these irregularities, Basil sought a personal interview with him at Nicopolis, where he was present at a synod; but, hearing of Basil's approach, he left precipitately, though the synod was still sitting (*Ep.* 128, 204, 207, 210). At the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) we find him subscribing through Cyril the reader (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1136, ed. Coleti).

Tillemont (ix. 197 sq.) makes him an Armenian bishop; but there can be little doubt that his see was Neocaesarea; for (1) he is so designated in some MSS. of Basil's letters; (2) the character and circumstances of Atarbius

described in *Ep.* 61, 126, entirely agree with those of the unnamed bishop of Neocaesarea referred to in *Ep.* 204, 207, 210 (see Garnier *Basil, Op.* iii. p. cxxv); (3) in the Acts of the Council of Constantinople he represents the province of Pontus Polemoniaca, of which Neocaesarea was the metropolis. [L.]

ATHANASIUS (Sr.), Archbishop of Alexandria. The materials for the biography of this great prelate may be thus described:—(1.) His own memoirs, as they may be called, or "Historical Tracts," as they are entitled in the "Library of the Fathers," including his great *Apology* (so-called) *against the Arians*, two *Enyclics*, the *Apology to Constantius*, the *Apology for his Flight*, a *Letter to Serapion*, a *Letter to the Monks* prefatory to a *History of the Arians*; to which must be added many passages, in other writings of his, which illustrate his history. (2.) Notices by contemporary Fathers, as Hilary, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Epiphanius; but as to some of these caution is necessary, *e.g.* Gregory is not historically exact, and Epiphanius relied too much on some questionable information. (3.) Chronicles, or Fragments of Chronicles, as the Index prefixed to his recently discovered Festal Letters, and the *Fragmentum Maffeanum*, published from the Chapter Library of Verona, in 1742, by Maffei, and supposed by Mansi to be the Latin version of annals written at Alexandria about A.D. 385. Valuable as these are, they contain some manifest errors. (4.) Subsequent church historians, as Sulpicius Severus, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret. Montfaucon says (in *Vit. Ath. Monitum*) that Sulpicius' notices of the subject are meagre and of little value, and that Rufinus is credulous and "negligentiae nomine suspectus." We may add, Socrates—although it would not be correct to call him a mere copyist of Athanasius—is by no means worthy of implicit trust when his narrative takes a different line; in fact, as Montfaucon observes, "quantum in ordine et tempore perturbationem attulerit pluribus est alias demonstratum," and his dates, which used to be thought safe landmarks, are now much questioned. Montfaucon says more in favour of Sozomen than is, perhaps, usual; and sets his authority far above that of Socrates, considering him to have had access to some valuable memoranda. He proceeds to assign a certain amount of value, on a similar ground, to the generally brief and confused narrative of Theodoret (to whom we owe a fragment of one of Athanasius' letters). He describes Gelasius of Cyzicus as "generally trifling, but as having done some service." Of the much earlier "Life of Pachomius," as contributing some materials, he speaks very highly: of the Greek Lives of Athanasius, his judgment is naturally contemptuous: one, by an anonymous writer, is wholly worthless—that which was read by Photius, and included in his "Library," and which he described as "tending towards carelessness rather than exactness," is "quisquiliae sine pari:" of the "Vita ex Metaphraste" he judges more leniently, but thinks it of no great use. An Arabic Life, translated by Renaudot, and by him communicated to Montfaucon, is characterized by the "stupendous ignorance and silliness" of the Copts for whom it was compiled. The Bollandist Life (May 2) speaks similarly of these Greek pro-

ductions as "undeserving of insertion:" "omnes iisdem laborant defectibus." Montfaucon's own Latin Life stands on an eminence among good biographies. Tillemont's 8th volume of *Mémoires* contains an elaborate Life, with notes. Cave has a full memoir of St. Athanasius in his *Lives of the Fathers*; a shorter in his *Historia Literaria*. Möhler's volume on *Athanasius the Great*, published in 1827, is rather an exposition of his work as a theologian than a record of his life: it is admirably described by the English translator of his *Symbolism*. The references in the following account will be made to the Benedictine edition, which is included with supplementary matter in Migne's series.

The life of Athanasius divides itself naturally into seven sections, respectively terminated by (1) his consecration; (2) his first exile; (3) his second exile; (4) his second return; (5) his third exile; (6) his fourth exile; (7) his death.

I. *From his birth to his consecration.*—He was born, it appears, at Alexandria; a letter of Constantine, recalling him from his second exile, seems to refer to that city as his "native home" (*Apol. c. Ar.* 51). Of his family circumstances we only know that his aunt suffered much from Arian cruelty during his second exile; that, by his own account to Constantine, he had but scanty private means; and that his father's tomb was at some distance from the city. (*Hist. Ar.* 13; *Ap. c. Ar.* 9; *Socr. iv.* 13.) We must date his birth at about A.D. 296; not earlier, because he had no personal remembrance of the persecution under Maximian in 303 (*Hist. Ar.* 64), and was comparatively a young man when consecrated bishop, soon after the Nicene Council; not later, because he received some theological instruction from persons who suffered in the persecution under Maximin II. in 311 (*De Incarn.* 56), and the first two of his treatises appear to have been written before 319. Of his boyhood there is a story which was first told by Rufinus (i. 14), and after him by other authors, and which many English readers know through a poem in Keble's *Lyra Innocentium*.^a Alexander, bishop of Alexandria—so runs the tale—was one day looking from the windows of a house belonging to him near the sea, and saw some boys on the beach, playing, as it seemed, at an imitation of Church ceremonial. After watching them some time with interest, he began to think that their game was touching too nearly on things especially sacred; he called them before him in the presence of some clergy, and ascertained that one of the boys, named Athanasius, had acted the part of a bishop, and as such had baptized some of his companions who were as yet unchristened. Alexander, after consulting with his clergy, resolved to recognize this baptism as valid; and commended the boy-bishop, and other boys who had acted as ministrants, to their respective relations, to be trained for the actual service of the Church. The story, though set aside by several high authorities,^b is considered by Dean Stanley

^a "Enacting Holy Rites." Rufinus, who loves a detailed story, says that Alexander, after the service on the anniversary of bishop Peter's martyrdom, was expecting some clergy to dine with him.

^b *E.g.* Cave says, "Fabulam certe esse et nunc et olim suspicatus sum." And see Tillemont, and the Benedictines. Neale (*Hist. Alex.* i. 153) calls it, "to say the least, very doubtful."

to have "every indication of truth." (*Lect. East. Ch.* p. 264.) But, apart from any difficulty as to the resolution ascribed to Alexander, the chronological objection appears quite fatal.^c When Alexander came, in 313, to the episcopate, Athanasius must have been about seventeen years old, and within six years he came forward as a theologian. But the legend, if we are so to consider it, may well represent thus much of truth, that the young Athanasius shewed the promise of a high vocation; and that Alexander, by whatever means he first came under his notice, regarded him as probably destined to do great things in the cause of Christ. There can be no reason to doubt that, ere long, Athanasius became an inmate of the good prelate's house, as his companion and secretary (*Soz.* ii. 17). The position involved great advantages. The place held by Alexander as "successor of St. Mark," and occupant of "the Evangelical throne," was second in the Christian hierarchy: we may call the bishops of Alexandria in the 4th century, for convenience' sake, Archbishops^d or Patriarchs, although the former name was then very rarely applied to them, and the latter not at all, and they were frequently designated, though not in contradistinction to all other prelates,^e by the title of *Papas* (Pope) or "dear father." Their power throughout the churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, was, by ancient custom, which the Nîcene Council afterwards confirmed, almost monarchical, extending over about a hundred bishops, who revered their judgments as the decisions of the see of Rome were revered in Italy.^f To be admitted then to the intimacy of "Pope" Alexander was for Athanasius a high privilege; and to live, "as a son with a father,"^g under the roof of one "beloved for the sweetness of his disposition,"^h must have been a happiness often recalled to mind in the storms and conflicts of after life. And the young secretary was one who had enjoyed other opportunities for thought, observation, and study, which he had carefully improved. From childhood he had lived in a city which was "an emporium for the interchange of ideas and speculations, along with the products of various climes and industries:"ⁱ where different nation-

alities jostled each other, and different streams of thought ran side by side. He was familiar with Paganism in divers forms: the towering mass of the Serapeion would be to him an embodiment of a native idolatry which, if dying, was not yet near its death; Osiris was still annually lamented, and Isis, Apis, and the Nile were still adored; Hadrian's visit to Alexandria was remembered; the apotheosis of Roman emperors would be, for Athanasius, an illustration of the Euhemeristic theory which he had learned to adopt as to the origin of the gods of Heathendom.^k He must have seen Judaism, in its most stubborn and self-asserting mood, established in two of the five regions of the city.^l He must have heard echoes of the Neo-platonism of Plotinus: he had probably fallen in with Manicheans: "his studies of "grammar" and "rhetoric" had introduced him to Homer" and to Plato, and trained, as Möhler observes, his logical ability: he accustomed himself to the consideration of such hypotheses as pantheism and materialism: he became an enthusiast for the argument from design to a Creator, and for the proof of a soul from the instinctive yearnings after immortality.^m According to one writer,ⁿ he added to his other studies that of the Roman law. But all these, it is evident, were subordinated, in his mind, to the great object of becoming "a scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven."^o Christian theology constituted his chief interest, and to him was given that high endowment which could alone make versatility and manifold cultivation truly precious—a commanding and elevating simplicity of aim. And for this special work of his life his antecedents had already been preparing him. He had seen what a Pagan persecution was like, especially when carried on by such a savage as Maximin II.: he had hung, as a boy of fourteen or fifteen, on the life of teachers who were shortly to seal their teaching with their blood. If he was too young to know personally the martyr-bishop Phileas of Thmuis, who confessed so earnestly the Divinity of the Crucified, he must have seen and spoken to some who had imbibed his spirit and followed in his footsteps; and he may well have learned to associate his own bishop Peter's constancy unto death with devotion to Him who, being "by nature God, became by nature man" (*S. Petr. Alex.*

^c The Bollandist Life of Athanasius indeed, by placing the death of bishop Peter at the beginning of the persecution, avoids this difficulty: and, as to the "baptism," refers to Athanasius's "gratia præcox."

^d See *Athan. Apol. c. Ar. 71*. It is questioned whether "archbishop" in the catalogue of Meletians refers to Alexander or to Meletius.

^e See Pearson, *Vindict. Ignat.* pars i. c. 11; cf. Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iii. 235. Dionysius spoke of Heraclius as pope (*Enseph. H. E.* vii. 7).

^f *Epiph. Haer.* 63. See Neale, *Introd. East. Ch.* i. 111. He considers that they had metropolitans as well as patriarchal authority. Valesius admits that they consecrated all Egyptian bishops, "non tamen sine consensu metropolitani" (*Obs. Eccl. in Soc. et Soz.* iii. 9). See Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 353, citing Synes. *Ep.* 76, *Soz.* viii. 19.

^g So Cyril Alex. says, in his Letter to the monks of Egypt.

^h Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 115. Compare *Rufin.* i. 1.

ⁱ Merivale, *Hist. Rom.* viii. 235; cf. iii. 298. A love of order, which was strong in his mind, and which appears in illustrations drawn from harmonious choirs and well-governed cities (cf. *c. Gent.* 33, 43), may have been fostered by early experiences of Alexandrian excitability. See a description of Alexandria in the 4th century, Ammian. xii. 16; and for its mobs, *ib.* 11.

^k See *Contra Gentes*, and *De Incarnatione*.

^l See his frequent comparison of Arians to Jews. More than once he alludes to the tricks of the Jewish vintners. In *Orat. c. Ar.* i. 54, ii. 15, he refers to current Jewish opinions.

^m See the remark in *Hist. Ar.* 61, on Manichean hard-heartedness.

ⁿ See especially the quotation of *Odys.* ii. 3633-66, in *Orat.* iv. 29.

^o Cf. especially *Contra Gentes*, 40: and cf. *ib.* 33 with some lines in Tennyson's *Two Voices*. "Athanasius was a man of liberal education" (Newman, *Athan. Treatises*, i. 52). His self-depreciatory language in his *Letter to the Monks*, and in *Ad Serap.* i. 33, does not disprove this. See the allusions to Greek philosophy in *De Decr.* 4, 19, 28; *Orat. c. Ar.* ii. 11, iv. 13; and Newman in *Athan. Treatises*, ii. 501.

^p Sulpicius Severus, li. 36. Compare also *Soc.* i. 31, "He took the legal exceptions" to the accusations in the Council of Tyre.

^q His intense love of Scripture, and reverence for its authority, appear throughout his writings. E.g., *c. Gent.* i, *Orat.* i. 9, *ad Ep. Aeg.* 4, *de Decr.* 32, *de Syn.* 6. See, on this, Keble's *Sermons* (1848), p. 406.

ap. Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 48; cf. Athan. *Orat.* iii. 41, 51; c. *Apollin.* i. 7). Intercourse with such heroic souls would tend to form in the young listener the heroism, not less true nor less religious, which was to bear him so well through the "long tragedy" (Hooker, v. 42. 5) of his own future: it would fill him, once for all, with a profound sense of the realities of Christianity; and his career is best appreciated when we recognize in him the confessor's spirit (See *Ep. ad Ep. Aeg.* 21). Even after the persecution was over, he would have constant evidence of the severity of the struggle which Christianity was still called upon to wage. Those hard Alexandrian mockeries which Hadrian had found so biting were levelled mercilessly at a religion which proclaimed an Incarnation and a Cross (*De Incarn.* 41, 48), and whose votaries had but lately been hurried in masses to a death of shame and torture. And one experience of a different kind, most fruitful in its consequences, was Athanasius' acquaintance with the great hermit Antony. He tells us, in his *Life of Antony*,^r that he often saw him; and although that reading of the conclusion of the preface which makes him say that "he himself for some time attended on him, and poured water on his hands," may be considered doubtful, yet we know that he was afterwards spoken of as "the ascetic," and that when, years later, he took shelter in the cells of the monks of Egypt, he found himself perfectly at home.^s He contracted an admiration for monasticism, which will not surprise those who remember that the spiritual intensity of the Christian life had found a most emphatic, though a one-sided expression, in such a life as was being led by men who fled, like Antony, from a society at once tainted and brutalized beyond all modern conception. The self-sacrifice of the monk seemed akin to the self-devotion of the confessor; and the morbid and eccentric elements in the rising institution were less observable in Antony's own case^t than in many others. The old hermit's energetic Christian zeal, his practical sense and sober-mindedness, not unmixed with humour, his serene courage, his deep tenderness, even the outward charm of a face that never lost its bright tranquillity, and that must have seemed especially radiant when in the last days of persecution he stood, conspicuous by his white cloak newly washed, in the very path of the prefect at Alexandria—all this union of sweetness and strength would act irresistibly on the imagination and affections of Athanasius (*Vit. Ant.* 67, 46); nor is it fanciful to think that he may often in subsequent troubles have "thanked God and taken courage," when remembering Antony's sentiment, once expressed in Coptic to younger monks

—"that the longest life of 'spiritual training' was nothing to the ages of ages and the Crown" (*Vit. Ant.* 16).

The two essays of Athanasius, *Against the Gentiles* and *On the Incarnation*, which form one complete work addressed to a convert from Heathenism, cannot be dated later than the end of 318; for they make no reference to the Arian controversy which broke out in 319. Dörner, in his work *On the Person of Christ*, has given a *résumé* of their argument on the threefold subject of God, man, and the Incarnate Word; and Möhler calls the book on the Incarnation "the first attempt that had been made to present Christianity and the chief circumstances of the life of Jesus Christ under a scientific aspect. By the sure tact of his noble and Christian nature, everything is referred to the Person of the Redeemer: everything rests upon Him; He appears throughout." These words account for the theological greatness attained by the young author, who seems to have been ordained deacon about this time, and placed in the position of chief among the Alexandrian deacons. Thus drawn into yet closer relations with his bishop, he was to him, doubtless, what St. Laurence was to Sixtus II. of Rome; and gave him effective help when Arius, one of the parish priests, while taxing Alexander with Sabellianism, expressly denied, on grounds which may be called rationalistic, (1) the eternity, (2) the uncreatedness^u of the Son of God. [ALEXANDER; ARIUS.] Among the clergy who joined the archbishop in calling on Arius to retract, and who afterwards assented to his deposition, was the young archdeacon of Alexandria. (See the *Benedictine Athanasius*, i. 396 sq.) To ascribe the line which he took to loyal feeling for a benignant superior, to mere polemical partisanship, or to mere ecclesiastical conservatism, would be to misread his character and to lose the lesson of his life. The greatness of the issue was never absent from his mind. The affinity of the Arian hypothesis to older heresies, and, in one respect, to ethnic habits of thought^v (*De Syn.* 50; *Orat.* iii. 16); its remarkable incoherency in starting from the premises, "A father must be prior to a son," and presenting a conclusion which separated the Son from the Father's essence (cf. *Orat.* c. *Ar.* i. 26); its strange tendency to promote irreverence, and to fight its way with unhallowed weapons—all this he saw: but his hostility to Arianism would be best summed up by saying, with Dörner, that "it was his intuitional perception of the Redeemer in His totality that marked out for Athanasius the direction which he ought to pursue;"—and it was in this spirit that he attended Alexander to the Nicene Council in 325.

^r "I conceive," says Dr. Newman, "no question can be raised with justice about its substantial integrity" (*Church of the Fathers*, p. 176). So Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 193, where he owns that it contains some things "tanto viro indigna," and refers to Dupin's "ingenuous" admission that it may be partially interpolated. Such a book was, indeed, almost certain to receive some additions from readers who thought they could enrich the common store of recollections of Antony.

^s Cf. *Vit. Ant.* 44, where the monastic retreats are compared to the "goodly tents of Jacob." And see the address of the *Letter to the Monks*, citing Matt. xix. 27.

^t It is not meant that they were absent in his case (e. g., see *Vit. Ant.* 45), or that Athanasius's judgment on such points in Antony was necessarily sound.

^u Cf. Athan. *ad Ep. Aeg.* 12, *de Decr.* 6, *Orat.* c. *Ar.* i. 5; Soc. i. 5, 6. The position that the Son was a creature implied that He had once, at any rate, been capable of moral fall. See, on the Arian phrase *τρεπτόν*, Athan. *Orat.* i. 33.

^v The Ditheistic tendencies of Arianism gave a great advantage to the Catholics; and Athanasius's pure and severe Monotheism comes out in such passages as *Orat.* iii. 16, *De Decr.* 11. See Merivale's *Conversion of the Empire*, p. 135 sq. In another point of view, Athanasius frequently charges the Arians with Judaical tendencies, as in *Orat.* iii. 27, *De Decret.* 10. In *De Synod.* 20, he traces Arianism up to the Humanitarian Artemas, and then to the Jews who condemned our Lord (i. e. for claiming Divinity).

And in that great assembly he is represented by Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* 21) as "foremost among those who were in attendance on bishops," and as "doing his utmost to stay the plague." We can picture him as he stood forward, with the diminutive figure that Julian afterwards sneered at, and the beautiful face that Gregory compared to an angel's; his keen eyes watching the Arianizers, who in hasty private conference were arranging evasive senses in which they could accept the phrases suggested by the majority (*De Decr.* 20; *Ad Afr.* 5); his readiness as a disputant, and his richness as an interpreter of Scripture, making him already a great power at a great crisis. His writings may assure us of the argument which he would maintain; that the real Divinity of the Saviour was (1) asserted in many places of Scripture, (2) involved in the notion of His unique Sonship,^a (3) required by the Divine economy of redemption, and (4) attested by the immemorial consciousness of the Church. And although, as he himself informs us, the Council would willingly have confined themselves to purely Scriptural terms (*De Decr.* 19) if their legitimate sense could have been *bonâ fide* admitted; although too he was far from imagining that any form or expression of human thought would adequately represent a Divine mystery;^a yet his convictions went thoroughly with the adoption of the term "Homoousion" or "co-essential," explained, as it was,^b in a sense which made it simply equivalent to "truly Son of God," and proposed as a test of adherence to the Scriptural Christology. And if we are to understand his mind at the close of the council, we must say that he regarded its proceedings as something done, in fact, "for the rightful honour of Jesus."^c Nothing was to him more certain than that Jesus was, in the full force of the words, God Incarnate; that Arianism was essentially a denial, and the "Homoousion" the now authenticated symbol, of this His claim on men's absolute devotion; and that it was infinitely worth while to go through any amount of

work or suffering in defence of such a truth, and in the cause of such a Master.

More work was near at hand, and suffering was not far off. A passage in Athanasius's *Apology against the Arians* (c. 59) has usually been taken to fix the death of Alexander within five months from the close of the Nicene Council, *i. e.* in January 326; but if it could be understood as reckoning from the reception by Alexander of the Meletian sectaries [MELETIUS] into the Church, according to a Nicene resolution, we might adopt the date fixed by Coptic authorities, the 22nd of Pharmuthi, or 17th of April, in the Easter-tide of 326.^d Alexander, it seems, had already discharged, for the year in which he died, an annual duty imposed by the Nicene Council on his see—that of announcing the days on which, according to Alexandrian science, Lent would begin and Easter would fall, first by a "Festal Letter" to his own people, and then also to the bishop of Rome, who was to give information, as Leo the Great afterwards expressed it, "to more distant churches" (*Leo, Ep.* 121; *Le Quien*, ii. 377). A solemn and touching incident of Alexander's last moments is connected with the history of Athanasius, who was then absent from Alexandria, perhaps on some mission from the archbishop himself to the Court, unless we suppose that he purposely retired in order to avoid election as successor. The dying man, while his clergy stood around him, called for Athanasius. One of those present, also bearing that name, answered, but was not noticed by the archbishop, who again repeated the name, and added, "You think to escape—but it cannot be." Some time appears to have elapsed between his death and the assembling of the Egyptian bishops to consecrate a successor. Of their proceedings we have, on the one hand, an Arian account, more or less detailed; as, that seven prelates, despite their vow to elect in open synod, clandestinely laid hands on Athanasius; or, that he with some followers seized a church by night, compelled two bishops, whom he found there, to consecrate him, procured by fraud an imperial sanction of his appointment, and employed the civil power to wreak his vengeance on those who shrank from his communion^e (*Soz.* ii. 17; *Philo-*

^a The Bollandist Life cites the Greek *Meneae* for Jan. 18, as describing his personal appearance,—stooping, bald, with an aquiline nose, a small mouth, auburn hair, &c.

^b It must be remembered, that whereas the Arian theology, properly speaking, viewed the Son as a creature (however exalted and glorious), made after the likeness of the *impersonal* Word, Athanasius identified the Son, admitted to be personal, with the Word, admitted to be eternal. See *Orat.* ii. 37.

^c *Orat. c. Ar.* ii. 32, 36; *Ep. ad Monach.* 2; *De Synod.* 35; *De Decr.* 22.

^d See *De Decr.* 20, *De Synod.* 39, 41, 45, 48, 54. Compare *Ad Afros.* 6. He laid stress on its having been used before as a test of orthodoxy, and carefully guarded against materializing misinterpretations of its real purport. His argument perpetually comes to this: "Either own Him to be Homoousios, or plainly call Him a creature." The Arian assertion, that the Son was *per se* morally "mutable," was to Athanasius a *reductio ad horribile* of Arianism.

^e Liddon's *Bamp. Lect.* p. 436, ed. 2. Athanasius says, *Ad Ep. Aeg.* 21, "our contest is for our all." So Neander, iv. 51: "He by no means contended for a mere speculative formula . . . it was an essentially Christian interest which actuated him," &c. See *De Synod.* 20, on the "loveable name of our Lord," and *Hist. Ar.* 67. "He was inflamed," says De Broglie, "from his youth, with that passion which makes saints—the love of Jesus Christ." (*L'Égl. et l'Emp.* i. 372.) See Bright's *History of the Church*, p. 149.

^d The Index of the recently discovered *Festal Letters of St. Athanasius*, while agreeing as to the day, gives the year 323. But this index is not of first-rate authority: see it on *Ep.* 3 and 8. This date cannot stand with the words of Athanasius, unless we suppose (which is surely improbable) that the reception of the Meletians was delayed for nearly two years. Meletius' own character has long been problematical. Athanasius declares that he was convicted by bishop Peter of escaping from persecution by apostasy, and that he thereupon formed a schismatic sect (*Apol. c. Ar.* 59). Epiphanius (*Haer.* 68), relying on Meletian authorities, makes Meletius a brave confessor, who took a strict view of the case of the lapsed. It is difficult to resist the force of Athanasius' express statement; yet we may observe that it was made many years after the schism began; that Athanasius was disposed to believe the worst about a bitterly hostile faction; that the letter of the Nicene Council speaks only of the "disorderly" conduct of Meletius; and that the "Maffetan Fragments" ascribe the schism to his irregularly ordaining clergy outside his own diocese, on plea of necessity during the persecution.

^e The statement of Epiphanius, that Achilles succeeded instead of preceding Alexander, is one of his manifest mistakes. What he adds, as to the Meletians setting up one Theonas as a rival bishop, looks rather like a Meletian

storg. ii. 11). On the other hand, an encyclical letter of these same Egyptian prelates—of whom Gibbon says, that they can scarcely be supposed to have solemnly attested “a public falsehood” (*D. and F. c. 21*) proclaimed to all Christendom, some years later, that a majority of them had elected Athanasius in the presence, and amid the applause, of the whole Alexandrian laity, who for days and nights persevered in demanding him as “the good, pious, ascetic Christian,” who would prove a “genuine bishop,” and prayed aloud to Christ for the fulfilment of their desire (*Apol. c. Ar. 6*). It was granted; and then, in the words of Gregory, “by the suffrages of the whole people, and not by those vile methods, afterwards prevalent, of force and bloodshed, but in a manner apostolic and spiritual, was Athanasius elevated to the throne of Mark,” some time after the beginning of May in 326, and very probably on the 14th of Payni, or 8th of June,—the day of the month, though not the year, given in the Index of the Festal Letters. (On the question of the mode of appointment of Alexandrian patriarchs, see ALEXANDER: it will suffice here to say that the story told 600 years later by Eutychius, as to a presbyteral college laying hands on the predecessors of Athanasius, is apparently an erroneous form of Jerome’s statement as to the election of early bishops to this see.)

II. *From his consecration to his first exile.*—It is usual to place at the outset of his archiepiscopate the organization of the Church in Ethiopia or Abyssinia. He was sitting in synod with other prelates, when a person just arrived from that country requested a hearing. His name, he said, was Frumentius. He and his brother Aedesius, Christians of Tyre, had some years before, when in their boyhood, accompanied their kinsman, a philosopher named Meropius, on a journey to Ethiopia. Their vessel, on their return, had put in at a port in the Red Sea; and they alone had escaped death at the hands of savage natives, had been sold as slaves to the king, and had become his confidential servants. After his death, Frumentius had been made guardian of his son, and in that position had done his utmost to provide places of worship for his fellow-Christians resident in the country for purposes of trade, and to facilitate the spread of Christian ideas among the people. The young king had now assumed the government, and the brothers, resisting his and his mother’s request that they would remain in Ethiopia, had returned to “the Roman world.” But while Aedesius had hastened home,^f Frumentius, feeling that “it was not right to conceal the Lord’s work,” had come to beg that the Church of Alexandria would send a bishop to build up a Church in the land which he had loved. “And who,” answered Athanasius, “can be so fitted as yourself for such a work?” With the assent of

story. In one of his two passages on the subject he makes Theonas sole bishop. The Festal Index dates Athanasius’s election on 14th Payni = June 8. If this interval elapsed, the custom mentioned by Liberatus, *Breviar.* 20, that the patriarch elect kept watch by the corpse of the dead patriarch, placed its right hand on his own head, and took from its neck the pall of St. Mark, “et tunc legitime sedere,” was not observed in this case.

^f He there took orders, and from his lips, many years later, Rufinus (l. 9) heard the narrative. See also Socr. i. 19, Soc. ii. 24. Rufinus says that Aedesius, whom the king made his cup-bearer, was endowed simply with “pure faith and a sober mind.”

the other prelates, Frumentius was forthwith consecrated. He returned to Abyssinia, fixed his see at Axum, was supported in his mission by the princes whom he had served, and left a name honoured for ages in the Abyssinian Church as “Fremonatos” and as “Abba Salama,” who had “kindled in Ethiopia the splendour of the light of Christ.”

Another event of these comparatively quiet times was Athanasius’s visitation of the Thebaid, a region where much trouble was being caused by the Arians, and by the Meletians, who resisted his earnest efforts to repress their separatist tendency.^g Pachomius, the first organizer of the coenobitic life, came forth from his monastery at Tabenne (or Tabennesus), with a choir of monks, to greet the archbishop; but finding that a probable result would be his own elevation to the priesthood, his humility^h induced him to hide himself in the throng, and gaze, unobserved, at Athanasius “in navi existentem.” “Cognovit,” adds the biographer, “esse verum Dei famulum,” who possessed great powers of endurance in the cause of the faith.

And now began the troubles which tested those powers to the utmost, and of which Hooker says, with but little of exaggeration, that “the Arians never suffered Athanasius, till the last hour of his life in this world, to enjoy the comfort of a peaceable day” (*Eccles. Pol. v. 42. 2*). It was probably in 330 that he had his first severe experience of their hatred. Constantine “the Great” was not great in his extreme susceptibility of opposite influences. Eusebius of Nicomedia, whose credit with his sister had given him a strong position at court, had, at the outset of the Arian controversy, contrived to make the emperor (as yet, and until his last illness, unbaptized) assume a tone of anti-dogmatic indifference (see his letter to Alexander and Arius, Soc. i. 7). After the Nicene Council, he had become a zealot for orthodoxy; or rather, perhaps, he had tried to establish peace in the Church by penal laws against Arianism. Eusebius had fallen under his displeasure on this account, and had been exiled. But he had procured his recall by orthodox professions; it may have been by his means that Arius himself was recalled, perhaps in November 330; and he now became the originator of the worldly and disingenuous policy which was so successful in “embellishing” Arianism (Newman’s *Arians*, c. 3, § 2), and concealing its true character from the unsuspicious. He now entered into a league with the Meletians of Egypt,ⁱ of whom a bishop named John Arcaph was the head. “He bought them,” says Athanasius, “by large promises, and arranged that they should help him on any emergency” by that machinery of false accusation which they had already employed against three archbishops. The charges were not to be

^g This, which we learn from Epiphanius (*Haer.* 69. 11; in 68. 6, he says, Athanasius “tried to compel them into unity,” but this may be an exaggeration), appears a trustworthy piece of information, amid a heap of Meletian romance.

^h See Gibbon, c. 37; and for Pachomius’s rule, Soc. iii. 14. Jerome also gives it. Tillemont dates this journey of Athanasius some years later (viii. 30).

ⁱ This was admitted, and lamented, by Epiphanius’s Meletian authorities. Compare Epiph. *Haer.* 68. 6 with Athan. *Apol.* 59.

theological: to attack Athanasius's teaching would be to declare against the Nicene doctrine, and this was a step on which Eusebius could not venture. He began by writing to Athanasius in behalf of Arius, and urging^k that, as a man whose opinions had been seriously misrepresented, he ought in justice to be received to Church communion. Athanasius's answer shews the ground on which he took his stand, and proves (if proof were wanting) that his readiness to "confront the world" for his belief was wholly unconnected with religious individualism.^l "It cannot be right to admit persons to Communion who invented a heresy contrary to the truth, and were anathematized by the Oecumenical Council." It is probable that (as Fleury thinks, though Tillemont and Neander date it much later) we should refer to this period the visit of Antony to Alexandria (*Vit. Ant.* 69), when he confounded the Arians' report that he "agreed with them," by exhorting the crowds attracted by his presence to hold no fellowship with deniers of the Eternity of the Word. This would be a great support to Athanasius. But, although hitherto baffled, Eusebius had recourse to Constantine, who thereupon wrote, commanding Athanasius to admit into the Church "all who desired it," on pain of being removed from his see by sheer State power.^m This gave him an opportunity of laying before Constantine his own views of his duty. "There could be no fellowship," he wrote, "between the Catholic Church of Christ and the heresy that was fighting against Him"—a phrase which frequently recurs, with much significance, in his controversial works. This, for the present, satisfied Constantine; but we may gather from the opening of Athanasius's Festal Letter of 331 that some vexatious charge—probably that of factious motives, which Eusebius would be ready to impute to him—had given him at this time some trouble. Not long afterwards, in compliance with instructions from Eusebius, three Meletians, Ision, Eudaemon, and Callinicus, appeared before the emperor, then at Nicomedia, with a chargeⁿ against Athanasius that he had assumed the powers of the government by taxing Egypt to provide linen vestments^o for the church of Alexandria. But two of Athanasius's priests, happening to be at court, at once refuted this calumny; and Constantine wrote to Athanasius, condemning his accusers, and summoning him to Nicomedia. Eusebius however persuaded the accusers to meet him on his arrival with a bolder charge than that of actual treason; "he had sent a purse of gold to Philumenus, a rebel." This, being easily overthrown,

^k In an oral message he spoke menacingly of what he would do if Athanasius were uncomplying. Gibbon has wrongly ascribed these menaces to Constantine, c. 21. Cf. *Athan. Apol.* 1. c.

^l See also *Orat. c. Ar.* 1, 7, 37, iii. 28, 58; *De Decr.* 27; *De Syn.* 14; *Ad Epict.* 3. Few points in his mind are more striking than the harmonious combination of the "scripturalist" with the ecclesiastical principle.

^m *Soc.* 1. 27, also gives the letter.

ⁿ Another charge, that of having been consecrated too young, is the only one mentioned in the Festal Index; but Athanasius, in *Apol.* 60, is silent about it; and see note to *Fest. Epp. Lib. Fath.* p. 31.

^o *Sticharia*, i. e. white tunics, or albs. See Suicer; *Gloss. Eucholog.* pp. 59, 110; Neale, *Intr. East. Ch.* 1. 306. That this and like charges should have been even thought of, shows the great position of the "Evangelical" see.

was at once followed up by the famous story of the broken chalice. A certain Ischyrras had for some years pretended to the character of a presbyter, although an Alexandrian council had pronounced him a layman, as having been ordained, not by a bishop, but by a schismatical presbyter named Colluthus (*Apol.* 12, 74, 76).^p He persisted in officiating at a little hamlet called "the Peace of Sacontarurum," in the Mareotis; his congregation consisted of a very few persons, including his father and near relations, and the services were held in the house of an orphan boy. Athanasius, being informed of this while on a visitation tour, sent a priest named Macarius, with the actual pastor of the district, to summon Ischyrras before him. Finding that he was ill, they conveyed the episcopal rebuke through his father; but Ischyrras, on recovering, when his friends declined to continue their support, attached himself to the Meletians, who were glad to get a footing in the Mareotis.^q They now resolved to use him as a tool, and by threats, and even blows, made him declare that Macarius had found him in church, in the act of "offering the oblations," had thrown down the holy table, broken the chalice, and burned the church books; of which sacrilege Athanasius was to share the responsibility. But he was able to prove before Constantine, who heard both this and the preceding charge at a suburb of Nicomedia, called Psammathia, that, point by point, it was a falsehood. There was no church in the hamlet; the day in question there could have been no celebration of the Eucharist, even had Ischyrras been competent to celebrate, for it was a common week day, and he happened to be lying sick in his cell; and, lastly, he was not competent, for he was not a priest by lawful ordination.^r The result is told by Athanasius, not only in his Apology, but in his fourth Festal Letter, written "from the Court," in the early part of 332, but somewhat later than his usual time. He had been suffering from long illness; but he rejoiced to tell his brethren in Egypt that his Meletian assailants had been driven away as convicted slanderers. About Mid-lent he returned home, with a letter from Constantine reprobating his enemies and praising him as "a man of God;" and then Ischyrras came to him, asking to be received into the Church, and piteously protesting that the Meletians had set him on to assert a falsehood. He signed, in presence of thirteen clergy, a statement denying the whole charge, and declaring that he had made it, so to speak, under duress. But his penitence was not thought trustworthy; he was not admitted to communion; and the story, perhaps in consequence, was ere long revived in an aggravated form—Athanasius himself being now called the perpetrator of the outrage (*Apol.* 62, 64, 28, 74, 17, 65, 68).

^p The case is commonly cited as shewing that ordination by a presbyter was considered invalid.

^q *Athan. Apol.* 85, 77, 76, 63. Some of his friends were afterwards frightened into siding with him (*ib.* 76).

^r See *Apol.* 11, 28, 46, 63. On Saturday, as well as on Sunday, the Eucharist was usually celebrated in Egyptian churches and monasteries. The prominence given to the "breaking of the chalice" is fully explained by observing that it implied an outrage done to the Sacrament itself (see Julius, in *Apol.* 30), the attack being said to have been made at the time of consecration. When the Egyptian bishops, in their remarks on the case, say there was no chalice, they mean none used for any legitimate celebration.

A darker plot, however, followed. John Arcaph persuaded a Meletian bishop, named Arsenius, to go into hiding. A rumour was then spread that he had been murdered, and dismembered for purposes of magic, by Athanasius; in proof of which the Meletians, "with feigned lamentations," exhibited a dead man's hand in a wooden box (*Apol.* 63, 42; *Soc.* i. 27; *Soz.* ii. 25; *Theod.* i. 30). The emperor heard of it, and was persuaded to think it a case for inquiry. Athanasius received from Dalmatius the censor, Constantine's half-brother, a formal summons to appear at Antioch and stand his trial. At first he disdained to take any steps; but, "since the emperor was moved," as he himself tells us, he wrote, apparently while on a tour in Pentapolis and Ammoniaca,* to his "fellow-ministers in Egypt," and sent a deacon to search for the missing Arsenius. The deacon went to the Thebaid, Arsenius's country, and ascertained that Arsenius was concealed in a monastery at Ptemencyrcis, on the eastern side of the Nile. Before he could arrive there, Pinnes, the superior, had been forewarned, and had promptly sent off Arsenius into Lower Egypt; but was himself arrested by the deacon, carried before one of the "dukes" of Egypt (see *Gibbon*, ii. 320) at Alexandria, and obliged to confess—as he informed John Arcaph in a singular letter, which somehow fell into Athanasius's hands—"that Arsenius was alive, and had not been murdered." To track the dead-alive was the next point, and a trivial incident led to his discovery. At Tyre, the servants of Archelaus, a consular, happened to hear it said in a tavern that Arsenius was hidden in one of the houses of the city. They marked the speaker's face, and told their master. The clue was taken up, the house searched, and a man found, who denied that he was the person sought for, until placed before the tribunal of Paul, the bishop, who had known Arsenius of old; whereupon, as Tillemont quaintly phrases it, "il fut convaincu d'être lui-même." Constantine stopped the proceedings at Antioch on hearing of this exposure, and sent Athanasius a letter, to be read frequently in public, in which the Meletians were warned that any fresh offences of theirs would be dealt with by the emperor in person, and according to the civil law (*Apol.* 9, 68).

The slandered archbishop had now a breathing time. Alexander, the aged bishop of Thessalonica, a right-minded though somewhat weak man, who had sat in the Nicene Council, sent to his "dear lord and son" a letter of congratulation; he had rejoiced, he said, to hear that Arcaph the calumniator (*ὁ συκοφάντης*) had come to disgrace. Arcaph himself "came into the church," was admitted to communion, blamed his own conduct, announced to Constantine his reconciliation with Athanasius, and received a gracious reply; while Arsenius sent to his "blessed Pope," in his own name and that of his clergy, a formal renunciation of schism, and a promise of canonical obedience to "the church over which, by the grace of God, you preside:" a promise which he kept (*Apol.* 66, 17, 70, 69, 3, 27).

* He was there during part of 332, according to the *Festal Index*.

See *Apol.* 67. It was probably intercepted by the friends of Athanasius. "The thing," writes Pinnes, "can no longer be kept a secret."

But the faction had not repented. Eusebius persuaded Constantine that such grave scandals as the recent charges ought to be examined in a council; and that Caesarea, the see of his namesake the historian, would be the fitting place. There, accordingly, a council was summoned early in 333; but it did not meet until 334. (See Tillemont, *Ath.* a. 15; cf. *Festal Epp.* index, for A.D. 334). Athanasius expected no justice from a synod held under such circumstances, and persisted, *Sozomen* says (ii. 25), "for thirty months" in his refusal to attend. This, of course, was represented as contumacy; and being at last peremptorily ordered by Constantine to attend a council which was to meet at Tyre (shortly before the contemplated dedication of the new church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem), he obeyed, in the summer of 335, and was attended by about fifty of his suffragans, who, on arriving, were indignant at being introduced into the assembly "not by deacons, but by a registrar of indictments," and protested, by Athanasius's mouth, against several bishops present as disqualified by partisanship from being judges of his cause. (*Apol.* 8, 78; see *Hooker*, v. 42. 2.) Although the large gathering included several who were not Arianizers, Athanasius saw at once that his enemies were dominant; the presiding bishop, Flacillus of Antioch, was one of an Arian succession. Macarius was dragged before the council in chains; he himself had to stand up as a defendant, and, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 68. 7), an old Egyptian bishop, Potammon, who had lost an eye in the great persecution, asked Eusebius of Caesarea, with a bitter taunt, how he dared to sit as judge of "the innocent Athanasius." The Count Dionysius, appointed by the emperor to keep order, was mostly swayed by Eusebian influences. Ischyrras appeared among the accusers. New charges were added to the old ones; some of these referred to the time of Athanasius's election. He was also said to have thrown down an episcopal chair (covered, as usual, with linen, *Apol.* 17); to have caused Ischyrras to be imprisoned on a charge of pelting the emperor's statues;* to have deprived, excommunicated, and exposed to military cruelties, a bishop named Callinicus, for suspecting him in the case of the chalice; to have given the see to a priest who had been deposed, and to have ill-treated other bishops for disowning his authority. A document was read, purporting to express the repugnance of the Alexandrian laity to join with him in worship. Some of the charges Athanasius at once confuted; as to others he demanded time. His suffragans were interrupted when they offered evidence in his favour, while even convicted slanderers found indulgence. Incredible as it may seem, the dead man's hand, in the box, was again exhibited; a cry of horror arose, and Athanasius calmly asked, "Did any one here know Arsenius?" Many replied, "We knew him." Athanasius led forward a man with downcast face, closely

* *Sozomen* (ii. 25) must have had some special information about the proceedings; but part of it—including a charge advanced by a woman, and signally confuted (see *Ruf.* i. 17)—seems untrustworthy. What he says about supposed friends of Athanasius coming forward to denounce him has the appearance of truth.

* This, Montfaucon is inclined to think, may have really happened before the death of Alexander.

muffled; then, bidding him raise his head, looked round and asked, "Is not this Arsenius?" The identity was undeniable. He drew from behind the cloak first one hand, and then, after a pause, the other; and remarked with triumphant irony, "I suppose no one thinks that God has given to any man more hands than two." In the confusion that followed, John Arcaph ran out of the court: his associates, with more presence of mind, first raised a cry of "magical illusion," and directed against Athanasius an outburst of fury from which he was just saved by the intervention of Dionysius; and afterwards tried to account for their "mistake" about Arsenius by a lame story of cruelties inflicted on him at Athanasius's command, from which he had contrived to escape. The case of the broken chalice now remained: it was resolved to send a commission of inquiry to the Mareotis; and in spite of remonstrances from the Egyptian bishops, the dominant party (four days after certain Meletians had been sent on to prepare evidence), despatched six commissioners, all thorough-going Eusebians, two of whom, Valens and Ursacius, had "in their early days been instructed by Arius, had been degraded from the priesthood," and, although still young, had been appointed to bishoprics in Pannonia "for their impiety," as Athanasius expresses it (Athan. *ad Ep. Aegypt.* 7, cf. *Apol.* 13)—meaning, for their zeal in the Arian cause. Macarius was left at Tyre under guard: Ischyrras accompanied the commissioners, as "a sharer in lodging, board, and wine-cup;" they opened their court in the Mareotis, unbelievers being admitted to an inquiry "respecting the table and the chalice" of the Christian mysteries, while presbyters were persistently shut out (*Apol.* 72, 14, 31). Philagrius, praefect of Egypt, an apostate to Arianism,² was there with his heathen soldiery to intimidate the witnesses. Among these were Jews and catechumens, none of whom could have been present at what purported to be an Eucharistic celebration; yet even so, it appeared in evidence that no books had been burned, and that Ischyrras had been—as he himself once admitted—too ill to officiate on the day of the alleged sacrilege.³ An inquiry of such an *ex parte* character—as Arsenius himself afterwards described it,—called forth indignant protests from the Alexandrian and Mareotic clergy, one of which documents bears the date of the 10th of Thoth, i.e. Sept. 7, 335. The commissioners, disregarding remonstrance, after procuring the exile of four Alexandrian priests, and allowing the heathen rabble almost in their presence, and on a fast day, to insult the Alexandrian Catholics, returned to Tyre (*Apol.* 27, 73–76, 17, 15).

² Theod. i. 30. Soc. i. 29 makes him say, "You see he has his two hands; where was the third cut off?" See Dean Stanley's account, *East. Ch.* p. 285. Athanasius's sense of humour appears also in the anecdote, that being once asked what was the spiritual condition of persons baptised without real faith, he answered that when in time of plague many sought baptism from fear of death, an angel said to Bishop Peter, "Why do you send us these sacks sealed up and empty?" (Rosweyde. *Vit. Patr.* l. x. c. 198. See Stanley, p. 286.)

³ That this is what is meant by παραβάρης in his case, see *Hist. Ar.* 9.

⁴ *Apol.* 72, 14, 83, 41, 28, 83. Care was taken to keep the minutes of the inquiry secret, but they came to light afterwards.

Athanasius had complained to Dionysius, as soon as they had started for Egypt, that the very men to whom he had objected were sent on the commission. His suffragans called on the count to reserve the case for the emperor's own hearing; and some of them passionately complained to Alexander of Thessalonica that "the wild beasts were about to rush upon them." He thereupon wrote to Dionysius, regretting the nomination of the commissioners, and speaking of Athanasius as the victim of a conspiracy; and Dionysius felt himself obliged to warn the Eusebians not to let the council's proceedings be vitiated by injustice (*Apol.* 78–81). But Athanasius regarded them as already vitiated (*Apol.* 82); and resolved, without waiting for the judgment of such an assembly (the ruling spirits of which soon drew back Dionysius into a line of violent unfairness, *Apol.* 9), "to make a bold and dangerous experiment, whether the throne was inaccessible to the voice of truth."^b Attended by five of his suffragans, he took the first vessel for Constantinople, and suddenly presented himself in the middle of the road when the emperor was riding into the city. Not recognizing him at first sight, Constantine, on learning who he was, and what was his errand, tried to pass him by in silence; but Athanasius firmly stood his ground. "Either summon a lawful council, or give me opportunity of meeting my accusers in your presence." The request was conceded. The bishops of the council, after receiving their commissioners' report, had by a majority condemned Athanasius, recognized the Meletians as churchmen, adjourned to Jerusalem for the dedication solemnity, and there pronounced Arius orthodox on the ground of a doctrinal statement made five years earlier, when they were startled by an imperial letter expressing suspicion of their motives, and summoning them to Constantinople.^c Many of them, in alarm, fled homewards; but the two Eusebii, Theognis, Patrophilus, Valens, and Ursacius, repaired to court, and, saying nothing of "the chalice," or the report of the commission, presented a new charge, like the former quasi-political ones—that Athanasius had talked of distressing Constantinople by preventing the sailing of Alexandrian corn-ships.^d "How could I, a private person, and poor, do anything of the kind?" asked Athanasius. Eusebius of Nicomedia answered by affirming with an oath, that Athanasius was rich and powerful, and able to do anything. The emperor cut short Athanasius's defence, with a show of indignation; and, perhaps^e not from real belief in the charge, but by way of getting rid of the case and silencing the archbishop's enemies in his own interest, ban-

^b Gibbon, iii. 73. One of Eutychius's strange fables is, that Athanasius hastened to Jerusalem, and there consecrated the church before the other bishops arrived.

^c *Apol.* 9, 86; Socr. i. 34; Soz. ii. 23. Epiphanius makes Athanasius say, when first repulsed, "The Lord judge between you and me" (*Haer.* 68. 8).

^d *Apol.* 9, 87. Soz., ii. 28, is mistaken here. The accusation is illustrated by the tragical death of Sopater in this very reign (see Milman, *Hist. Chr.* ii. 455); and by "the clamours" of the people of Constantinople, when "deprived of their daily sustenance" by the Moslem conquest of Alexandria, in 641 (Gibbon, c. 51).

^e Athanasius is not quite consistent as to Constantine's motives (*Apol.* 87; *Hist. Ar.* 50).

ished him to the distant city of Trier or Treves, the seat of government of his eldest son Constantine, who received the exile with much kindness, in February 336.

III. *From his first exile to his second.*—His life at Treves, including nearly two years and a half,[†] was an interval of rest, much needed and doubtless invigorating, between the storms of the past and those of the future. He had now to "stand and wait"—a new experience for him. And the scene was very new: transferred on a sudden to Northern Germany, which seemed to him "like the ends of the earth," he found himself in a city already venerable, and in some sense imperial—the "domicilium principum clarum" of Ammianus (xv. ii. 9)—which shewed to him in their freshness many features of Roman grandeur, some of which it still shows to the modern visitor in their decay. He would pass under the huge "Porta Nigra," would visit the baths, and the basilica of the palace, and the amphitheatre where the reigning emperor had exhibited his barbarous "Ludi;"[‡] and the present cathedral perhaps retains some portion of the church which he saw used on festivals by the Christian population, on account of its spaciousness, before it was out of the builder's hands (*Apol. ad Const.* 15). He was "abundantly supplied with all necessities" (Constantine II. in *Apol.* 87); he had the friendship of Maximin, the orthodox bishop of Treves, afterwards canonized;[§] he had with him some Egyptian "brethren," and kept up a correspondence with his friends at home, although at the risk of having his letters seized in order to find fresh matter for accusation. He may often have walked under those "broad walls," or by the "placid Moselle" (Ausonius, *Nob. Urb.* 4), pondering the news just received of his Alexandrians' success in resisting the return of Arius, or their failure (and Antony's) in petitioning for his own (Soz. ii. 31); of the terrible end of the heresiarch; and of the death-bed baptism of the emperor in May 337. He wrote to the presbyters of Alexandria, exhorting them to take up the Apostle's words, "Nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ," and at the beginning of 338 he wrote a Festal Letter, announcing the coming Easter, which he would keep with his flock in a spiritual communion too real for local separation to disturb (*Fest. Ep.* 10; *† Hist. Ar.* 40). Into one passage of it he seems to pour his whole spirit, in its faith, tenderness, and heroism, reminding his "beloved" people that the way to comfort was through affliction; that antichristian hostility was to be expected; but that the man who lived in Christ would win the victory.

For more than a year, Constantine's death produced no change in Athanasius's position; but at length, on the 17th of June 338,[‡] Constantine

II., who in the partition of the empire had a certain precedence over his brothers Constantius and Constans, the sovereigns of the East and of Italy, wrote from Treves to the Catholics of Alexandria, announcing that he had resolved, in fulfilment of an intention of his father, to send back Athanasius, of whose character he expressed high admiration (*Apol.* 87). In this he appears to have presumed his brother's consent, and to have then taken Athanasius with him to Viminacium, an important town of Moesia Superior, on the high-road to Constantinople. Here the three emperors had a meeting, and all concurred in the restoration of Athanasius, who after passing through Constantinople, saw Constantius a second time, at a further point on his homeward journey, at Caesarea in Cappadocia (*Apol. ad Const.* 5; *Hist. Ar.* 8). His arrival at Alexandria, in November 338, was hailed by popular rejoicing: the churches resounded with thanksgivings, and the clergy "thought it the happiest day of their lives."[§] But his enemies bestirred themselves, and "did not shrink from long journeys" in order to press on the emperors new charges against him—that he had misappropriated the corn granted by the late emperor for charitable purposes in Egypt and Libya, and that the day of his return had been signalized by bloodshed. Constantius wrote to him in anger, assuming the truth of the former charge; but Athanasius was successful in disproving both. However, Constantius—who was so soon to be "his scourge and torment" (Hooker, v. 42. 2)—fell more and more under the influence of his great enemy Eusebius, now transferred from Nicomedia to the see of Constantinople, which had been forcibly vacated by the second expulsion of the orthodox Paul.^m The Eusebians now resumed a project which had been found impracticable while Constantine lived; this was to place on "the Evangelical throne" an Arian named Pistus, who had been a priest under Alexander, had been deposed by him for adhering to Arius, and had been consecrated, as it seems (*Apol.* 24) by a notorious Arian bishop named Secundus. It was argued that Athanasius had offended against all ecclesiastical principles by resuming his see in defiance of the Tyrian sentence, and by virtue of mere secular authority. The charge did not come well from a party which had leaned so much on the Court and the State; but it must be allowed that Athanasius's return had given some colour to the objection,ⁿ although he doubt-

[†] *Apol.* 7. Perhaps the tract on Matt. xi. 27 (*In illud, Omnia Mihi*), was written soon afterwards. In it he maintained, against Eusebius of Nicomedia, that *πρεσβύτης* there referred to the Son's mediatorial office, not to anything prior to His Incarnation.

[‡] *Apol.* 3, 18, 6; *Hist. Ar.* 9. In one passage (*Ap. ad Const.* 4) he specially mentions that he had had to write, in his own defence, to Constans. For Athanasius's emphatic condemnation of the principle of persecution, see *Hist. Ar.* 67.

^m Paul succeeded Alexander of Constantinople in 336, and was four times expelled from his see, and ultimately, as Athanasius heard (*Hist. Ar.* 7), strangled in a "dark cell" at Cucusus in 352 (Clinton). The second expulsion followed soon after an accusation brought against him, in Athanasius's own hearing, by Macedonius; and was followed by Eusebius of Nicomedia's translation to his see. The second return was after the death of Eusebius, in 342.

ⁿ See Soc. ii. 2; Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 172. Cf. Encyclopædia of Egyptian Bishops, *Apol.* 8. But see *Hist. Ar.* 1.

[†] Hefele, in his *Conciliengeschichte*, says that the index to the Festal Letters is clearly a whole year wrong in dating Athanasius's banishment on Athyr 12 = Nov. 336.

[‡] See Kingsley's *Hermits*, pp. 26-28. Constantine had often resided at Treves; and his son was now representing him in the sovereignty of Gaul, Spain, and Britain.

[§] Mentioned with honour after his death, in *Ad Ep.* 8.

[†] Valesius (*Obs. Eccl.* i. 1) thinks it was 337. But for the later date see Newman, *Hist. Tracts*, p. xli.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i. 467.

less held that the assembly at Tyre had forfeited all moral right to be respected as a council. By way of harassing Athanasius, the Eusebians, apparently about this time, made Ischyra a bishop, after obtaining an order in the name of the emperor that a church should be built for him—an order which failed to procure him a congregation (*Apol.* 12, 85).

And now the Eusebians applied to the West in behalf of their nominee Pistus. Three clergy appeared as their envoys before Julius, bishop of Rome; on the other hand, Athanasius sent to Rome presbyters to state his case, and an encyclic—the invaluable document which has furnished us with so much information—from “the holy Synod assembled at Alexandria out of Egypt, Thebais, Libya, and Pentapolis,” composed, says Athanasius, of nearly 100 prelates. He had already written an encyclic of his own (now lost), which had drawn forth from many foreign bishops an anathema against his intended rival (*Apol.* 6). At Rome his envoys gave such evidence respecting Pistus as to cause the senior of the Eusebian envoys to decamp by night in spite of an indisposition. His companions asked Julius to convoke a council, and to act, if he pleased, as judge. He accordingly invited both parties to a council, to be held at some place which Athanasius should choose.^o Thus matters stood about the end of 339.

But early in 340 a new announcement disqualified the Alexandrian Church. It was notified in a formal edict of the prefect that not Pistus, but a Cappadocian named Gregory, was coming from the Court to be installed as bishop (*Encycl.* 2). This, says Athanasius, was considered an unheard-of wrong. The churches were more thronged than ever: the people, in great excitement, and with passionate outcries, called the magistrates and the whole city to witness that this attack on their legitimate bishop proceeded from the mere wantonness of Arian hatred. Gregory, they knew, was an Arian, and therefore acceptable to the Eusebian party: ^p he was a fellow-countryman of Philagrius. According to Gregory Nazianzen, he had once studied at Alexandria, and been kindly treated by the prelate whom he was now to supersede. Remonstrance was vain. Philagrius attacked the church of St. Quirinus, and encouraged a mob of the lowest townspeople and of savage peasants to perpetrate atrocious cruelties and profanations. Hideous orgies were carried on in the baptistery, church books burned, the Holy Table defiled by heathenish sacrifices, the stores of wine, oil, and candles pillaged, and monks, virgins, and widows maltreated, or even slain.^q Athanasius was residing in the precincts of the church of St. Theonas: he knew that he was specially aimed at, and, in hope of preventing further outrage, he withdrew from the city (after first, according to the Festal Index, baptizing many^r) to a place of

concealment in the neighbourhood, where he busied himself in preparing an encyclic to give an account of these horrors. This was on March 19. Four days later, Gregory is said to have “entered the city as bishop.”^s This Lenten season was a time of Arian persecution: Gregory, on Good Friday, punished the abhorrence shown at his entry into a church by causing Philagrius to scourge 34 women, one of them with her psalter in her hands: and Easter Day, to the delight of the heathens, was selected for the work of putting Catholics into prison. Captains of vessels were tortured to make them convey Gregory’s “letters of communion.” Clergy were prevented from giving baptism or visiting the sick; lay people could not pray in their own houses undisturbed; an indictment signed by heathens and Arians, and accusing Athanasius of capital crimes, was given to Philagrius for presentation to the emperor. Athanasius, after hastily completing and despatching his encyclic, sailed for Rome in the Easter season of 340,^t some weeks after Constantine II. had been slain during his invasion of Italy.

IV. *From his second exile to his second return.*—After Julius had welcomed Athanasius, he sent two presbyters, Elpidius and Philoxenus, in the early summer of 340, to repeat his invitation to the Eusebian prelates, and to fix definitely the next December as the time of the proposed Council, and Rome as the place.^u Athanasius says of himself, with a noble simplicity, “When I had laid my case before the Church” (at Rome) “for this was my one subject of anxiety—I spent my time in the Church services.” He received much kindness from the emperor’s aunt, Eutrope, from two persons named Abuterius and Sperantius, and from many others (*Ap. ad Const.* 417; cf. *Fest. Ep.* 13). He was “refreshed” by letters from Egypt; and he had with him two Egyptian monks, one of whom, Ammonius, is said to have shown no interest in any Roman buildings^v

^o The Index assigns these events to 339; but that would not leave time for the proceedings in the case of Pistus, &c., as Athanasius only reached home at the end of 338. As to the “four days,” Athanasius himself says (*Hist. Ar.* 11) that he sailed to Rome before Gregory arrived; which may be an abbreviated statement of the case, admitting of his first hiding himself near Alexandria. See Mansi (*Suppl.* i. 173 sq.) on these points; he relied on the “Anonymus Maffeiensis.”

^t The difficulties of the chronology at this period have long been felt. The opinion that Athanasius visited Rome twice is now generally (though not by Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 176) abandoned for what Gibbon (iii. 75) calls “the simple hypothesis” of Valesius. But the date of this single journey has been disputed. However, since the discovery of the Festal Letters, more light has been gained. In the 13th, at the beginning of 341, Athanasius expressly says that he “writes from Rome:” whence it appears that the spring in which he fled to Rome (i. e. the spring of the year of Gregory’s intrusion) must be that of either 339 or 340: but 339, for a reason given above, seems excluded. Hefele therefore decides for 340; and (as Mansi had done on grounds of internal probability) rejects the common notion that Gregory was appointed by the Dedication Council, which sat in 341. Newman’s arrangement, in the preface to *Historical Tracts of S. Athanasius* (*1. b. Path.*), was made before the publication of the Festal Letters.

^u *Apol.* 20, *Hist. Ar.* 11. As to the reception of Athanasius, see *Apol.* 29.

^v Soc. iv. 23. The other monk, Isidore, was “known to the senate, et procerum uxoris.” Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca* (*Vit. Patr.* i. 8, c. 1, p. 538).

^o *Encycl.* 6; *Apol.* 24, 20, 22; *Hist. Ar.* 9. This letter of Julius appears to have been synodical, *Apol.* 26.

^p His secretary had been excommunicated by Alexander (Athan. *Encycl.* 7).

^q *Encycl.* 3, 4; *Hist. Ar.* 10. Julius heard that “the holy Mysteries had been flung upon the ground by heathens,” *Apol.* 30. Antony was said to have had a premonitory vision of mules spurning the altar, *Vit. Ant.* 82.

^r He would naturally, in such circumstances, anticipate the Paschal baptisms.

except "the church" of St. Peter and St. Paul. But their presence in the city, and Athanasius's enthusiasm for Antony and other types of monastic saintliness, made a strong impression on the Roman Church society, and abated the prejudices there existing against the very name of monk, and the disgust at a rude and strange exterior. In fact, Athanasius's three years at Rome had two great historic results. (1.) The Latin Church, which became his "scholar" as well as his "loyal partisan," was confirmed by the spell of his master-mind² "in its adhesion to orthodoxy, although it did not imbibe from him the theological spirit." And (2) when Gibbon says^a that "Athanasius introduced into Rome the knowledge and practice of the monastic life," he records the origination of a vast European movement, and represents the great Alexandrian exile as the spiritual ancestor of Benedict, of Bernard, and of the countless founders and reformers of "religious" communities in the West.

Meantime Elpidius and Philoxenus had discharged their errand. The Eusebians at Antioch, finding that Athanasius was at Rome, and that the Council to which they were invited would be a free ecclesiastical assembly,^b detained the Roman legates beyond the time specified, and then dismissed them with the excuse that Constantius was occupied with his Persian war. At the same time they stimulated Philagrius and Gregory to new severities. Orthodox bishops were scourged and imprisoned; Potammon never recovered from his stripes; Sarapammon, another confessor-bishop, was exiled (*Hist. Ar.* 12). The letters of Alexandrians to Athanasius, consolatory as proofs of their affection, gave mournful accounts of torture and robbery, of hatred towards himself shown in persecution of his aunt, of countenance shown to Gregory by the "duke" Balacius; and some of these troubles were in his mind when, early in 341, he wrote "from Rome" his festal letter for the year. That year had begun without any such settlement of his case as had been hoped for at Rome. December had passed, and no council could be held, for the Eusebians had not arrived. January came, and at last the legates returned, the unwilling bearers of a letter so offensive that Julius "resolved" to keep it to himself, in the hope that some Eusebians "would even yet arrive (*Apol.* 24), and render the public reading of it unnecessary. No one came. On the contrary, the Eusebians resolved to take advantage of the approaching dedication of a new cathedral at Antioch, "the Golden Church," in order to hold a Council there. Accordingly, 97 bishops, many of whom were rather negatively than positively heterodox, assembled on this occasion, apparently in August^d 341. Constantius was present. The

sentence passed at Tyre was affirmed; several canons were passed; and three creeds were framed, in language partly vague and general, partly all but reaching the Nicene standard (cf. Newman, *Arians*, c. 4, s. 1; cf. *Ath. Treatises*, i. 105 sq.). This business necessarily lasted some time; and no information as to this Council had reached Rome when, in November, Athanasius having now been waiting at Rome for eighteen months (*Apol.* 29), Julius assembled the long-delayed Council, consisting of more than fifty bishops, in the church of the presbyter Vito. The Eusebian letter was read; Athanasius's case was fully examined; the reports of the Mareotic commission, which had been brought to Rome two years before by the three Eusebian envoys, were laid before the assembly; and priests from Egypt gave evidence of the more recent cruelties of the Arian intruder. Athanasius was formally pronounced innocent; his right to brotherly treatment and Church communion—admitted from the first by the Roman bishop,^c—was solemnly recognized by the Italian Council. Marcellus of Ancyra, who, in the course of opposing Arianism, had been accused of denying the personality of the Logos, the Eternity of the Sonship, the reality and the permanence of the Incarnation,^f had been deposed and banished, and had been staying at Rome a year and three months, was now declared orthodox on the ground of statements which he delivered, and which satisfied the Western bishops. Other prelates and clergy from various countries testified to wrongs inflicted by Arianizers. By desire of the Council, Julius wrote to the Eusebians a letter of dignified remonstrance, towards the conclusion of which he intimated that the Roman see ought in the first instance to have been informed of any complaints raised against the bishop of Alexandria.^g

The year 342 is not eventful in the Athanasian history. About the opening of it, the Eusebians, who had managed the Dedication Council, made an attempt to gain credit with the young Western emperor Constans. He had (perhaps unexpectedly, since Constantine II. had fallen in civil war with him) shewn himself friendly to Athanasius, who at his request had sent him from Alexandria some bound copies of the Scriptures (*Ap. ad Const.* 4). Narcissus, Maris, and two other prelates, appeared before Constans at Treves, spoke in support of the decisions against Athanasius, and presented a creed which might, at first sight, appear all but to confess the "Homousion." But Constans, doubtless swayed by Bishop Maximin, who would not admit the Eastern envoys to communion, dismissed them

^e This is implied in *Ap. ad Const.* 4. Vales. *Obs. Eccl.* i. c. 5. Cf. *Apol.* 20.

^f The view ascribed to him was akin to Sabellianism on the one hand, for it made the Logos only an eternal power in God, coming forth at certain times into energy; and to Ebionism on the other, for it made Jesus the "Son of God" only as the temporary organ of that energy. That he really did hold this, Newman and Dörner agree. His disciple, it must be remembered, was Photinus. Montfaucou thinks him scarcely excusable. Möhler treats him as misrepresented.

^g *Apol.* 35. Julius's claim is exaggerated by Socrates and Sozomen to a general one. It clearly alludes to the case of the two Dionysii in the 3rd century (*Hist. Tracts*, p. 56; Hussey, *Rise of Papal Power*, p. 6). Athanasius speaks of the Roman see as "an apostolic throne" (*Hist. Ar.* 35).

⁷ *Ap. ad Const.* 4, expressly gives this period.

⁸ Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. 61. The Roman introit for his festival is striking: "In medio ecclesiae aperuit os ejus; et implevit eum Dominus spiritu sapientiae et intellectus; stolam gloriae induit eum, alleluia."

^a Gibbon, iv. 308. Cf. Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, 6. 3. "Marcella," says Jerome, *Ep.* 96, "learned the disciplina of Antony from pope Athanasius."

^b "Not regulated by royal mandate," &c. (*Hist. Ar.* 11). The readiness of the Arians to take an ultra-secular line, and to allow the emperor an absolute authority in things ecclesiastical, is noticed (*ib.* 33, 36, 77).

^c See also the representation of it in *Soz.* iii. 8.

^d So Mansi. Hefele dates it some time between May and September. Cf. *Soc.* ii. 8.

from his presence (*Ath. de Syn.* 25; *Soz.* iii. 10; *Hil. Fragm.* iii. 27).

Athanasius remained at Rome until the summer of 343, when "in the fourth year" from his arrival, he received a letter from Constans, by which he was ordered to meet him at Milan (*Ap. ad Const.* 3, 4). Surprised at the summons, he inquired as to its probable cause; and learned that some bishops had been urging Constans to propose to Constantius the assembling of a new council, at which East and West might be represented. On arriving at the great capital of Northern Italy, which was to be so memorably associated with the struggle between the Church and Arianism, he was admitted, with Protasius bishop of Milan, behind the veil of the audience chamber, and received with "much kindness" by Constans, who told him that he had already written to his brother, "requesting that a council might be held." Athanasius left Milan immediately afterwards, being desired by Constans to come into Gaul, in order to meet Hosius, the venerated bishop of Cordova, and accompany him to the Council, which both sovereigns had now agreed to assemble on the frontier line of their empires, at the Moesian city of Sardica. And there, about the end of 343,^b some 170 prelates met, a small majority being Westerns.

It soon appeared that united action was impossible. The majority, ignoring the Councils of Tyre and Antioch, and treating the whole case as open, could not but regard Athanasius as innocent, or, at least, as not yet proved guilty; and he "joined them in celebrating the Divine mysteries" (*Hil. Fragm.* iii. 14). The minority, on reaching Sardica, had simply announced their arrival, and then shut themselves up in the lodgings provided for them at the palace, and refused to join their brethren until the persons whom they denounced as convicted men should be deprived of seats in the Council. The answer was, that the Council was prepared to go into all the cases which could be submitted to it: each party would be free to implead the other. Witnesses were ready to attest the sufferings of the orthodox, to tell of forged letters and of organized terrorism; even to exhibit wounds inflicted, and hands that had been fettered, by Eusebian violence. The Eusebian bishops, although urged to confront their adversaries, and even assured that they might privately state their case to the presiding bishop Hosius, withdrew from Sardica on an idle pretext, and, in spite of a formal summons from that majority,

established themselves as a council at Philippopolis within the Eastern empire, renewed the sentences against Athanasius, put forth new ones against Julius, Hosius, and others, drew up an encyclic, and adopted a creed (*Apol.* 48, 36; *Hist. Ar.* 15; *Apol.* 45; *Hist. Ar.* 44; *H. A.* 16; *Hil. de Syn.* 34; *Fragm.* 3). The prelates at Sardica proceeded with their inquiry, recognized in consequence the innocence of Athanasius,ⁱ and excommunicated eleven Eusebian bishops, as men who "separated the Son from the Father, and so merited separation from the Catholic Church." They enacted several canons, including the famous one providing for a reference, in certain circumstances, to "Julius bishop of Rome," in "honour of Peter's memory," so that he might make arrangements for the rehearing of a prelate's cause. It need hardly be added that they would have no creed but the Nicene. They wrote letters of sympathy to the suffragans of Athanasius and the Churchmen of Alexandria, urging the faithful "to contend earnestly for the sound faith and the innocence of Athanasius," and to remember that "although the Catholic Church had suffered many an outrage, yet he that endured to the end should be saved."^k

The bold line taken at Sardica provoked the advisers of Constantius to fresh severities; and the Alexandrian magistrates received orders to behead Athanasius, or certain of his clergy expressly named, if they should come near the city. Five Alexandrian clergy were banished into Armenia. Many Catholics, we are told, were terrified into dissembling their belief; many fled into the deserts, in order to avoid the dominant party (*Hist. Ar.* 19, 18, 20). The Council, supported by Constans, endeavoured to move Constantius by sending to him two delegates, Vincent, bishop of Capua, and Euphrates of Cologne.^l They reached Antioch at Easter 344. Stephen, the Arian patriarch of Antioch, devised an atrocious plot against Euphrates. It was detected, and visited by his deposition; and Constantius, in an honest revulsion of feeling, recalled the banished clergy from Armenia, and wrote to stop the persecution of Athanasius's adherents (*Hist. Ar.* 20, 21). Athanasius, himself still kept under the emperor's ban, had gone from Sardica to Naisus, and thence, at the invitation of Constans, to Aquileia. There, in company with the bishop Fortunatian (for, he observes, he never saw Constans alone), he was admitted to more than one audience; and whenever Constans mentioned Constantius, he replied in terms respectful towards the latter. Of his sojourn in this city, near the walls of which Constantine II. had met his tragical end, we read, that on one occasion, a large church, while still undedicated, was filled

^b The discoveries of the Maffei Fragment and the Festal Letters have had the effect of throwing back the dates of the Sardican Council and the second return of Athanasius. The received date of 347 for the Council (*Soc.*, *Soz.*) is proved to be too late (even apart from the difficulty as to Euphrates of Cologne). For Athanasius's return was some time after the death of Gregory, which was (says Athanasius, in *Hist. Ar.* 21) some ten months after the deposition of Stephen of Antioch, which was soon after the Easter subsequent to the Council. But not to say that the Fragment gives Oct. 346 for Athanasius's return, the 19th Festal Letter, for 347, was written after it. Therefore the Council cannot be placed later than the end of 344, which is Mansi's date, received by Gieseler; and cf. Newman, *Hist. Tracts*, p. vi. But Hefele's date, the end of 343, is more probable. The "Macrostich" Confession was presented by Eusebian deputies at Milan in the spring of 345. It could not have been presented within three months after the Sardican Council.

ⁱ Valesius remarks that they said nothing of Paul of Constantinople, and supposes that he had previously—for the third time—regained his see (*Obs. Eccl.* ii. 7).

^k *Apol.* 36-43. Maffei published letters of the Council and of Athanasius to the church in the Mareotis; and one of Athanasius to the Alexandrian clergy.

^l The deposition of Euphrates, by a Council of Cologne, "for denying that Christ was God," is dated in the acts A.D. 346. But this date must be too early; for the acts make Servatius, bishop of Tongri, say that he had rebuked Euphrates in the presence of Athanasius, who in that case could not have allowed him to be appointed a delegate from Sardica. Hefele doubts the whole story.

by a vast congregation, including Constans, who retained, amid his moral deterioration, a respect for religion which combined with his personal kindness to affect Athanasius's judgment of his character (*Ap. ad Const.* 4, 3, 15, 7; *Hist. Ar.* 44). He had peremptorily, and even with a threat of civil war, urged his brother to reinstate Athanasius (*Soc. ii.* 22). The death—according to Theodoret, the murder—of Gregory, about February 345 (*Hist. Ar.* 21), gave Constantius an occasion for yielding the point. He therefore wrote to Athanasius, affecting to be solicitous of the Western emperor's assent to an act of his own free clemency. He wrote two other letters (*Apol.* 51; *Hist. Ar.* 22), and employed six "counts" to write encouragingly to the exile; and Athanasius, after receiving these letters at Aquileia, made up his mind, at last, to act on those assurances; but not until Constantius could tell Constans that he had been "expecting Athanasius for a year." Invited by Constans to Treves, Athanasius made a diversion on his journey in order to see Rome again; it was some six years since he had been cordially welcomed by Julius, who now poured forth his generous heart in a letter of congratulation for the Alexandrian Church, one of the most beautiful documents in the whole Athanasian series; Julius dwelt on the well-tryed worth of Athanasius, on his own happiness in gaining such a friend, on the steady faith which the Alexandrians had exhibited, on the rapture with which they would celebrate his return; and concluded by invoking for his "beloved brethren" the blessings "which eye had not seen, nor ear heard."^m Athanasius travelled northward, about midsummer; visited Constans, passed through Hadrianople (*Hist. Ar.* 18), proceeded to Antioch, and saw Constantius for the third time (*Ap. ad Const.* 5). The reception was gracious: the emperor valued himself on his impassive demeanour (*Ammian.* xvi. 10). Athanasius, without vilifying his enemies, firmly desired leave to confront them (*Ap. ad Const.* l. c.; *Hist. Ar.* 22, 44). "No," said Constantius, "God knows, I will never again credit such accusations; and all records of past charges shall be erased." This latter promise he at once fulfilled, by orders sent to the authorities in Egypt; and he wrote letters in favour of the archbishop to the clergy of Egypt and the laity of Alexandria. One thing he asked, that Athanasius would allow the Alexandrian Arians a single church. Athanasius promptly replied that he would do so, if a church might be granted at Antioch to the "Eustathian" body, which held aloof from the crypto-Arian bishop Leontius, and whose services, held in a house, he had been attending. The emperor would have agreed to this, but his advisers stood in the way.ⁿ

From Antioch Athanasius proceeded to Jerusalem, where an orthodox council met to do him

honour, and to congratulate his church.^o And now he had but to return home, and enjoy the welcome which that church was eager to give. This he did, according to the Festal Index, on October 21 (Paophi 24), 346. We see in Gregory Nazianzen's panegyric^p a picture of the vast mass of population, distributed into its several classes, and streaming forth, "like another Nile," to meet him at some distance from Alexandria; the faces gazing from every eminence at the well-known form, the ears strained to catch his accents, the voices rising in emulous plaudits, the hands clapping, the air fragrant with incense, the city festal with banquets and blazing with illuminations—all that made this return of Athanasius in after times the standard for any splendid popular display. Characteristically, the kindhearted Gregory dwells on his hero's gentle bearing towards old opponents, and his peace-making zeal in allaying feuds. The 'Arian History' (25) says little of the exterior brilliancy of his restoration, but dwells with real beauty of style and tone on its practical results in multiplying acts of charity, in deepening religious earnestness, and in sanctifying family life while it stimulated exceptional self-devotion.^r

V. *From his second return to his third exile.*—His 19th Festal Letter, for 347, begins with a thanksgiving for having been "brought from distant lands," and ends with information as to recent appointments of bishops, among whom was Arsenius, now canonically established at Hypsele; others were doubtless Catholics, whom the archbishop had set in the places of Arians.^s The Egyptian prelates, in council, received the decrees of Sardica. More than 400 bishops of different countries, including Britain, were now in communion with Athanasius; he had a multitude of their "letters of peace" to answer. Many persons in Egypt who had sided with the Arians, came by night to him with their excuses: it was a time "of deep and wondrous peace" (*Hist. Ar.* 25), which lasted for a few years. Valens and Ursacius had already, it seems, anathematized Arianism before a council at Milan;

^o Philostorgius's statement (iii. 12) that he urged the bishops of Palestine to embrace the Nicene faith, but all refused except one, is a clear calumny.

^p Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 21. It appears that Gregory's description, which he connects with the third return, should rather belong to the second. The Festal Index favours this view: it is taken by Montfaucon and Möhler, though not by Tillemont and Neale. The grandeur of the popular demonstration seems certainly most suitable to a return which had the fullest measure of imperial sanction. Stanley connects it with the first return (*East. Ch.* p. 274).

^q "Chæreus," i.e. "Chæreus's land" (cf. *Vit. Ant.* 86), was "the first outpost of the city" (Stanley, *East. Ch.* p. 274). "Usque ad centesimum lapidem," says the Latin version of the Festal Index.

^r Pachomius did not live to hear of this return; but Antony sent a message to Athanasius by some monks of Tabenne, whom the archbishop welcomed with great kindness (*Act. SS. Mail.* iii. 326).

^s Soz., iii. 21, says that he was accused of having made similar substitutions even while passing through foreign countries. Both Soz. and Soer., ii. 24, say that he was charged with ordaining in the dioceses of other bishops in Egypt. See Vales. in Soc. Le Quien holds that he had a right to perform ordinary episcopal functions throughout Egypt. So Neale, *Intr. East. Ch.* i. iii.

^m *Apol.* 53. Soc. ii. 23, in his version of the letter, inserts eulogistic phrases which Athanasius's text does not give.

ⁿ See Socr. ii. 23, Soz. iii. 20. They were called after bishop Eustathius (*Hist. Ar.* 4), deposed by Arians in 330. For Leontius, see *De Fugâ*, 26; Theod. ii. 24; Hooker, v. 42. 9. Many of the orthodox continued to worship in his churches (e.g. Flavian and Diodore). Constantius's absolute dependence on his advisers is scornfully noted in *Hist. Ar.* 69, 70.

but they deemed it expedient to do more. In 347 they appeared at Rome, and presented to Julius a humble apologetic letter, having already written in a different strain to Athanasius, announcing that they were "at peace with him."^t He believed at the time that they were sincere; they afterwards ascribed their act to fear of Constans (*Hist. Ar.* 29). This motive, if it existed, was ere long removed; the revolt of Magnentius brought Constans to an ignominious death at the foot of the Pyrenees, in February 350.

This tragedy was a severe shock to Athanasius. He received, indeed, letters from Constantius, assuring him of continued favour, and encouraging him to pursue his episcopal work. The Alexandrian authorities were also commanded to suppress any "plotting against Athanasius." Thereupon, in presence of high state officers, including the bearers of these letters, Athanasius desired his people, assembled in church, "to pray for the safety of the most religious Constantius Augustus." The response was at once made, "O Christ, help Constantius!" (*Ap. ad Const.* 9, 10, 23; *Hist. Ar.* 24, 51). He had leisure for writing *On the Nicene Definition of Faith*^u and *On the Opinions of Dionysius*, his great predecessor in the 3rd century, whose language, employed in controversy with Sabellianism, had been unfairly quoted in support of Arianism.^x [DIONYSIUS.] And he brought out, at this time, what is called his *Apology against the Arians*, although he afterwards made additions to it.^y It may have been about this time that he chose the blind scholar Didymus, already renowned for vast and varied learning, to preside over the "Catechetical School." [DIDYMUS.] When Magnentius sent envoys to Constantius, one of them visited Alexandria; and Athanasius, in speaking to him of Constans, burst into tears. He at first had some apprehension of danger from Magnentius; but it was soon evident that his real danger was from the Arianizing advisers of Constantius. Valens and Ursacius, having now recanted their recantation, were ready to weave new plots; and Liberius, the new bishop of Rome, was plied with letters against him, which were outweighed, in the judgment of a Roman synod, by an encyclical of 80 Egyptian prelates; and Rome remained faithful to his cause. (See Liberius' letter to Constantius, *Hil. Fragm.* 5. Another letter in which Liberius is made to say that he had put Athanasius out of his communion for refusing to come to Rome when summoned, is justly regarded as

a forgery.) This was in 352; and Athanasius, in May 353, thought it advisable to send five bishops,^z one of them being his friend Serapion of Thmuis, and three presbyters, to disabuse Constantius of bad impressions as to his conduct. Five days later, May 23, Montanus, a "silentary" or palace chamberlain, arrived with an imperial letter forbidding him to send envoys, but purporting to grant a request from himself to visit the court of Milan. Athanasius, detecting an attempt to decoy him, replied that as he had never made such a request, he could not think it right to use a permission granted under a misconception; but that if the emperor sent him a definite order, he would set forth at once (*Ap. ad Const.* 19-21). Montanus departed; and the next news that Athanasius received from Europe was such as to make him forget all personal danger. The Western usurper had been finally overthrown in August; and Constantius, having gone to Arles for the winter, was induced by the Arians to hold there, instead of at Aquileia, the council which Liberius and many Italian bishops had requested him to assemble.^a The event was disastrous: Vincent, the Roman legate, was induced to join with other prelates in condemning Athanasius; but Paulinus of Treves had inherited Maximin's steadfastness, and preferred exile to the betrayal of a just cause.

In the Lent of 354, the Alexandrian churches were so crowded that some persons suffered severely, and the people urged Athanasius to allow the Easter services to be held in a large church which was still unfinished, called the Caesarean. The case was peculiar (*Ap. ad Const.* 15; *Epiph. Haer.* 69, 2): the church was being built on ground belonging to the emperor; to use it prematurely, without his leave, might be deemed a civil offence; to use it before dedication, an ecclesiastical impropriety. Athanasius tried to persuade the people to put up with the existing inconvenience: they answered, they would rather keep Easter in the open country. Under these circumstances, he gave way. The Arianizers were habitually courtiers, and ready, on occasion, to be formalists likewise; and this using of the undedicated imperial church was one of several charges now urged at court against their adversary, and dealt with in his *Apology to Constantius*; the others being that he had stimulated Constans to quarrel with his brother, had corresponded with Magnentius, and that he had not come to Italy on receiving the letter brought by Montanus. A letter which he wrote before the Easter festival of this year, or perhaps of 355, is particularly interesting; he seeks to recall Dracontius, a monk who had been elected to a bishopric, and had weakly fled from his new duties. The earnestness, good sense, and affectionateness of this letter are very characteristic of Athanasius. He dwells repeatedly on the parable of the Talents, reminds Dracontius of solemn obligations, and warns him against imagining the monastic life to be the one sphere of Christian self-denial.^b And the calm contemplation of

^t See Newman's note, *Hist. Tracts*, p. 86 (*Apol.* 19): cf. *Apol.* 2; *Hist. Ar.* 26, 44. As Westerns, they naturally treated the bishop of Rome with much greater deference than the bishop of Alexandria; and even in their statement to Julius they betray their distrust of Athanasius. That they should retract, from motives of policy, was for them no unnatural course. Compare *Hil. Fragm.* ii. 20.

^u In this treatise he guards the Catholic sense of the title "Son," gives some account of the Council's proceedings, and defends the language adopted by it, adducing ante-Nicene authorities. (He upholds Origen's orthodoxy.)

^x He urged that Dionysius had been speaking simply of Christ's *Manhood*. See Liddon's *Bamp. Lect.* p. 425.

^y In the Bollandist Life (*Act. SS.*, May 2), the *Apology against Arians* is called the *Syllogus*, or collection of documents, &c., framed about 342, and afterwards appended to the *Arian History* "ad Monachos." The old name of *Second Apology* is, at all events, clearly misapplied.

^z *Soz.* iv. 9, and *Fragm. Maff.*

^a See Liberius' letter to Hosius in *Hil. Fragm.* 6. The spurious letter referred to above (as to which see De Broglie, *L'Egl. et l'Emp.* 2me part. i. 233) begins "Studentes pacis," and forms *Fr.* 4.

^b "I know of bishops who do, and of monks who do not, fast."

fast-approaching trials, which would make a severe demand on Christian men's endurance, corresponds exactly to that "discernment" of the "signs" of 354-5, in which Athanasius cannot have been wanting.

For, in the spring of 355, he would hear of the success of Constantius in terrorizing the great majority of a large council at Milan, which had been summoned at the urgent desire of Liberius. A few faithful men, such as Eusebius of Vercellae, Lucifer of Caliaris, Dionysius of Milan, after a momentary weakness, and Maximus of Naples, who was suffering at the time from illness, alone refused to condemn Athanasius (*Hist. Ar.* 32-34); and in standing out against the incurable tyrannousness of Caesarism, as thus exhibited, must have felt themselves to be contending both for civil justice and for Nicene orthodoxy.^c

That some *coup d'état* was meditated against Athanasius, must have been evident, not only from the emperor's passionate eagerness to have him condemned, and from the really brutal persecution which began to rage throughout the empire against those who adhered to his communion (*Hist. Ar.* 31), but from the appearance at Alexandria, in July or August, 355, of an imperial notary, named Diogenes, who, though he brought no express orders, and had no interview with Athanasius, used every effort to get him out of the city. Failing in this, he departed in December; and on January 5, 356, Syrianus, a general, with another notary named Hilarius, entered Alexandria. The Arian party exulted in their approaching triumph: Athanasius asked Syrianus if he had brought any letter from the emperor. He said he had not. The archbishop referred him to the guarantee of security which he had himself received; and the presbyters, the laity, and the majority of all the inhabitants, supported him in demanding that no change should be made without a new imperial letter—the rather that they themselves were preparing to send a deputation to Constantius. The prefect of Egypt and the provost of Alexandria were present at this interview; and Syrianus, at last, promised "by the life of the emperor" that he would comply with the demand. This was on January 18; and for more than three weeks all was quiet. But about midnight on Thursday, February 8, when Athanasius was at a night-long vigil service in St. Theonas's church, preparatory to the Friday service, Syrianus, with Hilarius, and Gorgonius, the head of the police force, beset the church with a large body of soldiers. "I sat down," says Athanasius,^d "on my throne," (which would be at the extreme end of the church,) "and desired the deacon to read the Psalm" (our 136th), "and the people to respond, *For His mercy endureth for ever*,"^e and then all

to depart home." This majestic "act of faith" was hardly finished, when the doors were forced, and the soldiers rushed in with a fierce shout, clashing their arms, discharging their arrows, and brandishing their swords in the light of the church lamps. Some of the people in the nave had already departed, others were trampled down or mortally injured; others cried to the archbishop to escape. "I said I would not do so, until they had all got away safe. So I stood up, and called for prayer, and desired all to go out before me. . . . and when the greater part had gone, the monks who were there, and certain of the clergy, came up to me and carried me away."^f And then, he adds, he passed through the mass of his enemies unobserved, thanking God that he had been able to secure in the first instance his people's safety, and afterwards his own. As on a former occasion, he deemed it his duty to accept an opportunity of escape, especially when the sacrifice of his life would have been ruinous to the cause of the Church in Egypt (see Augustine, *Ep.* 228, 10); and he therefore repaired to a place of concealment in the country, "hiding himself," as the Arian History, c. 48, employs the prophet's words, "for a little moment, until the indignation should be overpast."

VI. *From his third to his fourth exile.*—On leaving Alexandria, Athanasius at first thought of appealing in person to Constantius, who could not, he tried to hope, have sanctioned the late outrage. But he was deterred by the news of one woe following upon another (*Ap. ad Const.* 27, 19). Bishops of the West who had refused to disown him were suffering under tyranny, or had been hurried into exile. Among the latter class was the Roman bishop himself, who had manfully spurned both gifts and menaces (Theod. ii. 16); and Hosius, for addressing to Constantius a remonstrance full of pathetic dignity, had been sent for to be detained at Sirmium. Then came news which touched Athanasius more closely. It was given out that one George,^g a Cappadocian of evil reputation and ruthless temper, was coming to supersede him; and that a vague creed, purporting to be simply Scriptural,^h but in fact ignoring the Nicene doctrine, was to be proposed for his suffragans' acceptance. This last report set him at once to work, with characteristic promptitude and energy, on a *Letter to the Egyptian and Libyan Bishops*. But he had soon to hear of a repetition of the sacrileges and brutalities of the days of Gregory. As before, Lentⁱ

^f The protest says that he fainted; and this, at the last moment of such a scene, and amid such a pressure and confusion, is not unlikely.

^g Though coarse, corrupt, and violent, "he collected a valuable library" (Gibbon, iii. 171). He had been recommended by an Arianizing synod at Antioch. See *Soz.* iv. 8, with Valesius's note. In *Hist. Ar.* 75, he is said to have been fraudulent as a contractor of stores at Constantinople.

^h Compare, on this phase of Arianism, such passages as *De Decret.* 21. The principle on which Athanasius went was Waterland's,—that "the sense of Scripture is Scripture."

ⁱ Comp. *Ap. ad Const.* 27; *De Fugâ*, 6; Theod. ii. 14. Other cruelties are narrated in *Hist. Ar.* There is a difficulty, in that Athanasius's language appears inconsistent with the date given in the Festal Index and Maffeiian Fragment, which defer George's arrival until Feb. 24, 357, although the Fragment says that on June 15, 356, the churches were given up to the adherents of

^c "The arts of the court party," says Neander (iv. 72, E. T.), "were aimed not barely against the person, but also against the doctrines of Athanasius." He adds that "it was not the State, it was only the Church, which in those times of despotism and servility had such men to shew" as these brave confessors.

^d *Ap. pro Fugâ*, 24. Compare *Hist. Ar.* 81, the protest of the Catholic laity.

^e His love for, and practical knowledge of, the Psalter is beautifully shown in his *Letter to Marcellinus*. He was wont to have the Psalms recited rather than sung (*Aug. Confess.* x. 50).

was the time chosen for the arrival of the usurper. Easter brought an increase of trouble in the persecution of prelates, clergy, virgins, widows, the poor, and even ordinary Catholic householders. On the evening of the Sunday after Pentecost, when "the brethren" had met for worship, apart from the Arians, in the precincts of a cemetery, a military commander, named Sebastian, a fierce-tempered Manichean, whose sympathies went with George, came to the spot with more than 3000 soldiers, and found some virgins and others still in prayer after the general congregation had broken up. On their refusal to embrace Arianism, he caused them to be stripped, and beaten or wounded with such severity that some died from the effects, and their corpses were kept without burial. This was followed by the banishment of sixteen bishops, doubtless for rejecting the new-made creed; more than thirty fled, others were scared into an apparent conformity, and the vacated churches were given over to men whose moral disqualifications for any religious office were compensated by their profession of Arianism. Tragical as were these tidings, Athanasius still clung to his purpose of presenting himself before Constantius, until he learned that one imperial letter had denounced him as a fugitive criminal who richly merited death, and another had exhorted the two Ethiopian sovereigns to send Frumentius to Alexandria, that George might instruct him in the knowledge of "the supreme God."^k

Then it was that Athanasius, accepting the position of a proscribed man who must needs live as a fugitive, "turned back again," as he says, "towards the desert," and sought for welcome and shelter amid the innumerable monastic cells. Antony had died at the beginning of the year, desiring that a worn-out sheepskin cloak (the monk's usual upper dress), which when new had been the gift of Athanasius, might be returned to him (*Vit. Ant.* 91). But many "abbots," who had imbibed Athanasius's spirit, would deem either their coenobitic settlements only too much graced by receiving their archbishop as a sufferer for the truth's sake; and many a young monk would think that the "discipline" which he had

"Gregory"—meaning, of course, George—by Heraclius and Cataphronius, the men who are named in *Hist. Ar.* 55, as setting on the young pagans to attack the Caserean church on a Wednesday, before George came, and evidently soon after Athanasius had fled. Perhaps the Fragmentist, knowing that George came in a Lent (and in 356 Lent began Feb. 24), that Heraclius had previously disturbed the Catholics' possession of the churches, and that in June 356 (the exact day, Sunday after Pentecost in that year was June 2) another great outrage took place, was led to mix up these facts with his erroneous notion (in itself sufficiently improbable) of a whole year's interval before the arrival of the intruding bishop, to place Heraclius's arrival about three months too late, and to confound his proceeding, in some degree, with Sebastian's. The exclusion of Catholics from Alexandrian churches is illustrated by a letter attributed to Athanasius, "Which has the most,—he who holds the place of worship, or he who holds the Faith?" A fragment of another letter, preserved by Theodoret, ii. 14, speaks of the Arians as "sitting like demons round the tombs, to debar the dead from burial."

^k Meaning, of the Father (see Arius, in Athan. *De Syn.* 15). Frumentius continued undisturbed; and, as Le Quien expresses it, "false garrit Philostorgius" about "Theophilus the Indian" "establishing Arianism at Axum." Cf. Philost. iii. 5.

embraced, and which Athanasius had propagated in distant lands, gained a new charm while the person whom he most revered on earth was actually mingling in the routine of prayer and psalmody, meditation and manual toil. As Athanasius appears to have made secret visits to Alexandria,¹ he probably spent some time among the recluses of Lower Egypt, on the Nitrian mountain, or in "the wilderness of cells" further inland, or in the yet remoter Scetis; but he also doubtless visited what Villemain calls "the pathless solitudes which surround Upper Egypt, and the monasteries and hermitages of the Thebaid."^m A veil of mystery was thus drawn over his life; and the interest was heightened by the romantic incidents naturally following from the Government's attempts to track and seize him.ⁿ When the pursuit was hot, there would be a rapid and well-arranged flight from one refuge to another, involving probably "hair-breadth 'scapes" and strange concealments which might anticipate the experience of a Jacobite or a Vendean. When comparatively undisturbed, he would still be full of activities, ecclesiastical and theological. The "royal-hearted" exile, "the invisible patriarch," was always effectively governing his church, consoling or stimulating the faithful, keeping in his hands a network of correspondence,^o despatching messages and orders which would be received as loyally as if brought by a deacon of the Alexandrian throne. And with that marvellous power of self-adaptation, prominent among the Pauline qualities which Dean Stanley has so well pointed out in this majestic character, Athanasius made those six years of seclusion available for literary work of the most substantial kind, both controversial and historical. The books which he now began to pour forth were apparently written in cottages or caves, where he sat, like any monk, on a mat of palm-leaves, with a bundle of papyrus beside him, amid the intense light and stillness of the desert.^p

¹ *Festal Index*, p. 358. And compare the Index for 360 on the virgin Eudaemonis, tortured by the prefect when he searched for Athanasius in a small chamber, with Palladius's famous story (*Vit. Patr.* viii. c. 136) of the young Alexandrian lady who sheltered him in her own house; a story which, although it bears exaggeration on its face, may possibly have some foundation. (See *Soz.* v. 6.) Cave and Montfaucon think that the lady may have received him for a few days after Syriacus's irruption.

^m *Soc.* iv. 23; *Soz.* vi. 29-31; Fleury, xx. c. 1, 7, 9.

ⁿ See *Ep. ad Serap.* i. 1. The *Life of Pachomius* gives a vivid scene. A "duke" named Artemius is hunting for Athanasius, and comes to a monastery called Paban. "Is Athanasius here?" Psarphi, the monk in charge, answers simply, "He is indeed the father of us all, but I never yet saw his face." Artemius, after a vain search, asks Psarphi to pray for him. But, as an Arian bishop is his companion, he is repelled by the answer, "We may not pray with those who are in communion with Arians." It is possible that Athanasius, by a visit or by letters, encouraged the intensely ecclesiastical population of Oxyrynchos, who, when their bishop joined the communion of George, at once disowned him, and procured for themselves an orthodox chief pastor,—supposing that in this matter we may trust the authority of Marcellinus and Faustinus (*Sirmond.* i. 251).

^o He tells Serapion that the letters he has received are a source of comfort, and make him feel as if his friends were with him (i. 1). Compare *Hist. Ar.* 40.

^p The story of his being concealed for six years in a dark dry cistern, which Rufinus appears to believe (i. 18)

(Kingsley's *Hermits*. p. 130, 19), which might well harmonize with his meditations and his prayers. The fondness of Athanasius for the illustration of "the Light and the Ray" is well known. He finished his *Apology to Constantius*,^a a work which he had for some time in hand, and which he still hoped to be able, in better days, to deliver in the emperor's presence. He met the taunts of "cowardice" directed against him by the Arians, with an *Apology for his Flight*,^r in which he dwelt on the precept and example of Christ, and on the conduct of eminent saints; enlarging at the same time on the fury of the persecution, and referring to the banishment of orthodox bishops. To the same period belong the *Letter to the Monks*,^a with the *Arian History* (not now extant as a whole), which it introduces (and as to which it is difficult to resist the impression that part of it, at least, was written under Athanasius's supervision, by some friend or secretary^t); a *Letter to Serapion*, bishop of Thmuis, giving an account of the death of Arius, the details of which he had learned from his presbyter Macarius, while he himself was resident at Treves;^u and, above all, the great *Ora-*

may be founded on his having once during those years lain hid in such a place. Compare *De Fugâ*, 17. Every cave and glen was known to the monks.

^a Throughout this *Apology* he addresses Constantius with the forms of loyal respect. This was necessary, if it was ever to be actually presented; and he may have forced himself, even at this time, to hope that Constantius might amend his conduct. Still it was going rather far to talk of Constantius's "well-known benignity" (c. 32): (his cruelties towards his relatives are referred to in *Hist. Ar.* 69). But Athanasius never afterwards spoke of him in this tone. See *De Fugâ*, 26, *Hist. Ar.* 76, *De Syn.* 55. He did indeed, in *Hist. Ar.* 69, make allowance for his imbecile credulity, which made him a tool in the hands of worse men.

^r The *Apologia de Fugâ* was written between the lapse of Hosius and that of Liberius—probably about the end of 357. The Arians who taunted him, he says, professed friendly feelings towards him. He considers the opportunity of escape granted him in Feb. 356 as parallel to those of which SS. Peter and Paul availed themselves (c. 25).

^s In this letter he says he has complied with their request for an account of the persecution and a refutation of Arianism. The refutation is identified by the Bollandist Life with the *Orations*; Montfaucon and Newman think it is lost. For some reason, Athanasius requests the monks not to copy or even retain the letter and the "History."

^t It is written generally in the third person; but the first person occurs in c. 7, 9, 15, &c. (see especially 64): in c. 52 ("If the text be not corrupt," see Newman, *Hist. Tracts*, p. 219), we find "he and we." This inconsistency is just what might happen if an amanuensis were used. And see c. 13. The style is somewhat declamatory. The numbers in *Apol.* 50 and *Hist. Ar.* 28, do not agree. One sentence, in c. 32, is suspicious; for Constantius's death could not have seemed near at hand.

^u Neander (iv. 58, E. T.) blames Athanasius for imputing deception to Arius in regard to the profession of belief which he had tendered to Constantine. But if the statement in this letter be true, he really did say that he had not taught what Alexander had imputed to him. And according to Athan. *ad Ep. Aeg.* 18, he told Constantine that he had never held or taught otherwise than the profession, couched in Scriptural words, contained. Neander says, Athanasius had no right to assume that Arius must take those words as he himself did. But the point is, that Constantine would naturally take them in a sense which, at least, was not that condemned at Nicæa.

tions or Discourses against the Arians. These last have been described by Montfaucon as "the sources whence arguments have been borrowed by all who have since written in behalf of the Divinity of the Word;" and although it cannot be denied that in some details of their argument a modern reader will detect what seems irrelevant or forced, or otherwise unsatisfactory, and that the close reasoning which Erasmus and other writers have so justly admired in Athanasius is occasionally embellished, as the taste of that age would consider, by forms of polemical oratory, yet all candid readers will appreciate the richness and fulness of the Scriptural exegesis; the steady grasp of the great idea of Christ's real and Divine Sonship,^z in which the whole Catholic doctrine was involved; the keen penetration with which Arian objections are analysed;^y the incidental exposure of earlier heresies, like that of Paulus of Samosata;^z the "distinct" and luminous protests, by anticipation, against "later heresies, like the Nestorian and Eutychian; and the solemn earnestness with which the orthodox conclusions are exhibited as ministering to the deepest needs of the Christian soul.^b The first discourse is occupied with an exposition of the greatness of the question at issue; with proofs of the Son's eternity and uncreatedness, with discussion of objections, and with comments on texts alleged in support of Arianism (*i. e.* Phil. ii. 9, 10; Ps. xlv. 7, 8; Heb. i. 4). The second, written after some interval, pursues this line of comment, especially on a text much urged by Arians in the LXX. version (Proverbs viii. 22).^c The third^d explains texts in the Gospels, and in so doing sets forth the Christ of the Church as uniting in Himself true Godhead and true Manhood; and it then passes to the consideration of another Arian statement,

^x E. g. *Orat.* i. 15, ii. 3, 5, 22, 23 (where, as indeed elsewhere, He, as true Son, is contrasted with angels), 32, 34, 45. Parts of the Discourses, it may be observed, are reproductions of what he had written before, e. g. in *De Decret.* (Cf. *Or.* i. 30 sq., *De Decr.* 28 sq., on the Arian "sophism" about "Ingenerate.")

^y E. g. *Orat.* i. 14, 27, 29; see also ii. 26. With this acute analysis should be compared the lucid statement of such plain arguments as that from the Baptismal Form, ii. 41. In this, as in other ways, Athanasius could be "all things to all men."

^z *Orat.* i. 38, ii. 13. He also frequently alludes to Gnostics and Manicheans; and he carefully excludes Sabellianism, e. g. iii. 4. (See also the acute remark in *De Sent. Dion.* 26, as to arguing against Sabellianism from proofs of Christ's Humanity.)

^a Newman on *Athan. Treat.* ii. 291; ib. ii. 295, and 436 on *Orat.* iii. 29 sq. See too *Orat.* i. 45. In *Orat.* i. 50, he implies the reality of a human "nature" in Christ, and expressly asserts His manhood. Compare *De Sent. Dion.* 9. Athanasius may indeed have occasionally used phrases which later theologians would deem inaccurate; e. g. in *Orat.* ii. 70, iv. 33. Compare *Cont. Apollin.* ii. 16.

^b E. g. *Orat.* i. 35, 49, 50, ii. 67, 69, 70 (cf. Cyril of Alexandria's argument from the Atonement against Nestorius), 43.

^c He explains it of the Incarnation. This discourse is also remarkable for its emphatic language on the Atonement, c. 9.

^d It begins by dwelling on the doctrine of the Co-inherence; for which see also i. 61. The general view taken in this discourse of Mark xiii. 32, is that the Son, *quâ* man, in His state of humiliation, assumed a limitation of knowledge as He assumed a capacity of suffering.

that the Sonship was a result of God's mere will.^a Differing from other writers, Dr. Newman^f considers the fourth discourse to be a undigested collection of notes or memoranda on several heresies, principally that which was, as we have seen, "imputed to his friend Marcellus, and to persons connected with him;" an imputation which Athanasius, about 360,^g began to think not undeserved, although, as if wishing to hope the best, he refrained from naming Marcellus while opposing what might be called Marcellianism. It may be felt by readers who have no bias against the theology of the Discourses, that this tenderness towards an old associate (which we shall see Athanasius exhibiting on another occasion) is in striking contrast with the exuberance of oburgation^h bestowed on the Arian "madmen" and "foes of Christ." But, not to urge that the 4th century had no established rules of controversial politeness, and that the acerbity of Greek disputation and the personalities of Roman society had often too much influence on the tone of Christian argument, one must remember that Athanasius is not attacking all members of the Arian communion, but representatives of it who had been conspicuous, not for heterodoxy alone, but for secularity in its worst form, for unscrupulousness, and for violence. And if some elements of human passion mingled with his indignation at what he deemed an apostasy from Christ, allowance must surely be made for the position of a man whom this party had been striking at for thirty years with a persistent energy of hatred; who knew that amid a general persecution his life was now being specially sought (*De Fugâ*, 9; cf. Stanley, *East. Ch.* p. 282); who, driven at sixty from the throne of a prince among bishops into outlawry under the ban of a malignant

^e See too *Orat.* i. 29, ii. 2; Newman, *Arians*, c. 2, s. 5; Neander, iv. 65, E. T. Cf. Didymus, *De Trin.* i. 9.

^f Newman on *Athan. Treat.* ii. 502. He regards Athanasius's arguments as rather heads for argument, on the identity of the Word with the Son, &c., as levelled against what was held by Marcellus or his school.

^g So Newman. Montfaucon thinks he did not begin to suspect Marcellus before A.D. 358. The statement in the 2nd Hilarian Fragment, that he broke off communion with him before 349, is derived from questionable authority, and is inconsistent with *De Fugâ*, 3, "Ancyra is mourning for Marcellus," and *Hist. Ar.* 6. It was probably after the third exile that Epiphanius, on asking Athanasius what he thought about Marcellus, inferred from a significant smile that he considered him to be "not far from heresy," but to have "made a defence for himself" (*Haer.* 72, 4). Perhaps Epiphanius is alluding to the defence made at Rome (*Hist. Ar.* 6), but hinting that it seemed no longer to satisfy Athanasius. Or it may be (if Epiphanius spoke to Athanasius as he passed through Palestine towards Alexandria in 346) that Athanasius was thinking of suspicions which had not unreasonably been entertained before that defence.

^h Dr. Newman has collected (*Athan. Treat.* ii. 341), and Dean Stanley has gently commented on, some cases in which Athanasius makes a rather large use of a precedent derived from such Scripture language as "brood of vipers." See also the vehement language in *Orat.* ii. 4. He does not omit to taunt Asterius, the old Arian writer whom he quotes (and from whom Arius borrowed an argument), with having sacrificed under persecution: *e. g.* ii. 24; cf. *De Decret.* 8. He says (*Orat.* iii. 59) that later Arians have become ashamed of such plain-spoken formulas as "the Son is a creature" (cf. *De Decret.* 28), and seek to convey their doctrine in less startling language,

autocrat, might seem to have, humanly speaking, no better earthly prospect than a few more years of perilous wandering, to be saddened by a deepening consciousness of defeat, and to be closed by death in some "wilderness of cells." Yet it would have been very unlike Athanasius the Great to give way to despondency, or to think that he had "spent his strength for nought" in a cause which his faith told him had in it all the elements of ultimate victory. The spirit in which he had chosen a psalm of thanksgiving as his church's answer to the din of a fierce onslaught enabled him to look through the present darkness, to foresee the future by manful hope, to keep his spirit braced for any exertion, to enjoy heartily the comfort of friendly letters, and to follow up his Discourses by four *Letters to Serapion* of Thmuis, his friend "beloved and longed for," of which the second briefly repeated the teaching of the Discourses, while the others were directed against a theory then reported to him by Serapion as springing up, and afterwards known as Macedonianism; which, abandoning the Arian position in regard to the Son, strove with singular inconsistency to retain it in regard to the Spirit, whom it declared to be neither a Divine Person nor a Divine attribute, but a ministering creature, "differing only in degree from the angels."ⁱ Athanasius met this error by contending for "a Trinity real and undivided," in which the Spirit was included with the Father and the Son; and replied to the pointed cavils which, in the eristic style of the old Arians, were being now directed against His coequal personality.

The general aspect of Church affairs was very unhopeful. At Constantinople an Arian persecution had again set in. But the defection of Hosius in 357, and Liberius in 358, after hard pressure and cruel usage, from the steadfastness which Athanasius had so much admired, must have wounded him to the heart. Yet he speaks of them with characteristic and most generous tenderness, and with full recognition of the trials under which they had given way (*Hist. Ar.* 45, 41; *Apol.* 89; *De Fugâ*, 5).^k Hosius, indeed, although he signed a strongly Arian formula,—the second of Sirmium, commonly called the "Blasphemia," and written by Potamius bishop of Lisbon,—refused to admit the personal charges against Athanasius; and Liberius, though disowning his communion on the alleged ground of those charges, accepted a creed of less pronounced heterodoxy.^l But in the person of its chief the

ⁱ The *Exposition of Faith* must have been written before this period, for it makes no reference to this view. On the position of the "Pneumatomachi," see Epiphanius, *Haer.* 74, 1. There is a passage of much interest on the Procession in *Ad Serap.* i. 20; and in the fourth letter Athanasius gives a characteristic exposition of his view of the unpardonable sin.

^k He made additions to the Apology and the History.

^l It was apparently a semi-Arian digest of several formularies (Newman, *Athan. Treat.* i. 162). Hefele thinks that Liberius was persuaded to regard the Homousion as a cloak for Sabellianism, and so "hat er nur das nicänische Wort, nicht den orthodoxen Glauben aufzugeben" (*Conciliengesch.* i. 673). He rejects as spurious four letters ascribed to Liberius, *i. e.* not only the one beginning "Studentes paci," but three others, "Pro deifico," "Quia scio," "Non doceo," in the first of which, as we have it, are inserted Hilary's anathemas against Liberius (Hil

Roman Church was temporarily dishonoured; and in the next year, 359, the general body of Western bishops, at the Council of Ariminum, were partly harassed and partly cheated into adopting an equivocal but really Arian confession, which was also adopted at the beginning of 360 by the legates of the Eastern Council of Seleucia.^m An account of the earlier proceedings of these two councils was drawn up, in the form of a letter, by Athanasius, who, on the ground of a few words in the opening of this *Letter on the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia*, has been thought by Tillemont and Gibbon to have been present, at any rate, at the latter place. This, however, is very improbable; and the words in question (ἀπὲρ ἐώρακα) may be taken in a less literal sense. The treatise is remarkable for his considerateness towards those of the Semi-Ariansⁿ whose objections to the Nicene Creed were rather verbal than real, while the second creed of Sirmium had driven them into open hostility to the Arians, properly so called, which they had expressed in their Council of Ancyra in 358. Athanasius, then expressly naming their leader, Basil of Ancyra,^o welcomes them as brothers who mean essentially what Churchmen mean. He will not for the present urge the Homocousion upon them. He is sure that in time they will accept it,^p as securing that doctrine of Christ's essential Sonship which their own symbol "Homoiousion" could not adequately guard (*De Syn.* 41). But while exhibiting this large-minded patience and forbearance, he is careful to contrast the long series of Arian creeds with the one invariable standard of the orthodox: the only refuge from restless variations will be found in a frank adoption of the creed of Nicaea (ib. 32; cf. *Ad Afros*, 9).

In the end of 360, the Arian party was in a position too plainly artificial to be permanent. The Semi-Arians had fallen into disgrace with Constantius, once their ardent disciple, but now under the influence of the men who had carried what Neander calls the "vapid" and indefinite

Fragm. 6). The correspondence between Liberius and Athanasius is, he says, acknowledged to be spurious: but Liberius's letter to Constantius is genuine. Both Hosius and Liberius returned to Catholicism.

^m The form of Arianism which thus triumphed was the vague Acacian theory, which adopted the "Homoion" as its symbol, and often served as a stepping-stone to the "Anomoion" of ultra-Arianism. The "Creed of Ariminum" was what is called the "Dated" Creed (3rd Sirmian) of May 22, with two alterations which made it still more unatholic: but it was signed in the sense of Valens's anathemas, one of which, however, in fact implied that the Son was a creature. Athanasius' criticism of the preamble of the "Dated Creed" is more rhetorical than just: but its point is, that the exposition of what the framers called "the Catholic Faith" was dated in a consular year. The Nicene Fathers, he adds, wrote, "This is the faith of the Catholic Church" (*De Syn.* 3-5).

ⁿ See Newman, *Arians*, c. 5, s. 2. Observe that in the discourses Athanasius does not bring the Homocousion forward (*Athan. Treat.* 1. 17).

^o It is remarkable that he should speak thus of one who had superseded Marcellus in his bishopric, and had been condemned at Sardica.

^p It is necessary to observe that this passage has been sometimes misapprehended, as if Athanasius had offered absolutely to waive the Homocousion in such cases. Cf. *De Decr.* 21.

formula of Ariminum, and who were secretly playing into the hands of those thorough-going ultra-Arians whom they found it for the present convenient to disavow. They had gained a point by placing in the see of Constantinople a man capable of singular profanity, named Eudoxius, who had previously been bishop of Antioch, where, at the beginning of 361, he was succeeded by Meletius, an Armenian bishop of known moderation, winning eloquence, and impressive piety. This prelate, soon after his installation, astonished and provoked his patrons by a sermon of reverential tone and essential orthodoxy, which has been preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 73, 29). He was promptly deposed, banished, and superseded by Euzoios, who had been associated with Arius in his original excommunication. But the orthodox members of what might be called the Established Church of Antioch, while abhorring Euzoios, found themselves repelled by the Eustathians (Soz. iv. 28), who had for their pastor a presbyter named Paulinus; and an open schism between two congregations of essentially the same faith was the unhappy consequence. Euzoios, in the following autumn, was visited by Constantius, who received from his hands a long-deferred baptism, on the eve of his westward march to crush, as he hoped, the revolt of his cousin Julian. But he was struck down by fever at the foot of Mount Taurus; and his death, on Nov. 4, 361, gave the empire to a prince who had long renounced Christianity in secret, and had recently avowed his adherence to Paganism.

On Nov. 30 the accession of Julian was formally proclaimed at Alexandria. The Pagans, in high exultation, thought that their time was come for taking vengeance on the Arian bishop, whom they had once before tumultuously expelled for oppressive and violent conduct, especially for his attacks on Pagan worship,^q and who, on the very day of his return, had rekindled their fury by threatening to destroy a temple under the odious epithet of a "sepulchre." They rose in irresistible force, threw George into prison, and on Dec. 24 barbarously murdered him, drew his body through the city on a camel's back, and, after burning it, flung the ashes into the sea.^r The Arians set up one Lucius in his place; but Julian, as if to show his supercilious contempt for the disputes of "Galilaeans," or his detestation of the memory of Constantius, permitted all the bishops whom his predecessor had exiled to return to their homes; and Athanasius, taking advantage of this edict, reappeared in Alexandria, to the joy of his people, Feb. 22, 362.

One of his first acts was to hold a Council for the settlement of several pressing questions. (1.) There were many bishops who deeply regretted their weak or thoughtless concessions at Ariminum: how were they to be treated? (2.) It had become urgently necessary to give some advice to Paulinus and his flock at Antioch, now that Meletius's return had increased the existing difficulty, for while Paulinus, owing to Euzoios's respect for his high character, was allowed to

^q See Soc. iii. 2, Soz. v. 7, for his exposure of the Pagan idols and ornaments found underneath a temple of Mithra, where he was building a church. The statements as to his expulsion and return, in the Maffiean Fragment, are inconsistent with each other. Athanasius refers to his expulsion, *De Syn.* 31.

^r Compare *Fragm. Maff.* with Ammian. xxii. 11.

officiate in a little church within the "New Town," Meletius occupied "the Apostle's Church" in the "Old Town" by the Orontes. (3.) A dispute had arisen between two sets of Churchmen as to the word "Hypostasis":^a a considerable number, including those who had emerged from Semi-Arianism, had formed the habit of asserting "three Hypostases" in the Godhead; the majority, however, adhered to the older phrase, "one Hypostasis." The latter charged the former with Arianizing, and were charged in return with Sabellianizing: could anything be done to prevent a breach? (4.) Lastly, some persons were thought to reduce the Incarnation to an association between the Word and a saintly human individual;^t while others seem disposed to minimize the human element in the mystery, by excluding from Christ's manhood a reasonable soul. The work before the Council was that of harmonizing and reconciling—a work most congenial, as Gregory Nazianzen says, to Athanasius, and to the excellent Western bishop, Eusebius of Vercellae, who was on his way home from exile in the Thebaid, and whose presence in Alexandria had been an immediate cause of the assembling of the Synod. His companion, Lucifer of Caliaris, a very earnest but a rigorous and impetuous man, had preferred to go on to Antioch. It was resolved (1) that any persons who had forfeited their right to Church communion might regain it by simply professing the Nicene Creed, and condemning the heresies of the day;^u (2) that on these terms the congregation in the "Old Town" might be united to the other community, which was considered to represent the faithful "Eustathians." As to the theological points raised, mutual explanations proved the difference to be the result of misunderstanding. Those who spoke of three Hypostases were found to mean three "really existing Persons;" those who spoke

of one Hypostasis used the term as equivalent to "essence" (Epiphan. *Haer.* 73, 17). The Council suggested that the Nicene language should be simply adopted by both sides.^x Again, it appeared that there was no disposition to deny either the actual Incarnation of the Word, or the completeness of the Manhood assumed by Him. A Synodal letter, or "Tome," addressed "to the Antiochenes" (*i. e.* to Paulinus and his flock), and composed by Athanasius, is one of the noblest documents that ever emanated from a Council. But it came too late to establish peace at Antioch. Lucifer, instead of waiting for the Council's decision, had taken upon him to consecrate Paulinus^y as the legitimate bishop of Antioch, and so perpetuated the division which his wiser brethren had hoped to heal; while his indignation against the "Ariminians" made him form a schism of his own, rather than acquiesce in their admission to communion on any other footing than that of lay penitents. The line which he took must have grieved Athanasius, who had held him in high esteem as a sufferer for the faith.^z

The Pagans of Alexandria had been rebuked by Julian for the murder of George; but he lent a ready ear to their denunciations of Athanasius as a man whose influence would destroy their religion. He assured them that he had never intended Athanasius to resume "what is called the episcopal throne;" peremptorily commanded that he should leave Alexandria; and in another letter, addressed to the praefect Ecdicius, he menaced the "foe of the gods, who had dared, in his reign, to baptize Greek ladies" (alluding to conversions from Paganism, which Athanasius since his return had effected), with a heavier punishment to follow upon his expulsion.^a The Imperial edict was communicated to Athanasius by Pythiodorus, a Pagan philosopher, on Oct. 23 (= Paophi 27, *Fest. Ind., Fragm. Maff.*). The faithful gathered around him weeping. "Be of good heart," he said; "it is but a cloud; it will soon pass." He instantly embarked to go up the Nile. But Julian's implied orders were not forgotten; some Government agents pursued his vessel. They met a boat coming down the river, and asked for news of Athanasius. "He is not far off" was the reply. The boat was his own—he himself, perhaps, the speaker (Theod. iii. 9).

^a See Newman, *Arians*, c. 5, s. 1; *Athan. Treat.* i. 70. The senses of ὑπόστασις are enumerated by Dean Liddell in his sermon on "Where two or three," &c.—(1) the sediment of a liquid; (2) a groundwork; (3) solid reality; (4) essence, as in Heb. i. 3; (5) personality. The Nicene anathemas had used it in sense (4). Athanasius so uses it (another term which he uses in the same sense is εἶδος, *De Syn.* 52, c. *Apoll.* i. 2) in *Orat.* iii. 65, iv. 1, 33, &c., but apparently in sense (5) in *Orat.* iv. 25, 35. In *De Syn.* 36, "three hypostases" appears as an Arian phrase: in *De Decr.* 26, Dionysius of Rome is cited as denying "three partitive hypostases foreign to each other."

^t A foreshadowing of Nestorianism. Athanasius had already been emphatic in guarding against such a notion of merely moral union between the Father and the Saviour as would reduce the latter to the level of the saints (*Orat.* iii. 10, 18; *De Syn.* 48; and see *infra* as to his later writings).

^u We are not called upon to approve the extent to which, according to Athanasius's *Letter to Rufinus*, written some years later, the conduct of the Ariminian bishops was held excusable as an instance of "economy." (In *De Sent. Dion.*, Athanasius uses "economy" in a perfectly unobjectionable sense, as meaning the consideration which, without compromise of truth, will adapt teaching to the recipient's capacity. On "economy," see also Vales. in Philostorg. vi. 3; Newman's *Arians*, c. 1, s. 3.) Rufinus has some touching words (i. 28) on the Council's compassionate gentleness towards these "fallen ones;" contrast the hard sarcasm of the Luciferians, Marcellinus and Faustinus (Sirmond. i. 242 sq.), "Quis est qui... pacem perfidiorum Deo placere confidat?" See Jerome, *adv. Lucif.* 19, 20.

^x This was an impracticable suggestion at that point of the debate; and the Nicene anathemas implicitly sanctioned "One Hypostasis," *v. supra*. Meletius and his friends spoke of three, Paulinus and the Latins of one. Jerome, in 377, asked Damasus whether "three hypostases" was a tenable phrase; for himself he thought it Tritheistic. Socr. iii. 7, makes a complete mistake as to the line taken by the Council—as if it had proscribed the words "ousia" and "hypostasis." It is observable that Didymus, who had worked under Athanasius, uses "hypostases" for "persons," *De Trin.* i. 11.

^y Valesius is clearly mistaken in thinking that the consecration of Paulinus preceded the sitting of the Council and was approved by it (on Soc. iii. 6, 9).

^z The statement that Athanasius translated into Greek Lucifer's Latin work against Constantius (Marc. et Faust.) cannot be relied on; and the "Letters of Athanasius to Lucifer" have a doubtful appearance.

^a Such is the sense of διακείσθαι, according to Heyler, *Julian. Epist.* p. 187. See Gibbon, iii. 176 (c. 23). Julian's letter fixes Dec. 1 as the last day on which Athanasius should be allowed to be in Egypt. The Fragment says that after his departure two of his presbyters were banished at the urgency of Pythiodorus.

His facilities of information had given him warning of the peril, and his presence of mind had baffled it. He sailed on towards Alexandria, but concealed himself at Chaereu, the first station from the capital; then proceeded to Memphis, where he wrote his Festal Letter for 363; and then made his way to the Thebaid.

VII. *From his fourth exile to his death.*—It was probably about this time,^b shortly before Easter 363, that Athanasius was met, while approaching Hermopolis, by Theodore of Tabenne. Seeing the banks of the Nile thronged by bishops, clergy, and monks, the archbishop exclaimed, in Isaiah's words, "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their cotes?" Night apparently favoured this demonstration; Athanasius, having disembarked, mounted an ass which Theodore led, and pursued his way amid a vast body of monks bearing lanterns and torches, and chanting psalms. "It is not we that are fathers," he broke forth enthusiastically; "it is these men devoted to humility and obedience." He stayed some time at Hermopolis and Antinoë, for the purpose of preaching; then proceeded southwards to Tabenne, observed everything, even to the seats of the monks, and warmly commended the abbot. "Remember us," said Theodore, "in your prayers." The answer was characteristic. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem!" At midsummer, according to another narrative,^c he was at Antinoë, apprehensive of being arrested and put to death, when Theodore and another abbot named Pammon came to see him, and persuaded him to embark with them in Theodore's closely covered boat, in order to conceal himself in Tabenne. The wind was against them; Theodore's monks began to tow the boat; Athanasius was in prayer, agitated by the prospect of martyrdom, but gaining calmness from his vivid faith. "Even if I am killed," he said—here the two abbots smiled at each other; and Theodore, according to the story, assured him that Julian had at that very hour been slain in his Persian war. The day of Julian's death was 26th June, 363.

"The cloud had passed," and Athanasius returned by night to Alexandria. After his arrival, which was kept secret, he received a letter from the new emperor Jovian, desiring him to resume his functions, and to draw up a statement of the Catholic faith. Athanasius at once assembled a Council, and framed a synodal letter,^d in which the Nicene Creed was embodied, its Scripturalness asserted, and the great majority of Churches (including the British) referred to as professing it: Arianism was condemned, Semi-Arianism pronounced inadequate, the Homoousion explained as expressive of Christ's real Sonship, the coequality of the Holy Spirit maintained in terms which partly anticipate the language of the Creed of Constantinople. On Sept. 5, Athanasius sailed to Antioch, bearing this letter. He was most gra-

ciously received, while the rival bishop Lucius and his companions were rebuffed with some humour and some impatience by the blunt soldier-prince, who, however, during his brief reign, showed himself as tolerant as he was orthodox. The general prospects of the Church must now have seemed brighter than at any time since 330. Liberius was known to have made a full declaration of orthodoxy; and many Western bishops, responding to the appeals of Eusebius and the illustrious Hilary of Poitiers, had eagerly renounced the Ariminian creed and professed the Nicene. But the local troubles of Antioch were distressing; Athanasius was at first disposed to recognise Meletius, but the latter, keenly annoyed by the consecration of Paulinus (although Lucifer alone was responsible for that proceeding), held aloof from all proposals of accommodation, or put off Athanasius with vague promises (Basil, *Ep.* 89, 258). The consequence was that Athanasius, who, ever since he had worshipped with the Eustathians in 346, had given them his warm sympathy, now recognized their bishop as the true head of the Antiochene church, on his appending to his signature of the Tome a full and orthodox declaration, which, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* 77, 20), Athanasius himself had framed.

Having written his Festal Letter for 364 at Antioch, Athanasius reached home, apparently, on Feb. 13,^e a few days before Jovian's death. Valentinian I. succeeded, and soon afterwards assigned the East to his brother Valens. The Alexandrian Church was not at first a sufferer by this change of monarchs; and 364-5 may be the probable date for the publication of the *Life of Antony*, which Athanasius addressed "to the monks abroad," i. e. those in Italy and Gaul.^f But, ere long, his troubles to some extent reappeared. According to the Egyptian documents, it was the spring of 365^g when Valens issued an order for the expulsion of all bishops who, having been expelled under Constantius, had been recalled under Julian, and thereby announced that he meant to follow the Arian policy of Constantius. The Maffiean Fragment tells us that on May 5 this order reached Alexandria, and caused a popular ferment, only quieted on June 8 by the praefect's promise to refer the case of Athanasius to the emperor. If we may combine his statement with Sozomen's (who, however, places these events in a subsequent year), we should suppose that the praefect was but biding his time; and on the night of Oct. 5, Athanasius, having doubtless been forewarned, left his abode in the precinct of

^e See Mansi's proposed correction of *Fragm. Maff.* as to the time.

^f It is very probable that he himself sent to Treves, in remembrance of his own sojourn there some thirty years previously, the copy which two young officers of the provincial government, walking one afternoon in the gardens beside the city wall, found in a cottage occupied by monks, and the reading of which "kindled" in them an instant resolution to exchange their secular prospects for the monastic "service" of God. The story contributed somewhat to the conversion of Augustine. See his *Confess.* viii. 15.

^g The usual date is 367; and it has been said that Valens was not an Arian until baptized by Eudoxius that year. But he was under the influence of that ultra-Arian when he banished the deputies of the semi-Arian Council of Lampsacus in the spring of 365.

^b *Vit. Pach.* Montfaucon places this incident in the period following the third exile; Tillemont defers it to 365: but both the Fragment and the Index connect a journey to the Thebaid with the fourth exile, and the Fragment names Hermopolis and Antinoë.

^c *Narr. ad Ammon.*; *Op.* ii. 695. The frank exhibition of Athanasius's sensibility to physical fear gives the story an air of truth.

^d Valsius, on Theod. i. 3, thinks the letter was drawn up at Antioch by Athanasius, and some bishops who accompanied him thither.

St. Dionysius's church, and took refuge in a country house near the New River.^b It was not an hour too soon: the praefect, with a military commander, beset the church that same night, broke open the outer gates, and searched the building, even to the roof, in vain. For four months the archbishop's concealment lasted; until Barasides, or Bresidas, an imperial notary, having brought an order for his return, came to the country house with a great multitude, and led Athanasius back into his church, Feb. 1 (Mehir 7), 366. His quiet was not again disturbed, except by such events as a Pagan riot on July 21, 366, in which the Caesarean church, completed by George just before his death, was burned; or the attempt of Lucius, on Sept. 23, 367, to establish himself within the enclosure of another church—the consequence of which was that the magistrates, in order to save him from the populace, placed him in the hands of the military power “to be removed from Egypt.” Athanasius was free to devote himself to his proper work, whether of writing or of administration. His Festal Letter for 367—which had been known from Greek MSS. long before the discovery of the series—contained a list of the books of Scripture which, so far as regards the New Testament, agrees precisely with our own (see, too, *De Decr.* 18). The canonical books are described as “the fountains of salvation, through which alone” (a mode of speaking very usual with Athanasius) “is the teaching of religion transmitted;” a second class of books is mentioned, as “read” in church for religious edification; the name “apocryphal” is reserved for a third class, to which heretics have assigned a fictitious dignity (Westcott, *On the Canon*, pp. 487, 520). To this period has been assigned the comment on doctrinal texts which is called a treatise *On the Incarnation and against the Arians*;¹ but its entire genuineness may be reasonably doubted, for it uses the phrase “Three Hypostases,”^k whereas his next work identifies *hypostasis* with essence (*Ad Afros*, 4), and it also refers John xiv. 28, not as he had done in *Orat.* i. 58, to the Divine Sonship, but, like Didymus, Cyril, and the Latins, to the assumed Humanity. In or about 369 he held a council at Alexandria, in order to receive letters from a Roman council held under Damasus, the successor of Liberius, and also from other Western prelates, excommunicating Ursacius and Valens, and enforcing the authority of the Nicene Creed. Hereupon Athanasius, in a synodal letter addressed *To the Africans*, i. e. to those in the Carthaginian territory, contrasts the “ten or more” synodical formulas of Arianism with the Nicene Creed, gives some account of its formation, and exposes the futile attempt of its present adversaries to claim authority for the later, as distinct from the earlier, proceedings of the Ariminian council. Another letter was written to Damasus, expressing some surprise that Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan (see

Hist. Ar. 75) had not been put under the same ban with Ursacius and Valens; and the suggestion was adopted by a subsequent Roman synod, and by others in Spain and Gaul.

It appears that on Sept. 22, 369, Athanasius, who had in May of the previous year begun to rebuild the Caesarean church, laid the foundations of another church, afterwards called by his own name (*Fest. Ind.*). About this time he shewed in two remarkable acts, on the one hand, his superiority to mere technical formalism, and, on the other, his resolution to enforce “ecclesiastical discipline” in “the cause of moral righteousness” (to borrow Dr. Freeman's words, in his *Norman Conquest*, about Anselm). The people of two towns in Pentapolis—Palaeabisei and Hydrax—wished to have a bishop of their own in the person of a young layman named Siderius. The aged prelate of the diocese to which they belonged was persuaded to consent; and Siderius was actually consecrated by a single bishop, and without any sanction from the “Evangelical throne.” Yet Athanasius, hoping that the young bishop's practical ability might be turned to good account in a district troubled by Arianism, not only overlooked the double irregularity of the consecration, but afterwards promoted Siderius to a more important see (Synesius, *Ep.* 77). Again, we find Athanasius excommunicating a cruel and licentious governor in Libya, and signifying the act by circular letters. One of these was sent to Basil, who had just become exarch, or archbishop, of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and had received, perhaps at that time, from Athanasius,^l a formal notification of the proceedings of the Council of 362 (*Ep.* 204). He immediately announced to his own people the sentence pronounced in Egypt; the strong sense of Church unity made such a step both regular and natural, and he wrote to assure Athanasius that the offender would be regarded by the faithful at Caesarea as utterly alien from Christian fellowship (*Ep.* 60). This led to a correspondence, carried on actively in 371. Basil, who had troubles of all kinds weighing upon his spirit, sought aid in regard to one of them—the unhappy schism of Antioch—from “the keen insight, the practical energy, the evangelical sympathy,” of the widely venerated man who must be supposed to feel with special acuteness the contrast between former peace and present confusion (*Ep.* 66). What he wanted, as he explained more distinctly in his next letter, was, that Athanasius should promote the recognition by the Westerns of Meletius as the rightful bishop of Antioch, and should induce Paulinus to enter upon some negotiation.^m The bearer of his letter was Dorotheus, Meletius's deacon, whom Athanasius, probably about Easter 371, sent back, with one of his own priests, to convey his answer to Basil. In the autumn Basil wrote again (*Ep.* 69), and the tone which he adopts towards Athanasius is very remarkable. He calls him the

^b Soc., iv. 13, says he concealed himself for four months in his father's tomb. See Soc. vi. 12.

¹ Newman speaks of it with an “if genuine” (*Athanas. Treat.* ii. 494).

^k He had used it long before. *In illud, Omnia Mihi*, 6, if the reading there be correct: but would he have used it after the Council of 362 had advised that neither “One” nor “Three Hypostases” should be asserted as a formula?

^l The Benedictine biographer of Basil considers that he received it some years before he became a bishop, in answer to a question whether he ought to communicate with Eustathius of Sebaste (*Vit. Bas.* viii. 8).

^m Basil fully recognizes both congregations as forming “the sound portion” of the Antiochene church (*Ep.* 69); and he gives Meletius an admonition to be conciliatory (*Ep.* 89).

foremost person (literally, the *summit*) of the whole Church, the man of "truly grand and apostolic soul, who from boyhood had been an athlete in the cause of religion"—"a spiritual father," whom he longed earnestly to see, and whose conversation would amply compensate for all the sufferings of a lifetime (*Ep.* 69, 80, 82). But although Athanasius consented to act as a medium between Basil and the Westerns (*Ep.* 90), he could not, with consistency or with dignity, take any direct part in favour of Meletius, whose bearing, in 363, had disappointed his pacific efforts, and whose rival's position he had unequivocally recognized.^a Even Basil, when Meletius's friends, Eastern bishops of like antecedents, desired that Athanasius would write to them as a body, felt that this might be asking too much (*Ep.* 82); and on the whole, as Dr. Newman expresses it (*Church of the Fathers*, p. 73), "nothing came of the application;" but when some Cappadocian monks complained of Basil's reserved language as to the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, Athanasius reproved them in a letter, the gist of which is evident from his extant letters, to *John and Antiochus*, and to *Palladius*. Basil, he insisted, was one who might well be trusted, for he was one of whom the Church might indeed be proud;^b it was captious to imagine an unsound motive for his cautious and gradual exposition of the truth.

But one of these letters of Basil (*Ep.* 69) had apparently a remarkable result. He complained of the countenance still given to Marcellus by the Westerns, who were therefore looked upon in the East as indifferent about any heresy that happened not to be Arianism. Athanasius, as we have seen, had written against the views ascribed to Marcellus, and had begun to regard him, at least, with more or less suspicion; but now, in consequence of Basil's letter (see *Montfaucon, Coll. Nov. ii.* p. 71 sq.; Newman, *Ath. Treat.* ii. 503), Marcellus, fortifying himself with commendatory letters from Athanasius's friends, the bishops of Greece and Macedonia, sent his deacon Eugenius, with others, as a deputation to Athanasius. On their arrival, Athanasius of course put questions to them as to doctrine. In reply, they presented to him, in the name of Marcellus "and a great multitude" who adhered to him, a statement which was explicit^c on all points save one, the permanence of Christ's Humanity and Kingdom. This point, however, might be supposed to be included in the rest: Athanasius might be only too glad to accept as satisfactory this representation of the belief of his former friend, who was now drawing to the close of a prolonged and troubled life. It is probably by accident that his own "name does not appear among the extant signatures" (Newman) by which four Egyptian prelates accepted the statement with "Amen."

But if his final opinion of Marcellus was thus lenient, he was far from tolerating, in these

^a Montfaucon, indeed, thinks that Athanasius was "reconciled to Meletius."

^b Probably Athanasius had heard about this time of Basil's majestic courage when assailed by the Praetorian praefect Modestus and by Valens (371-2).

^c *E. g.* it asserts an Eternal Son, who is identical with a Personal Word; and it condemns both Sabellianism and Photinism.

latter years of his life, any theories which seemed definitely heterodox respecting what may be called the human side of the Incarnation. If, in his *Letter to Adelphiis*, he condemned a certain class of Arians, and vindicated against their cavils the adoration paid to Christ's Manhood, that is, to His one Person Incarnate; if, in his *Letter to Maximus*, he denounced those who spoke of the man Christ as simply a saint^a with whom the Word had become associated; if he was also, in his *Letter to Epictetus*, bishop of Corinth—a tract called forth by a communication from Epictetus,—most earnest against some who, while "glorying in the Nicene confession," represented Christ's body as not truly human, but formed out of the essence of Godhead. This was, in fact, the second proposition^b of the heresy called Apollinarian; the first being that which had attracted the attention of the Council of 362, and had been disclaimed by those whom the Council could examine,—as to the non-existence, in Christ, of a rational soul, the Word being supposed to supply its place. These views had grown out of an unbalanced eagerness to exalt the Saviour's dignity: but the great upholders of Nicene faith saw that they were incompatible with His Manhood and His Headship, that they virtually brought back Docetism, and that one of them, at any rate, involved a debased conception of Deity. In the next year, 372, he combated both these propositions with "the keenness and richness of thought which distinguish his writings generally" (see Newman, *Church of the Fathers*, p. 162; *Praef. ed. Ben. ii.* 7) in two books which bear the title, *Against Apollinarius*. But he never mentioned the name of his old friend, the bishop of Syrian Laodicea (see *Epiph. Haer.* 77, 2), as responsible for either of these errors; his wish to believe the best of all whom he had loved or with whom he had acted may have made him reject suspicions which proved to be only too just. These books are remarkable for the masterly distinctness with which the one Christ is set forth as "perfect God and perfect Man" (i. 16): if words occur in ii. 10 which seem at first sight to favour Monothelitism, the context^c shews their meaning to be that the Divine will in Christ was dominant over the human: if in the next chapter the phrase, "God suffered through the flesh," is called unscriptural, the whole argument shews that he is contending against the passibility of the Saviour's Godhead. Inexact as might be some of his phrases, the general purport of his teaching on this great subject is unmistakable; it is, as he says in *Orat.* iii. 41, that Christ was "very God in the flesh, and

^a See above, as to the Council of 362. Nestorianism seems again foreshadowed in the opinions implicitly combated in *c. Apollin.* i. 9, 13, 21; ii. 7.

^b See Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 272. The original of this letter was kept in the archives of the Alexandrian church, and by it Cyril proved to Paul of Emesa that some copies had been corrupted.

^c It was chargeable on the school of Apollinarius.

^d Not to cite *De Incarn. et c. Ar.* 21, which distinctly attests two wills in Christ, the Sixth General Council, in condemning Monothelitism, appealed to some words of "the most wise Athanasius" which appear among his "Fragmenta varia." "It was necessary that the will of the flesh should be moved, but that it should be subjected to the will Divine."

very Flesh in the Word." In truth, these later treatises, like the great Discourses, exclude by anticipation both the forms of heresy, in reference to the Person and Natures of Christ, which troubled the Church in the next three centuries. (See especially i. 11, ii. 10.) Athanasius, in the fruits of his work, was "in truth the Immortal" (*Christ. Remembr.* xxxvii. 206): he was continually "planting trees under which men of a later age might sit." It might indeed be said of him that he "waxed old in his work" (*Eccclus.* xi. 20); but the time of work for him—a time so loyally and unweariedly employed from the days of his youthful attendance on Alexander—came to an end in the spring of 373. The discussions^a about the year of his death may be considered as practically closed; the Festal Index, although its chronology is sometimes faulty, may be considered as confirming the date of 373, given in the Maffieian Fragment, supported by other ancient authorities, and accepted by various writers. The exact day, we may believe, was Thursday, May 2, on which day of the month Athanasius is venerated in the Western Church.^x He had sat on the Alexandrian throne, as his great successor Cyril says in a letter to the monks of Egypt, "forty-six complete years;" had he lived a few weeks longer, the years of his episcopate would have been forty-seven. Having recommended Peter, one of his presbyters, for election in his place, he died tranquilly in his own house, "after many struggles," as Rufinus says (ii. 3), "and after his endurance had won many a crown," amid troubles which Tillemont^v ventures to call a continual martyrdom.

Such was the career of Athanasius the Great, as he began to be called in the next generation. Möhler has reason to say that "the narrative of his life is a panegyric which words can only effeeble." And yet one would not "willingly let die" the words in which many great writers have felt constrained to do homage to such a life and such a soul. If Gregory Nazianzen's eulogy is too rhetorically gorgeous^z for modern taste,

^a See Newman, *Hist. Tracts*, p. xx. sq.; Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 199. Montfaucon decides for 373. Probably it was in 372 that Melanta, a Roman lady, visited Athanasius, and received a sheepskin from his hands.

^x The Greek Church honours him, with Cyril, on Jan. 18. The day given in *Fragm. Maff.* is May 3.

^y *Mem.* viii. 249. See Newman, *Arians*, c. 6. His body was buried at Alexandria, and afterwards transferred to Constantinople: and the story of its removal by a Venetian captain in 1454, to Santa Croce in Venice, reads like a strange echo of some of his adventures during life.

^z Yet how terse and vivid is the passage which represents him as commending some, gently reproving others; here arousing the indolent, there curbing the impetuous; now seeking how to prevent men from falling, now planning how the fallen might be raised up; single in his line of action, manifold in his mode of administration; wise in speech, still wiser in thought; able to keep the level of common minds, and to soar high above the loftiest, &c. Cave, in his *Lives*, has condensed Gregory's panegyric into vigorous though quaint English: in his *Historia Literaria*, he gives one which reads like a good Latin epiphany. Montfaucon closes his 'Life' by a vigorous summary. The many-sidedness of the character, indeed, seems to suggest antitheses:—"He restored in the spirit of meekness, while he rebuked and rejected with power" (Newman, *Arians*, c. 4, s. 3: compare c. 6.) "That kingly and commanding, though still humble temper" (*Chr. Rem.* July, 1855, p. 155). See a fine passage on the sub-

Hooker's will live while English is spoken; and Gibbon's admiration for such manifest nobleness (iii. 70) is significant as contrasting with his general antipathy to Church heroes. (Stanley, *East. Ch.* p. 276.) Four points, perhaps, ought especially to dwell in our remembrance: (1) the deep religiousness which illuminated all his studies and controversies by a sense of his relations as a Christian to his Redeemer; (2) the persistency, so remarkable in one whose natural temperament was acutely sensitive; (3) the combination of gifts, "firmness with discretion and discrimination," as Newman expresses it, which enabled him, while never turning aside from his great object, to be, as Gregory Nazianzen applies the apostolic phrase, "all things to all men;" and in close connection with this, (4) the affectionateness which made him so tender as a friend, and so active as a peacemaker,—which won for him such enthusiastic loyalty, and endowed the great theologian and Church ruler with the powers peculiar to a truly loveable man. That he was not flawless,—that his words could be somewhat too sharp in controversy, or somewhat unreal in addressing a despot, that he was not always charitable in his interpretation of his adversaries' conduct, or that his casuistry, on one occasion, seems to have lacked the healthy severity of St. Augustine's,—this may be, and has been, admitted; but after all, and looking at the whole man, we shall not be extravagant if we pronounce his name to be the greatest in the Church's post-apostolic history.

The list of his genuine writings, besides those which have been mentioned in this account of his life, would include his *Exposition of the Psalms*; his work on the *Titles of the Psalms*, a series of short exegetical comments, verse by verse; two letters to monks; the *Greater Discourse on Faith* (which Newman describes as "hardly more than a set of small fragments from his other works"), and numerous fragments, exegetical, homiletical, polemical, and historical. Of these fragments^a there must have been many specimens and collections in the literature of the next succeeding ages. "When you meet with a saying of Athanasius," said Abbot Cosmas in the sixth century, "and have not paper on which to copy it, copy it on your clothes."

Among those writings which have been ascribed to him, but which are of doubtful genuineness, is a little tract on the Incarnation, which contains the phrase afterwards so productive of controversy, "one Incarnate *φύσις* of God the Word,"^b [CYRIL.] But Montfaucon and Möhler,

ject in J. B. Robertson's *Memoir of Möhler*, p. xcviil.: a brief but pregnant rationale of his strength as a theologian in Dörner's *Person of Christ*, ii. 248, E. T.: and compare the forcible words of Canon Robertson, *Hist. Ch.* i. 193, ed. 1. Bp. Pearson, in *Vindic. Ign.* p. i. c. 3 (i. 235) briefly recounts his troubles.

^a On his last works, *e. g.* against the Manicheans, a Commentary on Ecclesiastes, see *Præf.* ed. Ben. iii. Socrates, i. 13, refers to a work called 'Synodicon' by Athanasius, which is lost. The treatise or letter *De Decret.* had been preceded by another (c. 5), which also is lost.

^b In *Cont. Apollin.* i. 12, he seems to use *φύσις* for "personal subsistence" or "person." On the other hand, he uses *φύσις* for nature in several passages where he recognizes, more or less explicitly, a human *φύσις* (as the Council of Chalcedon afterwards declared) in the Person of the Incarnate Saviour (*Orat.* ii. 70, iii. 43, 58, iv. 36; c. *Apoll.* i. 6, 17, ii. 11).

following Leontius of Byzantium, are disposed to regard it as a forgery; and Tillemont inclines that way (although, he says, "Quelque parti que l'on prenne dans cette difficulté, il y a partout beaucoup d'embarras," *Mem.* viii. 717). Of the undoubtedly spurious^e writings, the *Quicumque vult* is by far the most eminent instance; in the middle ages it was believed to have been composed by the saint in a well or cavern at Treves. But the sermon *On the Annunciation*, which used to be quoted by Roman Catholic controversialists, may also be specified; and the *Synopsis of Holy Scripture* may be considered as certainly belonging to this class. (Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 520.)

With regard to editions of Athanasius's works,^d a Latin version of a few of his writings appeared in 1482. Two genuine works, and many spurious ones, were published at Paris in 1520; Erasmus edited some, in Latin, in 1527 (he rejected the first of the doctrinal letters to Serapion, on his own view of internal evidence). Another edition, uniting those of 1520 and 1527, appeared at Lyons in 1532. A Latin version, by Nannius, of a much larger amount of the whole works, was published in 1556. The first Greek edition was the Commelinian, at Heidelberg, in 1600. Soon afterwards, Peter Felckmann edited with much accuracy many Athanasian Fragments. Latin editions followed in 1608 and 1612. The Greek text with a Latin version, Paris 1627, "threw into the shade all previous editions," but the work was loosely executed. Another faulty edition appeared at Leipzig in 1681. Then came the great Benedictine edition of 1698, enriched by the Life from the pen of Montfaucon, which in 1707 published, in one of the volumes of his *Nova Patrum et Scriptorum Græcorum Collectio*, additional remains collected by his industry. The work on the 'Titles of the Psalms' was edited by Nic. Antonelli at Rome, in 1746; and in 1777 appeared at Padua an edition in four volumes folio, combining the labours of previous editors.

A few English translations of some of Athanasius's works had appeared before the publication of any part of the 'Library of the Fathers.' But the volume of 'Historical Tracts of St. Athanasius,' and the two volumes of 'Treatises in Controversy with the Arians,' published in that series at Oxford in 1843-4, under Dr. Newman's editorship, must (whatever exceptions may be taken to a few passages in the notes) be always ranked among the richest treasures of English Patristic literature. [W. B.]

ATHANASIUS. (1) Bishop of ANAGASTUS in Cilicia Secunda and metropolitan, a disciple of St. Lucian of Antioch (Philost. *H. E.* iii. 15), reckoned by Arius, in his letter to Eusebius Nicom., among the bishops who coincided with him in doctrine (Theodt. *H. E.* i. 5). The great Athanasius (*de Synod.* p. 886) accuses him of having, previous to the Council of Nicaea, written blasphemies equal to those of Arius, of which he gives a specimen. He is said by Le Quien, on the authority of the *Lib. Synod. Græc.*, to have supported Arius at the Council of Nicaea. Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 15) tells us that when Aetius was expelled from his master's house, after his

unlucky victory in argument, Athanasius received him and read the Gospels with him.

(2) An Arian bishop, who succeeded Philip in the see of SCYTHOPOLIS, c. 372. He is charged by Epiphanius with pushing his Arian tenets to the most audacious impiety, asserting that the Son and Holy Spirit were creatures, and had nothing in common with the Divine nature (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxiii. c. 37, p. 885).

(3) Bishop of PERRHA, a see dependent on the Syrian Hierapolis. This Athanasius becomes known to us in connexion with Domnus II., bishop of Antioch, in the middle of the 5th century. He was present at the first council of Ephesus, and supported Cyril of Alexandria and signed with him. Grave accusations, the nature of which is not specified, having been brought against him by his clergy, Athanasius declined to meet them when summoned for that purpose by his metropolitan Panolbuis of Hierapolis, and voluntarily resigned his see. Repenting, apparently, of his weakness, he took a journey to Constantinople, and moved the synod assembled there to tears by his representations of the violence to which he owed his deposition. He prevailed upon Proclus of Constantinople and Cyril of Alexandria to espouse his cause; and they wrote synodical letters on his behalf to Domnus, bishop of Antioch. Domnus in consequence summoned a council to consider the matter. The date is uncertain, but it was not till after the death of Cyril, and therefore subsequent to A.D. 444. Athanasius refused to appear, on the ground that Domnus was his personal enemy, and was unanimously condemned by default and deposed from his bishopric, to which Sabinianus was consecrated. After "the Robber Synod" of Ephesus, A.D. 449, had made the ambitious and unprincipled Dioscorus of Alexandria the temporary ruler of the Eastern Church, Sabinianus was in his turn deposed, and Athanasius reinstated at Perrha. Sabinianus appealed against his deposition to the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, where both he and his rival signed as bishop of Perrha. His case was fully heard, and it was determined that the original charges against him should be investigated by Maximus at Antioch; and, if substantiated, that his deposition should be confirmed; but if disproved, that he should be restored to his episcopate. We are in complete ignorance of the issue of this investigation. (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 717-754; Liberatus Diac. in *Breviario*, Labbe, v. 762; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 479; Christ. Lupus, ii.) [E. V.]

ATHANASIUS, bishop of ANCYRA (A.D. 360-369). His father, who bore the same name, was a man of high family and great learning, and had held important offices in the State (*ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων ἀρχὰς διεύθυναντος*); but was reputed harsh and unfatherly to his children. This rumour, reaching St. Basil's ears, led him to write a friendly remonstrance, and hence arose a correspondence of which one letter is preserved (*Ep.* 24). The son Athanasius was raised to the see of Ancyra by the Arian Acacius of Caesarea, through whose influence his predecessor Basilus had been deposed at a synod held at Constantinople, A.D. 360 (Sozom. iv. 25; Philostorg. v. 1). But notwithstanding this inauspicious beginning, he gave unquestionable proofs of his

^e See *Præf. ed. Ben.* iii. 3.

^d For this, see *Prolegomena to Benedictine edition.*

orthodoxy by taking an active part in the Synod of Tyana (A.D. 367), at which the Nicene symbol was accepted (Sozom. vi. 12). By St. Basil he is commended as "a bulwark of orthodoxy" (*Ep.* 25), and Gregory Nyssen praises him as "valuing the truth above everything" (*c. Evom.* i. ii. 292). Owing to some misunderstanding however, Athanasius had spoken in very severe terms of St. Basil, misled, as Basil conjectures, by the fact that some heretical writings had been fathered upon him; and the bishop of Caesarea sends an affectionate letter of remonstrance (*Ep.* 25), in which he speaks of Athanasius in the highest terms. At his death Basil writes a letter of condolence to the Church of Ancyra, on the loss of one who was truly "a pillar and foundation of the Church" (*Ep.* 29). This seems to have happened A.D. 368 or 369 (see Garnier, *Basil. Op.* iii. p. lxxvii sq.). [L.]

ATHENAGORAS.—I. *Life.* There is scarcely one catalogue of the ancient writers of the Church, wherein we find mention of Athenagoras or his works. He is not noticed by Eusebius, Jerome, Photius or Suidas. But in a fragment of the book of Methodius, bishop of Tyre, (3rd cent.), *De Resurrectione Animarum* against Origen, there is an unmistakable quotation from the *Apology* (c. 24, p. 27 B) with the name of Athenagoras appended. This fragment is given by Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 64, c. 21) and Photius (*Cod.* 224, 234). Scanty as this information is, it yet assures us of the existence of the *Apology* in the 3rd cent., and its ascription to Athenagoras. Much more is told us by Philippus Sidetes, deacon of Chrysostom (5th cent.) in a fragment preserved by Nicephorus Callistus (Dodwell, *Diss. in Irenaeum*, 429) to this effect: "Athenagoras was the first head of the school at Alexandria, flourishing in the times of Hadrian and Antoninus, to whom also he addressed his *Apology for the Christians*; a man who embraced Christianity while wearing the garb of a philosopher, and presiding over the academic school. He, before Celsus, was bent on writing against the Christians; and studying the divine Scriptures in order to carry on the contest with the greater accuracy, was thus himself caught by the all-holy Spirit, so that, like the great Paul, from a persecutor he became a teacher of the faith which he persecuted." Philippus says, continues Nicephorus, "that Clemens, the writer of the *Stromata*, was his pupil, and Pantaenus the pupil of Clemens." But Philippus' statement about Pantaenus is not true, according to Clemens and Eusebius; his character as an historian is severely criticized, and his book pronounced valueless by Socrates Scholasticus (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 27) and Photius (*Cod.* 35, p. 7, Bekker); and his assertion that the *Apology* was addressed to Hadrian and Antoninus is contradicted by its very inscription. Nevertheless, as he was a pupil of Rhodon (head of the school in the reign of Theodosius the Great) he may be supposed to have had some facts as the groundwork of what he has said. The only other source of information about Athenagoras is the inscription of his *Apology*, with such internal evidence as may be gathered from his works themselves. The inscription runs thus: "The embassy (πρεσβεία) of Athenagoras of Athens, a Christian philosopher, concerning Christians, to the Emperors

Marcus Aurelius, Antoninus, and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, Armeniaci, Sarmatici, and, greatest of all, philosophers." Without at present considering the peculiar difficulties involved in this inscription (of which below), we learn from it in general that Athenagoras was an Athenian and a philosopher, which character and profession he evidently retained after his conversion. His connexion with Athens (probably his birth there) and profession of philosophy are thus substantiated; and the manner in which he became converted to Christianity may very well have been as described by Philippus, whose account that he was head of the Academics is probably but an exaggeration of the fact that he had belonged to that sect. That he was ever leader of the Catechetical school of Alexandria can by no means be asserted. Clarisse (§ 8) inclines to believe it, on the ground that Philippus was unlikely to have mentioned a writer so little known as Athenagoras had he not found his name in Rhodon's catalogue. In the same section of the *Commentatio* is the acute conjecture that the treatise *De Resurrectione* was written at Alexandria rather than Athens, from c. 12, p. 52 A, where the builder of a house is represented as making stalls for his camels. And on a supposed Alexandrian tinge in the philosophy of Athenagoras vide Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philosophiae*, iii. 405 sq.). Of his death nothing is known; the idea that he was martyred apparently arising from a confusion between him and Athenogenes. That the *Apology* was really intended to be seen and read by the emperors is obvious; how it reached them is less clear: we are hardly entitled to assert that it was in any formal or public manner delivered to them by Athenagoras himself, an idea which may be due to the title it bears, of πρεσβεία or "Embassy." πρεσβεία, however, according to Stephanus (*Thesaur. Ling. Graec.* iii. col. 543), is occasionally used for an apology, intercession, or deprecation.

II. *Genuine Works.* These are, 1. The *Apology*. 2. The *Treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead*.

1. *Apology. Genuineness.* The testimonies to this work are the inscription which it bears, and the quotation by Methodius given above. Some indeed have supposed that when Jerome speaks of an apology delivered by Justin Martyr to Marcus Antoninus Verus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus (since these obtained the empire after Justin's death), he refers to the *Apology* of Athenagoras and attributes it to Justin; but it appears that he intends Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (Mosheim, *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.* i. 279) to whom Justin's *Lesser Apology* was given, (vid. *Prolegomena* to Maranus' *Justin*, pt. iii. c. 8, § 4, p. 93 sqq.). Attempts to prove the work in question to be that of Justin (vid. Le Moine, *Varia sacra* ii. 171), or of a later author (vid. Semler, *Introduction* to Baumgarten's *Theolog. Streitigkeiten* ii. 70 note) have alike failed. There is nothing whatever in the writings of Athenagoras unsuitable to their assigned age; and Athenagoras' name was not sufficiently known to have been selected for the author of a supposititious book.

Date. This is a difficult question; some have taken the Commodus of the inscription for Lucius Aelius Aurelius Verus (died A.D. 169),

son-in-law and brother of Marcus Antoninus. But Lucius Aelius Aurelius Commodus, Antoninus' son and successor, must be intended: for Verus dropped the name of Commodus after obtaining a share in the government, and could never have had the title of Sarmaticus; for Sarmatia was not conquered till after his death. Commodus indeed had no share in the government of Sarmatia; whence Mommsen, following Tentzel, but without MS. authority, would read *Γερμανικοῖς* for *Ἀρμενικοῖς*. As little right had Commodus to the title of "philosopher." Athenagoras may have only intended to include the son in the honours of the father. At all events, the illustration (at c. 18, p. 17 D) of the Divine government, taken from that of the two emperors, father and son, seems conclusive. We have also allusions to the profound peace of the empire, appropriate only between A.D. 176, when Avidius Crassus' insurrection was crushed, and A.D. 178, when the outbreak of the Marcomannic wars occurred. The *Apology* cannot well have been of later date than A.D. 177, since in that year arose the fearful persecution of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, upon the accusations brought by their slaves; whereas in c. 35, p. 38 B, Athenagoras declares that no slaves of Christians had ever charged their masters with the crimes popularly imputed to them: nor is there any allusion whatever to this persecution, which would hardly have been passed over in silence. We are therefore led to conclude that the *Apology* was written between the end of A.D. 176 and that of A.D. 177.

Analysis. The *Apology* consists of categorical answers to the three charges usually brought against the Christians, of (a) atheism, (b) incest, and (c) cannibalism. (a) They worship one God (1), and can give a reason why. (2) The philosophers have held like views; (3) Polytheism and (4) its worship are absurd, modern, and the work of demons. (b) Incest is most contrary to their pure and even ascetic life. (c) They are even more humane than the heathen, condemning abortion, infanticide, and gladiatorial games as murder.

2. *Treatise on the Resurrection. Genuineness and date.* There is no independent external evidence for the authorship of this work; but there is no reason whatever to doubt that, as its inscription informs us, it is from the pen of Athenagoras. It closely agrees with the *Apology* in style and thought, and all that has been said above of the internal evidence for the genuineness of the former work applies equally to this. That such a treatise was in Athenagoras' mind when he wrote the *Apology* appears from the words near its close, c. 36, p. 39 C, "let the argument upon the Resurrection stand over;" from which words we may not unfairly gather that the *Treatise on the Resurrection* shortly followed the former work. This is the only clue to its date which we possess.

From the closing sentences of c. 23 (p. 66 C) it seems that the *Treatise* we are considering was intended as a lecture. The words there used, "We have not made it our aim to leave nothing unsaid that our subject contained, but summarily to point out to those who came together what view ought to be taken in regard to the Resurrection" must allude not merely to a few friends who might happen to be present

when the book was read, but to a regular audience. From a reference, c. 1, p. 41 B, to an occasional mode of arranging his arguments, it may be supposed that Athenagoras was in the habit of delivering public lectures upon Christianity. The arrangement, too, and peculiar opening of the treatise decidedly favour the view, that it was a lecture, which has been somewhat enlarged or modified for publication.

Analysis. The work consists of two parts: I. The removal of the objections, (1) that God wants the power (2) or the will to raise the dead. (1.) He does not want the power to do it, either through ignorance or weakness—as Athenagoras proves from the works of creation; defending his positions against the philosophic objections, that the bodies of men after dissolution come to form part of other bodies; and that things broken cannot be restored to their former state. (2.) God wants not the will to raise the dead—for it is neither unjust to the raised men, nor to other beings; nor unworthy of Him—which is shown from the works of creation. II. Arguments for the Resurrection. (1.) The final cause of man's creation, to be a perpetual beholder of the Divine wisdom. (2.) Man's nature, which requires perpetuity of existence in order to attain the true end of rational life. (3.) The necessity of the Divine judgment upon men in body and soul, (a) from the Providence, (b) from the justice of God. (4.) The ultimate end of man's being, not to be attained on earth.

III. *Athenagoras as a writer.* To most of the Apologists Athenagoras is decidedly superior. Elegant, free from superfluity of language, forcible in style, he rises occasionally into great power of description, and his reasoning is remarkable for clearness and cogency; e.g. his answer to the heathen argument, that not the idols, but the gods represented, are really honoured. His treatment of the Resurrection is for the most part admirable. Even where the defective science of the day led him into error, e.g. in answering the question, apparently so difficult, as to the assimilation of the materials of one human body into another, the line taken is one that shews no little thought and ability; and his whole writings indicate a philosophic mind, which amply justifies the title given to him in the inscription of his two works.

His style, however, is not unfrequently somewhat obscured by difficult elliptic or parenthetical passages, and anacolutha (for examples of which see the *Apology* c. 1, p. 2 C; c. 20, p. 19 B; c. 22, p. 23 B; and *De Resurr.* c. 18, p. 60 D). Among his peculiar words and phrases, Clarisse notices his use of *ἄγειν* in the sense of *ducere*, to think, and *τὰ ἐπισυμβεβηκότα Θεῷ* for the attributes of God.

IV. *His philosophy.* Mosheim represents Athenagoras as having been the first of the Eclectics. It is far more true to say that he shared in the eclecticism which then pervaded all philosophy. That he had been a Platonist appears, on the whole, from his continual reference to Plato, and the thoroughly Platonic view which on many points pervades his works. We easily recognize this view in his language about matter and the soul, angels, natures sensible and intelligible, and the contemplation of God as the end of man's being; and also in that referring to the Son of

God as the Logos and Creator (except that this is not at all peculiar to Athenagoras), more especially in his calling the Word "idea (or archetype) and energy" in the work of Creation. He also appears to allude slightly to the doctrine of reminiscences (*De Resurr.* c. 14, p. 55 A) where it is said that "when the dispute turns on first principles, there is need only of recollections which stir up the natural concept." The Platonism of Athenagoras was modified however by the prevailing eclecticism (cf. e.g. the Peripatetic doctrine of the mean, so alien to Plato *Resurrect.* c. 21 p. 64 B), and still more, of course, by his reception of Christianity, which necessitated the abandonment of such views as the unoriginated nature of the soul. With all this agrees excellently so much of Philippus Sidetes' account as connects Athenagoras with the Academics; whose Platonism was precisely such as is here described. Allusions to the other philosophers are abundant; e.g. to Aristotle and the Peripatetics, *Apol.* c. 6, p. 7 A; c. 16, p. 15 D, to the Stoics; *ib.* c. 6, p. 7 B, to the Cyrenaics and Epicureans; *Resurr.* c. 19, p. 62 B. We see from *Apol.* c. 7, p. 8 A, that he regarded the Gentile Philosophers as possessing some measure of divine light in their minds, but unable thereby to come to the full knowledge of God, because this could only be obtained by revelation, which they never sought.

V. *Theology, &c.* Athenagoras' proof of the divine unity rests on the propositions, expressed or implied, that God is perfect, self-existent, uncompounded; the Creator, Sustainer, and Ruler of the universe. Were there more gods than one, they could not coexist and co-work as a community of beings similar to each other, in the same sphere; for things self-existent and eternal cannot be like a number of creatures formed all on one pattern, but must be eternally distinct and unlike. They could not be parts of one whole, for God has no parts. There could be no place for another God in connection with this universe; for the Creator is over and around His own works. Another God, confined to some other universe of his own, could not concern us; and so would be but a finite being.

The Son of God. In God, since He is an eternal, rational Mind, there dwelt from eternity the "Logos" ("Reason," "Expression," or "Word"), as His Son, and in the Son dwelt the Father. To bring matter into existence, and afterwards give it form and order, the Divine Word "came forth" (i.e. the eternal Son assumed, towards the finite, the office and relation of "the Word" or Manifestor of God), to be the Archetype and Effectuating Power of creation (*Apol.* c. 10, p. 10 D). His Incarnation is only indirectly mentioned, in the supposition at c. 21, p. 21 D (*ib.*), of God assuming flesh according to a divine dispensation.

The Holy Ghost is said to be the Spirit Who spoke by the prophets, and an Emanation from God (*Apol.* c. 10, p. 10 D), flowing forth and returning as a ray from the sun. It has hence been much disputed whether Athenagoras believed the blessed Spirit to be a distinct Person, or not. His expressions greatly resemble those used by some whom Justin condemns for their denial of the personality of the Son; "they say that this virtue is indivisible and inseparable from the Father, as the sunlight on earth is indivisible and inseparable from the sun in the heavens" (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 128, p. 358 B).

But it must be remembered that the Apologists present the *actings* and *offices* of the three blessed Persons of the Godhead in creation, &c., rather than Their eternal *subsistence*; and of necessity do this in a form intelligible to a heathen mind, yet so as not to be confounded with polytheism. It is not doubted that Athenagoras held the personality of the Father, but with "God the Father, and God the Son" (*Apol.* c. 10, p. 11 A), he joins as third, the Holy Spirit; so also c. 12, p. 62 D, and again c. 24, p. 26 D. That two divine Persons and an impersonal emanation should be thus enumerated together, by so philosophic a writer as Athenagoras, is not conceivable. The angels, too—indubitably personal beings—are mentioned as holding a place after the Trinity, in Christian theology (c. 10); and it is worthy of notice, that in the passage cited above from Justin, angels as well as the Word are described by the persons whom that writer is condemning, as temporary appearances; as if it were the Sadducees, or some similar Jewish sect, of which he is speaking. We are, therefore, decidedly of opinion that the personality of the Holy Spirit is held by Athenagoras; cf., however, Clarisse.

Man he holds to be composed of body and soul, the latter immortal, with spiritual powers of its own (*Apol.* c. 27, p. 31 A); but assigns the rational judgment not to the soul alone, but to the whole compound being, man; perhaps implying that in the actings and expression of thought both the mind and the bodily organs share. Hence he shows that the soul without the body is imperfect; that only when embodied can man be justly judged, or render to God perfect service, in a heavenly life. The sin and misery of man are described, in the Platonic manner, as entanglement with matter (*Apol.* c. 27, p. 30 C), and missing the true aim of his existence (*Resurr.* c. 25, p. 68 B); which is said to be the state of the majority, a prevalence of evil which Athenagoras only mentions so far as to connect it with the influence of the demons, i.e. of the fallen angels, or their offspring by human wives, a view common with the Apologists. The evil angels he regards as having fallen by misuse of free will, the like account which it is plain he would give of the fall of man; cf. *Apol.* c. 25, p. 29 B. Of infants, he remarks (*Resurr.* 614, p. 55 D) that they need no judgment, inasmuch as they have done neither good nor evil. The nature of the scheme of redemption is not treated of by Athenagoras.

VI. *Was Athenagoras a Montanist?* This idea was suggested by Tillemont, who founds it upon two points in the opinions of Athenagoras, his account of prophecy, and his absolute condemnation of second marriages. In the *Apology*, c. 9, p. 9 D, Athenagoras' view of inspiration is thus given; "who" (i.e. the prophets) "rapt in mind out of themselves by the impulse of the Spirit of God, uttered the things with which they were inspired; the Spirit using them as if a flute player were breathing into his flute." With this has been compared the language of Montanus (Epiphanius Panar. *Haer.* 48, c. 4, p. 405), where the prophet is said to be as a lyre, the Spirit like the plectrum. So Tertullian *Against Marcion*, c. 22. Yet similar language is found in Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 115, p. 343 A); and Athenagoras may only mean that the

prophet was carried beyond himself by the Holy Spirit, and that the words uttered were not his own. The severe condemnation of second marriage, in the works of Athenagoras, is doubtless a point of contact with the Montanists; but the same view is very common with the Greek fathers (vid. Hefele's *Beiträge*, vol. i. lect. 2). Moreover, of the authority and office of the Paraclete, in the sense in which Montanus is generally said to have understood that name, there is no trace in the writings of Athenagoras.

VII. *Quotations of Scripture, early writers, &c.* The inspiration of Scripture is strongly stated by Athenagoras, e.g. *Apol.* c. 9, p. 9 D. He is seldom careful to quote exactly, so that it is not always certain what version is employed; probably the Septuagint throughout. From the N. T. he often quotes or borrows phrases, without mentioning whence they come. It is treated as authoritative amongst the Christians; its maxims being used as samples of their discipline and practice. Vid. Lardner, *Credibility*, . . . ; Clarisse, *Athenag.* § 55.

It has been disputed whether or not Athenagoras makes any reference to the works of other Christian writers, particularly the *Apology* of Justin Martyr, which some consider him to have made the foundation of his own. Certainly the resemblance between them seems too great to be the result of accident alone. Both Justin and Athenagoras urge that Christians were unconvicted of any crime, that the mere name does not deserve punishment, and that they were no more Atheists than the poets and the philosophers; and both, in a similar manner, show the unworthiness of sacrificial worship. They give very much the same view of the Christian way of life; and both lay great stress on chastity, and on the confining of marriage to its sole end, the begetting of children. Nearly the same account of the fall of the angels is found in both: the same books are quoted, often the same passages; by both the very same phrases are occasionally employed. This correspondence is especially seen between the exordium of Justin's first *Apology* and that of Athenagoras. Hence Clarisse infers (*Comm. in Athenagor.* § 57) that Athenagoras intended to rearrange and epitomize the work of his predecessor. In the *Treatise on the Resurrection*, c. 8, p. 48 c, is an apparent imitation of Tatian, *Or. ad Graec.* c. 6, p. 146 B.

VIII. *Editions.* The treatise of Athenagoras *On the Resurrection* appeared separately at first, edited by Petrus Nannius (Louvain and Paris, 1541). It subsequently appeared in the *Micropresbyticom*, 1550, and in the *Orthodoxographia* of Heroldus, 1555. Both the works of Athenagoras issued from the press of Henricus Stephanus, under the care of Conrad Gesner, 1557; and both appeared in the collections of Lang, Morell, 1615 and 1636; Fronto Ducaeus, 1624; Maranus, 1742; Gallandi (Venice, 1766), and Oberthür, 1779. Separate editions of the works of Athenagoras were published by Fell (Oxford, 1882), Rechenberg, 1685, and Dechair (Oxford, 1706), who collated several MSS., and added copious notes, with several dissertations. The *Apology* was edited by M. Jo. Gottlieb Lindner, 1774, and Dr. Paul Ludwig, 1856. The best edition of Athenagoras is that of Otto (Jena, 1857); its text is based on the three earliest

MSS. (viz. the Cod. Paris. CDLI., Cod. Paris. CLXXIV., and Cod. Argentoratensis), with which the rest have been collated, some for the first time.

IX. *Spurious works.* From a careless expression of Gesner, in reference to the books of Antoninus, *Περὶ τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν*, a notion arose of the existence, amongst Gesner's books, of a work by Athenagoras with the above title; an idea which, though wholly erroneous, was entertained by Scultatus, and at one time by Tentzel, with some others.

About the close of the 16th century there appeared a French romance, entitled "*Du vray et parfait Amour*," purporting to be a work of Athenagoras, translated by M. Fumée, Seigneur de S. Geuillac. Not only, however, do its many anachronisms and whole character prove it the work of some later author; but, moreover, that author is generally taken to have been Fumée himself. Certainly no Greek original has ever been produced. The main objects of the book seem to have been the display of the writer's architectural knowledge, and the defence of alchemy.

References.—The following works may be consulted: Clarisse, *Commentatio de Athenagora*; Hefele, *Beiträge*; Möhler, *Patrologie*; J. Donaldson, *Hist. of Christian Literature*. [S. M.]

ATHENODORUS, Martyr, a brother of Gregory Thaumaturgus and (with him) a pupil of Origen, a bishop who joined his brother in withstanding Paul of Samosata, and who is said to have been martyred under Aurelian (see Baron. ad Oct. 18, and Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 30, vii. 28). [A. W. H.]

ATHENOGENES, fl. about A.D. 196, a martyr contemporary with Clement of Alexandria, mentioned by St. Basil (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 29). He endured martyrdom by fire (*τὴν διὰ πυρὸς τελέωσιν*); and on the way to the stake he sang a hymn (*ὥσπερ τι ἐξιτήριον*), which he left as a legacy to his disciples. This has been identified, but on very insufficient grounds, with one of the two early Christian hymns, *Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, κ.τ.λ.*, and *Φῶς ἱλαρὸν ἁγίας δόξης, κ.τ.λ.* (Ussher *De Symbol.* sub finem; T. Smith (*Miscellan.* Lond. 1686; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 94.)) [E. V.]

ATHINGANI. [PAULICIANS.]

ATLAS. [MANES.]

ATTICUS, archbishop of Constantinople, succeeded Arsacius the usurper of Chrysostom's see, in March 406, and held it for 20 years. He died Oct. 10, 426.

Atticus was born at Sebaste in Armenia. He early embraced a monastic life, and received his education from some Macedonian monks near that place. But he was of too ambitious a nature to be content to remain in a small provincial town, and we soon find him at the imperial city. Here the heretical views he had derived from his early teachers which would have been a bar to his ecclesiastical advancement, were speedily exchanged for the orthodox faith. He was ordained presbyter, and soon became known as a rising man of no great learning, but of sound common sense and practical power, who could hold his own in argument with better men than himself, and by his adroitness in concealing

his ignorance and making the most of his knowledge, was often credited with higher theological attainments than he possessed. He had good natural abilities, and he spared no pains to make up for the deficiencies of his early education by diligent study, often devoting whole nights to reading. Atticus gained no reputation as a preacher. His sermons, mediocre in style, had neither learning nor eloquence to recommend them, and the nice Byzantine ear was offended by his rough Armenian dialect. As a presbyter he wrote out his sermons and learnt them by heart; but as a bishop he preached extemporaneously. But the contrast between his discourses and those which his golden-mouthed predecessor had delivered from the same ambo was keenly felt. They were listened to coldly without applause, and no shorthand writer was employed to take them down (Soc. vii. 2; Soz. viii. 27; Niceph. xiii. 29, xiv. 27). The statements of Palladius with respect to the enemies of Chrysostom are always to be received with caution, and it would be hardly safe on his authority to convict Atticus of ignorance of the Scriptures, and infrequent preaching.

The precise grounds of quarrel between Atticus and Chrysostom we do not know; but he proved himself one of Chrysostom's most bitter and uncompromising adversaries. If not, as Palladius asserts (c. xi.), the architect of the whole cabal for the overthrow of Chrysostom, he certainly took a very leading part in carrying it into execution. The organization of the synod of the Oak owed much to his practical skill. He and Arsacius appeared as witnesses against the archbishop on the charge of illegally confiscating the property of the see, and eagerly clamoured for his immediate condemnation. "His guilt was clear, why should there be any further delay?" (Phot. Cod. 59.)

We have not the means of distinctly tracing Atticus' share in the subsequent events by which the overthrow of Chrysostom was finally accomplished; but all we know of his character and conduct, and the position he occupied as one of the leaders of the party resolved on the archbishop's destruction, confirms the conviction that he was very far from being idle. Chrysostom was an obstacle to his advancement, to be removed out of his way. Nor was he likely to be very scrupulous as to the means. Among the voices that were clamouring round the feeble emperor, seeking to force his fluctuating mind to a decision favourable to their own interests, that of Atticus must have been one of the loudest, and least readily silenced.

The expulsion of Chrysostom took place June 10, 404. His successor, the aged Arsacius, did not long enjoy the reward of his intrigues. His death followed in little more than a year, Nov. 5, 405. Few questions could be more important to the party now triumphant than the choice of the new archbishop. It had proved a mistaken policy to place on Chrysostom's throne a mild but inert old man, to be used as a tool in carrying out their measures, and a screen for their acts of violence and cruelty. The large majority of the people of Constantinople still regarded Chrysostom as their lawful bishop, and held aloof from the religious assemblies of the intruder. They were supported in their resistance by Pope Innocent and the Western Church, together with a considerable number of the most

highly esteemed Eastern prelates. A wise head and a vigorous hand were needed to meet the emergency. Four months of intrigue ended in the selection of Atticus, March 406.

The appointment of Atticus took place while the Occidental deputies despatched by Honorius in Chrysostom's behalf were on their way to Constantinople. The news of it greeted them on their arrival. What share he had in the ignominious treatment of these envoys is unknown. Palladius, however (c. iv.), does not scruple to suggest that he was the author of the base attempt to bribe them to desert the cause they had come to maintain, and the instigator of their subsequent ill-treatment (Niceph. xiii. 33).

Vigorous measures were at once adopted by Atticus in conjunction with the other members of the triumvirate to which the Eastern Church had been subjected, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Porphyry of Antioch, to crush the adherents of Chrysostom. An imperial rescript was obtained imposing the severest penalties of confiscation of property, loss of rank, fine, and banishment on all, of whatever rank or condition, who dared to reject the communion of the patriarchs. A large number of the bishops of the East persevered in the refusal, and suffered a cruel persecution; while even the inferior clergy and laity were compelled to keep themselves in concealment, or to fly the country. The small minority of Eastern bishops who for peace' sake deserted Chrysostom's cause were made to feel the guilt of having once supported it. They were compelled to leave their sees and take other dioceses in the inhospitable regions of Thrace, where they might be more under Atticus' eye and hand (Soc. vii. 36; Niceph. xiii. 30; Pallad. c. xx).

Unity seemed hardly nearer when the death of Chrysostom (Sept. 14, 407) removed the original ground of the schism. A large proportion of the Christian population of Constantinople still refused communion with the usurper, and continued to hold their religious assemblies, more numerous than the churches, in the open air in the suburbs of the city (Niceph. xiv. 23, 27). Stung to the quick, Atticus employed all means—force and persuasion, threats and bribes—to reduce the recusants to submission. But he obtained no decisive result. Chrysostom's adherents demanded that the archbishop's name should be restored to the diptychs of the church. On no other terms would they listen to propositions of reunion. This was a step for which Atticus was not prepared. To do so would be to nullify his own episcopate. It was in vain that Porphyry's successor, Alexander of Antioch—the first who had dared to replace the revered name on the rolls of the church—visited Constantinople and used his personal influence with his brother patriarch; in vain that the people of the imperial city, excited by his presence, made the demand openly of their archbishop. At last fear extorted from Atticus what higher considerations failed to obtain. The popular excitement was growing dangerous. To oppose the general wish was no longer safe. The emperor, fearing for the public peace, counselled yielding to the universal voice. At last by a tardy act of justice, most unwillingly granted, Chrysostom's name took its place on the registers and in the public prayers of the Church of Constantinople. When Atticus had been once forced

to yield he became earnest in his desire that all who had taken part with him in his previous line of conduct should now imitate him in his concession. The support of Cyril of Alexandria, who had recently inherited the throne and to the full the violent and despotic spirit of his uncle Theophilus was of the first importance. Two deacons of Alexandria, Peter and Aedesius, had happened to be in Constantinople on a mission to Cyril during the visit of Alexander of Antioch. To them, therefore, as well as to the patriarch, Atticus wrote urging that his example should be followed. These letters, together with Cyril's reply, have been happily preserved to us by Nicephorus (*H. E.* xiv. 26, 27). Few are more strikingly characteristic. The apology of Atticus, mean, insincere, cowardly, extenuating the importance of his act, laying the responsibility of it on others—the people so violent—the emperor so urgent—lamenting that a sense of expediency should have compelled him to take a step his judgment disallowed, contrasts most forcibly with the incisive severity and bitter irony of Cyril's reply, while with pitiless hand he dissects Atticus' excuses, and with withering scorn exposes their futility and dishonesty. "He would as soon be induced to place the name of Judas on the rolls as that of Chrysostom. Atticus must retract his steps, and remove it at all hazard."

Atticus' endeavours were vigorously directed to the maintenance and enlargement of the authority of the see of Constantinople. He obtained a rescript from Theodosius subjecting to it the whole of Illyria and the "Provincia Orientalis." This gave great offence to pope Boniface and the emperor Honorius, and the decree was never put into execution. Another rescript declaring his right to decide on and approve of the election of all the bishops of the province, was more effectual. Silvanus was named by him bishop of Philippolis, and afterwards removed to Troas. He asserted the same right to ordain in the cities of Bithynia, and put it in practice at Nicaea A.D. 425, the year before his death (*Soc.* vii. 25, 28, 37).

Atticus also displayed great vigour in combating and repressing heresy. He wrote to the bishops of Pamphylia, and Amphilochius of Iconium, calling on them to drive out the Messalians (Photius, c. 52). The zeal and energy he displayed against the Pelagians are highly commended by pope Celestine, who goes so far as to style him "a true successor of St. Chrysostom" (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 353, 361, 365, 1073; cf. S. Prosper. p. 549; S. Leo. *Ep.* cvi.; Theodt. *Ep.* cv.). His writings were quoted as those of an orthodox teacher both by the Council of Ephesus and that of Chalcedon (Labbe, iii. 518, iv. 831). Technical orthodoxy threw all moral deficiencies into the shade. The heart of Atticus when not biased by theological or personal hatred was kind, and his generosity great. When the persecution c. 420 drove the Christians out of Persia he gave them shelter, and induced the emperor to befriend them (*Soc.* vii. 18). His charity was not limited to his own diocese but extended to neighbouring cities. During a famine at Nicaea he sent 300 pieces of gold to the presbyter Calliopius, for the benefit chiefly of the "pauvres honteux" (*Soc.* vii. 25). Adamantius, a Jew physician driven from Alexandria by the popular fury, found refuge with him at Constantinople. Orestes, the praefect,

CHRIST. BIOGR.

when attacked at the same time as a heathen, asserted that he had been baptized by Atticus (*Soc.* vii. 13, 14). One pleasing trait in his character is his kindness to the Novatians when harried by the orthodox at Constantinople. He pleaded in their behalf that they had been fellow-sufferers with themselves in the Arian persecutions, and held the true faith regarding the Trinity. Socrates supplies us with some interesting details of a conversation with the aged Asclepiades, who had been bishop of the Novatians at Nicaea for 50 years (*Soc.* vii. 11, 25). Atticus was then near his end, which took place Oct. 10, 426.

Atticus was more an actor than a writer; and of what he did publish little remains. A treatise on *Virginity* combating by anticipation the errors of Nestorius, addressed to Pulcheria and her sisters, is mentioned by Marcellinus, *Chron. sub ann.* 416, and Gennadius, *de Scrip. Eccl.* c. 52. We have remaining a brief courteous letter to the 6th Council of Carthage, A.D. 419, accompanying a transcript of the Nicene Canons (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 1673); the letters to Cyril and his deacons mentioned above (*Niceph.* xiv. 26); that to Calliopius (*Soc.* vii. 25), and the fragments quoted at Ephesus and Chalcedon.

Socrates, who is a partial witness, attributes to him a sweet and winning disposition which caused him to be regarded with much affection. Those who thought with him found in him a warm friend and supporter. Towards his theological adversaries he at first showed great severity, and after having terrified them into submission, changed his behaviour and won them by gentleness (*Soc.* vii. 41; *Soz.* viii. 27). Socrates attributes to him a peculiar talent in naming places, but the examples he gives are very trivial (*Soc.* vii. 28).

[E. V.]

ATTILA (*Ἀττίλας*: *Teut.* Etzel, *Hung.* Ethela, *Scand.* Atli, *Angl.-Sax.* Atla), king and general of the Huns. The principal facts of his life, with a sketch of his personal and moral characteristics having been already given in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, it remains now (1) to expand what is there only hinted at—his influence upon Christendom as it is to be gathered from (a) historical and (b) legendary sources,—and (2) to examine his reputed claim to be the Antichrist. For the first point M. Amédée Thierry's *Histoire d'Attila* (Paris, 1864), especially the 4th part in vol. ii. pp. 221–436 has been chiefly consulted: the second position is maintained by the Hon. and Rev. W. Herbert in his poem and historical treatise on Attila.

1. (a). The immediate effect of the inroads of the Huns was to promote Christianity. Early in the 5th century Oktar or Ouptar, brother of Attila's father Mundzuk, led a horde of 10,000 Huns against that part of the Burgundian tribe which still inhabited the district between the Hercynian Mountains and the Maine. The Burgundians, who had hitherto submitted to a theocratic government composed of a permanent high-priest called *Sinistus* and elective kings (*Amm. Marc.* xxxviii. 6), finding themselves powerless to cope with these enemies, consulted a bishop (perhaps St. Severus of Trèves), and were baptized. As Christians they obtained the success hitherto denied them, and routed the Huns, Oktar having died suddenly on the eve of battle (*Socr. H. E.* vii. 30).

The historical portrait of Attila, as drawn by his contemporary Priscus, who was attached to the embassy of Maximin in 449 (*Exc. leg. ad ann.* 449), and by the Gothic bishop Jornandes (*Reb. Get.* 35), who, though writing a century later, had recourse to trustworthy sources of information, has been overlaid by modern historians, e. g. Malespini (*Hist. di Firenz.* c. 36) and even Chateaubriant (*Etud. Hist.* t. 1) and Herbert, with the fabulous or monstrous details of 9th century hagiography.

It is still more difficult to separate between history and legend in tracing out the immediate effect of Attila's ravages in Europe. The rapid series of events between the Hunnish attack on the Eastern Empire in 441 and the Battle of Châlons in 451 has been compared to a deluge of rain which sweeps a district and leaves no further trace than the debris which the torrent has washed down. In Eastern Europe this figure does not accord with fact; for, though Attila's kingdom was dismembered at his death, the great body of Huns, who had followed him from the wilds of Central Asia, settled permanently in the wide plains of the Lower Danube. Nor in Western Europe did the terror inspired by Attila's name disappear as speedily as the local effects of the ruin which he caused. Viewed as a special instrument of Providence, "a Messiah of grief and ruin," whose mission it was to chastise the sins of Christians, the "scourge or rather flail of God" had an abiding influence over Western Christendom, growing more formidable in his gigantic and spectral proportions as tradition gave place to legend, and this in turn to myth: while the virtues and merits of the saints who had thwarted him by bold resistance or prudent submission shone forth the brighter, the darker became the picture of their oppressor.

The following is a brief summary of the facts and results of Attila's Western incursion. Portents in sky and earth announced to the inhabitants of Gaul that the year 450 was the opening of a terrible epoch (*Idat. Chron. ann.* 450). Servatius, bishop of Tongres, visiting Rome to consult SS. Peter and Paul, was informed that Gaul would be entirely devastated by the Huns, but that he would be suffered to die in peace before the desolation came (*Paul. Diac. in Bouquet, Rec.* i. p. 649). The distracted state of the country having been reported to Attila by a chief of the *bagaudi* named Eudoxius, who had fled to him in 448 (*Prosp. Turon. Chron.*), Attila himself, being strengthened by an alliance with Genseric, king of the Vandals (*Jorn. Reb. Get.* 36), had two direct pretexts for his attack—his claim to the hand of Honoria, and the vindication of the rights of the elder son of a Frank prince, whose younger brother, placing himself under Roman protection, had been established by Aëtius in the possession of their paternal territory (*Prisc. Exc. leg.* p. 40). Theodoric, king of the Goths, whose alliance was sought at once by Attila and by Valentinian, inclined to the side of order, and the Hun, who now took the rôle of chastising his rebellious subjects, the Visigoths, attaching to himself in his march many Franks, Burgundians, and Thuringians, if we may believe Sidonius Apollinaris (*Paneg. Avit. v.* 324), proceeded with five or perhaps seven hundred thousand warriors of all nations to the banks of the Rhine, which was crossed by one division under his own com-

mand, near Coblenz, by the other at Augst, near Basle. He installed himself at Trèves, the Roman metropolis of Gaul, which was pillaged. Metz appeared impregnable, and after a fruitless investment he withdrew, discouraged, to a place called Scarpona, whence, on the information that a breach had been made in the walls, he returned to Metz, arriving on Easter-Eve, April 8, slaughtered indiscriminately priests and people, except the bishop, and reduced the city to ashes, all the churches perishing except the oratory of St. Stephen (*Paul. Diac. ap. Bouquet Rec. i. p.* 650). Reims, already deserted by its inhabitants, was easily reduced; but its bishop, Nicasius, in his episcopal robes, surrounded by priests and deacons, met the conquerors on the threshold of the church, and a Hun struck off his head while he was presenting the words "Quicken me according to Thy word" (*Ps. cxix.* 25). His sister Eutropia struck the murderer in the face, and fell by her brother's side. But the general massacre which followed was checked by a sudden panic among the barbarians (*Frodoard. Martyr. Remens.* p. 113). Tongres, Arras, Laon, and Saint-Quentin also fell. The inhabitants of Paris had resolved on flight. Their intention was frustrated and the city saved by the resolution and devotion of St. Geneviève (Genovefa), the maiden of Nanterre, who was warned in a vision that Paris would be spared. The Parisians reluctantly remained in the city, and Attila did not approach it (*Act. SS. Boll.* Jan. i. 143-147). Meantime the second division of the Huns on their march to Strassburg had been attacked by the Burgundians under Gundicarius. The complete failure of this attack induced the Salian and Riparian Franks to retire to a rallying-point on the Loire, and there fell almost simultaneously before the westward march of the Huns, the principal strongholds on the Rhine between Constance and Mayence. The two divisions effected a junction between the Somme and the Marne. Two points should be noticed in Attila's action at this time—he did not wish to wage war against Christianity, though doubtless some of his followers were stimulated against the Catholics by the rancour of polemical zeal: Attila fought against Rome, not against its Church; and secondly, it was not his intention to give up Gaul to indiscriminate pillage; he hoped to crush the Visigoths first, and then to cope separately with Aëtius and the Roman forces. With this view, about April 10th, he left Metz for Orleans, wisely selecting the route of the plains. See an accurate description of this march in Thierry's *Hist. d'Attila*, i. 154. Defensive precautions were taken, and Anianus (St. Agnan), bishop of Orleans, hastened to Arles, to apprise Aëtius of their danger. Aid was promised by June 23rd (*Bouquet, Rec. i. p.* 645). Much time was wasted in the vain endeavours of Aëtius to procure the assistance of Theodoric. But the influence of the senator Avitus of Clermont prevailed where the politic arguments of the Roman general were powerless, and Orleans was relieved only when the gates had actually been opened to the Huns, and pillage was beginning. A graphic account of this siege is given in the *Vita S. Aniani* in *Bouquet, Rec. i.* 645. Attila retreated precipitately towards Châlons-sur-Marne, in the *Campi Catalaunici*. Near Troyes he was met by its bishop, Lupus (St. Loup), who

entreated him to spare the defenceless inhabitants of Champagne. Attila consented, on condition that he should accompany the army to the banks of the Rhine; the presence of so honourable a hostage would no doubt be of some advantage to him.

The military movements which followed this retreat, including the famous battle of Châlons, are beyond the scope of the present article. The subject has long occupied the attention of French historians and antiquarians, and the results of their investigations are well summed up and weighed by M. Thierry, *l. c.*, pp. 172-188, 428-437, and in the article *Attila* of the *Nouv. Biog. Gén.*

In the spring of 452 Attila had re-united his forces and penetrated into Italy by the passes of the Julian Alps (Prosper. Aquit. *Chron.*), Aëtius being occupied in consulting for the safety of Valentinian, whom he sent to Rome. Attila received his first check at the walls of Aquileia, then "one of the richest, the most populous, and the strongest of the maritime cities of the Adriatic coast" (Gibbon, *Rom. Emp.* iv. 240). It resisted obstinately for three months, and Attila was almost yielding to the popular belief that the city, when ably defended, was impregnable, when he observed some storks preparing to leave their nests in the city with their young ones (*Jorn. Reb. Get.* 42). Interpreting the omen in his own favour, he pressed the siege with redoubled vigour, and a century afterwards, Jornandes (*ib.*) could scarcely trace the ruins of Aquileia. The terrified inhabitants of the Venetian towns, Concordia, Altinum, and Padua attempted resistance, and fled to the lagunes, whence shortly after was to spring Venice. In Liguria, Jornandes mentions the sacking of only Milan and Pavia. Local tradition assigns, with great probability, the same fate to Verona, Mantua, Brescia, Bergamo, and Cremona. Suidas (*s. v. Μεδίσλανον* and *Κόρυκος*) tells the well-known anecdote of the picture at Milan. (See *Gibbon*, iv. 241.) The effects of summer heat and the scarcity of provisions in the plains of Lombardy equally with the promptings of un-sated ambition determined Attila to march on Rome, notwithstanding the dissuasions of some of his followers, who remembered that Alaric had not long survived its capture (*Jorn. ib.*). An embassy, sent by the senate and people of Rome, with instructions to obtain, if possible, at any cost, Attila's peaceful evacuation of Italy, met the invaders on the Mincio, near Mantua, and Virgil's farm. At its head were two illustrious senators and Pope Leo the Great, who had been bishop of Rome since 440. In Leo there were united with high ability and rare eloquence a commanding presence and a strength of character which had made him renowned in the political as well as the religious world (*Vita S. Leon. Mag. ap. Act. SS. Boll.* Apr. ii. 17-21). His fame may have preceded him, at least, his appearance in pontifical robes, bespeaking the influence of religion, awoke in Attila some feeling akin to awe, and he retired as before a power superior to his own. The names Lupus and Leo, the preservers of Troyes and Rome, gave a point to the jest that Attila, though invincible by men, succumbed to the power of the beasts (*Sigon. De Occid. Imp.* xiii.). In leaving Italy by the Noric Alps for Pannonia, Attila, after the

pillage of Augsburg, was crossing the little river Lech, when a weird woman threw herself before him, shouting three times, "Back, Attila" (*Olabus, ut supr.* ii. 6). After sending a defiance to Marcian at Constantinople, he celebrated a fresh marriage with a bride of great beauty, whom Jornandes calls Ildico, probably a corruption of the Teutonic Hiltgund or Hildegond, and was found suffocated in his own blood on the following morning, from the bursting of a blood-vessel, according to the best authorities, though not without suspicion of some foul play. See a summary of the various accounts in Thierry's *Attila*, i. 218. An able comparison between the conquests of Attila, of Zingis Khan, and of Timour, and their effects is traced by Dr. J. H. Newman in his *Lectures on the History of the Turks in its Relation to Christianity*, Dublin, 1854. The personal character of Attila would bear the palm in such a review for humanity, justice, and moderation. All alike "powerful to destroy, helpless to construct" (though Attila showed diplomatic skill, Zingis, also a Pagan, laid down the maxim of religious toleration, and Timour, a zealous Mahometan, patronized literature), failed to establish a permanent kingdom.

(b) The legendary history of Attila is drawn from three principal sources—the Latin, Germanic, and Hungarian traditions. Little more can be attempted here than to show their distinctive characteristics with a few illustrations. The traditions are remarkable alike for their number and for their diversity. M. Thierry reduces them under these two heads—*Latin* and *Germanic*.

The Latin legends spring from ecclesiastical sources, and are enshrined in the acts of the saints. They are referable to a natural reaction from the panic fear which prevailed in Europe during Attila's conquests. Since every one had trembled at him, it became a point of honour to prove that they did so with good reason. Hence a multitude of traditions of siege and capture are to be traced in the early local history of places which Attila had never approached, and in the view of the Middle Age Attila was as universal a type of devastation as Julius Caesar of construction. The author of the second life of St. Lupus, written at the end of the 8th century (*Act. SS. Boll. Jul.*), states that no considerable town or fortress in Gaul escaped the Huns. Thus, in spite of the chronological discrepancy, the legend has attributed to Attila in 451 the martyrdom of St. Ursula and the 11,000 virgins, who are supposed to have set out from Brittany in 383. An imaginary siege of Paris is described in 451, with the evident intention of bringing into contrast Attila and St. Geneviève. Local vanity, as well as the desire to honour the saints, has given rise to strange perversions of history. The plain of Catalens, near Toulouse, has been substituted for that of Châlons, in Champagne; Attila and his armies have been drawn across the whole width of France, which he never traversed, necessitating the pillage of Lyons, Arles, &c., which he never approached; and the defeated remnants of his army have been actually despatched under one of his captains into Spain, to conquer the Moors. The legendary Attila thus becomes the champion of Christianity. Trèves was supposed to have preserved traces of his power, and these rather constructive than

destructive. The beautiful Roman "column of Igel" received the name of "Attila's triumphal arch"; and the miracles of St. Mathias (*Act. SS. Boll.* Feb. iii. 448) distinguish by Attila's name the bridge that spans the Moselle at Trèves. Strassburg, under the name *Argentoratum*, had been entirely demolished by Attila. The city, gradually rebuilt during the two following centuries, took its present name from its situation on the Roman military road (*Strata-burgum*), but the Alsatians, dissatisfied with this etymology, supposed that Attila had made four roads through the city walls, so as to open free communication between Gaul and Germany; and in reply to the objection of Schöpflin in his *Alsatia Illustrata*, that Attila could not well give German names to towns, the defenders of the tradition appealed to an ancient medallion over the Kronenburg gate, probably intended to represent a burgomaster, as an image of Attila. (See proofs in Thierry, *l. c.* 228-230.)

"*Attila, the scourge of God*," is, as Thierry shows, the culminating point of the Latin legend. Undoubtedly the great and distinguishing feature of the war in the eyes of the 5th century Christians would be the threefold repulse of Attila from Orleans by St. Agnan, from Troyes by St. Loup, and, above all, from Rome by St. Leo. In any age so signal a triumph of the Church's spiritual weapons over the hosts who were held to symbolize the powers of darkness, would have arrested general attention, in the 5th century it absorbed it, and every history of the campaign took its colour from the Divine interposition which guarded the Church and the Saints. It was the final and conclusive answer to the few still surviving murmurs of the heathen party which referred all the misfortunes of the empire to a national desertion of the ancient polytheism. In vain was Attila's retreat traced to the action of the stars. Christendom triumphantly rendered honour to St. Leo, and with him to his God. Sidonius Apollinaris, in withdrawing the promise which he had made to Prosper, bishop of Orleans, successor to St. Agnan, of writing a history of the war of Attila, discloses the most salient features of his proposed scheme—"the praises due to the very great and holy pontiff Anianus, equal to Lupus, and not inferior to Germanus—how the city of Orleans was besieged, forced, broken into, though not sacked" (Sidon. Apollin. *Ep.* viii. 15). An ecclesiastical historian, imbued with the spirit which prompted St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, would have brought out into strong prominence two figures, the barbarian, the agent of God's wrath—the priest, the agent of His mercy.

The next age materialised the hidden workings of God's Providence; and the motive power which compelled Attila's departure became in the legend the figure of St. Peter with a drawn sword, to whom was afterwards very naturally added St. Paul. This tradition, first found in Paul Warnefrid, a writer of the 8th century, was generally adopted by subsequent writers, consecrated by the Roman Breviary, and immortalized by the genius of Raphael. In like manner the touches of genuine character and action which mark the contemporary lives of SS. Agnan, Loup, and Geneviève disappear in proportion as their later biographers try to invest their persons with traits of the marvellous and supernatural.

The title *flagellum Dei*, though, no doubt, well known before, first appears in the legend of St. Loup, written in the 8th or 9th century, by a priest of Troyes (*Act. SS. Boll.* Jul. v. 67-72). Italy and Gaul both claim the honour of its invention. The Italian legend ascribes it to St. Benedict, who was not born till after Attila's death; the Gallic tradition places it in the mouth of a hermit of Champagne, who, when brought to Attila, replied to his question as to the issue of the battle of Châlons—"Tu es flagellum Dei—but God breaks, when he pleases, the instruments of His vengeance. God will take this sword from thee, and will give it to another" (Thwroc. *Chron. Hung.* i. 15). Thierry shows that there is nothing improbable in this legend, which preserves the language and ideas of the 5th century. Cf. the apostrophe to Sennacherib in Isaiah x. 5, 15, with Isidore of Seville's expression about the Huns (*Hist. Goth.* ad ann. 457). "They are the rod of the Lord's anger." The legend however, makes Attila assume the hermit's saying as a new title. "The star falls, the earth quakes, I am the hammer of the world" (*Chron. Hung.* i. 16). It is interesting to trace the effect of this dominant idea on the story of St. Loup's encounter with Attila at Troyes. History represents Troyes as defenceless, without competent garrison or fortifications. St. Loup meets the king, who consents to spare the city on condition of detaining him as a hostage. The legend is obliged to place this interview after the battle of Châlons. Troyes has recovered its ramparts, when Attila approaches it at the head of a vast army. Mounted on his war-horse, he gives an imperious order that the gates should be opened. "Who art thou" says the bishop, "who tramplest under foot the earth?" "I am Attila, king of the Huns, the scourge of God." "Welcome, then, scourge of the God whom I serve! Enter, and go where thou wilt!" (2^a *Vita St. Lupi*, 45, *ap. Boll. Act. SS. Chron. Hung.* i. 16). Accordingly, the legend continues, Attila enters the city with his army, but they see nothing, for they are smitten with supernatural blindness until they have passed out by the opposite gate. So, in the version of the siege of Metz, given by Paul Warnefrid (*Episc. Mett.* ap. Bouquet, *Rec.* i. 650), the oratory of St. Stephen appears to the barbarians, who are trying to demolish it like a great rock. The Italian legends imitate those of Gaul. Cf. the Life of St. Geminianus, bishop of Modena, composed about the 10th century, in *Act. SS. Boll.* Jan. ii. 1097. "If thou art the servant of God," says Attila, "I am the scourge of God. Disobedient servants are deservedly beaten." The tendency to impersonate the opposing powers of good and evil sometimes warrants the introduction of the devil as the instigator of Attila in his acts of violence and persecution; so in the martyrdom of SS. Nicasius and Eutropia (Surius *Vit. SS.* 14 Dec.), the Prince of Darkness appears near the gate of Reims. Attila is endowed with diabolical attributes—sarcasm, pride, malice, and hideous ugliness, joined with credulity and a certain comical good nature, such as characterizes the *Bon diable* of modern French pleasantries. The ecclesiastical legends even show an affinity to those of Teutonic origin in sometimes representing Attila as generous, chivalrous, and ready to promote all good ends. Thus he appears in the history of the

fabulous siege of Ravenna, written by Agnellus, an Italian priest, in the 9th century. Here Attila gladly accedes to the request of John, the archbishop, who approaches him at the head of a magnificent procession of ecclesiastics, to spare the city, on condition (to save his credit as a conqueror) that the gates should be taken off their hinges. This was done. The streets were decorated, and the citizens assisted the triumphal procession of the Huns through the city—an instance, naïvely remarks Agnellus, of the old proverb, that Attila had recourse to artifice before arms. There are two further versions of this legend, which mix up Attila in the polemical discussions which prevailed during the exarchate of Ravenna, between the archbishops of Ravenna and the court of Rome, as to the tenure of the *pallium* by the former, and, according to the bias of the writers, the archbishop John is presented as a Catholic or an Arian. We actually find Attila a champion of the Pope and an extirpator of heresies. Hence descends the last and strangest conception—a moral Attila—who preaches modesty, encourages good marriages, and portions virtuous maidens (cf. Olah. *Vit. Att.* 9; Desericius, *De initiis Hung.*). These stories are found in the writers of the 15th and 16th centuries, received and recorded as immemorial traditions. A telling story of this class is that of the flattering poet Marullus, who, on referring back Attila's origin to the gods, was sentenced by the king to be burnt alive, with his poem, but was spared at the last moment (Sigonius, *Occid. Imper.* xiii.). A Greek philosopher of the age of Justinian, named Damascius, had reported, by a pardonable mistake, that a great battle was fought under the walls of Rome against Attila, after which, the phantoms of the dead rose again and continued the fight with great fury for three days and nights. This story travelled to Rome, and was soon accepted there as fact. The theatre and particulars of this great combat were pointed out, and the interview between Attila and St. Leo was transferred from the Mincio to the Tiber. For further illustrations of the legendary Attila's exploits in Italy, see *Thierry*, ii. 254 sq.

The Germanic or Teutonic legends of Attila differ very widely from those of Latin origin. They present him as a magnificent, hospitable, and wise king—wise, indeed, as Solomon, but richer, more powerful, above all, more generous than he. It is one of the strangest contradictions in the Middle Ages, that while the Scourge of God was reprobated in the churches, the good and hospitable king was celebrated by the Minnesinger in the castles. The barbarian tradition took its rise among the Eastern Germans, and was adopted, with modifications, by those of the West. Remembering that Attila always treated honourably the chiefs of the Teutonic tribes which submitted to him, as Ardaric of the Gepidae, Walamir and Theodemir of the Ostrogoths, and that the subsequent conquests of Odoacer and Theodoric in Italy were the result of the development of Attila's designs, we can well imagine that he would, with the bold descendants of these warriors, rise to the rank of a national hero, a type of royal majesty in union with almost superhuman bravery and strength. In these legends little respect is paid to chronology. Theodoric, who was born only eight years

before Attila's death, and Hermanaric the Great, who died twenty-five years before his birth, are always associated with him—Attila invariably retaining his superiority. The patriotic traditions of Germany always took the form of poetry (cf. *Jorn. De Reb. Get.* 3; Tacitus, *De Mor. Germaniae*; Eginhard, *Vita Caroli Mag.* 29). The oldest extant monument of the Attila-legend is a fragment of an 8th century MS., discovered at Fulda, being part of a poem on the adventures of Theodoric, whom Attila reinstates in his kingdom of Verona, having defeated Odoacer in the battle of Ravenna. This fragment is a proof that the German epopee was circulating in Gaul during the Merovingian epoch in the Frank dialect.

The same legend was current in England at a very early date. See the description of three poems, scarcely later than the 8th century, in Grimm's *Deutsche Heldensage*, p. 21, Gott. 1829. The most curious of these is, according to Thierry, the *Lied vom Wanderer*, or *Traveller's Song*, describing the fancied pilgrimage through Europe of an English bard, who visits Greece with the *Odyssey* in hand, explores Italy by the help of the *Aeneid*, and thus puts the German legends under contribution for history and geography. "On the East of England I found the country of Hermanaric, the furious, the felon. Attila was reigning over the Huns, Hermanaric over the Goths, Ghibic over the Burgundians. His son Gunther gave me a bracelet as the meed for my songs. I received another from Hermanaric, who wished to keep me with him for a long time." The poem of *Beowulf* also mentions the Burgundian king Ghibic, and his son Gunther, potentates of the Rhine, who are both historical persons. The former is cited in the Burgundian laws; the latter is identical with the Gundicarius, who actually opposed Attila, near Constance, in 451.

But in Iceland and Scandinavia the German legend received its fullest development. The two poems entitled *Atla-Mál* and *Atla-Quida*, i.e. *The narrative*, and *Song of Attila*, are the most important of several rhythmical pieces. They generally follow the same version as the English poems just mentioned, making the Rhine the chief seat of events, and placing Theodoric in the second rank of importance. The analysis of these poems which own a common origin, but vary greatly in their details, is given with minute care by Thierry (t. ii. pp. 276-341). The subject being beyond the scope and limits of the present article, the reader is referred to his very interesting disquisition. The episode of Walter of Aquitaine, a hero hostile to Attila, created by the Visigoths of Spain, and the celebrated *Nibelungenlied*, are the principal offshoots from the primitive stock of tradition. In the latter mythical poem Attila becomes a friend of the Christians, and presents his son Ortlieb for baptism. The poem was written by Pilgrinus, Bishop of Passau from 971 to 991, and Apostle of the Hungarians, with the evident intention of aiding him in the propagation of the faith during an age of perpetual war and civil commotion. (See Hund, *Metrop. Salisburg.* i. 200.)

Hungarian Legends.—The popular poetry to which the Magyars as a nation were passionately addicted being the means of preserving heathen

associations and memories, was at first strictly anathematized by the Church, but in 1061, under the reign of Bela 1st, this rigour produced so strong a reaction in favour of Paganism, that Christianity was driven to purify the poems instead of banishing them. Through the Hungarian schools, which exercised a religious and literary criticism over the national songs, the traditional descent of the Magyars was traced from Magog, son of Japhet, and king of Scythia, through a line of biblical and mythical patriarchs, including Nimrod, down to Attila, ancestor of the Duke Arpad, and common patrons of the Magyars and the Huns. The oldest of these strange genealogies is the work of an anonymous chronicler, who wrote probably in the 11th century. (See *Thierry*, ii. 351.) The second, called *Chronica Hungarorum*, was composed by a bishop, Chartuicius, for King Coloman, and dates between 1095 and 1114. The third and most important is the Chronicle of Simon Kéza, dedicated about 1282 to Ladislaus III., in imitation of which the Chronicle of Buda was composed during the 14th century in rude leonine verses.

In the Hungarian legends Attila, Arpad, and St. Stephen, the first Christian king of Hungary, are invariably the dominant characters, and in this epic trilogy Attila is pre-eminent. "The inseparable patron of the Magyar people, he changes when they change, and lives through all the stages of their national existence. . . . When the Magyars become Christians, it is to the merits of Attila that they owe this blessing. Attila paved the way for their conversion ages before by his docility under the hand of God, whose scourge he was" (*Thierry*, ii. p. 362). Such is the systematic idea developed throughout these legends, which are not indeed either history or tradition, but an original conception, grand and poetical, well calculated to elevate and purify the taste which could only be satisfied with national epics, analogous to the Aeneid and Iliad. How far the Attila of Hungarian legend resembles and differs from the Attila of history, may be seen in *Thierry* ii. 364-383, his connexion with Arpad and St. Stephen in the following pages, and modern traces of the name and influence of Attila in Hungary and in the East from p. 413 to 422.

In 1838, the Hon. and Rev. William Herbert, afterwards Dean of Manchester, published a poem in 12 books, under the title *Attila, or the Triumph of Christianity*, to which he appended an historical treatise on "Attila and his Predecessors." His object in this work is thus explained in his dedication to Mr. Hallam:—"The foundation of the pagan empire of Rome was the noble subject of the Aeneid. That which I have chosen is the firm establishment of Christianity by the discomfiture of the mighty attempt of Attila to found a new Antichristian dynasty upon the wreck of the temporal power of Rome, at the end of the term of 1200 years, to which its duration had been limited by the forebodings of the heathens." This undertaking has been conducted by the author with great spirit and laborious research, but his authorities are chiefly drawn from those compilers who gave currency to the Italian and Hungarian traditions about the 16th century. For instance, he apparently assigns an equal historical value to the fact of the discovery of the mysterious

sword-blade by the Scythian shepherd, which rests on the unimpeachable authority of Priscus and Jornandes, and to the fabulous title of Attila, first recorded by Olahus, a Hungarian prelate of the 16th century (Bonfin., *Rev. Ungar. Dec.* p. 865, ed. 1606), who elsewhere (*ib.* p. 888) gravely proves that Attila lived 124 years. The following is the style:—"Attila, son of Bendegioz, descendant of great Nemroth (*i.e.* Nimrod), nurtured in Engadi, by the grace of God, King of the Huns, Medes, Goths, and Danes, the terror of the world:' to which title he added later, on account of the hermit's words, 'The Scourge of God'" (cf. *Thierry*, ii. 369). Mr. Herbert's ingenious arguments (pp. 348-364) which deserve a careful study, go to prove, not the assumption of the character of Antichrist by Attila himself, but that Christian writers, after the long blending of history with myth, traced in this mighty impersonation of the principle of evil a resemblance to the Antichrist of Scripture. Hence the almost diabolical features, and the goat's horns, in the frontispiece to the ancient Italian legend of Attila frequently printed at Venice in the later years of the 15th century. (See note in *Thierry*, ii. 424.) Dante is content to place Attila in the seventh circle of the Inferno, where the tyrants are tormented by Centaurs—

"There Heaven's stern Justice lays chastising hand
On Attila, who was the scourge of earth;
On Sextus, and on Pyrrhus."

Canto xii. 133, transl. Cary.

See a curious allusion to the fabulous destruction of Florence by Attila in Dante, *Infern.* cant. xiii. 144, and cf. *Thierry*, ii. 255-258.

The leading authorities for the life of Attila are enumerated in Gibbon's *Roman Empire* (ed. Smith), iv. 191 (notes). Other writers have been sufficiently indicated above. [C. D.]

AUDITORES. [MANES.]

AUDIUS or AUDAEUS, the founder of an Anthropomorphite sect, of which an account is given under ANTHROPOMORPHITAE.

AUDOENUS, formerly called DADO, S. (St. Ouen, or Ouein), son of Antharius and Aiga, brother of St. Ado, who shared with him the blessing of St. Columban, and (if we may trust Frigidogus) of Rado (*Act. SS. Boll.* Aug. 4, 797), was successively *referendarius* to Dagobert of France, and bishop of Rouen. He was born about 609 at Sancy near Soissons, and was educated at his parents' home, Ussy-sur-Marne. While still a youth he was sent to the court of Clothaire II., where he formed a most intimate friendship, based on their mutual love of asceticism, with St. Eligius, whose biographer he became. Ouen states in this life—first published with mutilations by Surius, then *verbatim* by D'Achery (*Spicilegium*, t. v. 190), and with notes by Ghesquiere, in *Act. SS. Belgii*, iii. 198-310—that he and Eligius were consecrated bishops of Rouen and Noyon respectively on the same day, *i.e.* May 14, 640.^a Shortly before this they had been associated in opposing the introduction of

^a This is Cuper's opinion, after Le Cointe and others. Chifflet fixed the date at 635, Henschen at 646. For the reasons and particulars of this elaborate discussion, see Cuper's dissertation in *Act. SS. Boll.* 1. c., and *Gall. Christ.* xi. 13.

the Monothelite heresy and the spread of simony; and Ouen alone had travelled into Spain, where his prayers, like those of Elias, says his biographer, relieved the country from a seven years' drought. The same virtue is ascribed to his relics as they were conveyed back to Rouen by Duke Rollo. Before his episcopate he also greatly helped his brother in the foundation of the monastery of Jouarre near Meaux, and himself in 634 founded that of Rebaix. He was ordained priest by Deodatus, bishop of Mâcon, before his journey into Spain. After his episcopate he ordained St. Geremar to the diaconate, and St. Wandregisilus to the priesthood; reconciled the latter to St. Filibert, abbat of Jumièges, whom he had previously imprisoned under the influence of a false charge preferred by Ebroin; attended the 3rd Council of Châlons-sur-Saône (644); translated the relics of St. Marculf, abbat of Nanteuil (658); and successfully opposed the tyranny of Ebroin. He subscribed to the privilege of Clovis for St. Denis in 653, and to several other similar documents. He was present at the death of St. Wandregisilus in 667; and about that time bestowed the veil on St. Angardrisma. In 673 he attended the funeral of Childeric. He persuaded a nobleman named Wanigus to found the monastery of Fécan. At a certain spot near Evreux, where he saw a fiery cross in the sky, an abbey was built in 692, called *Crux S. Audoeni*, afterwards known as *Crux S. Leufredi*; he also promoted the foundation of many other monasteries and churches. Devotion carried him as far as Rome; and on his return he was sent by Thierry to Cologne, at the instance of Warato, who succeeded Ebroin as mayor of the palace, to negotiate terms of peace with Pepin, duke of Austrasia. Returning from this mission, he fell sick and died at Clichy, near Paris, on August 24, 683, having requested the king to appoint as his successor Ansbert, abbat of Fontanelle.

St. Ouen's history does not end with his death. His body was carried to Rouen, and laid in a spot which he had himself prepared in the church of St. Peter, now replaced by the magnificent church, begun in 1318, which is dedicated to St. Ouen. The sacred body was transferred by St. Ansbert to a more honourable position in the same church; and rested there 165, or perhaps 185 years, till through fear of the devastations of the Normans it was removed from place to place into the diocese of Trèves. It was reinstated at Rouen on the conversion of Rollo, and enclosed in a golden chest by Duke Richard I. in the 10th century. This act of piety, says the legend, was in acknowledgment of a severe admonition delivered in a vision by the saint, whose remains had been almost plundered by two monks from France (*Boll.* l. c. p. 823). What really became of the relics after this Cuper (*Boll.* pp. 803-805) leaves to be determined by Norman and English hagiologists. The former have asserted that they remained at Rouen till 1562, when they were burnt by some zealous Calvinists who pillaged the monastery, and that during the 11th century they were carried round the diocese to stimulate the alms of the faithful for the erection of the new church. On the other hand William of Malmesbury states (*lib.* 5, *De Pontificibus*, ed. Gale, p. 371) that Emma, widow of Ethelred, when a refugee in Normandy about 1077, bought the relics of the monks and trans-

ferred them to Canterbury. And there is a third account by Capgrave of some clergy bringing the body to Edgar in 956.

A long account of his posthumous miracles, by a monk named Fulbert, is given edited from MS. by Cuper, *Boll.* l. c. 825-840.

Four days in the year were formerly consecrated by the people of Rouen to the memory of St. Ouen. The following places in England have churches under his patronage: Bromham, Beds; Gloucester, Hereford, and perhaps Bristol, if Ewin represents Owen or Ouen (Parker's *Calendar*, p. 274).

His writings. 1. The *Life of St. Eligius*—a very valuable and important piece of early history—was probably written before 672, when some fragmentary memoirs had already appeared. It contains two books; the first gives the life of St. Eligius up to his episcopate, the second ends with the first translation of his remains in 660. The work shows that St. Ouen had some knowledge of general literature, and of the Fathers of the Church, especially St. Augustine. The manner of execution is far from faultless. He is careless about chronological order, too diffuse, and gives a disproportionate space to miracles, especially in the second book, where however is found the invaluable though much-abused sermon on the character of a good Christian, vindicated and in part translated by Dr. Maitland, *Dark Ages*, 100-122. As to its style, the author apologises for its simplicity, saying that the absence of rhetorical ornament is best in keeping with the humility of his friend, and that he himself prefers substance to show. It is dedicated to a bishop (perhaps a suffragan of Rouen) named Rodobert, whose note of commendation is appended. A complete list of the earlier editions of this work may be seen in the *Hist. Lit. de la France*, iii. 625-628, whence this notice is drawn. Four translations into French (two of which, viz. by M. Charles de Barthélemy, Paris, 1847, and by M. l'Abbé Parenty, Arras, 1851, contain curious and learned notes) are enumerated in *Now. Biog. Gén.*

2. A MS. *Life of St. Remi*, attributed by Possevin to St. Ouen, was seen by him at the Abbey of St. Gall. Some other fragments are of no importance. [C. D.]

AUDOMAR, or as he was afterwards called ST. OMER, was the only son of a noble of the neighbourhood of Constance in Alemannia. Shortly after the arrival of the great Celtic missionary Columbanus on the shores of the Lake of Constance, he presented himself at Luxeuil, and brought with him his father, Riulphus, whom he had persuaded on the death of his mother to espouse the monastic life. Both were admitted by the abbot Eustacius, and there the father remained till his death. Audomar, however, left Luxeuil for the country of the heathen Morini, whose district extended from Boulogne to the mouth of the Scheld, and was appointed by Dagobert to the see of Therouane about A.D. 637. After some years perceiving that the missionary work to be done could not be carried on successfully without assistance, he requested abbot Walbert of Luxeuil to send him three of his former brethren. The abbot sent him Mommolin, Ebertrammus, and Bertin, whom Audomar placed in an estate called Sithin, on the banks of the

Aa, which a heathen noble, whom he had baptised, had bestowed upon him. Here in a sort of island, situated amidst a vast marsh, scarcely to be approached except in a boat, rose the celebrated abbey known at a later period by the name of St. Bertin, from the youngest of the three monks from Luxeuil. After thirty years of self-denying labours which recovered the heathen tribes of Morinia from their idolatries, St. Omer died about A.D. 667, bequeathing his name to the existing town, which was built round the cemetery originally intended for the monks of St. Bertin. *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.* iii. 535-541. [G. F. M.]

AUDUBALD. See EADBALD. *Baed. H. E.* ii. 10, 11.

AUGENDUS, a Carthaginian (*Cyp. Ep.* 41), who joined against Cyprian in the faction of Felicissimus. In *Ep.* 42 he is excommunicated by bishop CALDONIUS, Cyprian's commissary during his retirement, along with Repostus, Irene, Paulus, Sophronius, Sollassus. Possibly the same Augendus (*Cyp. Ep.* 44) reappears as a deacon of Novatian's sent to Carthage with the presbyter MAXIMUS, who becomes the Novatianist bishop in Carthage. In this case on the breaking up of Felicissimus' party, he would after his excommunication, accompany Novatus to Rome and join Novatian, and return as Novatus did (*Cyp. Ep.* 50) to push the Novatianist cause against Cyprian. [R. B. W.]

AUGULUS, AUGURIUS, or AUGUSTUS, M., an alleged martyr in Britain, bishop of Augusta or London, under Diocletian (*Martyrol.* Feb. 6). [A. W. H.]

AUGUSTINUS, AURELIUS, ST., was born, Nov. 13, A.D. 354, at Tagaste (Tajelt), a town of Numidia. His parents were of humble origin. His father, Patricius, seems to have been a violent, vulgar man; but God had placed near him the most precious of all guardian angels, a Christian mother. No person in the Ancient Church is so well known as Monica,* none is more worthy of our affectionate veneration. Purified and subdued, yet preserving all her natural ardour, Monica became a blessing to her family; she won over to Christ her husband, first, and then her beloved son, the object of her anxiety and of her prayers. Everywhere her holy love pursued him, while she was more persevering in her efforts to save him than he was in his endeavours to ruin himself; as indefatigable as Charity, like charity she kept on hoping against all hope. A long time elapsed before Monica's prayers were answered. Through a scruple which astonishes in the middle of the 4th century, but which would have been perfectly understood two hundred years before, she postponed her son's baptism, dreading lest he might be too hasty in giving him the seal of faith, and foreseeing the frailty of that unsubdued nature (*Confess.* i. 11). Augustine took away with him from his home only a few vague recollections of Christianity; he says himself that he kept within his soul the echo of the name of Jesus Christ which he had so often heard his mother pronounce; and, like those melodies which suddenly conjure up before us a whole

phase of our past life, that sacred name, whenever it resounded in his ear, recalled to him his mother's piety and the God of his infancy.

Augustine's sins are known. He yielded to the violent passions of youth, and fell a victim to the temptations which assailed him on all sides (*Confess.* ii. 3; iii. 1). He could not, however, find satisfaction in the sad pleasures of debauchery; he was stricken down by an illness which could find its cure only at the foot of the cross. He endeavoured to find peace in literary pursuits, and threw himself into that direction with intense energy. The longings of his soul, however, were not satisfied; nor was he a man who would seek in rhetoric a compensation for the loss of faith (*Confess.* iv. 2). He was not like his fellow countryman Apuleius, whose greatest pleasure was to arrange words in harmonious order, and who had no desire beyond that of calling forth applause. Augustine could not be comforted so easily; and, notwithstanding all the success he obtained, he still felt sick at heart. He endeavoured to find in the theatre and amidst the games of the circus a kind of intoxicating forgetfulness, but the only result was that his evil passions there received a fresh impulse. Even friendship proved to him an insufficient remedy; it became the source of his bitterest sorrows, and the loss of a friend rendered life insupportable (*Confess.* iv. 4).

The perusal of Cicero's *Hortensius* purified and developed in Augustine the love of truth, whilst it spoke to him in beautiful language of God and of immortality (*Confess.* iii. 4, viii. 7). And yet he was not capable of appreciating truth in its noblest shape. He confesses himself that, at that period of his life, the study of the Holy Scriptures produced no impression upon him. The simplicity and occasional ruggedness of the style offended him. Before escaping from the fascinating charms of error and the unruliness of passion, Augustine was to wander still further. He lost his way in two of the many false directions which attracted his contemporaries: heresy and pantheism.

At an epoch of syncretism, heresy exercised great influence; it favoured the popular tendencies of the age, and seemed to bring about a reconciliation between the popular religions and Christianity. It sheltered, so to speak, the old substratum of heathen ideas under the standard of faith. On the one hand, it gave satisfaction to the pride of metaphysicians, for instead of salvation through conversion and humiliation, it preached salvation through silence. The old Eastern dualism was revived, sometimes under its grossest form, sometimes with extraordinary subtlety, evil being uniformly stripped of its moral character, and represented as a metaphysical necessity. [GNOSTICISM.]

Manichæism was one of the numerous manifestations of that inveterate dualism, being a combination of Parsism with Christianity. Already the old religious ideas of Zoroaster had long been modified by the teaching of the Gospel, and the Bundeshesh, a book added to the Zendavesta, bears the evident mark of that kind of compromise. From the same alliance proceeded Manichæism which, however, allowed a greater share to Christian ideas. In that singular system the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness are seen to stand out in bold contrast to one another. Between them a war has broken out,

* For the orthography of this name, see Bähr, *Gesch. der Römisch. Literatur, Supplement*, vol. ii. p. 235, and note, p. 228.

and by means of evil spirits, darkness has invaded light: out of that twofold element the world has been formed. Jesus Christ and the Paraclete came from the sun, to teach us how we should cast aside the principle of night. This principle being assimilated by the Manichaeans to matter, the result was the encouragement of Asceticism, and then, by a natural reaction, the indulgence of licentiousness. [MANICHAISM.] Augustine embraced the Manichaean heresy at the age of 19, A.D. 373, and for the space of nine years was more or less under its influence (*Confess.* iii. 11, iv. 1).

From Manichaeism, Augustine went over to Neo-Platonism, and he was right in congratulating himself on the change (*Confess.* viii. 10). This system of philosophy may be considered as a desperate attempt made by Hellenism to spring into new life, through an association with the mysticism of the Hindus. It was far superior to Gnosis. The Neo-Platonists did not aim at an embodiment of Christianity: on the contrary, they attacked it, but at the same time they borrowed from it many of its doctrines. They, too, spoke of union with God; but that union was absorption; the annihilation of the creature lord in the contemplation of the sole and sovereign Being. The ecstasy of Neo-Platonism was an exact transcript of Brahminical asceticism. Although St. Augustine could not find a resting-place in such a system, yet he derived some advantage from his acquaintance with it. Whilst pondering the impersonal *Logos* of Philo and Plotinus, he gradually rose to an ideal which connected itself with the reminiscences of his childhood, and, thus prepared, he returned to the perusal of the Holy Scriptures. But the hour of deliverance had not yet struck; and all those diligent studies were doomed to remain barren until Augustine had taken a final leave of the dissipations of his youth. From Carthage he went to Tagaste, where he gave lectures on rhetoric; but he soon returned to the metropolis of proconsular Africa (*Confess.* iv. 7). While teaching at Carthage he published his first work in his twenty-seventh year, entitled *De Apto et Pulchro*, which he dedicated to Hierius, a Roman orator, known to him only by his high reputation. This work is now lost; and indeed the author himself seems to have been singularly careless about it, for when he wrote his *Confessions* he had lost sight of it altogether, and says he does not remember whether it was in two or three books. It was at Tagaste that he became acquainted with Alypius, who after being his pupil soon proved to be his dearest friend (*Confess.* vi. 6). From Carthage Augustine went to Rome in 383 with the view of finding a stage more worthy of his talents as a teacher of rhetoric; but his hopes of glory were blighted, and he almost succumbed to a violent illness. Not long afterwards Monnica, whom his departure from Africa had well nigh driven to despair, joined him at Milan (385), where he expected a high position as a public teacher. The sight of Ambrose, conspicuous by his austerity, and by the stamp of power and greatness visible in his person and in his eloquence, impressed Augustine in the strongest manner. He was never weary of listening to the Bishop of Milan, who seemed like a Christian tribune of the people, preserving

in the religion of Christ the masculine vigour of the old Roman nationality. "He received me like a true father," says Augustine (*Confess.* v. 13). "Touched by his eloquence, my heart opened itself to the truth of what he said" (*Confess.* v. 14). The life of the Bishop of Milan spoke, however, more clearly than the sermons which he preached. Augustine resumed with profit the study of the Holy Scriptures; he had a kind of foretaste of the beauty and majesty of his mother's religion; he was drawn towards it, and almost won over to it. If conversion had not yet come, it was because he had not yet learnt to be subdued. The difficulties which stopped him seemed solely of an intellectual kind; but they were really moral ones; he did not believe, because he would not believe; and if he would not, it was because he felt at what cost he must follow Christ. He still kept dragging along the chain of guilt, and, in order to deceive himself, he opposed to the Gospel objections of a metaphysical kind. Meanwhile the call from above resounded with increasing strength: Augustine was at the same time roused and irritated, attracted and repelled. At last a violent crisis came, a struggle even unto blood, which he has himself described to us with sincere and impassioned eloquence (*Confess.* viii. 7, 8).

Scarcely was Augustine converted than he retired into solitude, the better to prepare himself for his baptism, which took place at Milan on the 25th of April, 387. He was then 33 years of age. His friend Alypius, and his son Adeodatus, the monument of his sins and of the grace of God, were baptized at the same time. On his way back to Africa with Monnica, he had the grief of seeing her die at Ostia; yet he felt that he enjoyed, through the Lord, closer communion with her whom he had lost, than he had ever done in the stormy days of his youth (*Confess.* ix. 11). At last he landed on that African soil where he was to display as much zeal in the service of God as he had before shown ardour in the pursuit of folly: a successor of Tertullian and of Cyprian, he was to surpass his illustrious forerunners both by his activity and by his genius; though, on returning to Africa, he had no other thought than that of burying himself in retirement from the world.

Augustine spent a few years in his native town, Tagaste, where with some friends he formed a kind of holy community, living almost after the fashion of Coenobites, on an estate jointly belonging to them (*August. Epist.* 225). It was then that he had the joy of leading to Christ, by his letters, Nebridius, one of the dearest friends of his youth, who died shortly after his baptism (*Confess.* ix. 3). Augustine's works on *Genesis*, on *True Religion*, and on *Music*, belong to this epoch (*August. Vita Possid.* 3). In 391 he went to Hippo on a visit to the imperial commissioner, a friend of his (*Vita Possid.* 3); the bishop, Valerius, prevailed upon him to stay, ordained him a priest (*Vita Possid.* 4), sought his help and his advice in every business concerning the Church, and made him his colleague or associate in the episcopate in 395. He then entered upon a career of labour and of struggles when all his qualities shone forth. The illustrious Christian was also a distinguished prelate: he retained all the austere habits of an ascetic, in a position which im-

perial favour rendered most brilliant; his house was a monastery, where he lived frugally with his clergy. Self-denying, prodigal in his charity towards the poor, his only object was the salvation of souls. He knew, as St. Paul did, how to make himself a servant unto all; and, arrayed in the dignity which came to him unsought, he preserved the broken and contrite heart of a true penitent (*Vita Possid.* c. 22; also *Confess.* x.).

The influence of Augustine reached far beyond the limits of his diocese. He was invested with a kind of moral supremacy freely acknowledged by the Catholic Church. His influence as a theologian will be considered afterwards. At present we must review the part he took in the violent dispute which the schism of the Donatists had occasioned in Africa.

This schism was connected with a general tendency which had agitated the Church for nearly two hundred years. During the third century the Montanists had claimed, on behalf of the Christian community, the right of self-government, and asserted a system of rigorism; but the Montanists damaged their cause by the most deplorable exaggeration. Under the plea of strictness, they professed principles which only tended to discourage the sincerest penitents. On the other hand, the pretended revelation of which they boasted, and the sickly enthusiasm they encouraged, did much to throw them into disrepute. The ideas, however, which had given rise to Montanism survived. They inspired the sect of the Novatians, and at a later period that of the Donatists; while past exaggerations disfigured them, and gave to them a false direction. [DONATISTS.]

It is not our business to describe here all the episodes of the struggle between the Donatists and the orthodox Church. Strengthened by the Imperial protection, the latter condescended to back up the arguments of discussion with the argument of force. A short respite took place during the reign of Julian the Apostate, whose policy consisted in facilitating the divisions of Christendom. Afterwards the Donatist bishops, who at one time were nearly 300 in number, allowed themselves to be led to delusive conferences, presided over by an Imperial delegate, appointed for the purpose of taking care that the deliberations were carried out, and pledged beforehand to the orthodox side. The Council of Carthage (A.D. 410) decided that all bishops refusing to be reconciled to the Church, after three requests to do so, should be brought back by force within its pale, with their flocks. Thus ended the Donatist schism. The victors were really more to be pitied than the vanquished, because the triumph of violence over the free convictions of the soul is always barren. In these stormy debates Augustine played the foremost part, and he contributed powerfully to place within the grasp of the Church the dangerous weapon of persecution. Unfortunately, he made use of his powerful eloquence to vindicate the conduct of the orthodox party, and gave utterance to the most dangerous theories respecting the constitution of the Church and the rights of coercion in religious matters, for which the sanction of his illustrious name obtained universal assent.

The point at issue between Augustine and the

Donatists was the idea of the Church. Holiness, the Donatists argued, is above all the characteristic of the Church of Christ; and whenever that holiness has been either marred or compromised, the Church cannot be said to exist, although a regular succession can be traced back uninterruptedly to the Apostles. According to them, catholicity was independent of external circumstances. "The name of Catholic," they said, "should not be given to provinces or to nations. He alone is a true Catholic who is a tried Christian" (*Collectio Chartar. edit. du Pin*, viii. 301, 302.) The Donatists concluded from this that no church deserved the name of church which had admitted within its pale faithless or unworthy members, especially persons who, during the last persecution, had been guilty of fraud. From so tainted a community separation was absolutely necessary at any cost. There is, answered Augustine, only one church, namely, that which, by an uninterrupted succession, can be traced back to the Apostles. It is the hallowed ark which alone floats on the waters or the flood, and out of its walls there is no salvation. "No one," said he, "can have Jesus Christ, the head of the church, unless he belongs to Christ's body" ("habere caput Christum nemo poterit, nisi qui in ejus corpore fuerit," *De Unitate Eccles.* 49), and the body of Christ is the orthodox Church. Those persons, therefore, commit a serious error who think that the existence of the Church depends upon the holiness of its members. We must attach ourselves exclusively to the divine character of the institution. The Church is founded by God upon the rock or an immutable and sovereign will; if we make it depend on the dispositions of men, we shift its foundations from the rock to the quicksands. Thus, whilst the Donatists placed holiness above catholicity, Augustine reversed the order; and no one has carried the theocratic idea farther than the Bishop of Hippo.

Augustine did more than persecute the Donatists; he maintained the right of persecution against them. We must acknowledge that on this point their language was blameless, but they had not always acted consistently. Misfortune, however, enlightened them, and they eloquently expressed ideas of toleration which were a strange anachronism at the beginning of the fifth century (Neander, *Church Hist.* iii.).

On the other side, Augustine argued that all punishment is not *ipso facto* martyrdom. On Calvary, near the cross of the Just One, might be seen the crosses of the two thieves who were suffering a righteous condemnation. There are sufferings which are salutary chastisements. God, through trials, compels us into the right way. Why should not the State do the same thing? Can the State be indifferent to truth? Ought it not to prevent the invasion of error? If the civil power punishes criminals, are not the promoters of heresy a hundred times more dangerous? "Puniantur homicida, puniantur adultera, puniantur caetera quantalibet sceleris sive libidinis facinora; sola sacrilegia volam a regnantium legibus impunita" (*Contra Gauden.* l. 20). He who prevents the free circulation of poisons, should he not also prevent the diffusion of error? (*Epist. Parmen.* i. 16). Truth alone is wholesome; and as it is the possession of the Church, we must oblige souls to enter into the

Church ("compelle intrare," *Epist.* 93 *ad Vicent.*). On Augustine's struggles with the Donatists, see *Vita Possid.* 119.

It is as a divine that Augustine has left the most lasting proofs of his genius; in the theological field all his moral and intellectual qualities found free scope, and his authority there still remains unchallenged. He has accomplished for Christian psychology what Athanasius did for Christian metaphysics; and as it is on psychological questions that he has shed most light, we are naturally tempted to consider him chiefly from that point of view. But we must not forget the share he took in all the theological disputes of the day. His first writings, dating from the epoch which followed immediately upon his conversion, form a transition between the philosopher and the divine. To that period belong his three books *Against the Academicians*, his work *On the Happy Life*, and his *Soliloquies*. The first distinctly theological treatise he composed was a *Refutation of Manichæism*, in which he sought to point out the rock upon which he had once made shipwreck, and to expose the real substance of a doctrine of which the appearance was attractive. And while engaged in refuting a heresy which begins by eliminating man's moral principle, Augustine asserted that principle with an energy which he afterwards thought to be imprudent; for the views on liberty and responsibility which he then maintained do not harmonize with the system he finally adopted.

Setting aside the question of Divine grace, which exhibits all the originality of his thought, Augustine adopts, on all points, the Catholic doctrines of his age. He accepts fully the conclusions of the Nicene Council, and defends them, when necessary, with the usual vigour of his reasoning. As an exegetical writer he suffered, in common with all the fathers, the disastrous influence of the allegorical method. There is, indeed, no surer method of inflicting barrenness on the study of the Scriptures. When the real meaning is not apprehended, the imagination allows itself full play, and the most absurd ideas pass current. Augustine also gives way too often to the passion for discovering types everywhere. There are types, no doubt, of a broad character, which arrest the mind at once; the slightest glance is enough to discover them. Those which cannot be ascertained without some difficulty are, generally speaking, of human invention. With this qualification, we must admit that Augustine turned an erroneous method to very good account, and that he drew abundantly treasures of edification from the well of Scripture. "The Holy Scriptures," says he, "are accessible to all, although a few only understand them thoroughly. Like unto a familiar friend, the Bible communicates simply to the heart of the ignorant its deep meaning." ("Ea quæ aperte continet quasi amicis familiaris sine fūco ad cor loquitur indoctorum," *Epist.* 137.)

Augustine was one of the first to state the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture in its most rigorous meaning. He wrote a well-known treatise, in which he tried to reconcile even the slightest discrepancies in the narrative of the Evangelists. And yet he was very far from being fanatically attached to the letter of the sacred volume. We may even think that he exaggerates, to some extent, the spirituality of the

Gospel in the following words: "Grounded upon faith, hope, and charity, man needs the Holy Scriptures only for the purpose of instructing others. Many live in the depth of the wilderness supported by these three virtues, without any copies of the sacred volume." ("Itaque multi per hæc tria etiam in solitudine sine codicibus vivunt," *De Doctrin. Christian.* i. 39.)

As a preacher, Augustine was essentially biblical; his sermons form a consecutive exposition of the books of the Old and New Testaments. They have the defects of his exegetical writings; but whenever he allows the utterances of his heart to flow forth, he produces the greatest results. His sermons are remarkable for their simplicity; thought and feeling manifest themselves continuously together without any rhetorical effort. The pastor and the theologian are united; and it is seldom that we are reminded of the accomplished scholar of Carthage and Rome. We are told that one day Augustine had prepared an eloquent discourse, designed to produce a strong impression upon cultivated minds. Suddenly, in the midst of his preaching, he broke the thread of his argument, abandoned the period which he had begun, and discussed at once a more simple and more popular subject. On his return home, he told a friend that he had yielded to an irresistible impulse of the Holy Spirit, which had urged him to set aside his original plan. Hardly had he said this when a man, knocking at the door, entered, bathed with tears, and confessed himself to be won over to the cause of Christ. He had been struck by that very portion of the discourse which had been suggested to Augustine by the sudden inspiration.

The whole philosophical series of St. Augustine's writings is extremely remarkable; he often associates, with much skill, Plato and St. Paul. His general views on the relations between reason and faith are full of depth; he shows that faith is not only necessary in religion, but that it is the condition of everything beautiful and great. Thus friendship begins by an act of faith (*De Utilitate Cred.* 12, 13). Reason can arrive at truth only by being subordinate to faith. "It was necessary," says he, "that God, through a kind of popular clemency, should lower the authority of the divine intellect so as to make it the inmate of a human body. ('Populārī quadam clementia divini intellectus auctoritatem ad ipsum corpus humanum declinavit,' *Contra Acad.* iii. 19, 20). St. Augustine admits that faith strengthens reason, and exalts it instead of lowering it; and we know that he had the honour of forestalling Descartes in the expression of the famous formula: "[ego] cogito, ergo sum."

We must now approach the great struggle which nearly split up the Western Church into two parties, just as Arianism had been on the point of producing a schism in the Eastern one. Pelagius was the first to raise the stormy controversy on the relation between divine grace and human freedom. Such a question was quite in accordance with the genius of the Western Church. Unmoved by the metaphysical subtleties which occupied the church at Alexandria, and much more inclined to questions of a practical than of a speculative character, it might have been safely foretold of the doctors of the West that, if ever they approached the ground of deep theology, it would be on the side where practice is intimately

connected with theory; they would take up a problem of psychology, not anthropology, rather than one of pure metaphysics. Pelagius, the originator of the dispute on grace, was a Breton monk. Having entered a convent at an early age, he had lived in peace and solitude, far from the world and its temptations. He had never experienced those severe backslidings which enable us to measure the depths of human corruption. His life, always regular in its course, had been spent quietly under the protecting shadow of the cloister. There, no doubt, he had also acquired that dangerous spiritual pride which monkish asceticism uniformly tends to beget. Thus Pelagianism has for its commentary the life and character of Pelagius, just as Augustinianism takes us back to the great miracle of the conversion of St. Augustine, who, wrested as it were by main force from his sins and his pride, fell prostrate and broken at the foot of the cross.

Animated by an ardent zeal for the propagation of his doctrines, Pelagius repaired to Rome in the year 409, with Caelestius, the most distinguished of his disciples. He then went into Africa, but did not stay there; Caelestius, whom he left behind him, and who had received the order of priesthood, sowed heresy in the church of Carthage, whilst Pelagius diffused his ideas in Palestine. Condemned by a synod held at Carthage in 412, Caelestius joined his master trusting to that Eastern Church which was then the hope of all heretics. The expectation of both these men was not deceived; the synod of Diospolis (415) decided in favour of Pelagianism, notwithstanding St. Jerome's resistance. Acting under the inspiration of St. Augustine, the African Church, by way of retorting on that of Palestine, once more pronounced the condemnation of the heresy (416). This decision received the confirmation of the Bishop of Rome, Innocent I. Pelagianism seemed to be vanquished, when its upholders had the good fortune of winning over to their side Sozimus, the successor of Innocent, the first act of whose primacy was to proclaim the orthodoxy of the heretical doctrines. The African bishops nevertheless maintained their decision in a new synod held at Carthage in 418. Having obtained the support of the emperor Honorius, they regained the Roman prelate by his influence. After this defeat, Pelagianism reappeared a little later in the south of Gaul with a few slight modifications which took nothing away from its essential character. Whilst allowing more to the merits of Jesus Christ, the semi-Pelagians had nevertheless not abjured the pernicious doctrine of the merits of works. Augustine renewed the contest: his works *On Predestination* and *On the Gift of Perseverance* had the same result as his polemical treatises against Pelagius. The Marseille priests were condemned by the synod of Valence in 436.

When confronted by Pelagius' denial of divine grace, St. Augustine could not assume the calm attitude of a theologian. We feel that his indignation masters him: he longs to beat down human pride; he follows it from one lurking-place to the other; and he stops only when he has annihilated both pride and man himself in the presence of God and of His sovereign grace. Who comes and talks to us about the capacity for good which is in our nature? Our nature wills nothing but evil, and can do nothing but

unmitigated evil. Our fall has been a complete one: it has not been limited to one man; in Adam all have sinned, in him all have been condemned. "By their birth all receive the taint of the ancient death which he has deserved" (*Epist. ad Vital.* 5). "After his sin, Adam having been driven away from Eden, his entire posterity, which by his sin he had infected and corrupted in himself, as in the stem of the human family, has been included with him in the bonds of death and of damnation" (*De Fide, Spe, et Charit.* 10). St. Augustine pictures to himself humanity as if, like Lazarus, it were lying in its tomb. He rolls the funeral stone against the door of the sepulchre, and engraves upon it the mournful epitaph, "Without God, without hope." Mankind has not one spark of the divine life; it can only recover life through a resurrection, which, for it, is like a second creation. It is the work of that mediator "who by his one sacrifice has appeased the anger of God" (*De Fide*, 13). Son of God and Son of man, equal to the Father, our mediator having re-ascended to heaven, the efficacious grace of God is imparted to men, not for any merit or for any will on their part (*Epist. ad Vital.* 5), but solely in the name of an entirely gratuitous act of God's mercy. Man is quite passive in the scheme of his salvation; the Father draws him powerfully to the Son, and if he remains in the faith it is because he has received the gift or perseverance. "When God preserves a just man from all scandal, and makes him appear before His presence spotless and full of joy, what gift does He bestow upon him, if not that of perseverance in what is good?" (*De Corrupt. et Gratia*, 32).

In order the better to show the complete passiveness of man in the economy of salvation from the beginning to the end, St. Augustine quotes the example of children who are saved through baptism exactly as adults are through faith. "In the reception of grace, not only do those children manifest no act of their own will which can be regarded as a merit, but we even see them cry and struggle when the holy sacrament of baptism is administered to them" (*De Gratia et lib. arbit.* 13). This comparison between children and adults is full of significance. Not only does the divine vocation suppress every merit in the sight of God, but likewise excludes from the fact of salvation every participation of our own will. If it be asked, whence comes the difference which exists amongst men? Augustine answers by stating the decree of predestination which has beforehand determined the number of the elect who are to replace the fallen angels. "Let us fully understand," says St. Augustine, "the character of that divine vocation which makes the elect, and by virtue of which they are chosen, not because they have believed, but in order that they may believe. Divine grace, we know, is not given to all men, and it is through a righteous judgment that those upon whom it is not bestowed are deprived of it." "How can one say," adds he, "that all men would receive grace, if those to whom it is not given did not reject it of their own free will, because God will have all men to be saved,—how can we say this, when we consider that there are so many children to whom grace has never been given, and that several of them die without having received it,

although there is in them no act of the will opposing itself to the reception of that gift? It even sometimes happens that the parents of a child eagerly long to have him baptized, and yet the child does not receive the sacrament, because God, not willing that he should, causes him to die before baptism is administered. It is evident, therefore, that those who resist so clear a will do not understand the meaning of the expression, 'God will have all men to be saved,' since there are so many men who remain unsaved, not because they refuse to be saved, but because God wills not that they should" (*Epist. ad Vital.* 5, 6).

By these assertions Augustine attained the extreme point of reaction against Pelagianism: he could go no farther. He had stripped man of everything; and we are led to ask ourselves whether on such a system man himself exists as a moral creature; though we must add that St. Augustine stopped short of the idea of a positive decree of perdition. (On the controversy with Pelagius and his followers, see, in addition to the works already named, the *Vita Possid.* 18.)

St. Augustine was not satisfied with attacking heresy and schism: he also wrote the *De Civitate Dei*, one of the noblest apologetical works which the ancient Church can boast of. It was commenced about 413, and was not finished before 426. That treatise was composed, if we may so say, in the glare of the conflagration kindled by the barbarians in the midst of the Roman world. Rome had already been once taken; and the end had come to that vigorous society which, after a period of the most extraordinary development, was now falling to pieces, eaten up by inward corruption, and also shaken to its foundations by the violent attacks of the Teutonic tribes. All hearts were agitated with unutterable anxiety; every one felt that the scenes he had witnessed were nothing as compared with those which were to take place. Society was moving towards an unknown goal, unknown and yet but too clearly foreseen. Christians themselves ran the risk of being discouraged by the gloomy future, so much the more so because the heathens accused them of having brought about all these disasters by renouncing the time-honoured deities of their country.

Augustine wrote the *De Civitate Dei* with the intention of refuting these absurd calumnies, and also of giving fresh courage to his fellow Christians. Every page bears the stamp of his fervent piety. His eloquence and his indignation are unequalled when he exposes that corrupt paganism which, after bringing down upon Roman society evils of every kind, dared to lay these woes to the charge of the Christian faith, which was alone capable of saving the world. Taking a rapid survey of the history of Rome, he asks what the gods of heathenism had ever done for the prosperity of the state and for public morality. All the riches of learning are enlisted in the service of truth. Sometimes the sharpest irony is introduced; sometimes the entreaties of true charity give a new character to the reasoning, and the author's style becomes, so to say, transfigured by reflecting the rays of divine truth. We fancy we can hear Augustine himself addressing the people in the Forum, and there, surrounded by the smoking ruins of the city of men, declaring the stability of the city of God.

The effect which his eloquence produces is all the greater, because we feel that, Christian as he is, he remains still a citizen. Christianity has not inspired him with a selfish contempt of human sufferings, under the pretext that they form part of the plan mapped out in prophecy. He mourns over the calamities of Rome; but his tears do not conceal from him the destinies of the City of God, which appear to him so much the more glorious, as the city of men is more degraded and corrupt.

We must not think, he argues, that God places in complete opposition to each other the city of God and the city of men, society and the church. The Christian, he acknowledges, must discharge his duties as a citizen, and society is the sphere within which our moral activity finds its appointed scope for exertion. Peace, security, the respect of rights, obedience to the laws, every element of the prosperity of society, are in St. Augustine's eyes of paramount importance. It follows that, according to him, we may belong to the City of God, and at the same time take an active interest in the prosperity of our country, even when only the material improvement of our fellow-citizens is concerned; for, to quote his own expressions, "A certain amount of ease in our circumstances enables us to bear more easily, and to feel less, the weight of that mortal body which oppresses the soul." In short, the city of men, in St. Augustine's judgment, is not society, which is of God's appointment, but the world, which wages war against God. He opposes the destinies of the world to those of the Church; and the city of men, such as it appeared to him four centuries after Christ, formed a dismal picture, which unfortunately has lost none of its reality even at the present day. And if we look, for instance, at the description he gives us of the corrupt state of Roman society, we cannot imagine Augustine speaking to us in different language (*De Civit. Dei*, ii. 20).

What hope could he still retain? He had seen the Roman citizens who had flocked to Carthage for the purpose of avoiding danger, immediately after the siege of Rome, hurrying to the games of the circus and the dramatic performances; thus exhibiting the saddest sight in the world, because it was the mark of irredeemable wickedness (*De Civit. i.* 33).

There was another sign, still more distressing, to which St. Augustine draws our attention,—that hypocrisy which at the hour of danger had crowded the churches with impious men or professed heathens, who, after the peril was passed, had begun again to blaspheme the Saviour (*De Civit. i.* 1). It is in the presence of those ruins that St. Augustine describes the glory of the City of God, and foretells its progress; a society spiritual in its character, and whose native country is an abiding one, "eternal in the heavens" (*De Civit.* preface). And it is precisely that aspiration towards the eternal and the immutable which distinguishes the city of God from the city of men (*De Civit. xix.* 14). There alone is true wisdom; for we cannot apply the qualification of true to that wisdom which, with the utmost prudence and vigour, the greatest firmness and moderation, does not aim at that end where God is to be all in all in the certainty of eternity and the enjoyment of perfect peace (*idem*). True

wisdom shines forth with the fullest brilliancy at those terrible epochs when the false wisdom of this world, aiming only at the finite and the perishable, sees its ephemeral works crumble away like the tower built upon the sand; while the city of God "remembers that those who are its enemies to-day will be its citizens to-morrow" (i. 35). He dwells particularly on that thought. As the trials of the present moment are greater, so the energy with which Christians must bear them should be greater likewise. "When Christians are called upon to enlighten, to warn, to reprove and to correct, they are too often held back by a fatal dissimulation, originating either from idle indifference, or from the fear of man. . . . Were it not for this, they might have saved many of their fellow-creatures." The public calamities which have afflicted the believers appear to him both a chastisement for their cowardice, and a pressing exhortation for them to confess their Master. Thus, the city of God, in these evil days, amidst this frightful manifestation of evil, is called upon to make a fresh start. This is not the time for discouragement, but for a painful and fruitful contest, carried on in the perfect and everlasting peace which God has conquered on behalf of His Church (i. 29).

Two other works of St. Augustine deserve special mention, his *Confessions* in 13 books, written in 397, and his *Retractationes*, written in 428, the year before his death. His *Confessions* contain an account of his life down to the time of his mother's death. The last three books are occupied with an allegorical explanation of the Mosaic account of the Creation. The *Retractationes* consist of a review of his own works, and frequently point out the errors into which he had fallen.

Augustine died on the 28th of August, 430, in the 76th year of his age, at the moment when the armies of the Huns surrounded the city of Hippo. He belonged to that class of men who, though dead, yet speak. Ardent in his affections, comprehensive and deep in his learning, he had the greatness and also the want of moderation which we discover in all strong and impassioned natures. He could do neither good nor evil by halves. From a dissolute youth he recoiled into extreme asceticism, and from metaphysical freedom into the most stringent system of authority. He was the staunchest champion of orthodoxy; nor did he sufficiently respect the claims of conscience. He sacrificed the moral element to God's sovereignty, which he maintained most unflinchingly. But, on the other hand, his love for Christ and for the souls of his fellow men was quite as decided; nay, it was its very vehemence which often carried him beyond the bounds of moderation. Therefore it is that in more than one respect he committed mistakes, the influence he has exercised has been equally wide and beneficent. He still claims the honour of having brought out in all its light the fundamental doctrine of Christianity; despite the errors of his system, he has opened to the Church the path of every progress and of every reform, by stating with the utmost vigour the scheme of free salvation which he had learnt in the school of St. Paul.

Bibliographical Notice.—The earliest edition of the collected works of Augustine is that of Amer-

bach, which appeared in nine volumes folio, at Basle, 1506, and was reprinted at Paris in 1515. This edition did not, however, contain the *Epistolae*, the *Sermones*, and the *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, which had been previously published by Amerbach. In 1529, the works of Augustine were again published at Basle, from the press of Frobenius, and under the editorship of Erasmus, in ten volumes folio. This edition, though by no means faultless, was a considerable improvement upon that of Amerbach. It was reprinted at Paris in 1531–32; at Venice, with some improvements, in 1552, and again in 1570; at Lyons in 1561–63, and again in 1571. It was also issued from the press of Frobenius at Basle, with various alterations, in 1543, in 1556, in 1569, and in 1570. In 1577 the valuable edition of Augustine prepared by the learned divines of Louvain, was published at Antwerp, by Christopher Plantin, in ten volumes folio. It far surpasses in critical exactness all the preceding editions; and though, on the whole, inferior to that of the Benedictines, it is still held in high estimation. No fewer than sixteen of the "Theologi Lovanienses" were employed in preparing it for publication. It has been very frequently reprinted: at Geneva in 1596; at Cologne in 1616; at Lyons in 1664; at Paris in 1586, in 1603, in 1609, in 1614, in 1626, in 1635, and in 1652. The Benedictine edition of the works of Augustine, in eleven volumes folio, was published at Paris in 1679–1700. We subjoin an index to the contents of this edition.

Tomus I., published in 1679.—

Retractionum, lib. 2; Confessionum, libri 13; Contra Academicos, libri 3; De beata Vita, liber 1; De Ordine, libri 2; Soliloquiorum, libri 2; De Immortalitate Animae, liber 1; De Musica, libri 6; De Magistro, liber 1; De libero Arbitrio, libri 3; De Genesi contra Manichaeos, libri 2; De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae et de Moribus Manichaeorum, libri 2; De vera Religione, liber 1; Regula ad Servos Dei.

Appendix Tomi primi, containing the following treatises, which have been falsely ascribed to St. Augustine:—De Grammatica; Principia Dialecticae; Categoriae Decem; Principia Rhetorices; Regulae Clericis datae, fragmentum; Regula secunda, seu potius tertia; De Vita Eremitica, ad sororem.

Tomus II. (1679).—

Epistolae omnes.

Appendix Tomi secundi:—Augustini ad Bonifacium et contra, epistolae breviores sexdecim; Ad Demetriadem Pelagii epistola; Augustini ad Cyrillum et contra, de laudibus Hieronymi—Altercatio (sive uti Corbeiensis codex aliique MSS. praefertur) Conlatio.

Tomus III. (1680).—

(a) *Exegetica commentaria in vetus Testamentum*:—De Doctrina Christiana, libri iv.; De Genesi ad litteram, imperfectus liber; De Quantitate Animae, liber i.; De Genesi ad litteram, libri xii.; Locutionum, libri vii.; Quaestionum in Heptateuchum, libri vii.; Annotationum in Job, liber i.; Speculum seu compendium ex libris Scripturae.

(β) *Exegetica commentaria in novum Testamentum*:—De consensu Evangelistarum, libri iv.; De Sermone Domini in Monte, libri ii.; Quaestionum Evangeliorum, libri ii.; Quaestionum septemdecim in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum, liber i.; In Joannis Evangelium, tractatus cxiv.; In Epistolam Johannis ad Parthos, tractatus x.; Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos, liber i.; Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio, liber i.; Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas, liber i.

Appendix Tomi tertii (partis primae):—De Mirabilibus sacrae Scripturae, libri iii.; De Benedictionibus Jacob Patriarchae; Quaestiones veteris et novi Testamenti; Expositio in Beati Johannis Apocalypsim.

Tomus IV. (1681).—

Commentarium in Psalterium Davidis; Enarrationes in Psalmos.

Tomus V. (1683).—

Sermones legitimi Div. Augustino asserti:—(α) Prima classe continentur (183) Sermones de Scripturis veteris et novi Testamenti.

(β) ii. (183/88) Sermones de Tempore.

(γ) iii. (69) Sermones de Sanctis.

(δ) iv. (23/363) Sermones de Diversis.

His in quinta classe succedunt Sermones dubii, qui scil. non certo habendi videntur pro Augustinianis. In Appendice demum Sermones supposititii.

(ε) v. *Sermones dubii* ccclxiv.—394 (Sermoneum S. A. quorundam qui adhuc desiderantur Fragmenta 6 pp.) ccxcv.; Sermo S. Presbyteri Eraclii, discipuli S. Augustini, ipso praesente habitus (1 p.).

Sermones supposititii:—(α) De Scripturis veteris et novi Testamenti; (β) De Tempore; (γ) De Sanctis; (δ) De Diversis.

Tomus VI. (1685).—

Moralia:—De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus, libri 1; De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum, libri 2; De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus, libri 1; De fide rerum quae non videntur, libri 1; De fide et symbolo, libri 1; De fide et operibus, libri 1; Enchiridion de Fide, Spe et Charitate, libri 1; De agone Christiano, libri 1; De catechizandis rudibus, libri 1; De continentia, libri 1; De bono conjugali, libri 1; De sancta virginitate, libri 1; De bono viduitatis, libri 1; De conjugii adulterinis, libri 2; De mendacio, libri 1; Contra mendacium, libri 1; De opere monachorum, libri 1; De divinatione daemonum, libri 1; De cura pro mortuis gerenda, libri 1; De patientia, libri 1; De symbolo ad catechumenos, tractatus iv.; De disciplina Christiana, tractatus 1; De cantico novo, tractatus unus; De quarta feria, tractatus unus; De cataclysmo, tractatus unus; De tempore barbarico, tractatus unus; De utilitate jejunii, tractatus 1; De urbis excidio, tractatus 1.

Appendix Tomi sexti:—Viginti-unius sententiarum vel quaestionum libri unus; Dialogus quaestionum sexaginta-quinque sub titulo Orosii percontantis et Augustini

respondentis; De fide ad Petrum, sive de regula verae fidei, libri unus; De spiritu et anima, libri unus; De amicitia, libri unus; De substantia dilectionis, libri unus; De diligendo Deo, libri unus; Soliloquiorum animae ad Deum, libri unus; Meditationum, libri unus; De contritione cordis, libri unus; Manuale, libri unus; Speculum, libri unus; Speculum peccatoris, libri unus; De triplici habitaculo, libri unus; De scala Paradisi, libri unus; De cognitione verae vitae, libri unus; De vita Christiana, libri unus; Liber exhortationis, vulgo De salutaribus Documentis; De duodecim abusionum gradibus, libri unus; Tractatus de septem vitiis et septem donis Spiritus Sancti; De conflictu vitiorum et virtutum, libri unus; De sobrietate et castitate, libri unus; De vera et falsa poenitentia ad Christi devotam, libri unus; De antichristo, libri unus; Psalterium; Expositio canticum Magnificat; De assumptione Beatae Mariae Virginis, libri unus; De visitatione infirmorum, libri duo; De consolatione mortuorum libri, seu sermones duo; De rectitudine Catholicae conversationis tractatus; Sermo de symbolo; Sermo in pervigilio Paschae, de esu agni; Sermones duo ad neophytos; Sermo de unctione capitis et de pedibus lavandis; Tractatus de creatione primi hominis; Sermo de vanitate saeculi; Sermo de contemptu mundi; Sermo de bono disciplinae; Sermones de obedientia et humilitate, &c.; Sermones lxxvi. ad fratres in eremo commorantes, et quosdam alios.

Tomus VII. (1685).—

De Civitate Dei, libri xxii.

Appendix Tomi septimi:—Aviti ad Palchonium Epistola de Reliquiis Sancti Stephani, et de Luciani epistola, a se ex Graeco in Latinum versa; Luciani epistola ad universam ecclesiam de revelatione corporis Stephani martyris; Anastasii ad Landuleum epistola, de subseque scriptura; Scriptura de alia detectione ac translatione Sancti Stephani in urbem Byzantium, quam Anastasius ex Graeco in Latinum vertit; Severi epistola ad omnem ecclesiam, de virtutibus in Minoricensi insula factis, per reliquias S. Stephani martyris; Evodii episcopi libri duo, de miraculis S. Stephani.

Tomus VIII. (1688).—

Opera polemica contra Manichaeos et Arianos:—De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum, libri unus; Tractatus adversus Iudeos; De utilitate credendi, ad Honoratum, libri unus; De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos, libri unus; Acta seu disputatio contra Fortunatum Manichaeum, libri unus; Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum, libri unus; Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant fundamentum, libri unus; Contra Faustum Manichaeum libri triginta tres; De actis cum Felice Manichaeo, libri duo; De natura boni contra Manichaeos, libri unus; Secundini Manichaei epistola ad Augustinum; Contra Secundinum Manichaeum, libri unus; Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum, libri duo; Consultatio seu commonitorium

Orosii ad Augustinum; Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas, liber unus; Sermo Arianorum; Contra sermonem Arianorum, liber unus; Collatio cum Maximino Arianorum episcopo; Contra eundem Maximinum haereticum, Arianorum episcopum, libri duo; De Trinitate (contra Arianos) libri quindecim.

Appendix Tomi octavi:—(Ubi) adversus quinque Haereses seu contra quinque hostium genera, tractatus; Sermo contra Judaeos, Paganos et Arianos; De altercatione ecclesiae et synagogae dialogus; De fide contra Manichaeos liber, Evodio tributus; Commonitorium ecclesiae Catholicae (vulgo S. Augustini episcopi) quomodo sit agendum cum Manichaeis qui convertuntur; Contra Felicianum Arianum, de unitate Trinitatis, liber unus; Vigilio Tapsitano episcopo restitutus; Quaestiones de Trinitate et de Genesi; De incarnatione verbi ad Januarium, libri duo; De Trinitate et Unitate Dei, liber unus; De essentia divinitatis, liber unus; Libellus, seu dialogus de unitate Sanctae Trinitatis; De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus liber, Gennadio tributus.

Tomus IX. (1688).—

*Opera polemica contra Donatistas:—*Psalmus (S. Augustini episcopi) contra partem Donati; Contra epistolam Parmeniani, libri tres; De Baptismo contra Donatistas, libri septem; Contra litteras Petiliani Donatistae Cirtensis episcopi, libri tres; Ad Catholicos epistola contra Donatistas, vulgo de unitate ecclesiae, liber unus; Contra Cresconium Grammaticum partis Donati, libri quatuor; De unico Baptismo contra Petilianum ad Constantinum, liber unus; Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis; Ad Donatistas post collationem, liber unus; Ad Caesarensis Ecclesiae plebem, Emerito praesente, habitus sermo; De gestis cum Emerito Caesarensi Donatistarum episcopo, liber unus; Contra Gaudentium Donatarum episcopum, libri duo; Sermo Augustino tributus, de Rusticiano subdiacono a Donatistis rebaptizato et in diaconum ordinato.

*Appendix Tomi noni:—*Contra Fulgentium Donatistam incerti auctoris, liber unus. Excerpta et Scripta vetera ad Donatistarum historiam pertinentia, quorum lectio superioribus Augustini contra eosdem haereticos libris lucem affert.

Tomus X. (1690).—

*Opera polemica contra Pelagianos et Semi-Pelagianos:—*De peccatorum meritis et remissione, et de baptismo parvulorum ad Marcellinum, libri tres; De spiritu et littera ad eundem, liber unus; De natura et gratia contra Pelagium ad Timasium et Jacobum, liber unus; De perfectione justitiae hominis, epistola seu liber ad Eutropium et Paulum; De gestis Pelagii ad Aurelium, liber unus; De gratia Christi et de peccato originali contra Pelagium, ad Albinum, Pinianum et Melaniam, libri duo; De nuptiis et concupiscentia ad Valerium, libri duo; De anima et ejus origine contra Viacentium Victorem, libri quatuor; Contra

duas epistolas Pelagianorum, ad Bonifacium, libri quatuor; Contra Julianum haeresis Pelagianae defensorem, libri sex; De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Valentinum, et cum illo monachos Adrumetinos, liber unus; De correptione et gratia ad eosdem; De praedestinatione sanctorum ad Prosperum et Hilarium, liber unus; De dono perseverantiae ad eosdem, liber unus; Contra secundam Juliani responsionem, imperfectum opus sex libros complexens.

*Appendix Tomi decimi:—*Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos, libri sex; Liber suspecti auctoris de praedestinatione et gratia; Liber seu libellus ignoti auctoris de praedestinatione Dei; Varia scripta et monumenta certorum auctorum, ad Pelagianam historiam pertinentia; scilicet: Apologetica opuscula Properi Aquitani pro Augustino; Epistola de gratia et libero arbitrio ad Rufinum; Liber unus contra Collatorem; Responsiones ad capitula calumniantium Galorum; Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum; Responsiones ad excerpta quae de Genuensi civitate missa sunt, liber unus; Ejusdem liber sententiarum ex Augustino. Vita Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi, auctore Possidio Calamensi episcopo ipsius discipulo; Indiculus librorum, tractatum, et epistolarum Sancti Augustini Hipponensis episcopi, editus cura Possidii Calamensis episcopi.

Tomus XI. (1700).—

Vita S. Augustini; Index generalis.

This edition of St. Augustine's works was very sharply criticised by Richard Simon (see *Bibliothèque critique*, &c., par Sainjore, vol. iii. p. 101), but it is still held in high estimation, and has served as a model to later savants (Leclerc [who calls himself Joannes Phereponus], professedly at Antwerp, but in reality at Amsterdam, 1700–1703, 12 vols. fo.; Gaume, Paris, 1836–1839, 11 vols., in 22 parts, large 8vo.; Antonelli, Venice, 1858–1860, 14 vols. fo.; Migne, Paris, 1841, 10 vols. large 8vo.). Leclerc added to the Benedictine edition, notes and other matter; his twelfth volume contains the poem of Prosper of Ingratis, the commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St. Paul, and several treatises referring to the life and writings of St. Augustine (see *Histoire de la nouvelle édition de S. Augustin donnée par les P. P. Benedictins de la Congrégation de St. Maur en France* [Paris] 1736, 4to. [by D. Vincent Thuillier, with a preface and notes by the Abbé Goujet]; also the *Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de St. Maur*, p. 301 and follow.). The following works should be consulted.—*Epistolae duae recens in Germania repertae*, Paris, 1734, fo.; *S. Augustini sermones inediti, admixtis quibusdam dubiis, e membranis sec. xii., biblioth. palat. Vindob.*; *Summa Fide descriptis, illustravit, indicibus instruxit*, Mich. Denis, Vindob. 1732, fo.; *S. Augustini Sermones X. ex codd. Cassin. nunc primum editi, cura et studio D. Octavii Fraja Frangipane*, Rome, 1820, fo. (the second edition of this volume was reprinted under the title, *S. Augustini Supplementum, continens sermones ineditos extractos ex archivis Montis Cassini et ex bibliotheca Laurentiana Medicea Florentiae, opera et studio*

A. B. Caillau, nec non D. B. Saint Yves, Paris, 1836, fo.,—it contains a few additional pieces); *Sancti Augustini novi Sermones, ex codice Vaticano* (in Angelo Mai's nova bibliotheca patrum); *Restitution d'un manuscrit du VI^e siècle, mi-parti entre Paris et Genève, et contenant des lettres et des sermons de S. Augustin*, par Henri Bordier (in the brochure entitled *études paléographiques et historiques sur des papyrus du VI^e siècle*, Genève, 1866, 4to.)

The chief source for a biography of St. Augustine is his *Confessions* (13 books); his contemporary, Possidius, likewise left a memoir of his life (Opp. August. x.). The reader will consult profitably Tillemont's *Mémoires*, vol. xiii.; and amongst more modern works, Laurentii Berti, *De rebus gestis Sancti Augustini*, &c., Venice, 1746, 4to.; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. xv.; Neander, *Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche*, vol. ii.; Bähr, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, supplement, vol. ii.; Bohringer, *Kirchengesch. in Biog.* i. 3; Buson, *Librorum Augustini recens.*, Dorpat, 1826; Bindemann, *Der Heil. Augustinus*, 2 vols. 8vo., Berl. 1844–55; Clausen, (H. N.) *Aur. Augustinus Sacrae Script. interpret.*, 1828, 8vo. Hafn.; Klöth, *Der heilig. Kirchenl. Augustin.*, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1850; Ribbeck (F.), *Donatus und Augustinus, oder der erste entscheidende Kampf zwischen Separatismus und Kirche*, 2 vols. 8vo., Elb. 1858; Van Goens (J.), *Disp. hist. theol. de Aurel. Augustino apologeta secundum libros de Civitate Dei*, Amstelod. 8vo. 1838; *Études sur S. Augustin, son génie, son âme, sa philosophie*, par l'Abbé Flottes, Paris, 8vo. 1861; *Essai sur les Confessions de S. Augustin*, par Arthur Desjardins, Paris, 8vo. 1858; R. C. Trench, D.D., *An essay on the merits of S. Augustine as an interpreter of Holy Scripture* (see the work entitled, *An exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, drawn from the writings of S. Augustine*), Lond. 8vo. 1850. The essay is prefixed to the volume just mentioned.

For the metaphysical portion of St. Augustine's writings, we may quote Ritter, *Geschichte des Christlich. Phil.* i. 153–453; Nourrisson, *Philosophie de St. Augustin*, Paris, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo.; *De la psychologie de St. Augustin*, par M. Ferraz, Paris, 1862, 8vo.; besides the works of Brucker, Buhle, Cousin, and others. The translations of the works are almost innumerable. Amongst literary productions which relate to St. Augustine, we may mention M. Villemain's *Tableau de l'Éloquence Chrétienne au IV^e siècle*, Paris, 8vo. 1849, 2nd edition; and the introduction to M. Poujoulat's translation of the letters, Paris, 1849, 12mo.

For the editions of the works of St. Augustine, see Cas. Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus ecclesiae antiquis*, vol. i. pp. 931–993; C. T. Schönemann's *Bibliotheca Histor.-Literaria Patrum Latinorum*, vol. ii. pp. 33–363; and Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire*, vol. i. cols. 557–567.

On the Pelagian controversy, see (besides Tillemont) G. J. Vossii, *Historia de Controversiis quas Pelagius ejusque reliquiae moverunt*, opp. vol. vi.; (P. Merlin) *Véritable clef des ouvrages de S. Augustin contre les Pélagiens, prouvée par l'état même des questions et des controverses qui sont traitées dans les ouvrages du Saint Docteur* (in the *Mémoires de Trévoux*, for December 1736; see also the same journal, Nos. for Nov. 1716, Nov. 1717, and August 1730); C. W. F. Walch, *Ket-*

zerhistorie, vols. iv. and v.; G. F. Wiggers, *Versuch einer pragmat. Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, Hamb. 1821–33, 2 vols. 8vo.

In all the histories of the Church the chapter concerning St. Augustine is very full. Mohler's *Patrologie* should also be consulted.

[E. DE PRESSÉNÉ.]

AUGUSTINUS, ST., archbishop of Canterbury. 1. *Authorities.* The authentic materials for the life of the first archbishop of Canterbury are almost entirely comprised in the first and second books of Bede's 'Ecclesiastical History.' Some additional points, however, are brought out in (a) Gocelin's *Life of St. Augustine*, contained in the *Acta Sanctorum* of May 26, and written during the 11th century, in a singularly turgid and rhetorical style; (b) Thorn's *Chronicles of St. Augustine's Abbey*; (c). A few letters of Gregory the Great; (d). The lives of Gregory the Great by Paul the Deacon and John the Deacon (Cent. viii. and ix.).

2. *Origin of his Mission to England.* The mission of Augustine to England was due to circumstances of peculiar interest. While Gregory the Great was still a monk in the famous monastery of St. Andrew, which he had himself founded on the Caelian Mount at Rome, he was one day passing through the market-place of the city, at a time when it was crowded with people attracted by the arrival of new cargoes of merchandise. Amongst the bales of goods exposed for sale^a he noticed three boys, distinguished for their fair complexion, the sweet expression of their faces, and their light flaxen hair.^b Struck with pity, he inquired from what part of the world they had come, and was answered, "From Britain, where all the inhabitants have the same fair complexion." He next proceeded to inquire whether the people of this strange country were Christians or pagans, and hearing that they were pagans, with a deep sigh,^c remarked that it was "sad to think that beings so full of light and brightness should be in the power of the Prince of Darkness."

He next asked the name of their nation. "Angles," was the reply; whereupon, playing with the word, he answered, "Rightly are they called Angles, for their faces are as the faces of angels, and they ought to be fellow-heirs with the angels of heaven." "And from what country," he proceeded, "do they come?" "From Deira," was the reply, that is, from the country between the Tyne and the Humber, including Durham and Yorkshire. "Rightly," he answered, "are they named *Deirans*. From the *ire* of God are they plucked, and to the mercy of God are they called." "And who," he inquired once more, "is the king of this province?" "Ella,"^d was the answer. The word reminded him of the Hebrew expression of praise, and he answered "Allelujah! the praise of God shall be chanted in that clime." Years passed away after this

^a "Dicunt Gregorium inter alios advenisse, eo vidisse inter alia pueros venales positos."—Bede, *H. E.* ii. l.

^b "Candidi corporis" (Bede, ii. l.). "Crine rutila" (Gocelin). "Capillorum quoque forma egregia" (Bede).

^c "Intimo ex corde longa trahens suspiria" (Bede, *H. E.* ii. l.).

^d The name of this prince, as Dean Stanley remarks, fixes the date of the dialogue to some period before his death in A.D. 598. He began to reign A.D. 559 (Florent. Vignon) or 560 (*Chron. Sax.*), and reigned 20 years.

memorable interview, but the sight of those fair-haired boys was never forgotten by Gregory. He himself immediately afterwards went from the market-place to the Pope, and requested permission to go and win over the English people to the Christian faith. He set out from the city with all secrecy, and had advanced three days' journey toward the Alps when he was overtaken by messengers. The Abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew was so generally beloved that the populace had burst in upon the Pope in the Church of St. Peter and clamoured for his recall.^o

3. *Mission of St. Augustine.* Gregory was obliged, therefore, to return. But in the year A.D. 590 he himself succeeded to the Pontifical Chair, and five years afterwards an opportunity occurred of carrying out the desire of his heart. Twenty-two years before, or A.D. 568, Ethelbert became King of Kent, and soon took up a high position among the English princes. Two years afterwards he married a Christian princess, Bertha, a daughter of Charibert, King of Paris. It had been agreed, as a condition of the marriage, that the queen should be allowed to enjoy the free exercise of her religion,^f and she had been attended to the Kentish court by a French bishop named Liudhard.

It is a proof of Ethelbert's tolerant spirit that he allowed the bishop to celebrate the worship of the God of the Christians in the little church of St. Martin, a relic of Roman-British times outside the walls of Canterbury, and it is only probable that Bertha, who must have heard what a Clotilda had been able to effect with a Remigius by her side, should have endeavoured, during a union of twenty years, to influence her husband in favour of the Christian creed.^g When such was the feeling of their queen, it is not surprising that many of the people of Kent would be anxious to receive instruction in the faith she professed. That they made application to the Frankish bishops for missionaries is a fact we learn from one of Gregory's letters,^h and it was probably intelligence of this which induced him to write to the presbyter Candidus, administrator of the patrimony of St. Peter in Gaul, directing him to bring up English youths of seventeen or twenty years of age, that they might be trained in different monasteries, and become missionaries in their native land.ⁱ At length, in the sixth year of his pontificate, he resolved to send forth a band of forty monks from his own monastery on the Caelian Hill, headed by their prior Augustine, to commence a direct mission in England.

4. *The Journey to England.* Literally nothing appears to be known of the future Archbishop of Canterbury previous to his selection to head the mission. But we can hardly doubt that he must have evinced special gifts which recommended him to Gregory. Whatever zeal, however, he may have possessed himself, did not animate the

breasts of his companions. In the summer of A.D. 596 they set out, traversed rapidly the north of Italy, and, crossing the Gallic Alps, reached the neighbourhood of Aix, in Provence. But here their courage began rapidly to fail. The accounts they received of the savage character of the Saxons filled them with alarm, and they prevailed on Augustine to return to Rome and obtain for them from Gregory a release from their arduous task.

But Augustine had to deal with one who had learnt to crush all human weakness, and to recognise no call but that of duty. He was forthwith sent back with a letter to his timid brethren, wherein they were urged to accomplish what, by God's help, they had undertaken, to suffer nothing to deter them, and to remember that the more arduous the labour the greater would be their eternal reward. Thus urged by an authority they could not resist, and furnished with letters to the Bishops of Tours, Marseilles, Vienne, and Autun, as also to the Metropolitan of Arles, after the lapse of a year the missionaries slowly bent their steps from Aix to Arles, from Arles to Vienne, thence to Tours, and so through Anjou to the sea-coast. There having provided themselves with interpreters, they set sail, and landed at Ebbe's Fleet,^j in the Isle of Thanet.

5. *The Interview with King Ethelbert.* Once safely landed, they sent the interpreters to announce to Ethelbert that they had come from the great capital of the West, that they were the bearers of joyful tidings, and could promise him glory in heaven, and a never-ending kingdom in the presence of the living and true God. Ethelbert received the messengers in a friendly spirit, but begged that for the present they would remain on the other side of the Stour, and would abstain from entering Canterbury. He further stipulated that his first interview with the missionaries should not take place under a roof, but in the open air, from a fear of the charms and spells he fancied they might exercise over him.^k

Accordingly the Saxon king crossed the Stour and repaired to the Isle of Thanet, and there, either in the open space^l near Ebbe's Fleet, or, according to another account, under an ancient oak in the middle of the island, awaited the coming of Augustine. To make a deeper impression on the monarch's mind, Augustine came up from the shore in solemn procession, preceded by a vergar carrying a large silver cross, and followed by one bearing aloft on a board, painted and gilded, a representation of the Saviour. Then came the rest of the brethren and the choir, headed by Honorius and the deacon Peter, chanting a solemn litany for their own as also for the eternal welfare of the people amongst whom they had come. Arrived in the king's presence,

ⁱ Four spots claim the honour of the landing—(1) *Ebbe's Fleet*, the usual landing-place in the Isle of Thanet; (2) a place called the *Boarded Groin*, which, however, must then have been covered by the sea; (3) *Stonar*, near Sandwich; (4) *Richborough*, which, however, was not in the Isle of Thanet. See Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*, p. 55.

^j Bede, *H. E.* i. 25.

^k *Sub dīvo* (Bede, i. 25). "Under an oak that grew in the middle of the island, which all the German pagans had in the highest veneration."—Lewis's *Isle of Thanet*, p. 83.

^o Milman's *Latin Christianity*, ii. 106.

^f Bede, *H. E.* i. 25. "Quam ea condicione a parentibus acceperat, ut ritum fidei ac religionis suae cum episcopo quem ei adiutorem fidei dederant, nomine Liudhardo, inviolatam servare licentiam haberet."

^g "Pervent ad nos Anglorum gentem ad fidem Christianam Deo miserante desideranter velle converti, sed sacerdotibus vicino negligere, et desideria eorum cessare sua adhortatione succedere" (Greg. *Epp.* vi. 58).

^h Greg. *Epp.* vi. 7.

Ethelbert bade them seat themselves upon the ground. He himself could not understand Latin, and Augustine could not speak Anglo-Saxon. So the priests whom Augustine had brought from France did their best to interpret, while Augustine explained the meaning of the picture which was borne aloft, and told the king how the Merciful One there represented had left His throne in heaven, died for the sins of a guilty world, and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.^m Ethelbert listened attentively, and then, in a manner at once politic and courteous, replied that the promises of the strangers were fair, but the tidings they announced were new and full of meaning he did not understand. He could not give his assent to them and leave the customs of his people, but he promised the strangers kindness and hospitality, together with liberty, to celebrate their services, and undertook that none of his subjects, who might be so disposed, should be prohibited from espousing their religion. Thus successful beyond their expectations, Augustine and his companions again formed a procession, and crossing the ferry to Richborough, advanced to the rude city of Canterbury, then embosomed in thickets,ⁿ chanting as they went along one of the solemn Litanies which they had learnt from Gregory, and took up their abode in the Stable-gate,^o near the present Church of St. Alphege, till the king should finally make up his mind.

6. *The Baptism of Ethelbert.* Thus admitted into the city, the missionaries devoted themselves to prayer and fasting, and commended the Word they preached by their own self-devotion and pure and chaste living. This made a still more favourable impression, and they were before long allowed to worship with the queen in the Church of St. Martin, and were thus encouraged to carry on their labours more openly and with renewed zeal. At last Ethelbert avowed himself ready to accept Christianity, and was baptized on the Feast of Whitsunday, June 2, A.D. 597, in all probability at St. Martin's Church.^p

The conversion of their chief was, as is illustrated again and again in the history of Mediaeval Missions, the signal for the baptism of the tribe. At the next assembly, therefore, of the *witan*,^q the matter was formally referred to the authorities of the kingdom, and they decided to follow the example of Ethelbert. Accordingly on the 25th of the December following, upwards of ten thousand^r received baptism in the waters of the Swale, at the mouth of the Medway, and thus sealed their acceptance of the new faith.

Thus successful in the immediate object of the mission, Augustine repaired to France, and was consecrated the first Archbishop of Canterbury by Virgilius, the Metropolitan of Arles. On his return he took up his abode in the wooden palace of Ethelbert, who retired to Reculver, and this, with an old British or Roman church hard by, became the nucleus of Augustine's cathedral. Another proof of the king's kindness was soon

displayed. To the west of Canterbury, and midway between it and the church of St. Martin, was a building, once a British church, but now used as a Saxon temple. This Ethelbert, instead of destroying,^s made over to the archbishop, who dedicated it to St. Pancras, in memory, probably, of the young Roman martyr, on the tombs of whose family the monastery on the Caelian Mount at Rome had been built. Round this building now rose another monastery, at the head of which Augustine placed one of his companions, Peter, as its first Abbot.

Before, however, these arrangements were completed, he sent Peter and Laurence to inform Gregory of the success of the mission. They were to recount to him how the country of the fair-haired slaves he had once pitied in the Roman forum had received the faith, how Augustine himself had been advanced to archiepiscopal dignity, and they were to beg for answers to certain questions respecting the conduct of the mission, which caused him no little anxiety.^t

The messengers went their way, and executed their commission. Gregory was overjoyed at the receipt of the intelligence,^u and after an interval sent over a reinforcement of fresh labourers for the mission, amongst whom were Mellitus, Paulinus, and Justus. They brought ecclesiastical vestments, sacred vessels, some relics of apostles and martyrs, a present of books,^x and the pall of a metropolitan for Augustine himself, who was thus made independent of the bishops of France. In a lengthened epistle Gregory sketched out the course which the archbishop was to take in developing his work. London was to be his metropolitan see, and he was to consecrate twelve bishops as suffragans. Moreover, whenever Christianity had extended to York, he was to place there also a metropolitan with a like number of bishops under him.^y As to the differences between the Roman and Gallican liturgies (such as Bertha probably followed in her Church of St. Martin), Augustine was directed to select from either whatever appeared to him pious, religious, and right, to collect it into a volume, and establish it as the liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church, ever remembering, as a guiding principle, that "things are not to be loved on account of places, but places on account of good things."^z As to the line of conduct he was to assume towards the Gallic bishops, he was told that it was no part of his duty to interfere with them, or to rebuke and judge; but "as a man passing through his neighbour's corn-field, though he might not put in the sickle, yet might pluck and eat a few ears," so, if occasion required, Augustine might venture to use towards

^s On Gregory's advice respecting the destruction of the heathen temples, see the article on *MISSIONS*.

^t Bede, *H. E.* i. 27.

^u See his letter to the patriarch of Alexandria, *Epp.* viii. 30.

^x In the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, are two ancient MS. Gospels, which are deemed to have at least a fair claim to be considered the veritable books which Gregory now sent to Augustine.

^y Bede, *H. E.* i. 29.

^z "Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis res loca amanda sunt. Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesis, quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt elige, et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta, apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem deponere."—Bede, *H. E.* i. 27.

^m See Gocelin, ii. 17.

ⁿ See Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*, p. 19.

^o "In ea parte urbis quae Stable-gate dicta est, ut W. Thorn tradit."—Smith's note on Bede, *H. E.* i. 25.

^p Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*, p. 37.

^q Kemble's *Saxons in England*, ii. 205.

^r See the letter of Gregory to the patriarch of Alexandria, *Epp.* viii. 30.

them the language of gentle admonition. As to the British bishops, they were all entrusted to his care, "that the unlearned might be instructed, the weakened strengthened by persuasion, the perverse corrected with authority."^a

7. *Conference between Augustine and the British Bishops.*—The course he was to pursue being thus defined, Augustine invited the British clergy to a conference, which was arranged to take place at a spot on the confines of Wessex, near the banks of the Severn, under an oak, long after known as *Augustine's oak*.^b Prepared to make considerable concessions, he yet felt that three points did not admit of being sacrificed. He proposed that the British Church should (1) conform to the Roman usage in the celebration of Easter;^c and (2) the rite of baptism; and (3) that they should aid him in evangelising the heathen Saxons.^d The discussion was long and fruitless. At last the archbishop proposed that an appeal should be made to the Divine judgment. A blind Saxon was introduced, whom the British clergy were unable to cure. Augustine supplicated aid from above, and the man, we are told, forthwith recovered his sight.

Convinced but unwilling to alter their old customs, the vanquished party proposed another meeting. Seven British bishops met on this occasion, together with Dinoh, abbot of the great monastery of Bangor, in Flintshire. Before the synod assembled, they proposed to ask the advice of an aged hermit whether they ought to change the traditions of their fathers. "Yes," replied the old man, "if the new-comer be a man of God." "But how," they asked, "are we to know whether he be a man of God?" "The Lord hath said," was the reply, "take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly. Now if this Augustine is meek and lowly, be assured that he beareth the yoke of Christ." "Nay, but how are we to know this?" they asked again. "If he rises to meet you when ye approach," answered the hermit, "hear and follow him; but if he despise you, and fails to rise up from his place, let him also be despised by you."

The synod met, and Augustine remained seated, nor did he rise at their approach. It was enough. It was deemed clear that he had not the Spirit of Christ, and no efforts of the archbishop could induce the British clergy to yield one of his demands. "If he will not so much as rise up to greet us," said they, "how much more will he condemn us if we submit ourselves to him?" Thereupon Augustine broke up the conference with an angry threat that, if the British clergy would not accept peace with their brethren, they must look for war with their foes, and if they would not proclaim the way of life to the Saxons, they would suffer deadly vengeance at their hands.^e

^a Bede, i. 27.

^b "In loco qui usque hodie lingua Anglorum *Augustine's* ac, id est, robur Augustini, in confinio Huicicorum et Occidentalium Saxonum, appellatur," Bede, ii. 2. Stevenson fixes the locality at Aust-clive on the Severn.

^c See the art. on EASTER in *Dict. of Chr. Ant.*

^d Other points of difference were: (a) the marriage of the clergy; (b) a peculiar liturgy; (c) the tonsure; (d) a peculiar system of monastic rules. See Gieseler, *Ecl. Hist.* ii. 164, 165.

^e "Quibus vir Domini Augustinus fertur minitans praedixisse, quia si pacem cum fratribus accipere nollent,

Thus unsuccessful in his efforts Augustine returned to Canterbury, and there relaxed none of his efforts to evangelise the Saxon tribes. As all Kent had espoused the Faith, it was deemed advisable to erect a second bishopric at Rochester. Over it Augustine placed his companion Justus, and Ethelbert caused a cathedral to be built, which was named after St. Andrew, in memory of the monastery dedicated to that Apostle on the Caelian Hill at Rome, whence the missionaries had started.^f At the same time, through the connection of the same monarch with the king of Essex, who was his nephew, Christianity found its way into the adjacent kingdom, and the archbishop was enabled to place Mellitus in the see of London, where Ethelbert built a church, which was dedicated to St. Paul.

8. *Death of Augustine.* This was the limit of Augustine's success. It fell, indeed, far short of Gregory's grand design; but this had been formed on a very imperfect acquaintance with the condition of the island, the strong national prejudices of the British Christians, and the relations which subsisted between the different Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. On the 12th of March, 604, Gregory died, and two months afterwards, according to some authorities, or a year after, according to others,^g Augustine followed his patron and benefactor, and was buried in the cemetery which he himself had consecrated, by the side of the Roman road, that then ran over St. Martin's Hill from Richborough to Canterbury.^h

Several points, which have respect to the missionary labours of Augustine, will be found discussed under the head of MISSIONS. The most important modern authorities for the life of the first archbishop of Canterbury are (1) Montalambert's *Monks of the West*, iii.; (2) Dean Hook's *Archbishops of Canterbury*, i.; (3) Dean Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury*, 4th edition, 1865; (4) Dean Milman's *History of Latin Christianity*, ii. 4th edition, 1867. [G. F. M.]

AUNARIUS or AUNACHARIUS, S., bishop of Auxerre, early in the 7th century. Commemorated on September 25. He was of high birth, and was educated at the court of king Guntram, but while still a youth wishing to assume the clerical habit, he was admitted to ordination after instruction by S. Syagrius, bishop of Autun, and in time was raised to the bishopric of Auxerre. He governed the Church with great wisdom, and is to be noticed for the following disciplinary acts:—1. He caused solemn litanies to be said daily in the chief towns of his diocese by rotation, and on the first day in every month in the twelve largest churches and monasteries. 2. For the more solemn performance of the daily offices in his cathedral church, he enforced the attendance of secular and regular clergy in order. 3. In 581 he summoned a diocesan synod of seven abbats, thirty-four priests, and five deacons, for the restoration of discipline among the clergy, and the suppression of pagan superstitions among the people. For its Acts, see Labbé, *Concilia*, vol. v. col. 967, 980. He also caused the lives

bellum ab hostibus forent accepturi: et si nationi Anglorum nolissent viam vitæ prædicare, per horum manus ultionem essent mortis passuri," Bede, ii. 2.

^f Bede, ii. 3.

^g See Hussey's note on Bede, *H. E.* ii. 3.

^h "In the ground now occupied by the Kent and Canterbury Hospital" (Stanley, p. 44).

of his predecessors, Bishops Amator and Germanus, to be written. His remains, buried at Auxerre, were held in great veneration for their miraculous powers. They were disinterred and enclosed in a golden chest, which was plundered by the Huguenots in 1567. The relics, however, though partially dispersed, are said to have been preserved in a hollow pillar in the crypt. (*Acta SS. Boll. Sept. vii. 86-111.*) [C. D.]

AURELIAN, A.D. 270-275. The few facts which connect the name of this emperor with the history of the Christian Church are as follows:—(1) He is said (Vopiscus, c. 20) to have reproached the Roman Senate for not consulting the Sibylline books, as their fathers would have done, at a time of danger and perplexity. "It would seem," he said, "as if you were holding your meetings in a Church of the Christians instead of in the Temple of all the Gods." The words imply, it is clear, a half-formed suspicion that the decline of the old faith was caused by the progress of the new, and shew that the buildings used for the worship of Christians were becoming more and more conspicuous. The decree of Gallienus recognising Christianity as a *religio licita* had apparently stimulated their activity in this direction. (2) Startled by the rapid progress which the rival creed was making, Aurelian is said to have resolved towards the close of his reign on taking active measures for its repression. The edict of Gallienus was to be rescinded. A thrill of fear pervaded the Christian population of the empire. The emperor was surrounded by counsellors who urged on him a policy of persecution. His death, however, hindered the execution of his plans, and the conflict was for a time deferred. (3) In the interval we find him connected, singularly enough, with the action of the Church in a case of heresy. Paul of Samosata had been chosen as bishop of Antioch in A.D. 260. A synod of bishops including Firmilianus of the Cappadocian Caesarea, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and others, had condemned his teaching; but on receiving promises of amendment had left him in possession of the see. Another (A.D. 270) deposed him and Domnus was appointed in his place. Paul, however, relying perhaps on the support of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, refused to submit to their decision and kept possession of the episcopal residence. Such was the position of affairs at Antioch when Aurelian, having conquered Zenobia, became master of the city. The orthodox bishops appealed to the emperor to settle the question at issue, so far as it affected the rights of property, and he gave judgment that the house should belong to those to whom the bishops in Italy and in Rome had addressed their epistles. So far as the Christian society was recognised at all, it was better that it should be as a society having a centralized organization, the heads of which were under the immediate control of the imperial government. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 27-30.) [E. H. P.]

AURELIAN, praefect of the east and consul, succeeded Proculus as praefect of Constantinople in 392. His name appears in the title of several of Theodosius' laws (*Cod. Theod. Chronol.* tom. i. p. 127, tom. vi. p. 352). On the fall of Eutropius in 399, he was charged with the duty of conducting the eunuch to his place of banishment in Cyprus; and when he was recalled to Constanti-

nople, Aurelian presided at the commission at Chalcedon, by which he was condemned and executed (*Cod. Theod.* tom. xi. p. 312; Philostorg. xi. 6). In 400 he became consul. During his consulship he owed his life to the mediation of Chrysostom. Gainas had marched his troops to the neighbourhood of Constantinople, and refused to lay down his arms unless the heads of Aurelian and Saturninus were given him. The feeble Arcadius dared not refuse, and the two highest functionaries of the state were sent out to the camp of Gainas at Chalcedon. Chrysostom, "as the common father of his flock," on hearing of their impending fate, set out at once for the barbarian's headquarters, and gave him no rest, until he had obtained a promise to spare their lives. Gainas, however, did not set his prisoners free till he had made them suffer all the horrors of death. The sword was actually drawn and raised as if in act to strike. They were then banished to the Goths, whence they returned on the fall of Gainas (*Soc. vi. 6*; *Soz. viii. 4*; *Zosim. v. p. 759*; *Chrysost. Homil. iii. pp. 405 sq.*; ed. Montf.). He is probably the same to whom Synesius addressed several letters (*Ep. xxxi. xxxiv. xxxviii.*), from the first of which, written in 416, it would appear that he held a second prefecture under Theodosius II. with the title of Patrician. We learn from an epigram (*Anthol. lib. iv. c. 4, § 17, H. Stephens 1566*) that a gilt statue was erected to him by the senate of Constantinople for having delivered the city from serious apprehension. He built a church at Constantinople dedicated to St. Stephen, in which St. Isaac was buried (Ducange, *Urb. Constantin. descriptio*, vol. iv. p. 188.) [E. V.]

AURELIUS, MARCUS, Emperor, A.D. 161-180. The policy adopted by Marcus Aurelius towards the Christian Church cannot be separated from the education which led him to embrace Stoicism, and the long training which he had, after he had attracted the notice of Hadrian and been adopted by Antoninus Pius, in the art of ruling. In the former he had learnt, as he records with thankfulness, from his master, Diognetus (*Medit. i. 6*), the temper of incredulity as to alleged marvels, like those of seers and diviners. Under HADRIAN and ANTONINUS PIUS he had acquiesced, at least, in a policy of toleration, checking false accusations, requiring from the accusers proofs of some other crime than the mere profession of Christianity. It might have been expected that he would have adhered to the same line of action. Philosophical scepticism, natural humanity, strict conscientiousness might all seem to give guarantees for the maintenance of a system under which Christians would have been comparatively free in the profession of their faith. It is startling at first to find that he takes his place in the list of persecutors along with Nero and Domitian and Decius. The annals of martyrdom place in his reign the death of Justin Martyr at Rome (A.D. 166), that of Polycarp at Smyrna (A.D. 167), that ofalandina and Potheinos, and the other sufferers at Lyons (A.D. 177). The latter year seems indeed to have witnessed an outburst of popular fury against the new sect, and this could not have been allowed to rage without the emperor's sanction, even if there were no special edicts like those of which Melito

speaks (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26) directly authorizing new measures of repression. It was accordingly an era of Apologies; Justin had led the way under Antoninus Pius, and the second treatise that bears his name was probably written just before his own martyrdom under Aurelius. To the years 177 and 178 are assigned those which were written by Melito, Tatian, Athenagoras, Apollinaris, and Theophilus, perhaps also that of Miltiades. The causes of this increased rigour are not difficult to trace. (1) The upward progress of Christianity brought its teachers into rivalry with the Stoic philosophers, who up to this time, partly for good and partly for evil, had occupied the position of spiritual directors in the families in which there was any effort to rise out of the general debasement. They now found themselves brought into contact with men of a purer morality and a nobler fortitude than their own, and with a strange mysterious power which enabled them to succeed where others failed. The opposition of the Cynic Crescens to Justin (*Apol.* ii. 3) may fairly be looked on as a representative instance of what was going on throughout the empire. Just in proportion, therefore, as the emperor was true to his Stoicism, surrounded by Stoic teachers, was he likely to be embittered against their rivals. (2) A trace of this bitterness is found in his own *Meditations* (xi. 3). Just as Epictetus (Arrian, *Epict.* iv. 7) had spoken of the "counterfeit apathy" which was the offspring not of true wisdom, but "of madness or habit like that of the Galilaeans," so the emperor contrasts the calm considerate preference of death to life, which he admired, with the "mere obstinacy (*παράταξις*) of the Christians. "The wise man," he says, "should meet death *σεμνῶς καὶ ἀτραγῶδως*." The last word has, there seems reason to believe, a special significance. Justin, towards the close of his second Apology, presented to this emperor, had expressed a wish that some one would stand up, as on some lofty rostrum, and "cry out with a *tragic voice*, Shame, shame on you who ascribe to innocent men the things which ye do openly yourselves. . . . Repent ye, be converted to the ways of purity and wisdom (*Μετὰθεσθε, σωφρονίσθητε*)." If we believe that his acts were in harmony with his words, or that what he wrote had come under the emperor's eye, it is natural to see in the words in which the latter speaks so scornfully of the "tragic airs" of the Christians, a reference to what had burst so rudely upon his serene tranquillity. (3) The period was one of ever-increasing calamities. The earthquakes which had alarmed Asia under Antoninus were but the prelude to more serious convulsions. The Tiber rose to an unprecedented height and swept away the public granaries. This was followed by a famine, and the famine by a pestilence, which spread like the famous plague of Athens, from Egypt and Ethiopia westward. Everywhere on the frontiers there were murmurs of insurrection or invasion. The year 166 was long known as the "annus calamitosus," and it was in that year that the persecution broke out and that Justin suffered. These calamities had at once a direct and a reflex action. They roused the superstition of the great mass of the people, and a wild fanaticism succeeded to an epicurean atheism. The gods were wroth, and what had roused their anger but the presence of those who

denied them? "*Christianos ad leones*" seemed the remedy for every disaster. The gods might accept that as a piaculum offering. And, on the other hand, the Christians saw in them signs of the coming judgment, and of the end of the world; and now in apocalyptic utterances, now in Sibylline books, uttered, half-exultantly, their predictions of the impending woe (Comp. Tertull. *ad Scap.* c. 3). All this, of course, increased the irritation against them to the white heat of frenzy (Milman's *History of Christianity*, B. ii. ch. 7). They not only provoked the gods, and refused to join in sacrifices to appease them, but they triumphed in the miseries of their fellow-citizens.

Two apparent exceptions to this policy of repression have to be noticed. (1) One edition of the edict *πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*, though ascribed by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 13) to Antoninus Pius, purports, as given by him, to come from Aurelius. As the edict is unquestionably spurious (this variation being one indication of the spuriousness) it does not enter into the history of the period except as showing the wish of some Christians, at a later stage in the conflict, to claim the authority of the philosopher in favour of his brethren. (2) There is the decree mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 5) on the authority of Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 5, *ad Scap.* c. 4, p. 208) and appended to Justin's first Apology, which purports to be addressed to the Senate, informing them how, when he and his army were in danger of perishing for want of water in the country of the Marcomanni, the Christians in his army had prayed to their God, and refreshing rain had fallen for them, and a destroying hail on their enemies, and bidding them therefore to refrain from all accusations against Christians as such, and ordering all who so accused them to be burnt alive. The decree is manifestly spurious. The history of the facts connected with it will be found under LEGIO FULMINATRIX.

An interesting monograph, entitled *M. Aurelius Antoninus als Freund und Zeitgenosse des Rabbis Jehudas ben Nasi*, by Dr. A. Bodek (Leipzig, 1868), may be noticed as maintaining that this emperor is identical with the Antoninus ben Ahashuerus, who is mentioned frequently in the Talmud, and whom the writer shows to have been on terms of intimacy with one of the leading Jewish teachers of the time. If this hypothesis be accepted, it suggests another possible element in his scorn of Christianity. [E. H. P.]

AURELIUS, Martyrs. (1) A reader, and confessor, at Carthage under St. Cyprian, who it appears could not write (Cypr. *Epist.* xxxviii. Fell), and who is said to have been martyred, but possibly he is confounded with (2) an Asiatic bishop who wrote against the Cataphryges (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 19), placed by Baeda (Nov. 12) in Africa: see Baron. Nov. 12. [A. W. H.]

AUSONIUS, DECIMUS* MAGNUS, was the son of Julius Ausonius, a physician of Cosium (*Bazas*), in Aquitania (Aus. *Idyll.* ii. 2), a man eminent for his professional skill no less

* The nomen and prænomen of the poet are not found in the earlier authorities. One MS. has Decius, a manifest error. In others the name Paconius is added, probably from a confusion between the poet and his father, who, as a physician, might have been so styled.

than for his private worth (*Parent. i.*). His mother, Aemilia Aeonina, was descended from the ancient nobility of the Aedui (*Parent. ii.*). The young Ausonius, who was born at Burdigala (*Bordeaux*) early in the 4th century, was destined ere long to fulfil the twofold destiny thus foreshadowed in his parentage. His poems, which are singularly communicative as to his private history, display him to us in riper years both as student and courtier, professor and praefect, poet and consul. Owing probably to the high promise of a horoscope drawn for him by Caec. Agriculus Arborius, his maternal grandfather (*Parent. 4, 17*), special care seems to have been taken of his education by his female relatives (*Parent. ii., v., vi., xxv.*), one of whom, his aunt Dryadia, had taken a vow of chastity. From the professors of his native town he derived the first rudiments of Greek and Latin, and his education was completed by his uncle Arborius, who taught rhetoric at Toulouse (*Parent. iii. 12; Clar. Urb. xii.*). Upon his return to Bordeaux he practised for a time at the bar, but abandoned this calling for the more congenial one of a schoolmaster. At the age of 30 he was promoted to the chair of rhetoric in his native city, and not long after was invited to court by the then Christian Emperor Valentinian I., who appointed him tutor to his son Gratian (*Praef. ad Syagr. 15-26*). About this time he married Attusia Lucana Sabina, from whom he was separated by death after a brief union, and for whose sake he continued a widower during the remainder of a long life (*Parent. viii. 18*). Some of his most touching verses are addressed to this lady. Ausonius was held in high regard by the emperor and his son, and accompanied the former in his expeditions against the Alemanni. It was no doubt during the residence of the court at Trèves at this time that he composed his *Mosella*. Many of his lighter pieces also seem to belong to this period, those especially which reflect the loose morality of the camp. From Valentinian he obtained the title of Comes and the office of Quaestor, and on the accession of Gratian became successively Praefect of Latium, Libya, and Gaul, and finally, A.D. 379, was raised to the consulship (*Praef. ad Syagr. 35, &c.; Epigr. ii., iii., de fast.*). The letter of Gratian conferring this dignity, and the poet's grateful reply, are both extant. After the death of Gratian, A.D. 383, although he seems to have enjoyed the favour of Theodosius (*Praef. ad Theodos.*), it is probable that he returned to the neighbourhood of his native city and spent the remainder of his life in studious retirement (*Ep. xxiv.*). His correspondence with Paulinus evidently belongs to these later years. The date of his death is unknown, but he was certainly alive in A.D. 388, as he rejoices in the victory of Theodosius over the murderer of Gratian at Aquileia (*Clar. Urb. vii.*).

The question of the poet's religion has always been a matter of dispute. Voss, Cave, Heindrich, Muratori, &c., maintaining that he was a pagan, while Jos. Scaliger, Fabricius, Funccius, and later M. Ampère, uphold the contrary view. Without assenting to the extreme opinion of Trithemius, who even makes him out to have held the see of Bordeaux, we may safely pronounce in favour of his Christianity. The negative view rests purely upon assumptions, such

as that a Christian would not have been guilty of the grossness with which some of his poems are stained, nor have been on such intimate terms with prominent heathens (Symmach. *Epp. ad Auson. passim*), nor have alluded so constantly to pagan rites and mythology without some expression of disbelief. On the other hand he was not only appointed tutor to the Christian son of a Christian emperor, whom he seems at any rate to have instructed in the Christian doctrine of prayer (*Grat. Act. 43*); but certain of his poems testify distinctly to his Christianity in language that is only to be set aside by assuming the poems themselves to be spurious. Such are (1.) the first of his idylls, entitled *Versus Paschales*, and commencing *Sancta salutariferi redeunt solennia Christi*, the genuineness of which is proved by a short prose address to the reader connecting it with the next idyll, the *Epicedion*, inscribed to his father. (2.) The *Ephemeris*, an account of the author's mode of spending his day, which contains not merely an allusion to the chapel in which his morning devotions were performed (1. 7), but a distinct confession of faith, in the form of a prayer to the first two Persons of the Trinity. (3.) The letters of the poet to his friend and former pupil St. Paulinus of Nola, when the latter had forsaken the service of the pagan Muses for the life of a Christian recluse. This correspondence so far from being evidence that he was a heathen (see Cave, &c.), displays him to us rather as a Christian by conviction, still clinging to the pagan associations of his youth, and incapable of understanding a truth which had revealed itself to his friend, that Christianity was not merely a creed but a life. The letters are a beautiful instance of wounded but not embittered affection on the one side, and of an attachment almost filial tempered by firm religious principle on the other. Paulinus nowhere chides Ausonius for his paganism; on the contrary, he assumes his Christianity (Paulin. *Ep. ii. 18, 19*), and this is still further confirmed by a casual passage in one of the poet's letters to Paulinus, in which he speaks of the necessity of returning to Bordeaux in order to keep Easter (*Ep. viii. 9*). To say that Ausonius was a Christian in the same sense as Paulinus would be going too far, but he was one of those spirits that hovered on the border-land which still separated the new from the old religion; not ashamed, it is true, to pen obscenities beneath the eye and at the challenge of his patron, yet in the quiet of his oratory feeling after the God of the Christians; convinced apparently of the dogma of the Trinity, yet so little penetrated by its awful mystery as to give it a haphazard place in a string of frivolous triplets composed at the dinner-table (*Gryph. Tern. 87*): keenly alive to natural beauty, and susceptible of the tenderest affection, he yet fell short of appreciating in his disciple the more perfect beauty of holiness, and the entire abnegation of self for the love of a divine master. And yet the spirit which breathes in the poet's letters to Paulinus is a marked advance upon the careless tone of his more youthful productions; and it is possible that his collected works, as they have come down to us, include much that their author would have disowned at the close of his long life.

The works of Ausonius comprise:—

Epigrammaton Liber, a collection of 150 epigrams on all manner of subjects, political, moral, satirical, amatory, many of which for terseness and power of sarcasm are only surpassed by those of Martial. *Ephemeris* (see above.) *Parentalia*, a series of tributes to the memory of those of his family and kindred who had died before him, many of which are full of pathos, and prove that the poet's natural warmth of heart was not affected by the coldness and corruptness of his age. *Professores Burdigalenses*, a similar series, in commemoration of those who held the different chairs of public instruction at Bordeaux during his lifetime. *Epitaphia Heroum*, from the Greek; *Tetrasticha de Caesaribus*; *Ordo Nobilium Urbium*; *Ludus Septem Sapientum*; *Eclogarum*, consisting of short poems on the calendar; *Gratiarum Actio pro consulatu*, in prose; *Tres Praefatiunculae*; *Periochae*, or short headings for the several books of the Iliad and Odyssey; most of which last are but ingenious trifles, and represent perhaps the mere sweepings of the poet's study, collected and published after his death. Of a different nature, with some exceptions, are his *Idyllia*, a collection of 20 poems, comprising amongst others the Horatian "*Vilula*," the "*Rosae*" of doubtful authenticity, the "*Cupido cruci affixus*," a graceful piece of badinage suggested by a picture in the imperial triclinium at Trèves, and above all the "*Mosella*," a poem in praise of his favourite river, which he describes with all the warmth of home affection, and the minuteness of a pre-Raphaelite painter. The *Epistolae* are on the whole the most interesting, because the most heartfelt, of the works of Ausonius; they are 25 in number, and addressed to various friends: that to his father on the birth of a grandson is very elegant and tender; but the epistles to St. Paulinus of Nola, before alluded to, prove more than any of his works that the poet was capable of earnestness when his heart was stirred, and that had he lived in nobler times he might have turned his more than common ingenuity to better account.

The *Editio Princeps* of Ausonius was published at Venice in a folio vol., 1472, without a printer's name, along with the works of Proba, Calpurnius, and others. It is very scarce. The poems were first edited separately at Milan, fol., 1490, by J. A. Ferrari; this edition, however, is incomplete. The first complete edition is that of Taddeo and Angelo Ugoletto, Parma, 4to., 1499. The edition of Elias Vinetus appeared at Bordeaux in 4to., 1575, along with Jos. Scaliger's *Lectiones Ausonianae*. The best edition is the *Variorum* of Tollius, 8vo., Amstel., 1671. The works of Ausonius are published in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. xix., from a collation of several editions, of which the principal are Gryph., Lugdun. 8vo., 1540, and that in the *Collectio Pisaurensis*, 4to., 1766.

[E. M. Y.]

AUTHADEIA (Iren. 108) [OPHITES]. [H.]

AUTOGENES (Iren. 108) [OPHITES]. [H.]

AUTOPHYES (Iren. 165, [auct. Val.] 169) [VALENTINUS]. [H.]

AUTPERTUS (AMBROSIUS), a distinguished monk and abbot of the Benedictine Order, born in France, probably early in the 8th century; died at his monastery in Southern Italy, A.D. 778 or 779.

i. *Name*.—Though simply termed Autpert in a chronicle to be cited below, his full designation in its Latinized form is *Ambrosius Autpertus*. The latter name is variously spelt. Autpertus, Authpertus, Anspertus, Ansbertus. We have no conjecture to offer respecting the meaning of this name; but it appears to have been not uncommon in after times, as we find at least two Autperts of some eminence in the 9th century. The popularity of the name Ambrosius (*Ἀμβρόσιος*), of course dates from the time of the great Bishop of Milan.

ii. *Authorities*.—1. The notice by himself, appended to his book on the Apocalypse (*Bibliotheca Patrum maxima*, tom. xiii. *sub fine*. Lugduni, 1677). 2. A brief mention by Paulus Diaconus, *De gestis Longobardorum*, lib. vi. cap. 40 (*Bib. Pat. max.* tom. xiii. p. 161.). 3. *Chronicon Monasterii Sancti Vincentii prope Vulturum flumen*, in provincia Capuana: from which *excerpta* are given by Duchesne in his *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, tom. iii. p. 672 (Parisii, 1641). This Chronicle, though apparently written in the sincerest good faith, requires to be read with some caution, for its author has evidently the strongest *esprit de corps*, and does not display much critical power. 4. Tritheim has collected what he could with the zeal of a member of the same illustrious order, but without any great discrimination (*Domini Johannis Trithemii Abbatis Sparheimensis de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis Liber Unus*, Coloniae, 1546).

iii. *Life*.—Autpert was born in the south of France, most probably in Provence. He seems to have attained to some degree of secular distinction, as Charles the Great, in a sort of charter, given by Duchesne from the *Chronicon* (see above, No. 3), calls him his Orator. This has been magnified by the author of the *Chronicon*, who represents him as a favourite with Pepin, as tutor to Charles, and an active arch-chancellor of the imperial court. We agree with the learned Benedictines, Martene, Durand (*Veterum Scriptorum collectio*, Paris, 1733), in seeing no sufficient warrant for these assertions.

But Autpert, whatever his station, saw fit to retire from the world, at that time a very rough and tumultuous world. The river Vulturum (*Volturno*), (famous in the campaigns of Rome against Samnium and in the struggle with Hannibal, as again also in the contests of our own day), had witnessed the rise of a Benedictine monastery, said to have been founded by three brethren named Paldo, Tato, and Jason. Its fame had spread widely in the 8th century; but it was overthrown and destroyed towards the close of the succeeding age by the Saracens who invaded Italy from Africa, A.D. 872–882. In this monastery Autpert spent many years, during which he displayed in an exemplary manner the virtues appertaining to his station, and was evidently a diligent student of Holy Scripture and of the writings of the principal Latin Fathers. His chief work, the commentary on the Apocalypse, was composed, he tells us, during the Pontificate of Paul I. (A.D. 757–767); but it is dedicated to Paul's successor, Pope Stephen IV. (768–772), who had encouraged him in his studies and defended him against detractors. Autpert speaks of Desiderius (*i.e.* Didier) as king of the Lombards during the composition of his book,

and of Arichis as duke of the province which he inhabits; evidently the province of Benevento, of which Arrigis^a was duke. Now Didier was the last king of the Lombards, and was de-throned by Charles the Great in 774 (see Gibbon, chap. 49), and Arrigis submitted to the same great conqueror in 786, and consented to hold his duchy as a fief. Consequently it must have been after the completion of this book that Autpert was elected abbot, and in that capacity obtained from Charles a confirmation (*praeceptum*) of all the rights hitherto enjoyed by his monastery. The document is given by Duchesne; it is chiefly curious as a study of local geography. Autpert held the abbacy for about the last year and a quarter of his life. A later legend reports that having been afflicted with a stammering in his speech, he gained perfect freedom of enunciation through the favour of the blessed Virgin. His death, as has been said, took place in A.D. 778 or 779. Some have confounded him with a later Autpert, who was abbot of Monte Cassino under the Emperor Lothair.

Writings.—Tritheim remarked in 1546 that only few of Autpert's writings have come down to posterity. He had only been able to find the following:—*In Cantica Canticorum*, lib. i. *In Psalterium*, lib. i. *Donum Sapientiae. Epistolarum ad diversos*, lib. i. *De Cupiditate*, lib. i. *In Apocalypsin Joannis* lib. decem.

There have also been ascribed to him—*Liber de conflictu vitiorum et virtutum inter Ambrosii et Augustini opera repetus. Sermo in Assumptionem B. Mariae virginis inter Sermones Augustinianos de Sanctis. Sermo de lectione S. Evangelii, qui ad calcem operum S. Ambrosii in edit. Paris. reperitur. Vita SS. Paldonis, Tatonis et Jasonis una cum historica Monasterii sui relatione a Mabillonio edita. Homiliae de S. Matthia de purificatione B. M. et aliae Homiliae.* (These last are either lost or else preserved in the library at Monte Cassino.)

This second list is ab-judged away from our Autpert, and we should think justly, by Cave: who would assign all to the abbot of Monte Cassino except the lives of S. Paldo, &c., which he ascribes to a third and later Autpert. For remarks on Autpert's writings see the general notice of Gallican divines of the primitive and earlier middle age. [VINCENTIUS.] [J. G. C.]

AUXENTIUS, a bishop of MORSUESTIA in A.D. 360, by whom the heretic Aetius was hospitably received on his banishment (Philost. *H. E.* v. 1, 2; Suidas, i. 491). He is said by Philostorgius to have been brother of Theodore of Tarsus, but the chronology is confused. Philostorgius (apud Suidam *sub voc.*) relates a very pleasing tale of his having been an officer and notary in the army of Licinius, and having at once thrown up his commission rather than obey the emperor's command to lay a bunch of grapes at the feet of a statue of Bacchus. On this ground Baronius places him in the Roman martyrology (Dec. 18), but his authority for doing this is questioned by Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vi. 786–7, who is inclined to believe that Auxentius was an Arian, as his patronage of Aetius would indicate. [E. V.]

^a *Arrigo* is a common form for *Enrico* in modern Italian; just as we have *Harry* for *Henry*.

AUXILIUS, bishop of CARTHAGE, at the beginning of the 5th century. Chrysostom wrote to him from Cucusus, A.D. 406, commending the zeal he had shown in promoting the peace of the church (Chrysost. *Ep.* cxlix.). He was present at the councils held at Carthage, A.D. 411, 412, 416, that of Cirta, A.D. 412, and Milevium, A.D. 416 (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 1336, 1510, 1519, 1533, 1544). [E. V.]

AVIDA, the name of the antagonist in the Dialogue on Fate ascribed to Bardeisan (Cureton's *Spicileg. Syr.* 1–15). It is written 'Αβείδης in the common texts of Epiphanius, i. 477 A, but Αβείδης in the Venice MS. [BARDEISAN.] Hilgenfeld (*Bardesanēs d. letzte Gnostiker*, 74 f.) supposes *Avida* to represent *Avitus*, one of the original names of Elagabalus, with whom there are other reasons for thinking that Bardeisan came in contact; and refers to Eusebius's statement (*H. E.* iv. 30) that the Dialogue was addressed to "Antoninus," *Antoninus* being one of the Roman names assumed by Elagabalus. But the grounds are insufficient. [H.]

AVITUS, ALCIMUS ECDICIUS,^a son of Isicius or Hesychnius, Archbishop of Vienne in Narbonian Gaul, was born about the middle of the 5th century. His father belonged to a family of senatorial rank. His mother, Audentia, was, in all probability, a sister of M. Maecilius Avitus, Emperor of the West, A.D. 456. The mother of Sidonius Apollinaris the poet, who, in a letter to Alcimius Avitus, speaks of their near relationship and the identity of their youthful pursuits, seems to have been another sister of the same illustrious family (Sidon. Apoll. *Ep.* iii. 1, 61). The life of a student presented greater attractions to the young Avitus than the possession of wealth and rank, and though in after years he addresses Roman senators as still one of their own order (*Ep.* xxxi.), we find that at an early age he bestowed his patrimony upon the poor, and retired into the seclusion of a monastery close to the walls of his native city. Here he devoted himself to study, and gained so high a reputation for piety and learning that in 490 A.D., upon the death of his father, he was elected to succeed him in the archbishopric. In 494 A.D. he gave fresh proof of his charitable disposition by completing the ransom of the Italian captives whom Epiphanius, Bishop of Pavia, came to seek at the Burgundian Court (Ennod. *Vit. Epiphan.* p. 234 B, ed. Migne). The fame of Avitus rests partly upon his poetry and partly upon the important part he was called to play in the controversies of his time. In 499 A.D. Vienne was captured by Gundobald, King of the Burgundians, who was at war with Clovis, King of the Franks; and in the same year Avitus, as Metropolitan of S. and E. Gaul, took the lead in a conference between the Catholic and Arian bishops held in presence of Gundobald at Sardiniacum near Lyons (Greg. Turon., ii. 34). The king was convinced by the earnest entreaties and powerful reasoning of Avitus, several of whose extant letters are addressed to him, but could never be induced to recant his errors publicly. After his death,

^a Ecdicius seems to have been a family name, since it was borne by a son of the Emperor Avitus, who is celebrated in history for the defence of Clermont against the Visigoths, A.D. 473–4.

Avitus and his brother Apollinaris,^b bishop of Valentia, incurred the displeasure and persecution of Sigismund, his son and successor, by their excommunication of Stephanus the royal treasurer; but Sigismund, we are told, having been cured of a fever by the hood of Apollinaris obtained for him by his wife's entreaties, renounced his errors, allowed himself to be instructed by Avitus in the true faith (Labbe, *Bibl. MSS.* vol. i. p. 693) and was finally persuaded, by way of expiation for the murder of his son Sigeric, to found a monastery at Agaunum (*St. Maurice* in the Valais) in honour of St. Maurice the Martyr and his Theban legion (Greg. Turon., i. ii. c. 5; Adon. Viennens., *Chron.* ad ann. 492).

At the instance of his royal patrons, Avitus published treatises in confutation of the Nestorian, Eutychian, and Sabellian heresies; he also wrote against the Pelagian errors of Faustus, abbot of Lerins, and obtained great success in the conversion of the Jews who had settled in his diocese (*Venant. Fortun.*, l. v. c. 5).

From a letter of Pope Hormisdas to Avitus (*Ep. x.*), we gather that he was made vicar apostolic in Gaul by that pontiff; and in 517 A.D. he presided in this capacity at the Council of Epaune (Concilium Epaonense) for the restitution of ecclesiastical discipline in Narbonian Gaul. But his influence seems to have extended far beyond the limits of his own diocese, as is shown by his correspondence with several historical personages at Rome, e.g. Faustus, Symmachus, Vitalianus, &c. He appears also to have exerted himself to terminate the dispute between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople which arose out of the excommunication of Acacius [ACACIUS]; that this was accomplished before his death we gather from one of his own letters. (*Epp.* iii. vii.)

Avitus died Feb. 5, A.D. 523, was buried in the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Vienne, where the greater part of his youth was spent, and in due time received the honours of canonization. An epitaph preserved by Baronius, and prefixed to his works in most editions, is a glowing testimony to the estimation in which his piety and genius were regarded by the age in which he lived.

The extant works of St. Avitus are as follows:—

(1) A poem in five books on subjects drawn from Genesis and Exodus: *De Origine Mundi*; *De Peccato Originali*; *De Sententiâ Dei*; *De Diluvio*; *De Transitu Maris Rubri*; this is dedicated to his brother Apollinaris, and consists of 2611 hexameter lines. The first three books might almost have suggested the idea of Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' to which they bear a curious and in many points interesting analogy.

Besides these five books Labbe mentions (*Nov. Bibl. MSS. Coron. Poet.*) the unpublished MSS. of six more that bear the name of Avitus, and continue the Jewish history as far as the Book of Judges. They are in a very corrupt state and Sirmond, who examined them (*Opusc.* tom. ii. ad fin. *Op. Alc. Av.*), doubts their authenticity.

(2) *De Consolatoriâ Castitatis laude*, a poem in 666 hexameters, addressed to his sister

Fuscina, a nun, in which he mentions the name of his mother Audentia.

(3) A collection of 91 letters, which is all that remains of the nine books of correspondence ascribed to him by Gregory of Tours. Several are of historical interest, especially that addressed to Clovis (*Ep. xli.*) upon his baptism.

(4) A homily, *De Festo Rogationum*, from which the religious observance of Rogation days took its origin. [MAMERTUS.]

A second homily representing the Rogation of the third day, which was discovered in the library of the Grande Chartreuse, and first published in 1717 by Dom. Marten. (*Thesaur. Anecd.* p. 47.)

A homily preached on the occasion of the dedication of a church erected by Maximus, bishop of Geneva. It was reconstructed from certain papyrus leaves discovered in the Imperial library of Paris by M. Leopold Delisle and published in 1866. The title of this homily is connected with the previously discovered fragments of another (vi. and vii., ed. Sirmond) delivered at the inauguration of the monastery of S. Mauritius at Agaunum, Sept. 22, A.D. 522. At the same time were published two fragments of a homily, *In dedicatione Basilicæ Genova quam host(is) inc(enderat)*, the title of which was already known.

(5) Seventy-two short fragments of homilies, sermons, &c., together with the titles of five homilies that are still missing, edited by Père Sirmond (*Opusc.* tom. ii.).

(6) The *Collatio Episcoporum contra Arianos coram Gundobaldo rege*, first published in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, 1655 ff. (tom. iii. p. 304, ed. Paris, 1725).

These remains contain much that is valuable with reference to the history, doctrine, and discipline of the Church in the 5th century.

The poems of Avitus were first printed at Strasbourg in 1507 from a MS. in the possession of Beroaldo; were published separately at Basle, 1546, with notes by Menrad Molther; and subsequently at Paris, 1643, by Jacob Sirmond, together with the letters, the miscellaneous fragments, and the first of the above-mentioned homilies. The whole of the extant works of Avitus are contained in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. lix., except the discoveries of M. Delisle, for which the reader is referred to *Études sur des Papyrus du VI^{me} Siècle*, by MM. Delisle and Rilliet, Geneva, 1866, a valuable contribution to the biography of St. Avitus. [E. M. Y.]

AXIONICUS, one of the "Eastern" school of Valentinians, coupled with Bardeisan (*Ἀρδισιάνης*) by Hippolytus (*Hæc.* vi. 35). Early in the third century, when Tertullian wrote against the Valentinians (c. 4), Axionicus "alone at Antioch vindicated the memory of Valentinus by complete keeping of his rules." [H.]

AZADANES and AZADES, Martyrs, a deacon and a eunuch, martyred in Persia under Sapor II. c. A.D. 341 (Sozom. ii. 11; *Menolog.* April 14; Assemani, *Act. Mart.* i. 42 sq.; *Martyrol. Rom.* April 22). The latter was a favourite of the king, and was put to death instantly, upon his own mere profession of Christianity, to the king's great grief. [A. W. H.]

AZAZEL. In some verses by a Catholic writer quoted by Irenæus (80) the Gnostic Mar-

^b This was the name likewise of their cousin Sidonius, of his father, and son, to the latter of whom four of the letters of Alcimius Avitus are addressed.

cus is said to be enabled by "his father Satan" to practise magic arts through the agency of "the angelic power Azazel." In the book of Henoch one of the chief among the angels who fell by reason of the "daughters of men" bears this name (viii. 1; ix. 6; x. 4, 8; xiii. 1 f., &c.); and he is apparently referred to in other Jewish writings of various ages (Grabe and Harvey on *Iren.*; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud.* i. 823). The name is curiously coincident with the *Azazel* of *Lev.* xvi. 8, 10, 26 (זִזְיוֹן, A. V. "scapegoat"), by many supposed to be a demon, and by Origen (*c. Cels.* vi. 43) identified with the devil. An evil spirit so called is also referred to by Arabic writers (Reland *de Reliq. Muh.* 137, Utrecht 1705, etc.): and "among the devils" recognised by the modern Samaritans "the greatest is Azazel" (Petermann in Herzog, *R. E.* xiii. 372.) Traces of possibly kindred divinities in other nations are collected by Movers (*Phönizier*, i. 367 ff.): cf. Chwolsohn (*Die Ssabier*, ii. 246 f.). [H.]

B

BAANNES (Βαννὴν τὸν ὑπαρόν) or **BAANES**, a Paulician, mentioned in the Greek form of abjuration (ap. Cotelier, *Patres Apost.* i. 545; Photius, *contra Man.*). His followers were called Βαννίται (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii.). [E. B. C.]

BABAEUS, a leading member of the Nestorian church planted by Barsumas in Persia [BARSUMAS], who though originally a layman, and as such married, succeeded Acacius as archbishop or patriarch of Seleucia, after a two-years' vacancy of the see, in the year 496. Babaeus thus became the head of the Persian church, in which capacity he summoned a synod by which the Nestorian body was completely organized. Among the canons passed by this synod was one granting permission to bishops or presbyters to marry once. (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. pars ii. 79, 381, 429; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv. 285, Engl. trans.). [E. V.]

BABEL (Βάβελ), in the book of "Baruch" of the Gnostic JUSTINUS, the name of the first of the twelve "maternal angels" born to Elohim and Edem (Hipp. *Haer.* v. 26, p. 151). She is identical with Aphrodite, and is enjoined by her mother to cause adulteries and desertions among men, in revenge for Edem's desertion by Elohim (p. 154). When Heracles is sent by Elohim as "a prophet of the uncircumcision" to overcome "the twelve evil angels of the creation," i. e. the maternal angels, Babel, now identical with Omphale, beguiles and enfeebles him (p. 156; x. 15, p. 323). She may possibly be the Baalti or female Baal of various Semitic nations, though the intrusive β is not easily explained. But it is on the whole better to take *Babel*, "confusion" (Joseph. *Ant.* i. 4, § 3, Ἐβραῖοι γὰρ τὴν σύγχυσιν Βαβέλ καλοῦσιν), as a form of BARBELO, which probably has the same meaning. The eclecticism of Justinus would account for his deposition of Barbelo from the first to the second place, where she is still above Hachamoth. [H.]

BABYLAS (1) St. and martyr, bishop of Antioch from A.D. 237 or 238 until his martyrdom, A.D. 250 or 251, under Decius, either by death in prison for the faith (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 39),

or by direct violence (St. Chrys. *de St. Bab. c. Gentes*, tom. i.); other authorities—Epiphanius (*de Mens.* xviii.), Sozomen (v. 19), Theodoret (*H. E.* iii. 6)—simply calling him martyr, while St. Jerome (*de Scriptt. Eccl.* liv. lxii.) gives both accounts in different places. The *Acta* of Babylas (*Actt. SS.* Jan. 24) place his martyrdom under Numerian, by a confusion (according to Baronius' conjecture, *ad ann.* 253, § 126) with one Numerius, who was an active officer in the Decian persecution (Tillemont, *M. E.* iii. 729). The great act of his life was the compelling the emperor Philip, when at Antioch shortly after the murder of Gordian, to place himself in the ranks of the penitents, and undergo penance, before he was admitted to church privileges (κατέχει λόγος, according to Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 34, but asserted without qualification by St. Chrysostom, as above, while the *V. St. Chrys.* in *Actt. SS.* Sept. tom. iv. 439, transfers the story, against all probability, to Decius, and assigns it as the cause of St. Babylas' martyrdom). But his fame has arisen principally from the triumph of his relics after his death over another emperor, viz. Julian the Apostate, A.D. 362. The oracle of Apollo at Daphne, it seems, was rendered dumb by the near vicinity of St. Babylas's tomb and church, to which his body had been translated by Gallus, A.D. 351. And Julian in consequence, when at Antioch, ordered the Christians to remove his shrine (λάβρακα), or rather (according to Amm. Marcell. xxii.), to take away all the bodies buried in that locality. A crowded procession of Christians, accordingly, excited to a pitch of savage enthusiasm characteristic of the Antiochenes, bore his relics to a church in Antioch, the whole city turning out to meet them, and the bearers and their train tumultuously chanting psalms the whole way, especially those which denounce idolatry. On the same night, by a coincidence which Julian strove to explain away by referring it to Christian malice or to the neglect of the heathen priests, the temple of Apollo was struck by lightning and burned, with the great idol of Apollo itself. Whereupon Julian in revenge both punished the priests and closed the great church at Antioch (Julian Imp. *Misopog.* Opp. ii. 97, Paris, 1630; St. Chrys. *Hom. de St. Bab. c. Gent.* and *Hom. de St. Bab.*; Theodoret, *de Cur. Graec. Affect.* x. and *H. E.* iii. 6, 7; Socrat. iii. 13; Sozom. v. 19, 20; Rufin. x. 35; Ammian. Marcell. xxii. pp. 225, 226). St. Chrysostom also quotes a lamentable oration of the heathen sophist Libanius upon the event. The relics of St. Babylas were subsequently removed once more to a church built for them on the other side of the Orontes (St. Chrys. *Hom. de St. Bab.*; Sozom. vii. 10). Three, either boys or young men, were said to have suffered martyrdom with him (St. Chrys. *Hom. de St. Bab.*; Theodoret, *H. E.* iii. 6; Philostorgius, vii. 8; Suidas, s. v. Βάβυλας; and, confounding him with the Babylas to be next mentioned—the *Syr. Martyr* in *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1865, Jan. 1866). Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, is said to have written a life of him, about A.D. 352 (*Chron. Alex.* p. 630). The Greeks placed his day upon Sept. 4, the Westerns upon Jan. 24.

(2) One of the name, sometimes confused with his better known namesake, is said to have been martyred, with eighty-four of his scholars, at

boheen, or Inishboyne, to which it has given its name, in the parish of Dunganstown, barony of Arklow, county of Wicklow" (*Ibid.* pp. 297-8). Colgan thinks he was a disciple of St. Ciaran, who had to perform several miracles on account of St. Baithen's incaution, and thus must have flourished about A.D. 550 (*Acta SS.* p. 369 text and n.²; p. 463, c. 36); but Todd (*ut supra*) says he "is supposed to have flourished about the close of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century. The exact date of his obit has not been preserved in the Irish annals." (*Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. p. 374, n. u.)

(4) Ab. of Iona—June 9. He was son of Brendan, and pupil, cousin, and successor of St. Columba at Iona. He was one of the twelve companions of St. Columba who came with him from Ireland; and, though sent at times on such a mission as to be Superior of the monastery of Campus-Lunge, in Ethica, now Tiree, or to take charge of the monks at their labours at home (see Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 162), he was always closely associated with St. Columba till his death, when he became his successor, as marked out by the words of the dying saint: "Here I must stop—at the end of this page (in transcribing the Psalter): what follows let Baithen write" (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 336, c. 5; p. 369; p. 588; Ussher, *de Brit. Eccl. Prim.*, *Dubl.* 1639, pp. 694 sq.) He is called "S. Columbae alumnus et successor" by St. Adamnan (*S. Col.* iii. c. 2), and "familiarissimum discipulum," by Notker Balbulus (iii. 22). He is also known as *Comin*. (See Ussher, *ut supra*, p. 694, and Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 588, and *Tr. Thaum.* p. 488, n. e.) The curious story of the three empty chairs shown to him in heaven, which were prepared for St. Ciaran, St. Columba, and St. Baithen himself, is given in Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* p. 402, *Fifth Life of St. Columba*, c. 81); *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 163; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. of Scott. Saints*, p. 274.) He ruled four years (Dr. Reeves says three) in Iona after St. Columba's death, and resigned his soul to heaven on the same day of the same month in which St. Columba expired (June 6), A.D. 600. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 408, c. 3; p. 449, col. 2; *Tr. Thaum.* p. 18, n. 33; p. 480, c. 3; p. 498, col. 2; *Mart. Doneg.* p. 165; Bp. Forbes, *ut supra*; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. pp. 250, 259.) But Ussher (*de Brit. Eccl. Prim.* *Dubl.* 1639, p. 962) fixes his obit at A.D. 598, and is followed by Dr. Grub (see his useful note in *Eccl. Hist. of Scotland*, i. p. 70), while the Bollandist *Acta SS.* (Jun. tom. ii. p. 234) prefers to put it in 601. It is entered in the *Four Masters* at 595, and in the *Annals of Ulster* at 597. He was son of Brendan, St. Columba's uncle, and born, and born, and born, to Tighearnach, in 536, and "his principal church was Teach-Baithaein, now Taughboyne, in the barony of Raphoe, and county of Donegal. It is stated in the *Annals of Clonmacnoise*, A.D. 596, that he died in the 66th year of his age" (*Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. p. 221, n. e.). There is a curious story given by E. O'Curry (*Lect. on Manners and Cust. Anc. Ir.*, ed. by Sullivan, iii. pp. 32-3) with regard to his early education.

For his early life see Bolland. *Acta SS.* Jun. tom. ii. p. 235, in which are some interesting touches.

The *Felire* gives—

"Baetini ard Aingeach
Coluin cille Caindeach."

—(See Ulster *Journal of Archaeol.* vol. ii. pp. 239, 240; Todd, *St. Patrick*, p. 299; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. of Scott. Saints*, p. 274; Dr. Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. 372, et al. in Index.) In p. 182 Dr. Reeves gives also an account of his kindred to St. Columba, the coincidence of their festivals, and the Acts of St. Baithen, putting his obit in A.D. 599 and age 66 years. For an account of St. Baithen and his peculiarly gentle disposition see Montalembert (*Monks of the West*, *Edinb.* iii. pp. 213-5).

(5) Baotan or Boetan Mac Ua Corbmaic, Abbot of Cluain-mic-Nois, A.D. 663 (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 61)—March 1. *Mart. Tallaght* calls him "Baitanus Episc. Cluana" (Kelly, *Cal. of Ir. Saints*, p. xvii), and Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 437) says he died bishop there in A.D. 663 (compare *Tr. Thaum.* p. 377, n. 63). He was descended from an ancient Connaught family, and succeeded Aedlugh, son of Camman, in 651, as Abbot of Clonmacnoise, which is now called also "The Seven Churches," on the east bank of the Shannon in King's county. Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 437) and *Four Masters* (by O'Donovan, at A.D. 663, p. 275) attach him by birth to the sept of Conmaicene-mara, i.e. the inhabitants of Conmaicene, or the barony of Ballynahinch in the north-west of the province of Galway.

(6) Baetan of Monu—March 23. *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, p. 85) says: "This may be the Baetan, brother of Corbmaic and Eimhin, who are of the race of Eoghan-mor, son of Oilíoll Olum:" and Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 728) gives on this day Boedan, Ab. of Killboedain, son of Eugenius, and one of the six brothers of St. Corbmaic. According to this last account, he was the sixth son, and followed his elder brothers Corbmaic and Diernit into the scene of their missionary labours in Lethconn or the northern half of Ireland. He afterwards took up his abode and built his church at Killboedain, afterwards called Killoscoba or Killoseda, in Dalaradia, under the patronage of the three noble families of Cinel-Decil, Clann-Scoba (Clann-Serlo), and Silmiridhin. At first they devoted houses and lands to St. Baithen, but the first-named family afterwards transferred their affections to St. Cuan and St. Colman, and at last the place was not only deserted but had its name changed. St. Baithen perhaps returned to his native province of Munster, and died Ab. of Moin (Monensis) or Moanmore. He is supposed to have lived about the beginning of the sixth century. (See Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 728, and at p. 751 sq., in his *Life of St. Corbmaic* (March 26); Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, p. 103. On Shilvodon or Kill-boedain, see Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq. Down and Connor*, pp. 302-3.)

(7) Son of Maonan, of Lannleire—June 18. *Mart. Tallaght* gives "Furodrain ocus Baithin," and *Mart. Doneg.* has also this saint along with his brother Furadhran, Ab. of Lannleire, now the old church of Lyn, on the east side of Lough Ennell, in the barony of Fartullagh, and co. Westmeath (*Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. p. 342, n. w.).

(8) Baitan or Boetan of Cluain-an-Dobhair,

which was situated somewhere in the present King's County. Aengus and Marianus in their Festologies commemorate him on Dec. 1; and though he is come of the same Connemara family, yet he appears to be different from Baithen, son of Ua Corbmac (*ut supra*). Little, however, is known of him (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 437, n. 2). The *Mart. Doneg.* p. 335, identifies him with Mobaol (Dec. 13) of Cluain-fionnabhair, or of Cluain-da-an-dobhair, in Ui-Muireadhaigh, the name of both their fathers being called Sinell; while Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 598, c. 3, App.), in giving an account of the saints belonging to the house of Mochoemocus and race of Conmacus, mentions "Beodan, who is also Mobecus, son of Sinell &c., Abbot of Cluain-dobhair, Dec. 13."

(9) Baithonus, Bathanus, Bothanus, Bp.—Dec. 25, A.D. 639. He is said by Camerarius (p. 203) to be connected with all Scotland, but specially with Shetland and Thule, and he may have been one of the five bishops addressed in the epistle of Pope John IV. A.D. 640 (while yet but pope elect) to the nation of the Scots, warning them to keep the true Easter and to avoid the errors of Pelagius (Bede, *H. E.* ii. c. 19). But at the same time it may be mentioned that Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 17, n. 11) identifies the Baithanus in the epistle with St. Baithen, son of Cuanach, bp. of Tech-baithen, who flourished about A.D. 640 (see above, Baithen (2) and was a Scotie bishop in Hibernia, not Alba (see also Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. p. 413). In Berwickshire is the parish of Abbey of St. Bathans (*N. S. A.* "Berwickshire," p. 105; *O. S. A.* vol. xii. 61–64). The Register of the Priory of St. Andrews (p. 31), giving the taxation of the churches in the archdeaconry of the Lothians, assigns one mark to the "Ecclesia Sti. Boythani." The parish of Gifford, or Yester, in East Lothian, was anciently called St. Bothans (*N. S. A.* "Berwickshire," p. 105). The parish of Bowden is supposed also to take its name from this saint. "In the charter granted by King David I. to the Abbey of Selkirk, mention is made of Bothenden, which seems to favour the conjecture of this parish being named after St. Bothan or Bodwin, and the site of this town is still pointed out near the village" (*O. S. A.* vol. xvi. p. 230). Perhaps Bothwell is called after him (*O. S. A.* vol. xvi. p. 300). Balleboda, or Kilboda, in the parish of Ardchattan, may take its name from him, though the patron of the parish is St. Modan, but the *m* and *b* are interchangeable in Gaelic (*Orig. Par.* ii. pp. 148, 186). There is a Kiledane in the lordship of Morven and Sheriffdom of Inverness (*Ibid.* ii. p. 191). But Camerarius gives a St. Bothanus, bp. of Dunblane in Scotland at the 18th of January, though his reference does not exhibit the name (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. of Scott. Saints*, p. 276). [A. P. F.]

BALAAMITES, the name is derived from the allusion in Rev. ii. 14. There were in the church of Pergamus those who held "the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, *φάγειν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι*." The presence and activity of these teachers is urged as a matter of blame: it argues want of vigilance, and slackness of effort on the part of the "angel" of that church. The city watered with the martyr-blood of Antipas is in danger of being

transformed into "Satan's throne," and of becoming the head-quarters in those parts of the opposition to Christ and His Gospel. Incidental notices of the Balaamites occur in 2 Pet. (ii. 15), and Jude (11). The picture given is a sad, if not a worse, parallel to that given in Rev. They are "false teachers," leading many to follow their "lascivious ways" (*ἀσελγείας*) . . . "alluring through the lusts of the flesh"; "cursed children which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness." While they "promise liberty" to their followers, "they themselves are the servants of corruption" (2 Pet.) Or they are "ungodly men turning the grace of God into lasciviousness (*ἀσελγείαν*), and denying the only Lord God." Woe to them "for they have gone in the way of Cain, and run greedily after the error of Balaam" (Jude). As in the Old Testament history Balaam is the representative of a class which claiming prophetic power, debased divine inspiration to the suggestion of sensual and covetous practices; so in the history of the Church they who sought to introduce sensuality and idolatry, manners and customs, which to the far-seeing eye of men like unto the "Apostle of Love" could only prove a stumbling-block—are disciples and imitators of Balaam.

The existence of this class of teachers and taught is a matter of history. The identity of the Balaamites with the Nicolaitans, associated with them in the context of the passage in the Rev. (ii. 15), may be a matter of dispute [NICOLAITANS], but there need be none with reference to the substantial identity of their habits and teaching. In practical results the *διδασχὴ Βαλαάμ* and the *δ. Νικολαιτῶν* were equally detestable.

That *διδασχὴ*, whether it came from east or west, from Samaritan or Gnostic false prophet, was simply a caricature of the truth. "You are free," was the sum of the false creed; "free from law, from sin, from subjection of any kind: use your liberty—if you will—for the practice of sin; meats offered to idols cannot harm you; sensuality cannot hurt you." This doctrine, boasting to be divinely inspired, would act mischievously in two ways: in some, it would quench religious scruples; in others, it would excite coarse passions. In times of persecution, the convert—trembling at the alternative, sacrifice or die—would gladly accept the suggestion that the former was a matter of "indifference." In a less, but equally real, degree, the same doctrine would quiet the mind of the man consciously or unconsciously eating meats already offered in heathen sacrifices. It would then be an easy step to participate in the heathen festivals, and introduce the orgies of the Bacchanalia into the Agapae of the Christian Church.

The melancholy distinction of being foremost tempters of the church of Pergamus to this offence, is coupled with the name of Balaamites. They encouraged among the Christians the practices to which the Moabites had encouraged the Israelites: they advised and introduced after the example of Balaam a false freedom—a freedom of the flesh. The *πορνεία* to which Balaam and Jezebel had incited the people of God, was not of necessity that of a lawless indiscriminate connec-

tion, but that of forming matrimonial engagements with forbidden races; it was none the less an infraction of the Mosaic law (Lev. xviii.), to be repudiated for its consequences and results. To a *πορνεύα* capable of being clothed with a kind of legitimacy, but incapable of honest and Christian results, the churches of Pergamus and Thyatira were in danger of being seduced. The abstinence recommended in the decree of the church at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), was to be wrested into tolerating *εἰδωλόθυτα* and *πορνεύα*. Men would allege themselves able to indulge their sin, and themselves continue sinless.

Such miserable imposture was denounced with an earnestness and eloquence worthy of Moses or Elijah. These "Apostles" are "liars;" "they are not Jews, but the synagogue of Satan," "their doctrine the depths of Satan:" to yield to them is to forfeit the hitherto glorious praise of "holding fast the name and not denying the faith of the Lord:" to resist them and overcome them is to be rewarded "with the food of the hidden manna, and a knowledge of the new name which no man knoweth."

For the literature upon this subject see NICOLAÏTANS. [J. M. F.]

BALANUS (BALLOIN, BALLONUS)—Sept. 3. Given in the Table of *Mart. Doneg.*, by Mar. O'Gorm., Cath. Maguire, &c. He is said by Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 602, n.⁵) to have been brother of St. Gerald (March 13), and one of the four sons of Cusperius, king of England (unknown). When Colman, bishop of Lindisfarne, resigned his see after the Synod of Whitby in 664, Balanus and his brothers accompanied him to Iona, and retired with him into Connaught in Ireland. Balanus took up his residence at Techsaxon—"the house of the Saxons," named probably from himself and brothers—in the parish of Ath-na-riogh (Athenry and diocese of Tuam). (Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 88–97; Bede, *E. H.* iii. c. 27; iv. 4.) He flourished in the close of the seventh and beginning of the eighth centuries (see Colgan's *Life of St. Gerald* (March 13) in *Acta SS.* p. 599 sq. and notes). [A. P. F.]

BALDRED (BALTHERUS), H.—March 6, A.D. 608. After the translation of St. Kentigern to the society of angels, in A.D. 530, at the reputed age of 183 [see KENTIGERN], St. Baldred who had been his suffragan, became famous in Laudonia. He betook himself to the eremitic life in remote desert places and islands of the sea, among which is one termed Bass, where he for a long time dwelt upon the memory of his model St. Kentigern, and above all meditated on the bitter passion of Christ, in fasting, and weeping, and wailing. He also taught the faith in the three parochial churches of Aldhame, Tynninghame, and Prestoun, which had been subjected to him by St. Mungo. Here he performed some miracles of healing, and according to the tradition, a rock which impeded the navigation moved beneath him to the shore. It is still called the Tumba or Scapha of St. Baldred. At length, worn out by extreme old age, he died in the house of the parish priest of Aldhame. His three churches each demanded his body; and when the people could not agree, being advised to pray to God to give them a sign, on the morrow they found three bodies laid out, each with the same exequial pomp, and each congre-

gation carried off one to its own church, where it is kept with great honour unto this day. (*Brev. Aberd.* pars hyem., fol. lxiii. and lxiv.) A similar legend as to the triplication of his body is narrated of the great Welsh saint, Thelias. (See Capgrave's *Leg. Aur.* fol. cclxxi. verso.) Two bodies of St. Patrick and of St. Monenna were also under similar circumstances produced. Camerarius, who makes the day the 29th of March, refers to John Major, *In quart. Sent. Distinct.* 10, quaest. 4, where, in treating of the Holy Eucharist, he seeks to prove, by the example of the body of St. Baldred, that the same body can be in diverse places, *simul et semel*. He is called St. Kentigern's suffragan in the Martyrology of Aberdeen, but Bower is the first to give him this title. The church of St. Baldred of Tynninghame had the right of sanctuary (charter of Malcolm the Maiden, Robertson's *Stat. Eccl. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 261). At Preston Kirk, some places adjoining the church still bear the name of the ancient tutelar saint, as Baldred's Well and Baldred's Whill, a poor or eddy in the river. (*O. S. A.* vol. xi. p. 87; *N. S. A.* vol. vi. "Haddington," pp. 21, 58.) His cave is also shown on the coast near Aldhame (Gordon's *Scottichronicon*. i. p. 52). St. Baldred appears as St. Baltherus in a *Fragmentum Historiae de Pontificibus Eboracensibus*, given in Mabillon (*Acta Sanct. Ord. Ben.* pars 2^a, p. 208), where two miracles are attributed to him. He walked on the sea like St. Peter, and obtained the pardon of the soul of a deacon, who before death had fallen into carnal sin. Simeon of Durham gives his date at A.D. 756, if he be not referring to what appears to be another Baltherus, who was anchorite of Durham, and of whom at the above date Roger Hoveden says in his Annals,—"In the same year Balthere the Anchorite, having fulfilled the life of the saints, departed to the Lord:" this last died and was buried at Lindisfarne; but after being translated to Durham cathedral, the relics were stolen along with those of Venerable Bede and others. (See Bishop Forbes, *Kal. of Scott. Saints*, pp. 273–4; Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 687, c. 64, and p. 694, n.³²; Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* Pref. pp. xxi–xxii., Alhan's ed.) Alban Butler (vol. iii. p. 55) calls Balrede immediate successor of St. Mungo, and puts his obit in A.D. 608. [A. P. F.]

BALSAMUS, a mythological name among the Spanish Priscillianists, according to Jerome [BARBELO]. It is evidently *Beel-Samin*, "the Lord of Heaven," a well-known divinity of the Phœnicians, Carthaginians, Mesopotamians, &c. See Chwolson, *Ssabier*, ii. 158 f. [H.]

BALTHERE (1) A famous anchorite who lived at Tynningham in East Lothian. He died in 756, on the 6th of March (*Sim. Dun. Chron.* ad 756, *Hist. Dun.* ii. 2). Alcuin commemorates his sanctity and his victory over evil spirits (*De Pontiff. et Sanctis Ebor.* vv. 1318–86). His church at Tynningham was destroyed by the Danes in 941 (*Sim. Dun.* ad anq.); it possessed extensive estates, which afterwards belonged to the patrimony of S. Cuthbert. Mabillon states that his name occurs in the Benedictine calendars on the 27th of November, and that his relics were removed to Durham in the 11th century (*AA. SS. O. S. B. Saec.* iii. pt. 2, 509), and refers to an article on the subject in the Bollandist

Acts, Mar. 6. (See Bishop Forbes, *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, s. v. *Baldred*.)

(2) A priest who gave eight "mansae" to Evesham soon after its foundation (*Chron. Evesham*, ed. Macray, 18). [S.]

BANBAN. In Irish hagiology there are several Banbans usually given, but two at least of these are probably the same person, Banban the Wise, attached to separate days, May 1 and 9. Colgan (in *Tr. Thaum.* p. 176, n. ⁶⁷), names four Banbans, and is of opinion that the "Mauranum cognomento Barbanum, alias Banbanum, cognatum (Sti. Patricii), Deique Prophetam fidelem" (*Vit. Trip. or Sept. Vit.* pars ii. c. xx.), to whom St. Patrick committed the "Donnach Mor," or large basilica in Magh-Sleacht, co. Cavan, was Banban the Wise, whom again, in *Quint. App. de Patr. et Gen. Sti. Patricii*, c. 4, n. ¹² (p. 229), Colgan supposes to be a son of Richella, sister of St. Patrick, as elsewhere (p. 231) he calls him "Sti. Patricii nepos seu cognatus." (*Ib. Acta SS.* p. 259, c. 3.) In the Hymn of St. Patrick given at A.D. 448 in the *Four Masters*, it is said, "His sister's son was Banban of fame," though he is not given in a similar list of the household in Colgan's *Vit. Trip.* (pars iii. c. 98); but O'Donovan adds in a note (*Four Masters* by O'Donovan, p. 139, n. ⁶) that in the copy of Flann's poem, in the Book of Lecan, the reading is "Seannan was his brother" (or cousin) "of fame," and that, as neither name has been identified with true history, it is more than probable that both owe their existence to the errors of the transcribers. In *Tr. Thaum.* (p. 176, n. ⁶⁷), he is called "presbyter;" but at May 1, the *Mart. Tallaght* calls him "bishop." There are other Banbans, such as the bishop of Leithglinn (Leighlin, county Carlow), Nov. 26; the abbot of Claeenadh (Clane, county Kildare), who died A.D. 777; another bishop, put by *Mart. Doneg.*, Mar. Gorm. &c. on Dec. 3; and a "Banbhan, son of Donnghal, of the race of Fiacha Suighdhe, son of Feidhlimidh Reachtmhar" (king of Ireland, A.D. 164-174, or, according to the *Four Masters*, 111-119). (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 176, n. ⁶⁷; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, pp. 117, 363; *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. p. 383, A.D. 777.) [A. P. F.]

BAPTISM, in the sense now given to it, expressed in the N. T. by *βάπτισμα*, not *βαπτισμός*; in Latin more commonly by *Baptismus* than by *Baptisma*. For its origin, ritual, &c., see the *Dict. of Christian Ant.* and of the *Bible*. That there was "a doctrine" respecting it, even in apostolic times, is expressly stated in Heb. vi. 2, where *βαπτισμῶν* may have been used out of consideration for Hebrew ears, or suggested by a sojourn in Italy, or perhaps is due to the abbreviated way of writing *βαπτισμάτων* in MSS. The employment of the plural name is easily explained out of the N. T. itself, where the "baptism of John" is often distinguished from that of "Christ;" and by that of Christ is meant sometimes His own death; sometimes the baptism administered by His disciples during His lifetime; sometimes the baptism administered by them after His Ascension, or handed down to His church. In dogmatizing on this last, it had of course to be distinguished from, as well as illustrated by, the others. What the apostles themselves taught about it must be gathered

from their practice no less than their words; in both of which they doubtless conformed rigidly to what they had learnt from their Lord. Between it and the baptism first instituted by Him, there were some characteristic differences, as well as some points in which they coincided. First, the matter employed was common to both. This He must have settled among the first acts of His ministry: for one of the first things His disciples seem to have been commissioned to do for Him was to baptise, and to baptise with water, like the Baptist (John iv. 1-3). As little can it be doubted but that they baptised in His name; and to this form, as we shall see, they themselves adhered probably through life; though for this form He substituted another Himself, in terminating His earthly ministry, which they passed on to His church. Again, one was designed to be provisional, the other permanent; and in the former the Holy Ghost was not received. During His lifetime we are told expressly, "the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (*Ib.* vii. 39). But, even after His Ascension, as long as baptism was administered in this form, the Holy Ghost was not imparted in it, but at times preceded (Acts x. 44-48), at times followed its reception (*Ib.* viii. 16-17). It was the not distinguishing between these two baptisms instituted by our Lord that led St. Augustine to misapply to the second the following remark which is most true of the first. "Haec distinctio inter acceptionem baptismi, et acceptionem Spiritus Sancti, satis nos instruit, ne habere nos continuo Spiritum Sanctum putemus, quos habere baptismum non negamus" (*Serm.* 269, § 2, ed. Ben.). As long as baptism continued to be administered in the "name of the Lord Jesus," it preserved its original characteristics, and this distinction existed in fact; but when baptism came to be administered in the name of the Trinity, this distinction ceased, because the Holy Ghost was bestowed ever afterwards on every recipient of baptism at the font.

When the first form was disused, we might as well attempt to define, as when the observance of the law of Moses became obsolete. Certain it is, that in the Acts of the Apostles, we never hear of the apostles themselves baptising, or indeed of anybody superior to a deacon baptising at all; or, again, of anybody being baptised in any name but that of "the Lord," or "the Lord Jesus." Baptism formed no part of the commission given to the twelve when they were first sent forth; nor, again, to the seventy who followed them (Luke ix. and x.). Even St. Paul, in admitting that he baptised some few at Corinth with his own hands, expressly says: "Christ sent me, not to baptise, but to preach" (1 Cor. i. 17). And there are numerous passages in his epistles which shew that baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus was the baptism with which he was familiar (Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. i. 13, and vi. 11; Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 11), as it was certainly the baptism he received himself (Acts xxii. 16). True, we know from St. Matthew—yet from him alone (xxviii. 19)—that baptism formed part of the commission given by our Lord to the eleven on leaving them, and was to be administered by them in the name of the Trinity. If we compared the words spoken by Him on this occasion nakedly with the words spoken by Him in

instituting His other sacrament, we might be at a loss to understand on what principle they allowed themselves so much latitude in interpreting the first, while clinging so tenaciously to the text of the last. But the first rite having been in use among them for some time, they had their previous practice to guide them, and they would naturally be for retaining all that they were not distinctly told to change. When, therefore, they continued baptising by deputy, as they had done before, we may be sure they had His leave for it; and when they continued employing the form which He had first given them, we may be sure He had trusted them with discretionary powers when it was to be disused for the second. It would naturally fall into disuse when the first of the gospels had become current; and there is positive proof that in less than 100 years from their death the second form had become law everywhere.

So much, then, for its form and matter in their hands. We must enquire further, 1, the light in which they regarded it; 2, the effects they attributed to it; 3, the conditions on which it was bestowed; and 4, the persons charged with its administration.

1. They looked upon it as a rite that had been long prefigured; the fulfilment of what had been again and again foreshadowed. According to St. Peter it had been prefigured by the deluge; by the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, according to St. Paul (1 Pet. iii. 20-22; 1 Cor. x. 2); the latter, again, drew a sharp contrast between it and circumcision (Col. iii. 10-13). Our Lord had twice spoken of His crucifixion as His impending baptism (Luke xii. 50; *comp.* Matt. xx. 22, and Mark x. 38). St. Paul taught, conformably, that all who had been "baptised into Christ,"—or, through baptism, made one with Him—had been "baptised into His death"—in other words, "buried with Him"—that, like as He was "raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so they should walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 3-6; Col. ii. 12). Christian baptism was, therefore, from his stand-point, the medium by which people were brought into living fellowship with Christ, and made veritable partakers of His death and resurrection. If it was symbolical in one sense, it was doubly real in another. If their death was a figure, their new life was a fact attested by their own consciousness. It was that second birth, of which they had heard their Lord tell mysteriously years before, "Except a man be born again—born of water and of the spirit," in other words—"he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 3-5). The paraphrase of the apostle fixed the drift of those words, and accounted simultaneously for the peremptory declaration contained in them. Everybody now recognised intuitively what was meant by the old and the new man; each discovered for himself that what the gospels had called the baptism of the Holy Ghost was a power acting upon the soul, and no dream.

Another of its features dwelt upon by St. Paul was that the gift conveyed in it was purely gratuitous; in other words, was not bestowed upon man for any merit of his own. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but, according to His mercy, He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the

Holy Ghost" (Tit. iii. 5), as it is said: while by this phrase, "the washing of regeneration," its bestowal was associated indissolubly with the baptismal rite.

A further point in his teaching—in fact, a palpable corollary from it—was that Christian baptism once received could not be repeated, though it was often administered to those who had been baptised by John. Probably John himself never baptised anybody twice. But Christian baptism had a reality, no less than a meaning, which that of John had not, being the application of the death of Christ to its recipients in each case. Consequently, there could be "no more sacrifice for sin" where that was spurned (Heb. x. 26, and vi. 4). Post-baptismal apostasy was equivalent to "crucifying the Son of God afresh." As surely there was but "one baptism," as there was but "one Lord," "one faith" (Eph. iv. 5), one sacrifice upon the cross for sin.

2. This estimate of baptism in apostolic times alone shows how real its effects were supposed to be. "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord," said Ananias to the persecutor of his brethren (Acts xxii. 16). "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God," said he to them afterwards, in describing its effects on sinners in general, which he had then tested in his own person (1 Cor. vi. 11). In other words, that they were "sanctified," or made holy; that they were "justified" or had their sins cancelled, was due to their having been "washed," that is, baptised with water, "in the name of the Lord Jesus," and made temples of "the Spirit of God." On the day of Pentecost, after St. Peter had finished his sermon, the multitude, "being pricked in their heart," said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter, as their spokesman, replied unhesitatingly, "Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 37-8). As there is no limitation expressed or implied in these passages, it is clear that the remission of all sins is contemplated, and consequently that each recipient of baptism went up from the font sinless—as sinless as Adam and Eve were before they began life; as competent to abstain from sin as they were before they fell. This, indeed, on the face of it, implied that the future was left in his own hands; yet certainly the hope—the confident hope—was in those days that nobody who had once "put on the Lord Jesus" would ever put Him off. It then seemed a moral impossibility that any should. "He cannot sin, because he is born of God," says St. John (1 John iii. 9). If he did, another passage seems to say, there was no hope for him. "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost . . . if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance" (Heb. vi. 4-6). But these passages must be read side by side with the countless, and almost passionate, exhortations addressed by every apostle whose words are preserved, to Christians to do well, to be true to their calling, to flee lusts, to repent, to recover themselves, which would all

be meaningless, if there were no such thing as post-baptismal sin, "no place of repentance" for post-baptismal sinners. "Confess your faults one to another," says St. James, "and pray that ye may be healed" (v. 16). Could this have been said by one who considered baptised Christians beyond sinning? "Lest when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness which they have committed" (2 Cor. xii. 21). How could St. Paul have written this had he held that post-baptismal sinners would repent in vain?

3. It followed from hence logically that the effects of baptism, notwithstanding the reality of the grace bestowed in it, and its power for good at all times as designed by God, were liable in practice to be modified by man, according to his dispositions in receiving it and turning it to account through life. The grace given to him, instead of coercing his will, was efficacious only so far as he co-operated with it, or allowed it free course, and no further. The moment it was opposed or slighted it became inoperative, and unless he repented and supplicated for its return in earnest it died out, leaving him in a far worse state than if it had never been received. This was no new experience for the apostles. Their Lord, who had just left them, they knew to have been true man as well as true God. Yet, though He had walked about among them for years, He had been rejected by the majority by far, even of those who had seen His miracles. Notwithstanding, His human nature was just as much a reality when His hands and feet were nailed rudely to the cross, as when the hem of His garment was touched in faith. In the same way, baptism was not a sham, because there were many Judases who received it. If God were not true to His engagement in every case, how could man ever be proved false to his? The apostles, when they dilated on the glorious privileges it conveyed, were not unmindful of the conditions it involved to be received with profit. "Repent, and be baptised," said St. Peter (Acts ii. 38). Repent first. And what was the repentance denoted by the word then used by him (*μετανοεῖν*) but a *changed mind*, not a temporary feeling or flow of tears? If it never amounted to this, or if it ever relapsed, there was a proportionable eclipse of grace. Thus it was a life-long condition. Again, when the eunuch asked Philip, "See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptised?" "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest," was the reply. These words may not be found in some MSS.; but they are certainly *not* the gloss of a *later* age, as Alford thinks (on Acts viii. 37). A *later* age would not have been satisfied with so short a profession. Here, then, is another condition, namely faith; and this had not merely to be life-long but to be increased (Luke xvii. 5; comp. 2 Pet. i. 5) and was a complex term. For to be saving it had to work by love (Gal. v. 6): and love was the fulfilling of the entire law (Rom. xiii. 10). God did His part invariably; but if man ever failed in doing his, what he received was as good as lost in this world, and certain to tell against him in the next. The apostles leave us in no doubt that they knew this only too well. "We, then, as workers

together with Him, beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain" (2 Cor. vi. 1); says one: "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" (James iv. 17): says another. "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" (1 Pet. iv. 18) asks a third, which the first illustrates by a simile, and then answers reluctantly, "Whose end is to be burned" (Heb. vi. 8).

4. It was from an overwhelming sense, doubtless, both of the grace bestowed in baptism, and of the "necessity" laid on them of providing that "every creature" should have the offer of it, that the apostles employed others to baptise for them, as has been said; indeed, if we went back a point further on that head, we should find that those who baptised for Christ originally must have been laymen, for the apostles themselves were not ordained then. In the same way deacons must have been allowed subsequently to administer baptism almost as soon as they were ordained. For unless the Philip who baptised the eunuch was the deacon, not the apostle Philip, why should the apostles have sent Peter and John down from Jerusalem (Acts viii. 5-17 and 38) to impart to his earlier converts what he could not? Still even this shews there was a complement to it, which they retained in their own hands. "Remission of sins" is distinctly said to have been conveyed by the baptism which was then in use; but "the gift of the Holy Ghost" is as distinctly said *not*. This the baptised are recorded to have received subsequently by the laying on of the hands of the apostles, and visible manifestations of it in each case followed (Acts viii. 18, and xix. 6). These last passed away with the apostolic age, and then another change took place, which is partly theological and partly practical. We learn from Acts v. 14, that multitudes of both sexes—women as well as men—"were added to the Lord" thus early, but there is no reference to children, express or implied, as yet. In 1 Cor. vii. 14, however, we are apprised incidentally that infant baptism was then practised. This admits of no doubt. The apostle is contemplating mixed marriages that had been blessed in their results, and he reasons as follows:—"The unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife," and *vice versa*. The proof of this is, that, if it were not so, "your children would have been unclean," *i. e.*, have remained unbaptised; "but now they are holy," *i. e.*, have been baptised. The words "unclean" and "holy" cannot, in the original, mean anything else. But there are other passages which are still more conclusive—"Children, obey your parents in the Lord" (Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20). Nobody would think of contending that any children but such as had been made Christians are addressed.

It was this circumstance, doubtless, which led to a continuation of the apostolic custom of laying hands on the baptised by the successors of the apostles. This, under other circumstances, might have seemed a blind following of the apostles, and an empty form. For, after baptism had come to be administered in the name of the Trinity, and the Holy Ghost, in consequence, to be given at the font itself, why should there have been any subsequent imposition of hands, had the majority of those who were brought to

the font been always adults? But from the time that infant baptism became a custom, it must have been felt at once that the majority brought thither, being such as could not answer for themselves, might reasonably continue to receive imposition of hands from the heads of the church as before, though not on the same grounds as before, nor yet as soon. For, if it was no longer their first introduction to the gift itself, it would nevertheless serve to remind them of the presence of the gift within them, and of their consequent obligations, at the earliest age they could be supposed capable of appreciating either. Infant baptism in this way supplied grounds for the ceremony which we call confirmation; but this should not lead us to confuse two things, in other words, prevent our recognising that the apostles laid their hands on the baptised for one purpose, and their successors for another.

II. If we turn from the teaching of the apostles to that of the fathers, we shall find the identity between them so strong, as almost to lay us open to a charge of tautology for epitomising both. We must, therefore, be brief in our citations from the fathers, where there is nothing distinctive to remark upon. First of all, there was but one opinion among them about the form and matter of the rite, then obligatory. St. Justin says: "Whosoever are persuaded and believe that the things said and taught by us are true, and promise to the best of their ability to live thus, are taught to pray and ask with fasting from God the remission of their past sins, all of us praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us to where there is water: and that they may be regenerated in the same way in which we ourselves were regenerated, they are forthwith washed in the water, in the name of the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus, and of the Holy Ghost" (*Apol.* i. 61). "The law of baptising has been imposed and the form prescribed," says Tertullian: "Go teach the nations," said He, "baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (*De Bapt.* c. 13). "Such," he says in another place, was "the command given by Christ to the eleven, in returning to His Father, after His resurrection" (*De Praescrip.* c. 20). Origen on the Romans still more decisively (v. 8): "You may ask this also, perchance: why, when our Lord bade His disciples baptise all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the apostle should, in referring to baptism, have made mention of the name of Christ alone in this place, where he says: 'As many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ,' &c. For, unquestionably, no baptism is accounted valid, except in the name of the Trinity." On the remaining four points they were not less explicit: and substantially, not less unanimous. All of them followed the apostles in recognising types of baptism in the O. T., even if they pushed this now and then too far. "Noah," says St. Clement, "by his ministry preached regeneration to the world" (*Ep.* i. 9). "When the elements of the world had been ordained," says Tertullian, "and inhabitants had to be given to it, it was water that was first commanded to bring forth creatures endued with life. Water was the first to bring forth animals,

in order that it might be no new thing in baptism for water to have life-giving properties" (*De Bapt.* c. 3). "Is any perplexed," says St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 76, ad fin. Ed. Ben.), "because some who are baptised when sick, are still assailed by unclean spirits, let him know that the pertinacious wickedness of the devil has power up to the saving water, but in baptism it loses all its venomous influence—a type whereof we see in king Pharaoh, who, long struggling and treacherously delaying, could resist and prevail till he came to the water: but having come thither, was conquered and destroyed. That sea the apostle Paul declares to be the mysterious image of our baptism (1 Cor. x. 1-2)." "And we," says St. Justin, "who have come to God by Christ, have received, not that circumcision which is according to the flesh, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and his companions kept, but which we who were born sinners have received, by the mercy of God, through baptism, and which all may receive thus" (*Dial.* c. *Tryph.* c. 43). A vast collection of passages carefully translated, and quoted at length, on this head may be seen in Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism (No. 67 of *Tracts for the Times*) p. 301 and onwards, in which the meaning of every type, rite, and prophecy bearing upon baptism in the O. T. is exhausted, and many sayings of our Lord in the N. explained. His own baptism similarly received abundant comment, illustrating its significance from the literal account given of it in the gospels alone. Thus "Jesus," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "sanctified baptism, when He was baptised Himself. He was baptised, though sinless, that He might bestow grace and worth on those who receive baptism" (*Cat.* iii. 11). "St. Luke," says St. Augustine, "first records the baptism of our Lord, and then traces His pedigree: making seventy-seven generations between Him and God, through Adam—in other words, symbolising by this number, the abolition of all sins in baptism. Not that there was anything in Him to be removed by baptism: but that He condescended in His own Person to show the benefit that we should gain by it—and though it was the baptism of John that He received, yet in His case it was accompanied by a sensible revelation of the Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, thus consecrating the baptism of Christ Himself, in which Christians were to be baptised subsequently—the Father, in the voice that was heard from heaven; the Son in the Man-Mediator; the Holy Spirit in the dove" (*Serm.* li. § 33, Ed. Ben.).

As to the light in which they regarded baptism themselves, there is probably no subject on which they kept closer to Scripture. They called it "the bath, the holy bath, regeneration, second birth, illumination, God's mark, or seal." "Before a man receives the name of the Son or God," says St. Hermas (iii. 9, 16), "he is doomed to death: but on receiving that seal, he is freed from death, and consigned to life. But that seal is the water, in which men descend that are due to death: and out of which they ascend handed over to life. To them, therefore, was that seal preached: and by using it, they enter into the kingdom of God." Then follows a digression on the apostles, whose preaching it was. "That was rightly said by the Shepherd," says St.

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. circa med.), in reproducing the whole passage. St. Irenaeus (iii. 17) in the same way speaks of our Lord "giving His disciples the power of regeneration, when He bade them go and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." "Happy the Sacrament of water," says Tertullian, "which is ours, and in which the ill effects of our original blindness having been washed away, we are set free for eternal life. . . . True to our prototype, Jesus Christ, whose name is *Ἰησούς*, we that are named after Him are born in water, and cannot otherwise live than by remaining in it" (*De Bapt.* c. 1). "Let us therefore," says St. Cyprian (*De Zelo et Liv.* c. 8), after quoting Col. iii. 1-6, "who, according to the carnal sins of the old man, have both died, and are buried in baptism, and who have risen together with Christ in heavenly regeneration, let us both think and do the things which are of Christ as the same apostle again teaches and admonishes (1 Cor. xv. 47-9)." "On entering the baptistery," says St. Cyril (*Cat.* xx. 2), "you put off your garments—a type of the old man which you have put off also. Stripped of your garments, you were naked, imitating Christ on the Cross: Who thus 'having spoiled principalities, made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.' Afterwards, you were brought to the font, as Christ was from the cross to the sepulchre. There, each one was asked if he believed on the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Then, having made this salutary confession, you went down into the water thrice, and came out again: thus symbolising in figure the days passed by Christ in the grave." The difficulty, in extracting such passages, is where to stop. Equally striking is the incorporation, which Dr. Pusey fills pages in shewing (p. 35 *et seq.* and p. 58 *et seq.*), of those texts, John iii. 3 and Tit. iii. 5, into "every baptismal Liturgy, from Britain to India." That there was but one baptism is a further point which the fathers were unanimous in insisting upon: so much so, that a profession to that effect was at length inserted in the creed of the church. Hence, in affirming that the baptism of blood, or martyrdom—the baptism with which our Lord was baptised after that of John, as Tertullian says (*De Bapt.* c. 16)—was of equal, if not superior, efficacy to that of water, they did not mean that when baptised Christians were martyred, they were rebaptised: but only that those who were martyred, if they had not been baptised previously, were baptised then. In the same way, there was no real difference in principle between those who were for baptising heretics coming over to the church, and those who were for receiving them with imposition of hands only. Firmilian vindicated his practice from custom, as well as pope Stephen (ap. S. *Cypr.* Ep. 75; comp. what Dionysius of Alexandria says in Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 7). St. Cyprian and the Easterns who supported him held that baptism administered by heretics was no baptism at all: consequently, that there was no question of re-baptising them, when that rite was administered to them for the first time in the church. Any that had been baptised in the church, he says, in express terms, he never received otherwise than by imposition of hands, did they fall away and return (*Ep.* 74, ad fin.).

Firmilian (*Ep.* 75) seems to have been peculiar in baptising those who had received baptism from regularly consecrated bishops, become heretics. But this was exceptional to the question then at issue, which was, whether heretics coming over to the church, who had never been in the church before, were to be baptised or not. "Some of my colleagues," he says, "unaccountably suppose that heretics ought not to be baptised: because, say they, there is but one baptism. Now, why is there but one, except because the church is one: and there can be no baptism outside the church? (*Ep.* 71). . . . If you grant that heretics can baptise," he says in another place, "you cannot deny there are as many churches as heresies" (*Ep.* 76). He argued, in general, from the unity of the church, and from that alone. Had it been the eucharist, instead of the baptism of heretics that was being discussed, his opponents would have agreed with him to a man. Even St. Augustine (*De Bapt. c. Don.* i. 15-18, and iv. 23 *et seq.*), the most outspoken of them all, maintained that heretical baptism, though valid, carried with it no remission of sins, nor had any saving efficacy whatever, till its recipients joined the church. For some reason or other, the tendency from apostolic times downwards has been to minimise restrictions both in administering and receiving baptism, and to multiply them in administering and receiving the eucharist. As anybody might receive baptism, anybody might confer it. Anybody might be the means of bringing anybody to Christ. Lay-baptism, as has been pointed out, would seem to have been authorised by our Lord Himself; deacon-baptism by His apostles. In the same way, according to the teaching of the fathers, to which we shall return again, anybody might baptise. They were led to say this on the same principle that they administered baptism to infants: namely, from the sense they entertained of its overwhelming necessity to salvation—a necessity which they were unanimous in finding laid down in those words of our Lord which St. John records, and in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans—overwhelming, indeed, yet not absolute. St. Augustine may suffice to be cited on both points. "Hear the gospel," he says (*Serm.* cxciv. 8 and 16), "you that are for sending unbaptised infants into the kingdom of heaven—hear the gospel: 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' It is the Lord who speaks thus: whom nobody resists, but he that is no Christian. . . . Wherefore let no man deceive us. The Scripture is of the clearest: the authority of the highest; the faith most catholic. Everybody that is born is condemned: nobody save the regenerated is set free." Further on, he quotes St. Cyprian in his favour, as follows:—"Moreover, if the greatest of sinners may obtain remission of their worst sins on believing, and baptism and grace are denied to none, how much less ought it to be denied to the infant, who, just born, has never sinned, except that he has inherited the contagion of the old death transmitted to him from Adam, through his birth according to the flesh; and who therefore may come with all the more assurance to receive remission of sins, as the sins which are forgiven him are not his own" (§ 19, and St. *Cypr.* Ep. 59). That infant baptism was

not unknown in apostolic times has been already shown; and it was current in the next age, as the following passage from St. Irenaeus proves:—"Christ came to save all through Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again unto God: infants, and young children, boys, youths, and elders" (*Haer.* ii. 22). Origen also says:—"By the sacrament of baptism, the uncleanness of our birth is put away, and therefore infants are baptised" (*Hom.* xix. in *St. Luc.*). Yet, even then, we find Tertullian (*De Bapt.* c. 18) debating whether infants might not have their baptism deferred advantageously till they grew up. "Quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissionem peccatorum?" is his terse remark: and from this letter of St. Cyprian we see that it was a moot point still. Only, let us remember, that the question, as it was then argued, had a twofold aspect and a twofold application—a twofold aspect: as it was influenced 1. by the stern notions then prevalent on the subject of post-baptismal sin; and 2. by the completeness of the remission of all sins whatsoever, which everybody believed was obtained at the font;—a twofold application: as it was argued in the interest of adults as well as infants. Constantine the Great, it is well known, deferred his baptism to his dying day. There were numbers who were for imitating him in the days of St. Chrysostom. "Now should it happen," he says, "that death coming upon us unexpectedly, which God forbid, we depart hence uninitiated, no matter how many good things we may have acquired, there will be nothing in store for us, save gehenna and the venomous worm: the fire unquenchable, and chains insoluble" (*Hom.* in *Joh.* xxv. 3; comp. *ib.* xviii. 1). But it is just here that St. Augustine comes in again, taking his text, as before, from St. Cyprian. "That martyrdom is sometimes a substitute for baptism, the same blessed Cyprian showed abundantly from the case of the unbaptised robber, to whom it was said: 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise': and from constant reflection on whose circumstances I have learnt myself, not only that suffering for Christ's sake may compensate for the defect of baptism, but that faith and conversion of heart also may, where there has not been sufficient time for administering the baptismal rite. For this robber was crucified, not for Christ's sake, but for his own crimes. Nor was it that he suffered because he believed; but that he believed whilst he suffered. Thus it has been made plain to us through this robber, of what force that saying of the apostle:—'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation'—is, even where the visible sacrament of baptism cannot be had. But this is then made good to us invisibly, when what has precluded its administration has been the dictation of necessity, not any scorn of religion" (*De Bapt.* c. Don. iv. 29).

This extract alone shows how far he was from considering baptism absolutely necessary to salvation even in Christian lands, where people were not deprived of it by their own negligence, but by circumstances beyond their control. Nor must it be forgotten that he said this, with his view bounded by the horizon of the Roman empire. Can we suppose that he would have stopped there, had his range been enlarged and his eyes

opened to the countless millions outside that circle, to whom, fifteen centuries from his own time, the glorious gospel is not yet known, simply because it has not yet been preached? His answer to the second question of Deogratias, in point of fact, covers their case (*Ep.* 102).

It was due to his logic, rather than to his circumstances, perhaps, that he was oppressed with difficulties about unbaptised infants. This, in his own words, was his position. He was convinced that man had fallen into sin of his own free will, and from no fault of God, nor any supposed necessity whatsoever. He was equally convinced he could not be freed from the effects of his sin by any power or act of his own, but only by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, the indispensable Mediator between God and man. He held, therefore, that whosoever departed this life, young or old, without the grace of Christ and without His sacrament, was gone to be punished; and at the judgment-day would rise with his body to be punished further (*Ep.* 166, § 5). Infants, who died never having done good or evil, would, if they had not been baptised previously, be condemned for original sin, but for that alone. Thus their punishment would be the lightest conceivable, though they would be excluded from heaven (*Ep.* 215, § 1).

It was due to his circumstances rather than to his logic, that while maintaining heretical baptism to be valid, he disowned its having any saving efficacy. For as yet there were no heresies old enough to have produced generation after generation of unconscious heretics; as yet the external unity of the Church had known no breach. What St. Augustine wrote was sure to be widely read and long and largely followed: still on both points his judgment has been since modified. Church legislation, indeed, has not been so clear on the latter point as it might have been. The 8th canon of the first council of Arles reads much too pronounced to be genuine. For the 19th of the Nicene canons merely decides against the baptism of the followers of Paul of Samosata: and the 7th of the Constantinopolitan canons—if it was really passed then (*Beveridge's Synod. ad l.*)—enumerates the heretical baptisms which it allows, and those which it denies as void. Gradually the rule observed in the West, whether it originated at Arles or not, was, that baptism administered with water in the name of the Trinity, no matter by whom, was true baptism: and that all heretics, so baptised, were to be received with imposition of hands alone. The Eastern rule differed only from this in maintaining that a wrong belief in the Trinity vitiated baptism, even when conferred in their name. Finally, Novatian having denied that those who lapsed or betrayed their faith to escape persecution could ever afterwards be restored to communion, this point was decided in their favour by the church at large, and his view of it having been adjudged heretical, a system of canonical penance was elaborated, as time went on, for all other forms of post-baptismal sin.

Similarly, there was nothing in the teaching of the fathers on the effects of baptism, but what was at once Scriptural and practical. They were faithful exponents both of the power of baptism as ordained by God, and of its actual issues, as received by man. "For me," says St. Cyprian of himself, "while I yet lay in darkness

and bewildering night, and was tossed to and fro on the billows of this troublesome world, ignorant of my true life, an outcast from light and truth, I used to think that second birth, which divine mercy promised for my salvation, a hard saying according to the life I then led: as if a man could be so quickened to a new life in the laver of healing water, as to put off his natural self, and keep his former tabernacle, yet be changed in heart and soul! How is it possible, said I, for so great a conversion to be accomplished? Such were my frequent musings. for whereas I was encumbered with the many sins of my past life, which it seemed impossible to be rid of, so I had used myself to give way to my clinging infirmities, and from despair of better things, to humour the evils of my heart, as slaves born in my house, and my proper offspring. But after that life-giving water succoured me, washing away the stain of former years, and pouring into my cleansed and hallowed breast the light which comes from heaven, after that I drank in the heavenly Spirit, and was created into a new man by a second birth, then marvellously what was before doubtful became plain to me; what was hidden was revealed; what was dark began to shine; what was before difficult now had a way and means; what had seemed impossible could be now achieved; what was in me of the guilty flesh now confessed that it was earthy; what was quickened in me by the Holy Ghost now had a growth according to God" (*De Grat. ad Don.* § 2, Oxford Tr.). This was his own case: but there were cases widely different from his. "Plainly, the same spiritual grace which is equally received in baptism by believers, is afterwards diminished or increased by our act and conversation: just as the seed which the sower went out to sow in the gospel was equally sown: but according to the varieties of soil on which it fell, some came to nothing, some yielded fruit that sprang up, and increased thirty, or sixty, or a hundred-fold," as he says elsewhere (*Ep.* 76). "He who has not been baptised," says St. Basil, "has not been illuminated. Without light the eye cannot discern the objects belonging to it, nor the soul attain to the contemplation of God Singularly akin to baptism is Easter-day: for on that day we commemorate the resurrection, and in baptism, there is the power of rising. Let us, therefore, on the day of the resurrection receive this power" (*Hom. de Div.* xiii. § 1). "Whence are we Christians," he asks in another place (*De Sp. S.* c. 10, and comp. the five following), "by faith, perchance some one will reply. But in what way? Having been regenerated by the grace conferred in baptism? Assuredly: for how else? If, therefore, baptism was to me the beginning of life, and that day of regeneration the first of days, it is clear that word must be the dearest of all to me which I pronounced then," viz. the profession he made. St. Chrysostom, whom we might expect more fervid, is even more practical. "Having, then, been counted worthy of these mysteries," as he says in one place, "let us exhibit a life worthy of the gift—a blameless conversation" (*Hom.* xxv. § 3). And again (*De Comp. ad Dem.* i. 8): "You, when you were baptised, obtained divine grace, and were made partaker of the Spirit, it may be, not to the extent of enabling

you to work miracles, but amply sufficient to enable you to lead an upright and correct life: so that it is due to our own carelessness when we go astray. Further, Christ is not going to bestow rewards on those who have merely worked miracles, but on those who have kept His commandments. Those who lead a virtuous life, not those who work miracles, have places assigned them amongst His beatitudes."

To the same effect, others who are less known—St. Chromatius (*Tract. in St. Matth.* i.), for instance—"Christ's baptism is the washing away of our sins, and the renewal of a saving life. Hear the apostle proving this (*Gal.* iii. 27 and *Rom.* vi. 4). By baptism, therefore, we are dead to sin, but live to Christ. We are buried to our former life, but raised to our new life. We have put off the errors of the old man, and put on the garments of the new man." And St. Gaudentius (*Serm.* viii.)—whose turn of mind on ritual was almost medieval:—"Let the home of a Christian and baptised man be closed to the devil: let it be thoroughly humanised and hospitable. Let it be sanctified by continual prayer. Let psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs be in frequent use there. Let the word of God and the sign of Christ be in its heart, on its lips, and on its brow: in drinking, in conversation, in ablutions, in bed; in going out, in coming in; in joy and in sorrow: that according to the teaching of the blessed Paul, whether ye eat, drink, or do anything whatever, you may do all in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath called us unto grace." Finally, Leidrad, bishop of Lyons at the end of the 8th century (*De Bapt.* c. 6): "A man is restored by baptism to the pristine condition of the first man before the fall: yet not so, that after baptism, he may consider himself secure while he lives. For he has a struggle to support all his life, with the ruler of wickedness, the devil" . . .

It was plainly no part of their teaching that the grace bestowed in baptism included immunity from sin in future, or was irresistible or indefectible. According to St. Augustine, the whole church was committed to a daily confession of sins in the Lord's Prayer (*Serm.* 181, § 6 *et seq.*).

It has been pointed out already, that our Lord in parting from His apostles commissioned them to baptise. Thus they, in strictness, received the charge, though they performed it through others. This explains the theory that has been maintained ever since. "Without the bishop," says St. Ignatius (*Ad Smyrn.* § 8), "it is neither lawful to baptise, nor celebrate the love-feast." And Tertullian—as if bent on expanding his meaning (*De Bapt.* c. 17)—"The chief priest, who is the bishop, has the power of giving baptism: and after him, presbyters and deacons, yet not without his authority, for the honour of the church, which must be maintained, to maintain peace. Otherwise laymen have the right as well The word of God," he continues, "ought not to be hidden from any. Wherefore baptism, which is equally derived from God, may be administered by all. Only laymen should consider themselves all the more bound to act with moderation in this matter, seeing that their superiors are similarly bound, lest they should usurp what has been set apart to the bishop . . .

... In other words, they should be content to act in emergencies, whenever the conditions of time, place, or person are imperative." St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* xvii. 35), and St. Jerome (*Adv. Lucif.* § 9), simply repeat this passage. St. Augustine, when he speaks to the point (*Cont. Ep. Parm.* ii. 29), is more reserved; but when, arguing against the Donatists in general, he says (*De Bapt. c. Don.* v. 14): "Per quemlibet enim ministrum detur, Illius est baptismus de quo dicitur: 'Hic est qui baptizat' ". . . . he concedes all. St. Ildefonse, bishop of Toledo in the 7th century, whose work is a mosaic of quotations mostly from St. Augustine, speaks to the same effect as Tertullian (*De Cogn. Bapt.* c. 116).

Little more need be said than that the treatises of St. Ildefonse in the 7th, and of Leidrad in the 8th century, prove that the teaching on baptism in their day was not to be distinguished from that of the fathers, save that, perhaps, the instruction on the creed given to catechumens was becoming more and more dogmatic, and had proportionably more stress laid on it. St. Nicetas, in the 5th century, closed his explanation of it by bidding his hearers: "Remember the covenant which they had made with the Lord, viz. the creed which they had confessed before angels and men. And whether they sat, worked, slept, or watched, they were to be turning over this salutary confession in their hearts" (*Exp. Symb. ad fin.*). The work of St. Ildefonse seems put together, in short, on the assumption that every candidate for baptism should be well acquainted with dogma. There are some passages in it besides on miraculous fonts, which show that superstition was creeping in (c. 105-6).

But both his work, and that of Leidrad, end with a short account of the eucharist, on the unimpeachable principle, "Quod oportet renovatos per baptismum mensae Dominicae applicari." And an apposite quotation is given by the latter (c. 9) from St. Augustine, which may well be transcribed, as it stands, to conclude the subject. "Optimè Punici Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam salutem: et sacramentum Corporis Christi nihil aliud quam vitam vocant. Unde? nisi ex antiqua, et existimo, et Apostolica traditione, quā Ecclesiae Christi insitum tenent, praeter baptismum et participationem mensae Dominicae, non solum ad regnum Dei, sed nec ad salutem et vitam aeternam posse quinquam hominem pervenire. Hoc enim et Scriptura testatur, secundum ea quae supra diximus. Nam quid aliud tenent, qui baptismum nomine salutis appellant, nisi quod dictum est: 'Salvos nos fecit per lavacrum regenerationis': et quod Petrus ait 'Sic et vos simili formā baptismi salvos facit.' Quid aliud etiam, qui sacramentum mensae Dominicae vitam vocant, nisi quod dictum est: 'Ego sum panis vivus, Qui de caelo descendi': et 'Panis quem Ego dederō, caro mea est pro saeculi vitā': et 'Si non manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis' ". . . . (*De pecc. mer. et rem.* i. 34).

There have been numberless works written on baptism, controversial as well as didactic, but only those which embody the mind of the first eight centuries of the church are to our purpose. Among these may be named Wall on *Infant Baptism*, Bingham on *Lay Baptism*, and the

learned Editor of the *Library of the Fathers*, in a note to Tertullian, on heretical baptism. No. 67 of the *Tracts for the Times*, and Wilberforce on *Baptism* exhaust the general subject.

[E. S. Ff.]

BARACHUS, Bishop of Bacatha, or Metrocome, in Palaestina Tertia, in the middle of the 4th century. When Justinian at the request of St. Sabas erected a church at Jerusalem in honour of the blessed Virgin, Barachus was made superintendent of the works. Cyril. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sabae*, No. 73. In 536 he attended the council held at Jerusalem against Anthimus and the Monophysites. Labbe, *Council.* v. 268.

[E. V.]

BARADATUS (VARADATUS), a celebrated hermit near Antioch, in the 5th century. After many years of utter seclusion in a cell so small that he could neither stand nor lie in it, he was at last induced by Theodotus the bishop of Antioch to come forth. He appeared wrapped in skins from head to foot, with the exception of his mouth and nostrils. Among other eminent monks and hermits, he was consulted by the emperor Leo after the Council of Chalcedon (*Theod. Phil.* 27; *Evag. Hist.* ii. 9; *Niceph. Hist.* xv. 22; *Assem. Biblioth. Orient.* c. cix.)

[J. G. S.]

BARAEAS (*Bapalas*), mentioned as one of Manes' disciples in the Greek form of abjuration (ap. Cotelier, *Patres Apost.* i. 545).

[E. B. C.]

BARBELITAE, one of the names given to certain Ophitic Gnostics (*Epiph.* i. 85 B), taken from BARBELO, a personage in their mythology. Theodoret (*H. F.* i. 13) calls them *Barbeliotae*, apparently on no independent authority. The common text of Irenaeus (p. 107) speaks of *multitudo Gnosticorum Barbelo*; but Mr. Harvey reasonably suggests that *Barbelo* came in from the margin. This sentence refers to a "multitude" of heretics, "some" only of whom are said in the next sentence to have "imagined" (*ὁπνευτο*) Barbelo. [BORBORIANI.]

[H.]

BARBELO (*Βαρβηλώ* Iren., *Epiph.*, *Philast.*, *Pist. Soph.*, *Hier.*; -*ρώ* *Epiph.* as an alternative, 92 A, and similarly the Epitome, p. 354 Dind.; -*λ*, *Epit. l. c. bis*; -*λώθ* Theodoret), a mythological personage in several forms of Ophitic Gnosticism. She is obscurely described by Irenaeus (p. 107) as "a never-aging aeon in a virginal spirit," to whom, according to certain "Gnostici," the Innominate Father wished to manifest Himself, and who, when four successive beings, whose names express thought and life, had come forth from Him, was quickened with joy at the sight, and herself gave birth to three (or four) other like beings. She is noticed in several neighbouring passages of Epiphanius, who in part must be following the Compendium of Hippolytus, as is shown by comparison with Philaster (c. 33), but also speaks from personal knowledge of the Ophitic sects specially called "Gnostici" (i. 100 f.). The first passage is in the article on the Nicolaitans (i. 77 f.), but is apparently an anticipatory reference to their alleged descendants the "Gnostici" (77 A; *Philast.*). According to their view Barbelo lives "above in the eighth heaven;" she had been 'put forth' (*προβεβλήσθαι*) "of the Father;" she was mother of Jaldabaoth (some said, of Sabaoth), who insolently took possession of the

seventh heaven, and proclaimed himself to be the only God; and when she heard this word she lamented. She was always appearing to the Archons in a beautiful form, that by beguiling them she might gather up her own scattered power. Others, Epiphanius further seems to say (78 f.), told a similar tale of Pruniceus, substituting Caulacau for Jaldabaoth. In his next article, on the "Gnostici" (83 CD), the idea of the recovery of the scattered powers of Barbelo, "the Mother above," stolen from her by "the Archon who made the world, and the other gods and angels and daemons who were along with him," recurs as set forth in an apocryphal Book of Noria, Noah's legendary wife. In both places Epiphanius represents the doctrine as giving rise to abominable immorality. In a third passage (91 f.), enumerating the Archons said to have their seat in each heaven, he mentions as the inhabitants of the eighth or highest heaven "her who is called Barbelo," and the self-gendered Father and Lord of all things, and the virgin-born (αὐτολόχευτον) Christ (evidently as her son, for, according to Irenaeus her first progeny, "the Light," was called Christ); and similarly he tells how the ascent of souls through the different heavens terminated in the upper region, "where Barbero or Barbelo is, the Mother of the Living" (Gen. ii. 20). Theodoret (*H. F.* f. 13) merely paraphrases Irenaeus, with a few words from Epiphanius. In the *Pistis Sophia* Barbelo is named often, but her place is not clearly defined (cf. Köstlin in Baur and Zeller's *Jahrbücher* for 1854, p. 61). She is one of the gods (p. 359), "a great power of the Invisible God" (373), joined with Him and the three "Thrice-powerful deities" (379), the mother of Pistis Sophia (361) and of other beings (49); from her Jesus received His "garment of light" or heavenly body (13, 128; cf. 116, 121); the earth apparently is the "matter of Barbelo" (128) or the "place of Barbelo" (373). Jerome several times includes *Barbelo* in lists of portentous names current in Spanish heresy, that is, among Priscillianists; *Balsamus* and *Leusibora* being three times associated with it (*Ep.* 75 c. 3, p. 453 c. Vall.; *c. Vigil.* p. 393 A; in *Esai.* lxi. 4 p. 361 c; in *Amos* iii. 9 p. 257 E).

Barbelo doubtless represents one of the various attempts to imagine a supreme female principle, the single passive antecedent of creation in its manifoldness. The only plausible etymology of the name that has been proposed is that of Harvey (on Irenaeus, l. c.), and Lipsius (*Gnosticismus*, p. 115; *Ophit. Syst.* in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1863, p. 445), *Barba-Elo*, *The Deity in Four*, with reference to the tetrad (sufficiently ill defined in our present text, at least), which by the report of Irenaeus proceeds from her. Her relation to this tetrad bears however no true analogy to the *Col-Arba* of Marcus [COLAR-BASUS]; it forms only the earliest group of her progeny; and it is mentioned but once. The root *balbēl*, much used in the Targums (Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* 309), in biblical Hebrew *balal*, signifying mixture or confusion, suggests a better derivation for *Barbelo*, as denoting the chaotic germ of various and discrete existence: the change from *l* to *r* is common enough, and may be seen in the alternative form *BapBmpō*. If the BABEL of Justinus (Hipp. *Haer.* v. 26; x. 15) is identical

with Barbelo, as is at least possible, this derivation becomes still more probable. [H.]

BARCABBAS and BARCOPH. Agrippa Castor, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 7. 7), stated that BASILIDES "named as prophets to himself Barcabbas and Barcoph, providing himself likewise with certain other [?] prophets" who had no existence, and that he bestowed upon them barbarous appellations to strike amazement into those who have an awe of such things." In Latin transcripts of this passage (*Ruf. l. c.*; *Hier. de Vir. Ill.* 21; cf. Routh, *R. S.* i. 90) the names appear variously in the MSS. as *Barchabas*, *Barchabbas*, *Barcabas*, and *Barchob*, *Barcob*, *Barchabos*, *Barcho*, *Barchon*, &c. Each name virtually recurs elsewhere. According to Epiphanius (i. 83 CD) some of the Ophitic heretics whom he calls "Gnostici" appealed to a certain prophet called Barcabbas, and quoted from him a "foul narrative" (διήγησιν αἰσχράν), the purport of which may have been immoral, but may also, to judge from his language, have been only directed against the doctrine of virginity. Clement of Alexandria quotes books written by Isidore, the son and disciple of Basilides (*Strom.* vi. 767), which were "expositions of the prophet Parchor." Lastly, Terebinthus or Buddas, the predecessor of Mani according to the story, and heir of Scythianus's books of magic, conversed, we are told, in Persia with the priests of Mithras, and "disputed about the two principles with a certain Parcus and Labdacus," who apparently were of their number (*Epiph.* i. 621 A; *Acta Arch. et Man.* 52 p. 188 Routh), Labdacus being in one account called a son of Mithras (*Act. Arch.*): it seems not unlikely here that in the dative Πάρκω we have a corruption of Παρκώρ or Παρκῶφ but it is as old as the Latin version of the Acts. There can be no reasonable doubt that the names *Barcoph* and *Parchor* are identical (ἑ), and *Parcus*, if genuine, another inflected form. It is possible that *Barcabbas* is only a duplicate of it with the Greek ending superadded; but on this supposition A. Castor must have combined two different reports of the same fact. The alleged prophecies, we see, were evidently current among different Gnostic bodies, and also among Manicheans. It is remarkable that the use of books of this class by the Gnostics is the most prominent circumstance dwelt on by Porphyry (*V. Plot.* 16) in his account of Plotinus's controversy with them; and Amelius and himself, as well as Plotinus, wrote treatises against the claims set up for some of the books, especially a claim to have been written by Zoroaster. Now we learn from the passage of Clement already cited that Isidore declared the theological allegories of Pherecydes to have been taken "from the prophecy of Ham." Josephus (*c. Ap.* i. 3) and other authors maintain that Pherecydes derived his materials from the Egyptians or Eastern nations, but the prophecies of Ham appear never to be mentioned, either in this connection or in any other. There was however a tradition that Mizraim, the reputed progenitor of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Persians, was identical with Zoroaster, and that he was taught magical arts by his father Ham (*Rec. Clem.* iv. 27; cf. *Hom. Clem.* ix. 3 f.); and some even identified Ham himself with Zoroaster (Cassian. *Coll.* viii. 21 ["quantum antiquae traditiones ferunt"], and later writers;

cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. V. T. i.* 292–308). Thus it is likely that the prophecies referred to in this article belonged to the apocryphal Zoroastrian literature. [H.]

BAR-COCHBA (בַּר כּוֹכְבָּא), SIMON, the celebrated leader of the Jewish insurrection against Hadrian in A.D. 132, or, according to some less trustworthy accounts, 122. His origin and early life are quite unknown; but Graetz (*Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 159) supposes that his usual title in Jewish literature, Bar-Coziba (בַּר כּוֹזִיבָא), indicates that he was born in the town Cozeba or Cezib. The more usual and probable interpretation, however, is that the name was given to him, “the son of a lie,” as a bitter commentary on the false hopes which he had excited as “the son of the star.” Rabbi Akiba became one of his most enthusiastic supporters; he addressed him as the King Messiah, and applied to him the prophecies in Numbers xxiv. 17 (whence his name Bar-Cochba), and Haggai ii. 6, 7. The Jews, already greatly discontented under Hadrian’s rule, flocked from all sides to his standard; and the Christians of Palestine were severely persecuted for not joining the national movement. Ticinius (Tinius) Rufus, the Tyrannus Rufus of the Talmud, was at that time the governor of Judaea; but when he failed to crush the outbreak, Julius Severus was summoned from Britain. The chief seat of the rebellion was Bethar or Beth Zor (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 7, calls it Βῆθηρα), to the S. of Caesarea; but it extended over a great part of Palestine. The Romans pursued a cautious policy, and gradually hemmed in the insurgents, until at last Bethar was besieged. It was taken and Bar-Cochba slain in A.D. 135, in the fourth year of the war; according to tradition it fell on the fatal ninth of Áb, on which the temple had been twice destroyed. Hadrian followed up his victory with ruthless severity towards the conquered Jews. A Roman colony was established in Jerusalem, and a temple to the Capitoline Jupiter erected on the site of the temple; and the name of the city was changed to Aelia Capitolina. Some of Bar-Cochba’s coins are extant; they bear the old Hasmonæan type, but are really Roman coins restamped (Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. 157–197; Dion Cassius, lxi. 12–14). [E. B. C.]

BARCOPH. [BARCABBAS.]

BARDAISAN (בַּרדַּיְסַן; Βαρδαισάνης, also -δα-, also -δανης; Bardesanes), a Syrian theologian, commonly reckoned among Gnostics. He was born at Edessa (Barhebraeus, *Chron. Eccl.* ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, Louvain, 1872, p. 49; Abulpharag. jun. *Hist. Dyn.* p. 79; Epiph. i. 476 D; Theodoret, *H. F.* i. 22), and received his name *Son of Daisan* from his mother having brought him forth on the bank of the river Daisan (“the Leaper,” Σκίπρος of Greek writers), which flows by that capital of Osroene or N.W. Mesopotamia (Barheb.; Abulph.; cf. Eph. Syr. ii. 439 F). The date of his birth was July 11, 155 (=465 Aer. Edess.; see Clinton, *F. H.* iii. 370, corrected by Schöne’s MSS. of Eus. *Chron.* s. an. Abr. 1706), according to the *Chronicle of Edessa* (Assemani, *B. O.* i. 389; the same year is implied by Barhebraeus, *l. c.*); and we may

safely trust the local and virtually contemporary authority, since Bardaisan as an astrologer would assuredly ascertain and record the exact time or his birth (Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes der letzte Gnostiker*, 1864, p. 112). His parents, Nuhama and Nahashirama by name (Barheb.), were probably rich and noble, for he was educated with a prince who afterwards became Abgar (Epiph. 477 A). He was famed at the court for his skill in archery, of which a singular example has been recorded by an eye-witness (Julius Africanus, *Cest.* 29, in *Vett. Mathem. Opp.* Paris, 1693, p. 275 f.). It is said that, “leaving the heathen doctrine of a priest of Mabug” (Hierapolis, the chief seat of the worship of the Syrian goddess Tharatha or Atargatis), “he embraced the faith, and received baptism; yea he taught the doctrine of the Church at Edessa” (Barheb.); but at what period of his life the change took place is unknown. The scanty records (Dionys. Telmar. ap. Assemani, *B. O.* i. 423; *Chron. Edess.* ib. 388 ff.) of the Abgars of Edessa do not suffice to identify with confidence the friend of Bardaisan, or to disclose the facts which lie behind the bald statement of Epiphanius, that after his death Bardaisan “survived till the times of Antoninus Caesar.” But the nearly contemporary chronographer J. Africanus (in Routh, *R. S.* ii. 307; cf. Eus. *Chron.* an. Macrin. 1 = A.D. 216) speaks of an Abgar in the early years of the 3rd century as “a holy man,” while the Bardesanit *Book of the Laws of Countries* (Cureton, *Spicil. Syr.* 31 f.) notices the abolition of the Edessene custom of mutilation in honour of the goddess Tharatha by an Abgar on his conversion to Christianity. These three accounts Hilgenfeld (18 f.) has with reasonable probability brought to converge upon Bar-Manu, said to have been Abgar from 202 to 217 (cf. Bayer, *Hist. Osrb.* 169–180), whom he accordingly salutes as “the first Christian king,” and over whose state he supposes Bardaisan to have exercised a powerful influence. We have as yet however no certain knowledge even of the number of reigns of Abgars about this period, much less of their dates (cf. Scott, *On Royal Coins of Mesopotamia*, in *Numism. Chron.* 1856, 21–27; Langlois, *Numism. d’Arménie*, 48 ff., 70 ff.—authorities kindly supplied by Mr. R. S. Poole); and it is quite possible that Bardaisan’s friend, the Christian ruler, should be sought among the last Abgars of the 2nd century. The terms indeed in which the destruction of “the temple of the church of the Christians” by a sudden flood of the Daisan in 203 is noticed by the public archivists (ap. *Chron. Edess.* l. c. p. 391), writing a few (Bayer, 171) but evidently only a few years later, are hardly consistent with a complete official adoption of Christianity, even at their own time. But it is likely enough that Christianity had long found at the Edessene court the same kind of recognition which was accorded to it at Rome shortly afterwards by the Orientals Alexander Severus and Philip the Arabian, and that Bardaisan had a share in raising the new faith to a more commanding position on the accession of either Bar-Manu or one of his immediate predecessors, and was his trusted counsellor so long as the state lasted. It is probably to his life as a courtier and yet a theologian that Ephraim alludes when he opposes the “rich robes and beryls,” with which “the devil adorned Bar-

daisan," to the sackcloth of the ascetic Marcion (438 f.).

The winter of 216 was spent at Edessa by Caracalla, on his Eastern expedition; and about this time he inveigled Bar-Manu into his power, threw him into chains (Xiph. *Epit. D. Cass.* lxxvii. 12), and apparently sent him to Rome. It seems likely that Caracalla allied himself with a native party discontented with the rule of Bar-Manu (see a fragment of Dion Cassius, *l.c.*), and thus lent his aid to a reaction of conservative heathenism. Such, we may conjecture, was the occasion of the persecution in which undoubtedly Bardaisan proved the strength and reality of his faith. "He resisted Apollonius, the companion of Antoninus" (on this view, Antoninus Caracalla), says Epiphanius (*l.c.*; cf. Eus. *H. E.* iv. 30), "when exhorted to deny that he called himself a Christian: he stood almost as a confessor, and replied with wise arguments, making a manful defence of true religion, declaring that he feared not death, since he would needs have to encounter it, even if he withstood not the emperor." It was perhaps likewise in consequence of Bar-Manu's fall that Bardaisan set forth on an expedition recorded by Moses of Chorene (ii. 66). "He came here," wrote the historian of Armenia (the native land, there is good reason to believe, of the Abgars then reigning at Edessa; cf. Langlois, 49, 56 ff.), "to try to make some disciples among this wild people of heathens. As he was not received, he next went into the fortress of Ani, read the history of the temples, in which were likewise found related the acts of the kings, added to it that which came to pass in his own time, and translated the whole into Syriac." This narrative of Bardaisan, which Moses names as the chief authority for his own history for the period, and which he says was afterwards translated into Greek, ended at the reign of Chosru I., which commenced about 217. Our last glimpse of Bardaisan exhibits him in yet another light, as an interested investigator of Indian religion. The Neoplatonist Porphyry, born in 233, twice appeals to what he had written on this subject; describing him as "Bardanes, a Babylonian, contemporary with our fathers, who held intercourse with the Indians that had been sent to the Caesar with Damadamis at their head" (*De Abst.* iv. 17: condensed by Jerome, *adv. Jov.* ii. 14); and again as "Bardanes of Mesopotamia," who learned certain facts in conversation from "Indians" (Sandales is afterwards named as their spokesman) "that had arrived (reading ἀφικόμενοι for -ομένων) in Syria in the reign of Antoninus of Emesa" (*De Styge*, ap. Stob. *Ecl.* i. iii. 56), *i.e.* Elagabalus, A.D. 218-222. The scene of this conference must remain uncertain. Not many years later Armenia contained a Hindu colony (Ritter, *Erakunde*, x. 552 ff., cited by Chwolsohn, *Ssabier*, i. 370). But it is more likely that Bardaisan met the embassy either at Edessa or at Haran (Carrhae), which was only twenty miles distant, on the great road from India to the West (Chwolsohn, i. 339 ff.). The date supplied by Porphyry is confirmed by Moses of Chorene (*l.c.*), who states that "Partadzan of Edessa" flourished as a historian at the time of the last Antonine." Bardaisan lived just long enough to witness the commencement of the brighter reign of Alexander Severus, for he died, as we

now know from Barhebraeus (*l.c.*), in 223, at the age of 68.

It has been usual to place Bardaisan more than a generation earlier, under M. Aurelius (161-180), on the authority of the chief Greek writers (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 30, followed by Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 33; Epiph. *l.c.*; Theodoret, *H. F.* i. 22). So also the Arabic *Fihrist* of En-Nedim (ap. Flügel, *Mami*, u. s. v. 85) dates his teaching from thirty years after Marcion, whom he fixes at the first year of "Titus Antoninus" [Pius], *i.e.* from 168; and Jerome in his version of the Eusebian Chronicle, at M. Aur. 12, *i.e.* 172. They or their authorities were doubtless all alike misled by the common confusion between the true Antonines and the obscurer secondary Antonines of the 3rd century. The coincidence of so common a name as *Apollonius* with that of the Stoic preceptor of M. Aurelius is of no weight: indeed two imperial rescripts are addressed to an Apollonius in the years 225, 238 (*Cod. Just.* v. 18. 4; viii. 43. 3). It may be added that Hippolytus, somewhere about 225, names him (Ἀρῆσιδανης, *Haer.* vi. 35; cf. vii. 31) with Axionicus, an Antiochian contemporary of Tertullian at an earlier year of the century (*Adv. Val.* 4), evidently as at least a somewhat recent representative of the "Eastern" school of Valentinians. He is not mentioned by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, the contemporary anonymous Latin writer on heresies (Suppl. to *Tert. de Praesc.*), or Origen. The late date, long ago maintained by Dodwell (*Diss. in Iren.* iv. 35), Grabe (*Spicil.* i. 317), and others, has been amply vindicated by Priaux (*J. of Asiatic Soc.* for 1862, pp. 289 ff., and later), Merx (*Bardanes von Edessa*, Halle, 1863), and Hilgenfeld (*l.c.*), and signally confirmed by the explicit and evidently authentic notices in the recently published Chronicle of Barhebraeus. The theory of two Bardaisans has nothing to recommend it: the various epithets, "Syrian," "Mesopotamian," "Babylonian," "Parthian," might all be applied to a native of Edessa; and the episode attested by Moses curiously explains Hippolytus's designation (vii. 31), "Bardanes the Armenian."

The theology of Bardaisan offers a more difficult problem. Scarcely anything survives of his writings, for the *Book of the Laws of Countries*, as we shall see presently, must be adjudged to a disciple. With this single exception, it would seem that the Greek and Latin authors had access to no better source of knowledge respecting Bardaisan's doctrines than vague hearsay, even when, as in Epiphanius's case, they show some acquaintance with his personal history. Bardaisan, Epiphanius says, was at first a distinguished Church teacher, accomplished (λόγιος τις) alike in Greek and in Syriac, and the author of many orthodox books; who at length became corrupted by contact with Valentinians, himself set forth a doctrine of many "principles" and emanations (ἀρχὰς καὶ προβολὰς), and denied the resurrection of the dead. The same order of change appears in the Syrian Barhebraeus, who makes him "turn aside to the fictions of Marcion and Valentinus," after "teaching the doctrine of the Church at Edessa, and composing treatises against heresies." Eusebius (*l.c.*) reverses the history. According to him, Bardaisan was exclusively a Syrian writer, attached at first to the school of Valentinus, but afterwards con-

denying and refuting the greater part of the Valentinian mythology; supposing himself to have passed over to orthodoxy, yet not altogether successful in washing away the stains of his old heresy. Eusebius not only dwells with emphasis on his controversial dialogues against Marcionism and other heresies that "abounded in Mesopotamia," of which we have independent evidence in the statement of Hippolytus (vii. 31) that he was answered by the Marcionist Prepon; but he writes throughout on the assumption that Bardaisan was on the side of the Church. Again according to Moses of Chorene he "had been a disciple of the sect of Valentinus, which he subsequently rejected and combated: he had not however attained to the truth; only, separating from Valentinus, he had formed a sect of his own: yet he did not falsify history." And once more the tone adopted by Moses in speaking of his works is that of kindly admiration. Yet Hippolytus, as we have seen, about the end of his life, ranks him with the "Eastern" school of Valentinians (vi. 35); and to fathers of the 4th century, who encountered the disciples that bore his name, he appears only as a pernicious heresiarch. To one of these, Ephraim of Edessa, we owe nearly all the trustworthy primary evidence that we possess as to his doctrines. In what writings they were contained is not clearly expressed. Once Ephraim mentions "a book," apparently denying the resurrection of the body, which had saddened him for an hour, till he banished the dark cloud of thoughts which it suggested by turning to Holy Scripture (*Carm. ap. Acta S. Ephr. Opp.* iii. p. 2). Elsewhere he speaks of the deadly power of the Book of 150 Hymns, after the number of the Psalter, by which Bardaisan had beguiled the people's hearts (554; cf. 558); and he often uses language to the same effect. On the other hand Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 16) and Theodoret (*H. E.* iv. 26; *H. F.* i. 22) tell us that Harmonius, the son of Bardaisan, who had received a Greek education at Athens, was the first to adapt the Syriac tongue to metrical forms and musical accompaniments, and that his hymns with their tunes continued in use at Edessa till Ephraim composed hymns in the same metres, which were henceforth sung to the familiar tunes. They mention no hymns of Bardaisan; and Ephraim is silent on Harmonius. The best explanation of this contradiction, which has hardly received sufficient attention, is to suppose that the book of hymns mentioned by Ephraim was really written by Harmonius, perhaps in his father's lifetime and at his suggestion. According to Sozomen, Harmonius was "not altogether free (*οὐ παντάρως ἐκτός*) from his father's heresy and from the doctrines of the Greek philosophers about the soul, and the generation and corruption of bodies, and regeneration." But this vague statement, on a matter not coming within the range of Sozomen's own knowledge as a Greek, can hardly be pressed, more especially as he does not mention any difference in Bardaisan's own doctrines at different times. It seems at all events impossible, without further evidence, to divide the double personality; and we must be content to gather our knowledge of Bardaisan's theology chiefly from so much of the substance of the hymns as Ephraim has preserved, whether they came directly from his pen or not. Sometimes indeed Ephraim in words refers only to

disciples, and it is conceivable that he has mixed speculations of the later sect with those of its founder. There is however no clear trace of such a confusion; and in practice we may safely treat Ephraim's materials as supplied by Bardaisan himself. A possible exception in the case of the last hymns will be noticed further on.

The 56 Hymns of Ephraim against Heresies (printed with a Latin translation in vol. ii. of Ephraim's Syriac works, edited by P. Benedetti, Rome, 1740, pp. 437-560; translated, except Hymns 1-6 a, more accurately into German by Zingerle, Kempten, 1850), are intended to refute the doctrines of Marcion, Bardaisan, and Mani. Sometimes the three heretics are contrasted in rhetorical antitheses; but they are more usually dealt with separately or in pairs, though in some cases it is not obvious who is intended, the name being often withheld, and the ornate copiousness of Ephraim's style being unfavourable to definite statements. Between Hymns 7 and 50 there is little to be gleaned about Bardaisan: the last two hymns comprise almost all the quotations, which are unfortunately very brief. As a critic of doctrines, Ephraim is harsh and unintelligent, but he leaves no impression of wilful unfairness.

Bardaisan's theology, as known to us, is doubtless a mere fraction of his actual theology. His reception of the Pentateuch, which he seemed to contradict, is expressly attested (438 D, 558 B: the *Acta S. Ephr.* p. liii. include the "Prophecy" and "Apostles"); and there is no reason to suppose that he rejected the ordinary faith of Christians, as founded on the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, except on isolated points. The more startling peculiarities of which we hear belong for the most part to an outer region of speculation, which it may easily have seemed possible to combine with Christianity, more especially with the undeveloped Christianity of Syria in the third century. The local colour is everywhere prominent. In passing over to the new faith, Bardaisan could not shake off the ancient glamour of the stars, or abjure the Semitic love of clothing thoughts in mythological forms.

Ephraim's most frequent complaint is that Bardaisan in effect taught polytheism, which in words he repudiated (443 ff., 547 ff.). He spoke much, it seems, of numerous eternal "Beings" (*Itje*), while he anxiously maintained their inferiority (554) to the "One God," and apparently contrasted their accessibility to human comprehension with His "unsearchable height" (555 f.). The human soul is once said to have been made by them (555 F), and once they are represented as having "spoken in the Law" (547 DE: cf. Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2). For the rest, their nature and office are not explained. If we could be sure that they are the subject of some words attributed to a disciple, "minds of fire" (? Seraphim) cannot comprehend ought which is in the Godhead" (555 D), we might with more confidence accept with Ephraim their separate existence. Indeed we may see by the example of Philo's "Powers" how easily the conception of heavenly "hosts" passes into that of the manifestation of Divine attributes. The significance of the name *Beings*, which Ephraim treats as profanely stolen from the Highest "Being" (556 DE, 444 AB), might be cited for either alternative.

In approaching the subject of Evil, as dealt with by a speculative Christian of the third century, deeply interested in heathen religions, we expect to find clear records, if not of a formulated doctrine, at least of a decisive position. Recent critics accordingly use what they severally lay down to have been Bardaisan's doctrine of evil as a standard for fixing his place in the history of belief. Yet as a matter of fact the evidence is scanty, unsubstantial, and confused. Ephraim once alludes casually to some designation of the evil spirit as "the dregs of the principle of darkness" (504 C): a phrase which recalls the origin of Ophiomorphus from the despairing gaze of Jaldabaoth in *subiacentem faciem materiae*, according to a peculiar sect associated by Irenaeus with Ophites (pp. 109 f.: cf. Lipsius in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1863, pp. 421 ff.), and of the evil spirit Fetahil from the face of Abatur reflected "in the black water," according to the Mendaite *Thesaurus* (i. 309, ed. Nørberg). But it is more than questionable whether the reference is to Bardaisan, who is neither named nor indicated within many pages; whereas similar language occurs in En-Nedim's account of Mani (Flügel, 86, 192 f.). The Bardesanists are however named, though indistinctly, in the midst of one passage directed chiefly against the Marcionites and their doctrine of the intrinsic evil of the Serpent (483 D); and said, more clearly as to the reference, though still obscurely as to the sense, to hold the derivation of the body from the evil one (553 F). It is difficult to believe that Bardaisan's doctrine of evil, whatever it was, could have left but these slight traces in Ephraim's elaborate refutations, if it had held a leading or determinant place in Bardaisan's own thoughts. If we try to find some guidance in the tenets of disciples, we are met by contradictory evidence. The Greek Bardesanists of the fourth century, as we shall see, insist on the independent existence of the evil principle from eternity, as against the Church, while they disallow its indestructibility. The Edessene *Book of the Laws of Countries*, on the other hand, written apparently before the rise of Mani, and in its doctrine of astral destiny retaining the features of the Bardaisan of Diodorus and Ephraim (see further on), is not darkened by any departure from the ordinary Christian language and tone of the period on the subject of evil. It seems on the whole hardly likely that any speculative difference on this subject can have been considerable enough to exercise a decisive influence upon Bardaisan's theology generally.

That his cosmogony postulated an eternal Matter of some sort, though it may be only a principle of Matter, is attested by a solitary passage (468 D E), in which its co-agency with God is contrasted with the hostile position which it assumed among the Marcionites. In another place Wisdom (*Hachmuth*) appears as called by Him to His aid in the creation of "the heaven and the world" (444 D). This representation may only have translated into dramatic form the familiar words in Prov. viii. 22-31, on which it was assuredly founded. But an easy identification of "Wisdom" with the Holy Spirit (cf. Iren. 236, 253 f., &c.) would associate it with the following fragments of mythology which meet us in Ephraim's concluding hymns.

They are selected by him, it should be observed, without coherence, merely as specimens of Bardaisan's shameless profanity.

From the Father of Life there was a descent of somewhat, whereby the Mother (cf. Gen. iii. 20; and also Movers, *Phön.* i. 275 f., 586) conceived and bore a son, called "the Son of the Living" (557 B C). Again Paradise is addressed as "*Thou fountain of joy, Whose gate by commandment [the Father's] Opens wide to the Mother;—a place Which 'Beings' divine Have measured and founded, Which Father and Mother In their union have sown, With their steps have made fruitful*" (558 B C). We are probably still hearing of "the Mother" under another name, when we read (557 D E) that the Holy Spirit (the Semitic feminine *Kuach*: cf. Orig. in Jo. iv. 63 f. Ru. . . . τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγελίον, ἐνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησὶν Ἀρτί ἐλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριῶν μου κ. τ. λ.) thus addressed the elder of two daughters (whose birth Ephraim declines to expound), "Shame of the Dry" and "Image of the Water" by name: *Let her who comes after thee* [Syr. "the daughter of thy foot"] *To me be a daughter, A sister to thee.* (A singular phrase in an invocation of the Holy Spirit in the *Acts of St. Thomas* [Greek recension only, c. 47; cf. Thilo's note, p. 190: ἐλθέ, . . . ἡ ἱερὰ περιστέρα ἡ τοὺς διδύμους νεοσσούς γεννώσα, ἐλθέ, ἡ ἀπόκρυφος μήτηρ] may have the same ultimate source; and the name of the second daughter is curiously like that of the mysterious "Idol of the Water" worshipped at the neighbouring city of Haran, the return of which from a flight to India is said to have been annually awaited with solemn rites at a temple outside the city [En-Nedim ap. Chwolsohn, i. 343; ii. 40 f.; 301 ff.]) Once more we seem to hear an echo of Wisdom's invitation to her guests (Prov. ix. 1-5) in the pleading hymn to the Holy Spirit, *When at length shall it ours be To look on thy banquet, To see the young maiden, The daughter thou settest On thy knee and caresses?* (557 F). We may perhaps recognise a similar pleading (? of the Church), addressed to the Father, in the words which a female voice uttered in a "secret" (? mystical) hymn (558 A), *My God and my Head, Hast thou left me alone?* The resemblance to Ps. xxii. 1, repeated on the Cross, gives little help towards interpretation: Ephraim notices it, but only as a profane borrowing of a fair garb from a holy Psalm; by certain Valentinians, probably Ptolemaeus, the cry was transferred from our Lord to the lower Wisdom, when forsaken by the light (Iren. 37 f.); but in Bardaisan we have no trace of the dramatic accompaniments. The mystical hymn of the Church, "the Daughter of Light," in the *Acts of St. Thomas* (cc. 6, 7 Gr.; pp. 150 ff. of Wright's transl. from Syr.), though in a different strain, suggests the more probable application.

The Semitic feeling respecting relations of sex, so unlike the Persian, Neo-Pythagorean, and other Greek modes of sentiment which early found their way into the Church, is everywhere strongly perceptible. Some distinct utterance on this subject probably gave rise to a singular phrase in Barhebr. 47, which cannot be referred to Gnostic licentiousness, Bardaisan being entirely free from that stain. Ancestral forms of speech having the same origin, of which one of

the mythological names already quoted may afford an instance, will best explain the enigmatic language of Ephraim about the seat of Bardaisan's Paradise (558 B; cf. 557 D and Hilgenfeld, p. 40): the same imagery recurs in two distinct forms of Syrian Gnosis, in the Simonian *Apophysis* (ap. Hipp. *Huer.* vi. 14: ἔστω, φησί, παράδεισος ἡ μήτρα κ. τ. λ.) and among the Sethians (*ib.* v. 19, p. 140 Mill.); and more obscurely in a third, the strange myth of Elohim and Edem as set forth by Justinus (*ib.* v. 26).

Before leaving the subjects of the last two paragraphs it is right to recall attention to the fact that the evidence is not furnished by any part of Ephraim's long polemic except the last two hymns. It seems not impossible that the Bardesanist hymns here quoted came into Ephraim's hands after the bulk of his own hymns were written, and themselves belong to a later generation than that of either Bardaisan or Harmonius. Such a hypothesis would explain the singular fact that all this strange Mesopotamian heathenism is unknown to every writer on Bardaisan except Ephraim. The only matter at all similar is the language about the Sun and Moon cited two paragraphs on from Barhebraeus and Abulpharagius; and the doctrine recorded by these two late writers, taken from Syriac sources, might easily be genuine Edessene Bardesanism without being as old as Bardaisan. But on the whole it seems best to follow the usual assumption, though with some misgiving.

On the other hand it cannot be doubted that Bardaisan held a doctrine of resurrection which either amounted, or seemed to amount, to a denial of the resurrection of the body (438 C, 551 B, 553 F; *Acta S. Eph.* p. 1.; Barheb.; Epiph.). According to a single obscure phrase of Ephraim (553 F) he connected the soul with the Seven Stars, as another already cited (555 F), which further refuses to the soul the capacity of understanding its own nature and operation, derives its origin from the heavenly "Beings." It seems also tolerably certain, notwithstanding the silence of Epiphanius, that, like some at least of his followers, he attributed to our Lord a "heavenly" body, as distinguished from an ordinary human body. On this point we have the evidence not only of Hippolytus, who probably refers to his Valentinian period (see further on), but also of Philoxenus of Mabug (ap. Cureton, *Spic. Syr.* p. vi.). This last Syrian writer (about A.D. 500) likewise (*ib.*) makes him responsible for statements of a Patristian colour, viz. that "the Ancient of Eternity was a boy," and that "the Child of the Virgin was the Highest."

The Seven Stars, i.e. the Sun, Moon, and five planets, with the heavenly bodies generally, evidently held captive Bardaisan's imagination, if not his reason. "He preaches," says Ephraim, "the signs of the zodiac, and observes the birth-hour, and proclaims the Seven, and inquires after times [by a book, 439 A E, 560 C]: therefore hath he accepted seven plagues, and bequeathed them to his disciples" (550 D: cf. 553 F, *Acta S. Eph.* p. liii.). Supernal "Beings," the rulers of the bright luminaries, were doubtless to him the ultimate powers. Yet he may not always have known how to distinguish the visible from the invisible. According to the literalism of the later Eastern records (Abulph., Barheb.) he called the Sun the Father of Life,

and the Moon the Mother of Life, and represented her as periodically "laying aside her garment of light" for joint renewal of the universe (cf. Plut. *de Is. et Osir.* 43); and doubtless he saw in the two great lights suggestive images of the Father and the creative Spirit. The same association appears in one of Ephraim's last hymns (558 D E), who adds that Bardaisan spoke of male and female deities and their children, and thus expressed his homage, "All praise, O my rulers, O assembly of gods." It is to be observed that elsewhere (457 f.) Ephraim speaks of differences and relations of sex being attributed by "the Chaldees" to the Seven, the Moon and Venus being female; and a similar statement appears in En-Nedim's account of the Haranites, or heathens of Northern Mesopotamia (ap. Chwolson, ii. 38: cf. 273).

To the same spell of astral superstition we may probably refer the origin of Bardaisan's characteristic modification of Chaldee fatalism, the existence of which cannot be doubted, though its precise nature is difficult to ascertain. Diodorus of Tarsus, a weighty Antiochian writer of the 4th century, devoted the 51st and 52nd chapters of his elaborate treatise on Fate, analysed by Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 223, pp. 221 f.), to a refutation of the Bardesanist doctrine. They of his sect, he tells us, affect to accept the Prophets, and acknowledge the soul to be free from the power of *Genesis* (the destiny of birth), and to possess free will; but they place the body under the government of *Genesis*, for they say that wealth and poverty and sickness and health and death, and all things not within our own control (οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῶν), are a work of destiny (τῆς εἰμαρμένης). This language, as far as it goes, agrees exactly with the doctrine of the *Book of the Laws of Countries*, and very possibly has no other origin. That Dialogue (p. 11) puts into Bardaisan's mouth a recantation of a doctrine once propounded by him when he loved the Chaldaic art, that the soul of man is capable of a knowledge possessed by few, viz. of men's designs, failures, successes, and outward vicissitudes, as depending on the influence of the Seven Stars (cf. Merx, 36 f.). There is however nothing to show whether the reference, supposing it to be authentic, is to a time before or after Bardaisan's conversion to Christianity. The testimony of Ephraim, occurring again in the midst of a prolix series of arguments against the thoroughgoing heathen fatalism, is probably confused. Censuring the vulgar destiny, Bardaisan, he complains, vainly thought to invent a better, one which should touch only lower things and spare the higher; the theory apparently being that up to birth destiny is supreme, but that its power dwindles with the growth of mind and will (452 f.). Such a doctrine evidently need be no more than a recognition of physical constitution, leaving the question of Providence untouched; and such a recognition of "Nature" is clearly made in the Dialogue (7-10, 13 ff., 27). The references however to the Stars point rather to some form of Chaldaic "Destiny," properly so called; and the Dialogue once more concedes a certain efficacy to astral Destiny, while maintaining the supremacy of Free Will. Thus it is impossible to say how far the Dialogue faithfully represents Bardaisan's own doctrine of the Stars. It may be that the truest

impression of his real mind is to be gathered from some striking extracts taken by Clement of Alexandria from a writing of the "Eastern School," of which, as we saw above, Hippolytus makes him a representative. The difference lies chiefly in the significance attached to baptism as the close of the reign of destiny; yet some of the accompanying words show the difference not to be absolute. A few lines only can be given. "Destiny is a concourse (*σύννοδος*) of many and contrary powers, and these are invisible and inapparent, directing the motion of the stars, and through them having their action (*πολυτευόμεναι*). . . . From this strife and conflict of the powers the Lord delivers us, and grants us the peace from the battle-array of the powers and of the angels, some being on our side and some against us. . . . For this cause there arose a strange Star and a new, dissolving the old scheme of the stars, shining with a new light not of the world, the Star which takes its course by new and saving ways, even the Lord and Guide of men Himself, who descended to the earth that He might remove them who believed on the Christ out of destiny into His providence. . . . Until baptism therefore destiny is true, but afterwards the astrologers are no longer found to speak truth. It is not however the Bath alone which makes us free, but the knowledge;—who we were, what we are become; where we [originally] were, and where we have been placed; whither we are hastening, whence we are redeemed; what is generation, what is regeneration" (pp. 985 ff.).

The whole of the direct evidence respecting Bardaisan's theology having been now set forth, the difficulty of interpreting the fragments becomes apparent. Supposing that nothing of his personal history beyond his date and country had been recorded, we should find little, if anything, in his doctrines suggesting a Valentinian origin. Yet the statements of writers so various as Hippolytus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Moses, and Barhebraeus cannot be set aside, notwithstanding their differences of order. The language of Hippolytus requires to be quoted (*Haer.* vi. 35). He first mentions the division of the Valentinians into an Eastern and an Italian School, the latter of whom pronounced the body of Jesus to be psychical only, and to have been united to a higher power only from the Baptism. "But they of the East," he then proceeds, "of whom are Axionicus and Ardesianes, assert that the body of the Saviour was spiritual; for there came on Mary a 'Holy Spirit,' that is, the Wisdom, and [also] the 'power of the Most High,' [that is,] the fabricative art, that what the Spirit gave to Mary might be moulded into form." This brief and vague sketch of doctrine contains nothing indubitably Valentinian in itself; but the introductory statement is circumstantial, and the Valentinian character of the "Eastern School" is placed beyond doubt by the solitary remaining notice of its other representative, Axionicus. Tertullian, while dwelling on the differences of the numerous Valentinians of his own day from each other and from their founder, singles out Axionicus at Antioch for the unique fidelity with which he "cherished the memory of Valentinus by keeping his rules inviolate" (*Adv. Val.* 1, 4). The fact that Tertullian thus isolates Axionicus, while Hippolytus

at a later date combines the two names, is not enough to prove that Valentinianism was the latest phase of Bardaisan's creed. We may on the whole with better reason follow the two most trustworthy authorities, Moses and Eusebius, as well as the probability that his final doctrine was that which was perpetuated at Edessa by his disciples in his name. We can see by the writings of Clement and Irenaeus, and the vestiges of Hippolytus's lost Compendium, how rank and vigorous was the growth of Valentinianism about the time of Bardaisan's youth and early manhood; while the constant communication between Antioch and Edessa must have brought it within his knowledge. Its brilliant phantasies may easily have dazzled him while yet an immature convert, if indeed it did not constitute an intermediate stage on his way from heathenism to Christianity. It would be no less natural that, when the enchantment passed away, his belief should still retain traces of Valentinian doctrine; or again, that the earlier and inbred images of native heathenism should permanently affect his thoughts, and generate a peculiar and hybrid creed. Strange to say, however, the traces of Valentinianism are all questionable; and the varying constructions of Neander, Lipsius, Merx, and Hilgenfeld are all alike arbitrary. It is only by importing imaginary Tetrads or Ogdoads, and other extraneous mechanism, that the extant fragments (assumed to be his or his son's) can be made to yield even the semblance of forming part of a Valentinian scheme. Whatever they have in common with Valentinianism seems to belong to Syrian ideas pervading the primitive Asiatic Gnosticism out of which Valentinus developed his partially Greek system. The "syzygies" have no special applicability in the face of the general tendency to range divinities in pairs, male and female, in the religions of "Syria, Arabia, and the basin of the Euphrates and Tigris" (Lenormant, *Lettres Assyriologiques*, ii. 70: cf. Chwolsohn, ii. 252 f.). Indeed "the Father of Life" and "the Mother" constitute the only Bardesanist pair of whom we have any knowledge. Even if the identity of "the Holy Spirit" or "Wisdom" with "the Mother" were less probable than it is, there is not the slightest ground for representing "the Son of the Living" as her consort (with Hahn, 64, 68 f.), or for giving him the name of "Christ" (with Lipsius, *passim*). In a passage cited by Hahn, Ephraim declares that "Marcion and Bardaisan impiously deny that there was One Creator of the world; for they attributed the works of the Supreme Maker to things made by Him, so as to confound with them the Son and the Holy Spirit" (444 B). The charge here brought against the heretics cannot be that they assigned a share in creation to "the Son" and "the Holy Spirit,"—the strangest of accusations to proceed from an orthodox Father,—but on the contrary that they recognised in creation the action of the First Person alone of the Godhead, and ascribed to creatures what belonged to the other Persons. These creatures may include the *Itje* or "Beings" (see just above, 444 A), or Matter (as 468 E), but doubtless, as far as Bardaisan alone is concerned, chiefly *Hachmuth* or "Wisdom," as just below (444 D), where it is expressly said that the glory of co-operating with the Father in

creation had been diverted from the Son to a strange woman, *Hachmuth*. Such language would be inconceivable if "the Son" and *Hachmuth* constituted a second cosmogonic pair; and yet on this supposition are built all the efforts to construct a Bardesanist genealogy analogous to the great "Gnostic" schemes of syzygies. *Hachmuth* herself, the creative "Wisdom," has nothing in common either with the lovelorn ambitious Upper Wisdom of Valentinus, or with her forsaken offspring, the Lower Wisdom (*Hachmuth*) of the visible world; while both the Valentinian Wisdoms, with their human associations, stand apart from the cosmogonic functions apparently assigned by Bardaisan to the daughters of "the Holy Spirit." Once more the feminine representation of the Holy Spirit is too widely spread to be distinctive. Bardaisan shows no knowledge of a Pleroma, or of Aeons (for his *Itje* present none of the special characteristics of Aeons), or of a Bythos, or of a Horos, or of a separate Demiurge; or again of the speculative ideas which inspired this mythology. He has various isolated resemblances to various Gnostic systems other than the Valentinian; but stands in no coherent relation to any one of them, nor does he appear to have had any analogous scheme of his own. He cannot, in short, as far as our present knowledge goes, be called a Gnostic, without giving the name a sense so vague as to be unmeaning; but he was haunted by images from the same sources which supplied materials to the Syrian Gnosticisms. So again his language has a certain affinity with that of the Syrian Acts of St. Thomas (likewise wrongly called Gnostic), little as they reflect his mind in their singular rigour; in which however they resemble Tatian, another remarkable Syrian heretic of an earlier generation. Lastly coincidences are not wanting with some of the Manichean records (e.g. with regard to the Mother of Life), though Bardaisan's imperfect and subordinate dualism is far removed from the Persian doctrine of Mani.

On the whole, whatever might have come to Bardaisan through the medium of Valentinianism might as easily have come to him directly from the traditions of his race; and both alternatives are admissible. It is on any supposition a singular fact, that the remains of his theology disclose no traces of the deeper thoughts which moved the Gnostic leaders. That he held a doctrinal position intermediate between them and the Church is consistent with the circumstances of his life, but is not supported by any internal evidence. On this, as on many other points, we can only deplore our ignorance about a person of singular interest.

The Greek Fathers speak of "many" works of Bardaisan as known to them through Greek translations (Eus., Epiph., Theodoret). They name Dialogues against the Marcionists (Eus., Thdt.), that is, probably Prepon (Hipp.), as also other heretics (Eus.; cf. Barheb.); the Apology in which he "resisted Apollonius the companion of Antoninus, when urged to deny that he was a Christian" (Epiph.), evidently identical with what Eusebius calls his "writings on the occasion of the then existing persecution;" and finally, the Dialogue on Fate, in which he "copiously refuted Avidas the astronomer" (Epiph.; cf. Eus., Thdt.). This last treatise is either the *Book of the*

Laws of Countries, on which more presently, or an extract from it. In Eusebius's text (supported by Rufinus and Jerome, *de Vir. ill.* 33), the Dialogue is described as addressed "to Antoninus:" but it seems probable that there is either a confusion with Avidas, or a transposition of Antoninus from the next clause: the strange suggestion (Hilgenfeld, 74, 151) that *Avidas* may be a corruption of *Avitus*, a name of (Antoninus) Elagabalus, is disproved, if disproof be needed, by its occurrence among native Edessene names in the *Ancient Syriac Documents* published by Dr. Cureton (pp. 14, 18, 63), which also contain another name found in the Syriac Dialogue (p. 13), *Shemashgram*, borne by a king and a priest of Emesa (Cureton, 77). In describing the later Bardesanists, En-Nedim (ap. Flügel, *Mani*, p. 162) says that Bardaisan "is the author of the book *The Light and the Darkness*, of the book *The Spiritual Nature of Truth*, of the book *The Unstable and the Stable*, and of many other writings; the heads of the sect wrote likewise on the same subjects, but their writings have not come to our knowledge." The name however of the first book points to doctrines like those previously described by En-Nedim, belonging to a time when the sect had been subjected to Persian or Manichean influence; and the authorship of all three books must accordingly remain somewhat doubtful. All that is really known of the book of 150 hymns, whether the author be Bardaisan himself or Harmonius, has been mentioned already. On their metre, identical with that of the well-known Greek hymn of Clement of Alexandria, Hahn's essay may be consulted (pp. 28 ff.: cf. Augusti, *de Hymnis Syrorum sacris*, Breslau, 1814). The nature of the book or books which supplied Porphyry with his extracts on Indian subjects is unknown. A treatise of Bardaisan, "a man of antiquity and renowned for the knowledge of events," "on the conjunctions of the heavenly luminaries," is cited by Aphraates (ap. Cureton, *Spic. Syr.* 40, 102), a Syrian writer of the fourth century, as stating that a period of 60 years is a multiple of all the times of circuit of the Seven Stars, the calculation being made with a view of "showing that this world would last only 6000 years." The names of the signs of the zodiac current among the Bardesanists have been preserved (Land, *Anecd. Syr.* p. 32), and are shown by Merx (123 f.) to resemble in their peculiarities the Mendaite nomenclature. A much later date must apparently be assigned (Merx, 61 f.) to a secret alphabet fathered upon Bardaisan in a Syriac MS. of A.D. 1352 ("Assemani, *Cat. Bibl. Vat.* ii. 522"); it is singular that En-Nedim describes two peculiar alphabets as used by Mani and the Marcionites respectively (ap. Flügel, *Mani*, 85, 166 ff.).

One treatise alone survives to represent Bardesanist literature, the *Book of the Laws of Countries*. Till lately it was known solely by a copious extract preserved in Greek in Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica* (vi. 9, 10), where it is thus introduced: "I will also set before thee the proofs of these matters [concerning Fate] furnished by a man who was a Syrian by birth, and who was highly accomplished in the Chaldaic science, Bardesanes by name, who is related to have spoken as follows in his dialogues with his companions." The entire treatise however, in the Syriac original, was recognised by Dr. Cureton

among the Nitrian MSS. brought to the British Museum (Add. 14,658) in 1843, and in 1855 published by him in Syriac and English, in his *Spicilegium Syriacum*, with a preface and notes: a German translation with notes is given by Merx (pp. 25-55). In form the book is a dialogue reported by one Philip as taking place at the house of Shemashgram. These and apparently two other young men, Awida and (p. 11) Barjamma, are conversing on the mysteries of Providence, in consequence of doubts raised by Awida, when they are joined by Bardaisan, who speaks with authority as an elder. For some time Awida and Philip take a small part, but in the last third, which gives the name to the whole, the monologue of Bardaisan is nearly uninterrupted. The natural impulse to confuse the author with the chief interlocutor in an anonymous dialogue [ADAMANTIUS] will sufficiently explain the early ascription of this Dialogue to Bardaisan himself by the Greek Fathers; while not many modern readers are likely to agree with Dr. Cureton in thinking the form of composition compatible with Bardaisan's authorship. The date can hardly be many years later than his death. There is an allusion to the abolition of mutilation (Merx, 53) in honour of Tharatha, in Syria and Edessa, by Abgar the king on his conversion, and a statement that "from that day and up to this hour" mutilation had ceased "in the country of Edessa" (pp. 31 f.); which seems to imply the lapse of some little time since the revolution of policy with which Bardaisan appears to have been connected. But it is also said (p. 30) that "*but as yesterday* the Romans took Arabia and abrogated all their ancient laws," where the allusion seems to be either to the Arabian war waged by Macrinus in 217-8, or to the great conquest of Arabia by Septimius Severus in 195-6: Dr. Cureton must have overlooked these events, as he refers only to the war (of Avidius Cassius) under M. Aurelius, probably about 162-5. The doctrine of the Dialogue may possibly be Bardaisan's own altogether, as it certainly is in some important respects. But it cannot be accepted unreservedly as furnishing a sufficient standard: and the possibility that it may exhibit a modification of Bardesanist views, produced by contact with orthodox teachers, is not to be forgotten. The real difficulty lies in determining the kind of importance attached by Bardaisan to the mythology quoted by Ephraim from the hymns, supposing him to be responsible for it; for of this there is no vestige in the Dialogue. That the Dialogue does not depart widely from the spirit of Bardaisan's teaching may well be believed. If it was the source of the testimony of Philoxenus (quoted by Cureton, p. v.), "Bardaisan, whom his disciples celebrate in their books for his patience and courteous answers to every man," yet it is likely to have preserved a true local tradition of the old man's gracious ways and intelligent faith.

The starting-point of the reply given to Awida's first doubt, as to the creation of man under a liability to sin, is the need of preliminary faith. Many, he says, "have not the foundation of faith on which to build, or of hope on which to rest. And because they doubt even respecting God, they lack moreover the fear of Him which would deliver them from all terrors. . . . Even in respect of that which they do not believe,

CHRIST. BIOGR.

they are not sure that they rightly deny it, but they fluctuate in their thoughts, and are unable to gain a standing-ground; the taste of their thoughts is rapid in their mouths, and they are always anxious, fearful, and reckless." He replies to Awida's doubt by reference to the special human prerogative of free will, and the power given to man, as created in God's image, to use the lower creation as his minister; to the stars indeed ("elements") he concedes a certain freedom by which they will be judged, but not comparable to that of man, whereby those who have done the will of their Lord are exalted and hallowed and endowed with glorious gifts; "for every thing that exists has need of the Lord of the universe, and of His gifts there is no end." Awida assents, but complains of the difficulty of keeping the commandments. Bardaisan replies that the will of the soul has power to fulfil the two commandments, of abstinence from evil and performance of good, the latter being the easier task, since evil comes from the enemy, whereas good is a man's own, and so he rejoices when he does that which is good. Here Philip recalls a plea of Awida, that Nature is the cause of man's wrong doing. Nature, the answer is, is the cause of those acts and processes of man which he has in common with all creatures that have life: but its inability to bind the souls of men is proved by their diversity of habits and propensities, and also by their conversions from good to evil or evil to good. Once more Philip and Barjamma repeat another allegation that human responsibility is destroyed by the power of Destiny (Genesis). Bardaisan's answer is careful. He rejects alike the Chaldaic doctrine, once held by himself, that the influence of the Seven Stars determines all the doings and fortunes of men, and the opposite position that Destiny has no existence at all; some who hold this last view maintaining that bodily defects and calamities are fortuitous, and others that they are Divine punishments. He asserts that God in the richness of His wisdom "has given to all things the power which has been suitable for each one of them,"—Angels, Rulers (*Schlitane*), Governors (*Medabbrane*), Elements, men, and animals. As then men are subject to Nature in things of the body, so are they subject also to Destiny depending on Nativity (the configuration of the stars at critical moments), which sometimes helps, sometimes disorders the works of Nature (e.g. by causing disease or poverty), according as the Right or the Left Heads and Governors are in the ascendant, while the free will of man constrains Destiny itself: for "it is befitting that the three things, Nature and Destiny and Free-will, should be maintained in their being, until the outflow (or procession, i.e. of events) be accomplished, and the measure and number be fulfilled, as it has been decreed by Him who preordains the manner of life and completion of all creatures, and the state of all beings and natures." On the subject of Nature Awida is convinced: his remaining doubt about free will on account of Destiny is met by Bardaisan with an appeal to experience. A long list is given of special laws and customs which prevail in different nations and tribes, although in each nation men are born under all configurations of the stars: "in all places, every day and at all hours, men are born in Nativities which are dis-

ting from one another, the laws of men overcome the decree, and they are governed by their customs." In the same manner the Chaldaic assignation of seven "climes" of the earth to the Seven Stars is shewn to be of no weight, since each "clime" includes different sets of laws, local laws themselves are sometimes entirely changed, and national customs are sometimes independent of locality: above all, in whatever place may be "the new race, consisting of ourselves who are called Christians, whom at every place and in all lands the Christ has established by His coming," "the laws of the countries do not separate them from the laws of their Christ; nor does the Destiny of the Governors compel them to use things which in their eyes are unclean; but sickness and health, riches and poverty, which do not come within the scope of their free will, befall them wherever they may be." This limited power, the speaker concludes, proceeds from "that great and holy Will" "which nothing can hinder." He permits their resistance for a time, though they are "bound by the deeds which are done, and by the plans which have been devised for their welfare." "But there will be a time when even the injury which still subsists in them shall be brought to a close by the teaching which will lie in another combination. Then, at the establishment of that new world, all evil disturbances shall come to rest, all revolt shall cease, all the foolish shall be persuaded, and all wants be supplied; and then shall rest and peace prevail, through the gift of Him who is the Lord of all natures."

This sketch sufficiently represents the doctrines of the Dialogue, except perhaps an obscure statement (p. 13) chiefly to the effect that "what is called Destiny is an order of outflow (or procession) given to the Rulers and the Elements by God, and according to this outflow and order the intelligences (or spirits) are changed by their descent into the soul, and the souls by their descent into the body." The term "Beings" (*Itje*) is elsewhere (p. 5: cf. 4) so employed as to include all creatures.

There are large coincidences of language in the passages of the Dialogue excerpted by Eusebius with a few chapters (19—29) of the ninth book of the Clementine Recognitions as preserved in Rufinus's Latin version; and again, to a less extent, with two "answers" (109 f.) in the second Dialogue bearing the name of Caesarius. A slight examination shews (1) that Caesarius followed the lost Greek Recognitions, and (2) that the Greek Dialogue used by Eusebius, (which sometimes departs from the Syriac by omission, paraphrase, or expansion,) was the intermediate source through which either the Greek Recognitions drew from the Syriac Dialogue, or *vice versa*. The second alternative is maintained with much ingenuity by Hilgenfeld (*Theol. Jahrb.* for 1854, 529 ff.; *Bardees.* 5 ff., 72 ff.; cf. Ritschl, *Entst. d. althath. Kirche*, ed. 1, 186 f.; Ewald in *Gott. gel. Anz.* for 1854, 529 ff.), though it obliges him to postulate a fourth unknown authority supposed to have been used by the Recognitions. All his arguments however from modifications of language are capable of being turned with at least equal force in the opposite direction; and though the Recognitions prefix in the mouth of Faustinianus a crude piece of astrological dogma, its presence

is no clear mark of superior originality, since it might easily be added for the sake of enabling Greek readers to understand fully the subsequent allusions which wanted no explanation in the native home of astrology. On the other hand, the Syriac Dialogue contains various names and other particulars pointing towards a Mesopotamian origin, which are obliterated partially in the Greek Dialogue, and much more in the Recognitions. If they were absent at first, they must have been carefully infused afterwards without adequate motive, and that at two different stages; whereas they might naturally be dropped by a Greek translator, and yet more by a Greek compiler. In like manner the pruning out of some slight indirect concessions of a certain influence to the Stars agrees exactly with the peremptory controversialism of the Recognitions; but their introduction in this shape by a Bardesanist would be unintelligible. On the whole, a close scrutiny proves fatal to the paradoxes into which Hilgenfeld has been led by his anxiety to throw back the Recognitions in their present form to the earliest possible date, and vindicates Merx's defence of the priority of the Dialogue (88 ff.), though he has failed to prove the indebtedness of the Recognitions to the Dialogue in other books besides the ninth.

After the Dialogue we are without information respecting the Bardesanism which evidently flourished at Edessa till the arrival of Ephraim. He found the city "wretchedly overrun with pernicious sects of all kinds, especially that of Bardaisan" (*Acta S. Eph.* l. c. p. l.). The members of the sect were, it appears, either unconscious of their heterodoxy or, as Ephraim naturally but perhaps wrongly assumed, dissemblers of it. According to him, Bardaisan had died "with the Lord in his mouth, with demons in his heart" (558 f.);—a garrulous sophist (550 D) of tortuous and double mind (554 A), outwardly orthodox, a heretic in secret (438 E), a greedy sheep-dog in league with the wolves (551 B), a faithless servant (556 D), a cunning dissembler practising deceit with his songs (554 A). Such also he describes the living disciples to be, not beasts of prey, but foxes (468 F), beguiling the unwary by soft words and songs in caves (439 D). It was inevitable that he should misunderstand the immaturities of the earlier time, more especially as he seems to have known nothing of Bardaisan's life and career; but it is likely enough that the Bardesanist creed had long lost its original vitality, and become a mischievous anachronism. As we shall see, it lingered long in the East, but under changed forms.

The silence of Greek and Latin Fathers is sufficient evidence that Bardesanism spread westward little if at all beyond Syria. To this silence there is but a single exception. In the latter years of Constantine, two anonymous Greek Dialogues were written to controvert the doctrines of the followers of Marcion, Valentinus, and Bardaisan. The chief interlocutor, ADAMANTIUS, was early confused with Origen: Marinus, who comes forward in the second Dialogue (III., IV., V. of the editors) to represent Bardesanism, is an equally unknown personage. After declaring his concurrence in the doctrine that there is but one God, Marinus continues: "There are three points in which we do not agree with the Catholic Church: we say that the devil

was not created by God; and we deny that the Christ was born of a woman; and we say that the body is not raised" (Orig. *Opp.* i. 835 Ru.; xvi. 322 Lom.). In another form the three points appear as denials that evil was made by God, that the Word of God took human flesh, and that this flesh, "into which we are bound," is raised. Under the first head Marinus rejects the position of Adamantius that evil is the privation of good by referring to the serpent's beguiling of Eve and the names given to him (*sic*) in Scripture. He holds the devil to be self-sprung, self-gendered, and recognises two "roots," an evil and a good, the evil root being unable to turn and change its nature; while it produces everything evil or "sinistral," including physical darkness. That the two essences (*οὐσίαι*) however of good and evil are alike indestructible is maintained only by the Marcionist Megethius, who is apparently introduced for the sake of giving a complete and symmetrical exposition to dualism; for Marinus says distinctly, "I maintain that God alone is indestructible." On the other hand, he will not allow that evil arises out of man's free-will, lest he should attribute the authorship of evil to God. God's operation, he says, results in what is good, just, merciful, reverent, holy: the good root saves, the evil destroys: God causes man's salvation, the devil his perdition. Yet not the less is God just, judging the devil and his angels and the men who betake themselves to him. So also He is almighty, and contains all things, Himself uncontained. The place of the evil one, he says when pressed, quoting Luke x. 18, is the earth. He ends with his fundamental thesis: if there cannot be two original principles (*δύο ἀγένητα*), then the Good Being is the author of evil (839 Ru.; 333 Lom.). After two Valentinians have contributed their solutions of the question, Marinus is called on by the empire to maintain his second thesis (849 Ru.; 360 f. Lom.). No ground of the Bardesanist negation beyond an instinctive shrinking comes to light: Marinus "deems it altogether most absurd to attach to the inviolate (*ἀχράντη*) essence" the assumption of flesh "of our substance" (*ὁποσάσας*): such a notion appears to him shameful (*φέρεαι αἰσχος*). But he eagerly quotes passages of Scripture (1 Cor. xv. 40 ff.; Eph. iv. 10; John iii. 13) in support of his aversion. There is nothing peculiar in his belief as to the origin of things. Man, he states, was created by God, that is, the Father with the Word, as the Scriptures relate: he was made out of the earth-dust, thereby raised to a better state; and it is still a power of God which quickens man. But the Word, as St. John declares, became flesh, with no addition from without, and so the body was a heavenly body. The flesh was taken in appearance only (*δοκέσει*), as with the angels who came to Abraham and ate with him: what suffered on the Cross was the Word Himself, but in appearance: He was born not of Mary but through Mary, as water passes through a pipe (a Valentinian comparison, Epiph. i. 167 A, 171 D); and when the Jews called Him the Son of David, He rebuked them, saying that He was David's Lord, not his Son (858 Ru.; 383 Lom.). The Bardesanist feeling about the Resurrection seems to have a similar origin. The present body is looked on as a bond, a weight, a tomb, in which the soul is bound for its sins (859, 834 Ru.; 386, 322 Lom.). At the same

time Marinus dwells on the material flux which changes the body from one age of life to another, and on the resolution into the four elements supposed to accompany decay. But on this head the chief arguments are texts from Scripture (Gen. vi. 3; Ps. lvi. 13; xlii. 2; lvii. 1; xvi. 10; Rom. vii. 24; Gen. iii. 21 [the much-disputed "coats of skins"]; Lam. iii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 50, 38, 36). The question is not however as to the act of resurrection, but as to the nature of the new body: on the strength of the last-quoted passage it is maintained that the soul will be the recipient of a heavenly body (865 Ru.; 402 Lom.).

This Greek Bardesanism evidently has dropped those characters of the Syrian doctrine which seemed irrelevant to the kindred Greek controversies of the day, while it has apparently been likewise somewhat changed under their influence. Not the least curious feature is the emphatic appeal which Marinus loves to make to Scripture, and the reluctance with which he approaches the speculative argumentations (*τὰ φιλοσοφούμενα*) of his orthodox antagonist (859 Ru.; 386 Lom.). But the Bardesanist tradition remains distinct from the Valentinian: its doctrine of evil has possibly received a darker shade from Manichean influence; but it would be rash to speak confidently in the absence of precise knowledge about Bardaisan himself.

On the other hand, the Manichean or Persian colouring is so predominant in the accounts given by Arabic writers (En-Nedim [saec. x.] ap. Flügel, *Mami*, 161 f.; and Schahrastani [saec. xii.] ap. Merx, 83 ff.; like En-Nedim, a resident at Bagdad, but apparently unacquainted with his *Fihrist* [Chwolsohn, ii. XXII f.]) respecting the Asiatic Bardesanists of later days, that only the faintest traces of the primitive doctrine can be discerned. The two principles, the Light and the Darkness, are contrasted as good, beneficent, fragrant, beautiful,—and evil, injurious, fetid, hideous; but also as free, living, intelligent, powerful, sensitive,—and subject to the bondage of Nature, dead, unintelligent, powerless, immovable, dull. The sensitive power of the Light is represented as one and homogeneous, owing its division into the several senses only to various commixtures with the Darkness. While all believed the Light above and the Darkness below to be in constant mutual pressure, there was a division of opinion as to their combination and separation. Some, according to the scarcely intelligible report of Schahrastani (this singularly aberrant person is entirely passed over by En-Nedim), compared the Light to the smooth sides of a saw, the Darkness to its rough edge, the one substance being common to both. Others represented the Light as always endeavouring to repel the attempt of the Darkness to cling to its under side, but always in the effort becoming more deeply entangled with the Darkness, like a man striving to gain firm footing in a morass (Schahr.), or thrusting away from him a log armed with sharp splinters (En-Nedim). According to a third party, the Light plunged into the Darkness of its own free choice, hoping to change it to goodness, and then raise to its own upper world what it thus succeeded in setting free; but on the contrary it was itself held fast in bondage by the Darkness, and compelled to do what is unrighteous and vile: and this representation was apparently (Schahr.) combined with a theory that goodness and beauty

belong to free action, their contraries to constrained action.

A remark of Chwolsohn (i. 812), to the effect that a Maimun Daisan is named elsewhere as the author of a dualistic sect likewise called "Daisanites," suggests the need of caution in making use of the Arabic records. But there can be no reasonable doubt as to the founder of the sect of "Daisanites" known to En-Nedim and Schah-rastani; for En-Nedim not only states him to have derived his name from the river beside which he was born, but also places him before Mani in date. En-Nedim's list of Bardaisan's books however, as we have already seen, must not be taken as more than a list of books current in the sect at a late period. Another brief statement of his suffices to shew the wide and lasting diffusion of the followers of Bardaisan in Asia. "At an earlier time," he says, they "were settled in the marsh districts (i.e. the comparatively inaccessible swamps of the Lower Tigris and Euphrates, a frequent haunt of the persecuted; see Flügel, 134 f.): and even in China and Khorassan they form scattered communities, although no point of union or house of God belonging to them is known."

In 1710 F. Strunz published at Wittenberg a *Historia Bardesanis et Bardesanistarum*, which has found little favour with those who have been able to consult it. Intelligent criticism may be said to have commenced with Neander's *Geneitische Entwicklung der Gnostischen Systeme*, Berlin, 1818, which was followed in 1819 by A. Hahn's monograph, *Bardesanis Gnosticus Syro-rum primus Hymnologus*. The references to Bardaisan in Neander's History and Baur's *Christliche Gnosis* are of no great importance. More lately his life and doctrines have been investigated in two other valuable monographs, by Merx in 1863, and Hilgenfeld in 1864. R. A. Lipsius' slight sketches, in his *Gnosticismus* contributed in 1860 to Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopaedia* (pp. 111 ff., 174 ff. of the separate issue), and in an article *Ueber die Ophitischen Systeme* in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* for 1863 (pp. 435 ff.), have the special merit of insisting on Syrian heathenism as a source of illustration. The writings of Hahn, Merx, Hilgenfeld, and Lipsius all contain valuable matter indispensable to the student; but all more or less misrepresent Bardaisan by arbitrary and mutually inconsistent attempts to adapt his doctrines to known Gnostic schemes. [H.]

BARDESANES. [BARDAISAN.]

BARLAAM, said to have been a monk in India, in the earliest period of monasticism. According to the legend he converted Josaphat, the son of Abenner, an Indian prince. Zardan, one of the prince's tutors, reported this to the king, who, by the advice of Araches, one of his courtiers, had recourse to Nachor and Theudas, astrologers. In the end Abenner became a convert: and after his death, Josaphat abdicating in favour of Barachias, a Christian, lived for thirty-five years in a hermitage (Rosw. *Vit. Patr.* i.). But the arguments for the authenticity of this narrative are weak (v. *Not. ad loc. ap. Rosw. Vit. Patr.*; comp. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 484), and it bears internal marks of being unhistorical. It is attributed to John Damascene, but even this is uncertain. [JOANNES DAMASCENUS.] [J. G. S.]

BARLAAM or **BARLÂHA**, martyr, an uneducated countryman, martyred either at Antioch or at Caesarea in Cappadocia under Diocletian, his special torment being that he was forced up to the altar, and burning incense placed upon the back of his hand, in order that he might seem to kindle, and so offer it by the involuntary movement of the hand through pain, a device which the martyr's constancy defeated (St. Basil, *M. Hom. de St. Barl.* xviii.; St. Chrys. *Hom. de St. Barl.* lxxiii.). An apostrophe of St. Basil's, addressed to the "painters" of such scenes, was transformed by the second Council of Nice, A.D. 787, into a literal picture, quoted by the council as evidence in the Iconoclast Controversy (*Act. iv. Labb. vii. 272*). [A. W. H.]

BARNABAS. [See *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*, s. v.]

BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF. It is impossible, in the limited space at our command, to enter upon all the important and interesting questions connected with this Epistle. We proceed, therefore, at once to what will be readily acknowledged to be the most important, that of its

I. *Authenticity.*—Is it the production of the Barnabas so often associated with St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles of the New Testament; or has it been falsely connected with his name? The question is one of deep interest, both on its own account and because of its bearing on the historical and critical spirit of the early Christian Church.

It is admitted on all sides that the *external evidence* is decidedly in favour of the idea that the epistle is authentic. Clement of Alexandria bears witness to it as the work of "Barnabas the apostle"—"Barnabas who was one of the seventy disciples and the fellow-labourer of Paul"—"Barnabas who also preached the Gospel along with the apostle according to the dispensation of the Gentiles" (*Strom.* ii. 7, 35; ii. 20, 116, v. 10, 64. Comp. also ii. 6, 31; ii. 15, 67; ii. 18, 84; v. 8, 52). The same thing may be said of Origen, who speaks of it as "the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas" (c. *Cels.* i. 63). Eusebius disputes the canonicity of the Epistle, but is hardly less decided than the fathers already mentioned in favour of its authenticity. It is included by him at one time among the disputed, at another among the spurious, books; yet there is no reason to doubt that when, in both passages, he calls it the Epistle of Barnabas, he has in his eye not an unknown person of that name but the Barnabas of Scripture (vi. 14, iii. 25). Jerome must be understood to refer to it when he tells us of an Epistle read among the apocryphal books, and written by Barnabas of Cyprus, who was ordained along with Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles (*De Vir. ill. c. vi.*). In the *Stichometria* of Nicephorus, in the 5th century, it is enumerated among theuncanonical books; and, at the close of that century, a similar place is assigned to it by Anastasius Sinaita. Add to all this that it is found in Codex N attached to the books of the New Testament, and there can be no doubt that the early Christian Church considered it authentic. That she refused to allow its canonicity is little to the purpose. The very fact that many thought it entitled to a place in the canon is a conclusive proof of the opinion that had been

formed of its authorship. Nor does the refusal of such a place to it by the Church at large invalidate the force of this proof for our present object. The early Church was able to draw the line between apostles and companions of apostles; and, although writings of the latter, such as the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, were received into the canon, it must always be remembered that she thought herself able to establish such a connection between the writers of these books and one or other of the apostles that the authority of the latter could be transferred to the former. Such a transference it would be more difficult to make in the case of Barnabas, because, although he had been associated at one time with the Apostle Paul in his labours, the two had differed in opinion and separated from one another.

It is by the contents of the Epistle, by the *Internal Evidence*, that the many distinguished critics who have in later times denied its authenticity, have been led to their conclusion. That there is great force in some at least of the arguments adduced by them from this source it is impossible to deny, yet they do not seem so irresistible as not to merit renewed consideration. They have been summed up by Hefele (*Patr. Apost.* p. 14), and succeeding writers have added little to his statement.

Of the eight arguments brought forward by Hefele, five may be at once and without difficulty rejected; the first, that the words of Augustine regarding the Apocrypha of Andrew and John, *si illorum essent recepta essent ab ecclesia*, show that our Epistle would have been placed in the canon had it been deemed authentic; for Andrew and John were apostles, Barnabas was not; the second, that Barnabas had died before the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Epistle bears clear marks of not having been written until after that date; for this idea is no just inference from the texts referred to, Col. iv. 10, 1 Pet. v. 13, 2 Tim. iii. (iv.) 11, and the authority of a monk of the 6th or 9th century is not to be relied on; the third, that the apostles chosen by our Lord are described in c. v. as *ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντων ἀμαρτίαν ἀνομώτεροι*; for these words are not introduced, as seems to be often thought, for the sake of reproaching the apostles, but for the sake of magnifying the grace of Christ in calling not the righteous but sinners to repentance. It was an undoubted fact that the Saviour had associated with publicans and sinners, and Barnabas may mean no more than that out of that class were the apostles chosen.^a He may even have had the career of Saul previous to his call to the apostleship mainly in view. The fourth argument of Hefele, that the Epistle betrays in c. x. so much ignorance of the habits of various animals is not more valid than those that have been mentioned; for natural history was then but little known. The fifth argument of the same writer is also to be set aside, that Barnabas, who had travelled in Asia Minor, and lived at Antioch in Syria, could not have asserted in c. ix. that the Syrians were circumcised, when we know from Josephus (*Contr. Ap.* i. 22; *Antiq.* viii. 10, 3) that they were not; for, however

frequently this statement has been repeated, Josephus says nothing of the kind. What he says is, that a remark of Herodotus, to the effect that the Syrians who live in Palestine are circumcised, proves that historian's acquaintance with the Jews, because the Jews were the only inhabitants of Palestine by whom that rite was practised, and it must have been of them, therefore, that he was speaking. The statement of Josephus does not extend to the Syrians beyond Palestine; nay, rather he quotes Herodotus, and without any word of dissent, as saying that the Syrians about the rivers Thermodon and Parthenius, that is in the northern parts of Syria, did submit to circumcision. So far from contradicting he may thus be said to confirm the statement of our Epistle.

The three remaining arguments of Hefele are more important.

1. That the many trifling allegories of cc. v.-xi. are inconsistent with the notions that we must form of one who, from the warmth of his eloquence, had been honoured with the name of the "Son of Consolation." But it may well be doubted whether the estimate founded upon these allegories of the general ability of the writer is not too low. It is true that they are in the highest degree foolish and unnatural; and it is difficult for us even to conceive how a person of the slightest thoughtfulness could find in the numeral letters of the Greek version of the Old Testament an indication of the will of Him who had given that Testament in Hebrew to his ancient people. Yet, after all, is it not the time rather than the writer that is here in fault? It is unfair to take as our standard of judgment the just principles of interpretation now prevailing. We must transfer ourselves into the early Christian age, and remember the spirit of interpretation that then prevailed. We must call to mind the allegorical explanations of both Jewish and Heathen schools, whose influence passed largely into the Christian Church, and the gross mistakes of even such men as Origen and Augustine. Above all, we must think of the estimation in which the Epistle before us was held for centuries; that it was highly approved of by Clement and Origen; that it was a matter of dispute whether it ought not to have a place assigned it in the canon; and that, even when no such honour was claimed for it, it was regarded as a most useful and edifying work. It must have been felt to be so; and the Christian Church has afforded too many examples of the adoption of the most perverted principles of interpretation by gifted minds and by large sections of her members to permit us to make folly in that particular direction a proof of general mental weakness. In judging, therefore, of the ability of our author, it is necessary to turn from the form to the substance of his argument, from the shell in which he encloses his kernel of truth to that truth itself. When we do so his Epistle will appear in no small degree worthy of approbation. It exhibits a high appreciation of many of the cardinal truths of Christianity, of the incarnation and death of Christ, of the practical aims of the Gospel, of the freedom and spirituality of Christian living; while the general conception of the relation of the New Testament to the Old, although in some respects grievously at fault, embodies the important principle that the Old is

^a Dr. Donaldson, though a decided opponent of the authenticity of the Epistle, allows this (*History of Christian Lit.* i. 210).

but the shadow of the New, and that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Throughout the Epistle, too, there are not a few sentences of great beauty and warmth of Christian feeling; and nothing could well be more eloquent than the description of the rebuilding of the spiritual temple in c. xvi.

2. The second important argument against the authenticity of our Epistle is taken from the numerous mistakes committed by the writer in cc. vii. viii. with regard to the rites and ceremonies of Judaism, mistakes to all appearance inconsistent with the idea that he could be a Jew, a Levite, who had lived long in Jerusalem, and must have been acquainted with the ceremonial institutions of the Jews. It is impossible not to feel the great force of the objection, or even to complain of one who, upon this ground alone, should reject the authorship of Barnabas. Let it only be remembered that these mistakes are almost equally inexplicable on the supposition that the author was not Barnabas. If such rites were not actually practised, whence did he learn their supposed existence? It is out of the question to think that they were a mere fancy of his own. And how came the great fathers whose names have been already mentioned, how came the Church at large to value the Epistle as it did if in the mention of them we have nothing but absurdity and error? We are hardly less puzzled to account for such inaccuracies by the idea that the writer was a heathen Christian of Alexandria than by admitting that he may have been a Jew and a Levite.

3. The third and last important argument adduced by Hefele is taken from the unjust notions with regard to Judaism which are presented in our Epistle. They are correctly so described. But it is not so clear that they might not have been entertained by one who, educated in the school of St. Paul and animated by a high sense of the spirituality and universality of the Christian faith, would be easily led, in the heat of the Judaic controversies of his day, to depreciate a system which was threatening to overthrow the distinctiveness and power of the Gospel of Christ.

To the arguments thus brought forward by Hefele recent writers have added the consideration, that the strong anti-Judaistic tendency of the Epistle is inconsistent with its ascription to Barnabas, inasmuch as he erred in too great attachment to the Jewish party (Gal. ii. 13). But the incident thus referred to reveals no such trait in the character of Barnabas. His conduct on that occasion was a momentary weakness by which the best may be overtaken; and it rather shews us that his position on the side of the freer party had been previously a decided one, "inasmuch that *even* Barnabas was carried away by their dissimulation." The incident may also have made him in time to come ashamed of his weakness, firmer and more determined than before.

To sum up the evidence, it seems to us that its balance is more in favour of the composition of our Epistle by Barnabas than later critics have been for the most part willing to allow. The bearing of the external evidence upon this result is unquestionable; and, where we have such evidence, it is a sound principle that nothing but the strongest internal evidence should be permitted to overcome it. The traditions of the early Church with regard to historical facts

do not appear to have been so loose as is often alleged. It is difficult also to imagine how a generally accepted and firmly held tradition could arise without some good foundation upon which to rest.

Finally, we are too prone to forget that the substance of Christian truth may be held by others in connexion with misapprehensions, imperfections, misinterpretations, of Scripture, absurd and foolish views, in connexion with which it would be wholly impossible for us to hold it. Let these remarks be borne in mind, and the whole character of the Epistle before us judged in the spirit which they suggest, and it may perhaps be granted that its authenticity, though by no means free from doubt, is more probable than is commonly supposed. It may be well to add that the authorship of Barnabas is rejected by, among others, Neander, Ullman, Hug, Baur, Hefele, Winer, Hilgenfeld, Donaldson, Westcott, Mühlner, while it is maintained by Gieseler, Credner, Guericke, Bleek, Möhler, and, though with hesitation, De Wette. Reuss and Weizsäcker do not attempt to decide the question.

The next important point which offers itself for our consideration, though not without a bearing on the question of authorship, is

II. *The date of the Epistle.*—External evidence does not help us here. We are thrown wholly upon the internal. Two limits are allowed by all, the destruction of Jerusalem on the one hand, and the time of Clement of Alexandria on the other, that is from A.D. 70 to the last years of the 2nd century. Between these two limits the most various dates have been assigned to it; the general opinion, however, being that it is not to be placed earlier than towards the close of the 1st, nor later than early in the 2nd, century. It is impossible to speak with anything like certainty upon the point, but the following considerations may be worthy of notice:—

(1.) When the destruction of the temple is referred to in c. xvi. the idea of *recent* destruction seems to correspond better with the whole tenor of the chapter than the thought of a destruction at least thirty years by-past. In particular the *ἐγνώκατε* (Cod. N instead of *γνώστε* of the T. R.) *ὅτι μακάρα ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν* leads the thoughts to a moment when the readers had themselves just seen the hope placed by the Jews in their temple proved to be vain. It is not the hope of its *rebuilding* that is thus set at naught, it is the hope which these deceived ones placed in the temple itself, *εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομήν*, when it stood in all its glory, and when they turned their hearts to it instead of their God who made them. "This hope," says Barnabas, "ye have perceived to be a vain one." To anything connected with proposals for rebuilding the temple in the time of Hadrian it is impossible that these words should apply; and, although they might perhaps have been used many years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and while the temple yet lay in ruins, they certainly receive a more natural explanation and gain in force if we suppose that the overthrow of the great centre of the Jewish theocracy had been recent. Again, in the same passage, we read, *νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρετοὶ ἀνοικοδομήσωσιν αὐτὸν* (Cod. N instead of *νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν* κ. τ. λ. of the T. R.). It is impossible to doubt,

notwithstanding the reasoning of Weizäcker (*zur Kritik des Barnabasbriefes*, p. 22, &c.) to the contrary, that it is the spiritual temple which is here in the writer's eye, that *ναὸς τέλειος* of which he had spoken in the beginning of his Epistle, c. iv., and which embodied his leading conception of what the true children of God were to be. The whole drift of the 16th chapter proves incontestably that he has not the slightest reference to a re-erection of the material building.^b The thought of Hadrian's time is therefore wholly out of the question. The end of the 1st century, again, is too late to supply a natural meaning to the words, "*now shall they rebuild.*" The rebuilding spoken of had by that time gone on for thirty years, and been to a large extent accomplished by the spread of the Gospel throughout the empire. To a date, on the contrary, immediately after the destruction of the temple they apply with force: "*Now,*" says Barnabas, "these very enemies shall, along with you, erect a new and better temple, a true temple of God."

(2.) A note of time would be supplied us by c. iv., were it possible to come to a more definite conclusion as to the interpretation there put by Barnabas upon Daniel vii. 7, 8, 24. It is clear that in the view of the writer the prophecy has been fulfilled; and its fulfilment is a sign of the times which the spiritual ought to understand. Who, then, are the three great horns followed by the little one? Are they the Flavian house, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, followed by Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, who, the two last having been successively adopted, are considered as one dynasty, *τρεῖς "ὅφ' ἐν" βασιλεῖς* (Volkmar)? or are they Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, while the little horn refers to Nero, who was to return as Antichrist, and to overthrow the three kings immediately preceding and belonging to one family (Hilgenfeld)? or, finally, are the three—Galba, Otho, Vitellius, whose united reigns comprehended only about one year, a space which might be allotted to the shortest single reign, and whose rapid succession of one another might well illustrate the fact that the Lord was now "cutting short the times and the seasons" (Weizäcker)? The first of these explanations is obviously untenable. It regards the three horns as distinct from the ten; enumerates the three kings of the Flavian house as one; and omits Vitellius altogether on the plea that he was not reckoned at Alexandria. The second is hardly more tenable than the first. It is not of something that is to happen, but of something that has already happened that Barnabas is speaking; nor is it possible to explain why the returning Nero should be represented as overthrowing only three who had preceded him instead of all. The

third explanation is certainly the best, and seems, though somewhat fancifully put by its author, to be in substance correct. The true defence is to be sought—where Weizäcker does not seek it—in the language of the original prophecy, "and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots," *καὶ τρία κέρατα τῶν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἐξεβρίζωθαι ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* (Dan. vii. 8). These are the words which Barnabas renders freely by *ἐταπείνωσεν ὅφ' ἐν τρία τῶν μεγάλων κεράτων*. He sees them cut off by the same speedy fate in order to make room for their successor, and he finds in this the token that God is "making a short work on the earth." It is this shortness of their reigns alone that he has in view, not the idea that together they make up no more than a single reign. Enough for him that the kings are no sooner seated on the throne than they are together humbled and rooted up. It is true that the difficulty presents itself that, even counting from Julius Caesar, the little horn is thus one of the ten. But the very mode in which the quotation is given in our Epistle seems to shew that its writer was sensible of this difficulty. He drops the *τῶν ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ* of the prophet, and substitutes *καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μικρὸν κέρας*. We must acquiesce, therefore, in the conclusion of Weizäcker that this passage affords no slight indication that the Epistle before us belongs to the reign of Vespasian, to a date, therefore, between A.D. 70 and A.D. 79.^c

(3.) The temptation to relapse into Judaism, that is, as we shall see, the particular temptation before the writer's eye in this Epistle, would probably possess all the strength here ascribed to it only at a point of time immediately subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. Christians must have been in no small degree startled and even shocked by that destruction of the temple and holy city which was almost the sweeping away of the old world to the Jew. As yet they had not only been considered by others, they had considered themselves, as little else than the adherents of a purified and exalted Judaism. It is quite natural to think, therefore, that many might be ready to doubt their own faith when they saw the centre of the ancient theocracy overthrown. Then, too, they would find the snares of Jewish

^c We would venture to suggest, hoping only that the suggestion may not appear fanciful, that there were circumstances connected with Vespasian which might seem to Barnabas to justify his application to him of the figure of the "little horn." Not only had the birth of that emperor been mean, but he was himself accustomed to draw special attention to it. "He was never ashamed of the meanness of his origin, and ridiculed all attempts to make out for him a distinguished genealogy. He often visited the villa in which he had been born," the house of a private soldier, "and would not allow any change to be made in the place." [*Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biogr. VESPASIAN.*] Contrast this with the fact that his own merit had raised him to the throne, and have we not here a simple and natural explanation of the fact that he should be regarded by Barnabas as the "little horn"?

Since the argument in the text was written Müller's Commentary on the Epistle of Barnabas has appeared. That writer adopts the same view as that here taken, and defends it by somewhat similar arguments. It is difficult to see, therefore, how he can place the date of the Epistle so late as A.D. 119. Has he failed to give due weight to the important words of iv. 3, *τὸ τέλειος σκάνδαλον ἡγίκεν*?

^b It is inconsistent with the whole view of Barnabas to suppose that he could see in the rebuilding of the material temple a fulfilment of prophecy, which he does see in the rebuilding he speaks of, xvi. 3, 4. Again, *ἀνοικοδομήσασιν*, instead of *ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν*, arises from the fact that he has not yet explained in what the rebuilding was to consist. He can therefore only speak of it as something that may be expected. Only when he has shewn what the rebuilding really is will he be able to speak of it as certain. (Comp. Jelf, § 415, 2.) The *ζητήσωμεν* of paragraph 6 is to be regarded as the taking up again of what has thus been hinted at, not as the introduction of a new subject.

seducers to be most powerful when Jewish fanaticism awoke to the consciousness that its glory was on the point of perishing, and was stirred up to efforts of despair. These are the efforts that we have here before us, and their existence favours the idea of an early date.

(4.) The frequency of reference to Christians as the true and perfect "temple" leads us to the thought of a time when the idea of the temple was a living one even in Christian minds, and when even Christians were under the first powerful impression produced by the destruction of the material building.

Upon the whole we conclude that there is every reason for believing that our Epistle was written only a very few years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

We pass to a third point.

III. *Object of the Epistle, and line of argument pursued in it.*—Two points are especially insisted on by the writer; first, that Judaism, in its outward and fleshly form, had never been commended by the Almighty to man, had never been the expression of God's covenant; secondly, that that covenant had never belonged to the Jews at all.

In carrying out his argument upon the first point the writer everywhere proceeds on the idea that the worship which God requires, which alone corresponds to His nature, and which therefore can alone please Him, is spiritual, not a worship of rites and ceremonies, of places and seasons, but a worship of the heart and life. It is not by sacrifices and oblations that we approach God, who will have no offerings thus made by man^d (c. ii.); it is not by keeping sabbaths that we honour Him (c. xv.); nor is it in any temple made with hands that He is to be found (c. xvi.). The true helpers of our faith are not such things, but fear, patience, long-suffering, continence; and the "way of light" is found wholly in the exhibition of moral and spiritual virtues (c. xix.). But how was it possible to reconcile with such an idea the facts of history? Judaism had had, in time past, and still had, an actual existence. Its fasts and sacrifices, its sabbaths and temple, seemed to have been ordained by God Himself. How could it be pleaded that these things were not the expression of God's covenant, were not to be always binding and honoured? It is to the manner in which such questions are answered that the peculiar interest of our Epistle belongs. They are not answered as they would have been by St. Paul. The apostle of the gentiles recognized the value of Judaism and of all the institutions of the law as a great preparatory discipline for the coming of the Messiah, as "a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." There is nothing of this kind in the argument of Barnabas. Judaism has in it nothing preparatory, nothing disciplinary, in the sense of training men for higher truths. It has two aspects—the one outward and carnal, the other inward and spiritual. The first was never intended by God; they who satisfy themselves with it are rather deceived by "an evil angel." The second is Christianity itself, Christianity before Christ

(c. ix. and *passim*). This view of the matter is made good partly by shewing that, side by side with the institutions of Israel, there were many passages of the Prophets in which God even condemned in strong language the outward ceremony, whether sacrifice, or fasting, or circumcision, or the temple worship (cc. ii. iii. ix. xvi.); that these things, in their literal meaning, were positively rejected by Him; and that the most important of them all, circumcision, was fully as much a heathen as a divine rite (c. ix.). This line of argument, however, is not that upon which the writer mainly depends. His chief trust is in the *γνώσις*, that deeper, that typical and allegorical, method of interpreting Scripture which proceeded upon the principle that the letter was a mere shell, and had never been intended to be understood literally. By the application of this principle the whole actual history of Israel loses its validity as history, and we see as the true meaning of its facts nothing but Christ, His cross, His covenant, and the spiritual life to which He summons His disciples. It is unnecessary to give illustrations. What is said of Moses, that he spoke *ἐν πνεύματι*, is evidently to be applied to the whole Old Testament. The literal meaning is nowhere what was really intended. The Almighty had always had a deeper meaning in what was said. He had been always thinking, not of Judaism, but of Christ and Christianity. The conclusion, therefore, could not be mistaken; Judaism in its outward and carnal form had never been the expression of God's covenant.

The argument upon the second point spoken of, To whom does God's covenant belong? connects itself closely with the argument upon the first. It is indeed a legitimate conclusion from the latter that the Jews cannot claim the covenant as theirs. By the importance they always attached, and still attach, to outward rites they prove that they have never entered into the mind of God; that they are the miserable victims of the wiles of Satan (cc. iv. ix. xvi.). But the same thing is shewn both by Scripture and by fact—by Scripture, for in the cases of the children of Rebecca, and of the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, we learn that the last shall be first and the first last (c. xiii.)—by fact, for when Moses broke the two tables of stone on his way down from the mount, the covenant which was at that moment about to be bestowed upon Israel was dissolved and transferred to Christians (c. xiv.).

Looking now at this line of argument as a whole, we can have little difficulty in perceiving what was the special object of the Epistle, the special danger against which it was designed to guard. It was no mere Judaizing tendency that was threatening the readers for whom it was intended. It was a tendency to lapse into Judaism itself. The argument of those who were endeavouring to seduce them was, "The covenant is ours" (c. iv.).* These men, as appears from the tenor of the whole chapter, must

^d The reading of Codex N, to be preferred to what we find in the Latin, *ἵνα ὁ καρὸς . . . μὴ ἀποπροσπολήσῃ τὴν προσοφάν*. For the sense cf. Matt. xv. 9.

* The *ὁς ἦν δεικναιμένος* of c. iv. has led Hilgenfeld (*die Apok. Väter*, p. 38) to think of those who were turning the grace of God into lasciviousness. But the whole passage leads rather to the thought of a proud Judaic self-righteousness, "the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we."

have been Jews, and their statement could have no other meaning than that Judaism, as the Jews understood and lived it, was God's covenant, that it was to be preferred to Christianity, and that the observance of its rites and ceremonies was the true divine life to which men ought to be called. Yet Christians were shewing a disposition to listen to such teaching, and many of them were running the serious risk of being shattered against the Jewish law (c. iii.).^f With this the errors of a coarsely Judaistic life naturally connected themselves, together with those many sins of the "evil way" in which, when we take the details given of them in c. xx., we can hardly fail to recognise the old features of Pharisaism. In short, those to whom Barnabas writes are in danger of falling away from Christian faith altogether; or, if not in actual danger of this, they have to contend with those who are striving to bring about such a result, who are exalting the ancient oconomy, boasting of Israel's nearness to God, and praising the legal offerings and fastings of the Old Testament as the true way by which the Almighty is to be approached. It is the spirit of a Pharisaic self-righteousness in the strictest sense of the words, not of a Judaizing Christianity, that is here before us. Let us allow that this is the case, and we have at once an explanation of all the most peculiar phenomena of our Epistle, of its polemical zeal pointed so directly against Judaism that, as Weizsäcker has observed, it might seem to be directed as much against Jews as against Judaizers; of its effort to show that the whole Old Testament *cultus* had its meaning only in Christ; of its denial of all value to outward Judaism; of its aim to prove that the inward meaning of that ancient faith was really Christian; of its exclusion of Jews, as such, from all part in God's covenant; and of its dwelling precisely upon those doctrines of the Christian faith which were the greatest stumbling-block to the Jewish mind, and those graces of the Christian life to the importance of which it had most need to be awakened.

IV. *Integrity of the Epistle.*—We have proceeded throughout on the idea that the integrity of the Epistle can be defended with success. Upon this point we refer our readers to Hefele and Donaldson.

V. *Authorities for the text.*—These consist of MSS. of the Greek text, of the old Latin version, and of citations in early Christian writings. The MSS. are tolerably numerous, but the fact that, with the exception of the Sinaiticus which deserves separate mention, they all want exactly the same portion of the Epistle, the first five and a half chapters, seems to shew that they had been taken from a common source and cannot be reckoned as independent witnesses. Since the

discovery of Codex N by Tischendorf a new era in the construction of the text has begun. That MS. brought to light the portion of the Greek text wanting in all MSS. previously known. Throughout the whole Epistle, also, valuable readings were suggested by it, and it is now justly regarded as our chief authority for the text. The old Latin version is of high value. The MS. from which it is taken is probably as old as the 8th century, but the translation itself is supposed by Müller to have been made from a text older even than that of Codex N. It wants the last four chapters of the Epistle. The citations in early Christian writings are extensive, but occupy only a subordinate rank as authorities for the text.

Editions and Literature.—It is hardly necessary to speak of the older editions. The most valuable modern editions are those of Hefele, 1855 (4th ed.); Reithmayr, 1844; Dressel, 1863; Hilgenfeld, 1866; and Müller, 1869. Dressel was the first to make use of Codex N, but of all these editors Müller seems to have constructed his text upon the most thoroughly scientific principles. The literature is very extensive. Notices of the Epistle will be found in the writings of Dörner, Baur, Schwegler, Ritschl, Lechler, Reuss, and others. The following monographs on it are especially worthy of notice; that of Hefele, entitled *Das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas aufs neue untersucht, übersetzt, und erklärt*, Tübingen, 1840; that of Hilgenfeld in his *Die Apostolischen Väter*, Halle, 1853; that of Weizsäcker, *Zur Kritik des Barnabasbriefes aus dem Codex Sinaiticus*, Tübingen, 1863; and that of Dr. Donaldson in his *History of Christian Literature and Doctrine*. The most recent and valuable work on the Epistle is that by J. G. Müller, *Erklärung des Barnabasbriefes, Ein Anhang zu de Wette's Exegetischem Handbuch zum neuen Testament*, Leipzig, 1869. This work contains general *prolegomena* to the Epistle, a critically constructed text, and an elaborate commentary, together with careful *Excursus* on all the most important difficulties connected with the interpretation. [W. M.]

BARNIC, ST., a Celtic bishop, whose burial-place in Cornwall is thus given by William of Worcester, 113: "S. Barnic episcopus, called Anglice Seynt Barre, sepelitur in ecclesia de Fowey; et ejus festum per tres dies proxime ante festum S. Michaelis." Leland (*Itin.* 3, 33) gives his full name as St. Fim-barrus (i. e. "fine hair"). Barrocius seems another form of the name, and there are several saints of the same name in Ireland (see Whitaker's *Cathedral of Cornwall*, ii. 214). The St. "Barrus," bishop of Cork, of the *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. vii. 142, is commemorated on 25 Sept. [C. W. B.]

BAROES, bishop of Edessa, to which see he was translated from Haran, by the Emperor Constantius, A.D. 361, *Chron. Aitallahan*, apud Le Quien. Sozomen, however, states (*H. E.* vi. 34), that Baroes (together with Eulogius) was not consecrated to any definite see, but was raised to the Episcopate, while he remained in his monastery, as a token of honour for his services to the church. Baroes was banished by the Arian Valens to Egypt: first, to the island of Aradus (where, according to a statement recorded by Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 16 his bed was preserved,

^f *ἵνα μὴ προσερχόμεθα ὡς ἐπιλύται τῷ ἐκείνων νόμῳ.* So Hilgenfeld reads, *Nov. Test. extra Canonem*; but Codex N, *ἵνα μὴ προσησώμεθα ὡς ἐπιλύται τῷ ἐκείνων νόμῳ.* The passage is almost unintelligible. Weizsäcker proposes to read *ἐπιλύται*; and to render by means of 2 Pet. 1, 20, which is utterly untenable. Might we suggest that *ἐπιλύται* may here be used in the sense of "set loose," the figure being that of persons or things loosened from their true foundations or securities, and then dashed against a wall, or perhaps against the beach, and thus destroyed?

^g l. c. pp. 5, 15.

and "through their faith" was the means of curing the sick); then, with the view of checking the crowds that flocked to the holy confessor, to Oxyrynchus in the Thebaid; and finally to a fortress named Philae, on the barbarian frontier, where he died in extreme old age, A.D. 378, the same year in which his persecutor died in or after the disastrous battle of Adrianople. His name stands in the *Martyrol. Roman.* on Jan. 30. [E. V.]

BARRFINN (latinized Barrindus, Barinthus, and known also as Finbar and Findbar). Under its various forms this name is frequent in Irish Annals, and means "white-hair." (1) Barrfhinn, son of Aedh, given at Nov. 8 in *Mart. Doneg.*, as of Achadh Chaillten, in Ui-drona, (the barony of Idrone, county Carlow,) and sprung from the race of Eochaidh Finn-Fuath-Airt, from whom St. Brigida was descended, i.e. the race of Eochadh Finn Fothart, son of Feidhlimidh Reachtmhar, or the Lawgiver, king of Ireland A.D. 164-174, and brother of Con of the Hundred Battles (Todd's *St. Patrick*, 287; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 613, c. 3, App.).

(2) Bishop of Druim-cuilinn (now Drumcullen, in the barony of Eglisli, King's co., and standing on the boundary between the ancient Meath and Munster; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 321, n. ^m) and of Cillbairrhinn to the east of Eas-Ruadh, a cataract on the river Erne, in Tironel—May 21. He was come of the race of Conall Gulban (*Mart. Doneg.*). His date, as given by Ussher (*De Brit. Eccl. Prim.*, Dublin, 1639, Ind. Chr.), is A.D. 590; but Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 221) thinks he must have flourished earlier. Ussher (*ib.* 914) counts him among the 300 who formed the second order of Irish saints ("pauci Episcopi et multi Presbyteri"), and (p. 962) quotes from the Life of St. Carthagus, calling him Abbot of Druim-cuilinn on the borders of Munster and Leinster, in the territory of Fearcel or Ferghal, where a town called Raythen (now Rahen) stands. (For his supposed connection with St. Brendan of Clonfert, see Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 35, 219, 221; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 192). Kilbarron parish, in the diocese of Raphoe, co. Donegal, receives its name from this saint. (*Stat. Acc. Ireland*, i. 462.)

(3) Of Inis-doimble. Jan. 30. He is said to have been abbot of Inis-damle, on the borders of Kensalach and the Desii, in Leinster: another feast Oenghus, Mar. O'Gorm., *Mart. Tallaght*, and *Mart. Doneg.* place on July 4, the last-named making him "brother to the sons of Aedh, of Ath-cliaith" (Dublin), and of the same race as St. Brigida, but at Jan. 30 giving a different identification. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 597, n. ¹⁴; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 517; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 31, 187.) [A. P. F.]

BARRINTHUS was a disciple of St. Brendan. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 35, 219, 221.) [BARRFINN, 2.] [A. P. F.]

BARROCUS, ST., a disciple of St. Cadoc, in the 6th century. When Cadoc sailed from the island Echni ("qui modo Holma dicitur," i.e. Flat Holm in the Bristol Channel) to Barreu (Barry island), with his disciples Barruc and Gualches, he found that they had forgotten his Enchiridion, and sent them back for it, saying "Go, not to return." The irritable and revenge-

ful character of Celtic saints is noted by Giraldus, (*Itin. Cambriae*, ii. c. 7). A sudden storm over-set their boat, and Barruc lies buried in the island Barry, to which he gave his name (*Cambro-Briton Saints*, p. 63). This account is late, and there is an evident use of Nennius in it. Giraldus Cambrensis (*Itin. Cambriae*, i. 6), whose family took its name from Barry Island, describes the saint's shrine in his time thus: "Cujus et reliquiae in capella ibidem sita, hederarum nexibus amplexata, in feretrum translatae continentur." His feast day is variously stated as Nov. 29 (Cressy's *Church History*, xx. 18), or as Sept. 27 (Ritson's *Arthur*, 157; but see BARNIC).

[C. W. B.]

BARRY (BARRIUS, BARRINDUS, BARROCUS, BARR, FINBAR)—Sept. 25. This saint has a Scotch and an Irish history. According to the former, St. Finbar or Fymberrus was born in the island of Cathania, now Caithness. The prince concerned in the history is called Tigrinatus, and the story of the saint, both before and immediately after his birth, reproving him for cruelty, is in accordance with the records of the Irish Lives printed by Mr. Caulfield. With the exception of this legend, nothing more is said in the *Brev. of Aberdeen* of one who is known to hagiologists as St. Barry or Finbar, patron of Cork. His cultus was very prevalent in Scotland, and many places are named from him (see Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 275-6, and reff.; Torfaeus, *Orch.* i. c. 10; C. Innes, *Sket. Ear. Sc. Hist.* 70-1). According to the Irish history, he was a native of Cork or its neighbourhood (but Lanigan says, of Connaught), the founder, bishop, and patron of the first church there, and spending his life in that district as a confessor. In O'Curry's *Lect. Anc. Irish*, i. cccxxii. is a curious account of his birth and of his father, Amergin, son of Dubh, in Achad Dorbehon, in Muscraige. He was of the race of, and eighth in descent from, Brian son of Eochaidh Muighmhedhoin (king of Ireland A.D. 358-365); his real name was Lochan, so that Finnbar (White-haired) contracted into Barr, must be considered only as his surname (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 314). He was educated at first in Leinster under Mac-corb, a pupil of St. Gregory the Great. At Corcach-Mór of Munster, the "marshy place," where Cork now stands, he founded his church and established a school, which is said to have been attended by 17 holy bishops and 700 prosperous monks, though it may be that this number only *lie* there (Lanigan, *ib.* p. 318); but he had previously had a school at Loch Ire (Iree), which was attended by St. Tamlach (Feb. 26), Modhiomog (March 3), and Caolchu of Lui-airthir (Sept. 24), each of whom is said to have "given up his church to God and to Baire." (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 58, 62, 257, 259; Ussher, *de Brit. Eccl. Prim.*, Dublin, 1639, pp. 971, 1067.) All accounts agree that he visited Rome as "mos erat illis diebus Hiberniensibus . . . apostolorum limina prae locis omnibus magis frequenter devoto labore visitare." In going thither with his twelve companions, or returning, he paid a visit to St. David at Menevia, but we know nothing further of the time when the visit took place. (Ussher, *ib.* 953; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 221, 436 n.²)

After an episcopate of seventeen years, he died at Cloyne on Sept. 25, and was buried at Cork; but the year is uncertain, A.D. 633 or 630: Ussher says he flourished in 630, and the *Four Masters* give the death of Suibhne, his successor at Cork, in 680, but Tighernach more truly at 682, though either date would require St. Barry's to be later than 633: some however may have come between. (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.*, 129; *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. 287.) Lanigan gives his death as perhaps about A.D. 623 (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* 313-19; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* 143. *Dubl.* 1704). Mr. Caulfield, after Dr. Reeves, gives the following lives:—*MS. Hib.* Bruss. iv. pp. 2, 16, Nos. 2324-2340. Smith's *MSS. R.F.A.* No. 12, pp. 506-528; No. 150, pp. 129-137; No. 168, pp. 110-116. *MS. Lat.*, Primate Marsh's Lib. Cod. Kilken., fol. 132b-134. *Trin. Coll. Dub. E.* iii. 11. fol. 109 aa-110 bb. (See the *Life of St. Fin Barre, First Bishop and Founder of the See of Cork*, edited by Richard Caulfield, B.A., London, 1864.) He is patron of Kilbarry parish, in Waterford (*Stat. Acc. Ir.* i. 217); perhaps also of Kilberry parish in the diocese of Dublin and county of Kildare, with its Tobberawell, but the patron day is 24th June (*Ibid.* i. 450). [A. P. F.]

BARSANIANIANS, one of the minor sects into which the Monophysites fell asunder in Egypt during the latter part of the 5th century. Joannes Damascenus (*De Haeres.*), whose account is neither very intelligible nor very consistent, identifies them with the *Semidalitae*, and states that they had no valid consecration of the Eucharist, but having mixed a few crumbs of sacramental bread which had been consecrated by Dioscorus, the Eutychian Patriarch of Alexandria, with a measure of fine wheat flour (*σεμιδαλῖς*), partook of the loaf made therefrom, and regarded it as a reception of the Holy Communion. Damascenus strangely attributes to them the tenets both of the Gajanitae (or Julianists), and of the Theodosiani (or Severians), who held opposite doctrines as to the corruptibility of Christ's body, adding thereto something of their own. [E. V.]

BARSANUPHIANS, an obscure subdivision of the Monophysites, taking their name from Barsanuphius, an Egyptian pretender to the episcopal rank. They separated from the Jacobites in the reign of the Emperor Zeno, at the latter part of the 5th century, and were re-united to them in the time of the Patriarch Mark, *circ.* 810. At this time they had two bishops, whom Mark at first refused to recognize, but afterwards acknowledged, and appointed them to the first vacant sees. The founder of this sect was a different person from the Palestinian anchorite. (Fleury, *H. E.* x. 116; Neale, *Patr. of Alexand.*, ii. 137, 221.) [E. V.]

BARSANUPHIUS, a solitary of Palestine, an Egyptian by birth, in the reign of Justinian, c. 540. According to the story related by Evagrius (*H. E.* iv. 33) he shut himself up in his cell in a monastery at Gaza, where he remained for more than fifty years seeing and seen by no human being, and eating no earthly food. Eustochius, the bishop of Jerusalem, disbelieving the tale, commanded the cell to be broken open, whereupon fire burst out and consumed the

sacrilegious disturbers of the holy man's repose. Barsanuphius was the author of *Quaestiones et Responsiones Asceticæ variae*, and a *Paraenesis ad proprium discipulum*, originally printed by Montfaucon, *Biblioth. Coislin*, p. 394; and afterwards by Galland, *Biblioth. Vet. Patr.* xi. and Migne, *Patrolog.* lxxxvi. pars i. 887, sq. The questions have reference to the views attributed to Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus on the pre-existence of souls and the restitution of all things. The answers of Barsanuphius simply amount to an earnest exhortation to abstain from such erroneous writers, and not to be led astray by great names, since the ripest saints only know in part (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 524). [E. V.]

BARSUMAS (the Eutychian), an archimandrite or abbot of a Syrian monastery, who warmly espoused the cause of Eutyches. When, in 448, Eutyches was denounced as entertaining heretical views before the local synod of Constantinople, Barsumas, who was resident in the imperial city, raised a violent opposition to the Eastern bishops. The next year, 449, at the infamous council of Ephesus—"the Robbers' Synod,"—Theodosius summoned Barsumas as the representative of the malcontent monastic party, and granted him a seat and vote among the bishops. He was the first monk who was allowed to act as a judge at a general council. Barsumas did not come to the council alone. He brought with him a turbulent band of 1000 monks to second the brutal violence of the soldiers and coerce the assembly to come to a decision in accordance with their wishes. He took a prominent part in the violent and disorderly proceedings of this base counterfeited of a general council, vociferously expressing his joy when the acquittal of Eutyches was pronounced, and personally joining in the brutal assault made on the aged Flavian by the monks and soldiers. Barsumas and Dioscorus are even charged with having struck Flavian on the face, kicked him, and stamped upon him. The injuries inflicted were so serious that the venerable patriarch died three days afterwards on his way to a place of banishment. Barsumas' brutal violence was remembered against him, and when with great effrontery he presented himself at the council of Chalcedon, 451, an outcry was raised against him as "the murderer of the blessed Flavian." He actively propagated Eutychian doctrines in Syria and died 458. His disciple, Samuel, carried Eutychianism into Armenia. He is regarded among the Jacobites as a saint and worker of miracles (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 4; Labbe, iv. 105 sq.; Liberatus, c. 12; Tillemont, xv.; Schröckh, xviii. 451 sq.). [E. V.]

BARSUMAS (the Nestorian), bishop of Nisibis and Metropolitan, 435-489, who, after the suppression of Nestorianism within the empire, engaged actively and successfully in its propagation in eastern Asia, especially in Persia. Banished from Edessa by Rabulas, after his desertion of his former friends, Barsumas proved the chief strength and wisdom of the fugitive church. In 435 he became bishop of Nisibis, where, in conjunction with Maanes, bishop of Hardaschir, he established a theological school of deserved celebrity, over which Narses presided for fifty years with great ability. The refugees held several councils of their body, whose decisions separated them still further from

the orthodox church. Barsumas had the skill to secure for his church the powerful support of the Persian king Perozes (Firuz), who ascended the throne in the year 462. He worked upon his enmity to the Roman power to obtain his patronage for a development of doctrine which had been formally condemned by the Emperor and his assembled bishops, representing to him that the king of Persia could never securely reckon on the allegiance of his subjects so long as they held the same religious faith with his enemies. Perozes admitted the force of this argument, and Nestorianism became the only form of Christianity tolerated in Persia. According to the statement of Abulfaradsch (Asseman, *de Syr. Nestor.* tom. iii. p. i. pp. 391 sq.), it was propagated by the sword, and "the blood of 7700 Monophysites or Catholics confirmed the uniformity of faith and discipline in the churches of Persia" (Gibbon, c. xlvii.). We may reasonably question with Schröckh (*Kirchengeschichte*, xviii. 309), whether Barsumas, as Abulfaradsch asserts, took a personal part in this fierce persecution. His death is placed in 489, in which year the emperor Zeno broke up the theological seminary at Edessa on account of its Nestorianism. The college was consequently transferred to Nisibis, where it could freely develop itself under the Persian government, and only flourished the more. It became famous for the prosecution of the study of Holy Scripture, carried on in the liberal spirit of Theodore of Mopsuestia. In the 6th century the Nestorian school at Nisibis was the only regular institution for the training of the clergy. Missionaries went out from it in great multitudes, by whose means Nestorianism became established as the recognized form of Christianity in eastern Asia. The Malabar Christians are the lineal descendants of the churches thus planted.

The charges brought against Barsumas by Leontius of Byzantium (*in Eut.* p. 1007) of regarding all human actions as indifferent, and encouraging sensual excess, may safely be regarded as calumnies invented by theological adversaries. [E. V.]

BARTHENOS (Βαρθενός, -θενός), the name which Epiphanius gives to Noah's wife (i. 82 D). Scipio Gambatus ("*Archiv. Vet. Test.* p. 150," cited by Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep. V. T.* i. 274) points out that it is only a corruption of *Bath-Enos*, "the daughter of Enos." In the *Conflict of Adam* (p. 98 of Dillmann's translation, or i. 354 in Migne's *Dict. des Apocryphes*) Noah is said to have married "Haikal, the daughter of Abaraz, of the daughters of the sons of Enos," &c., and Dillmann subjoins (p. 141) that in the Ethiopic *Clementinum* and by Eutychius she is called "Haikal daughter of Namias, the son of Henoch, the brother of Methuselah." This evidence from Eastern apocryphal books disposes of Lipsius's strange conjecture (*Zur Quellenkritik d. Epiph.* 107) that Βαρθενός is a corruption of *παρθενος*. [H.]

BARTHOLOMEW. [See *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.]

BARUCH, Gnostic Book of. [JUS-TINUS THE HERETIC.]

BASIL. [BASILUS.]

BASILAS. [BASILUS of Ancyra, p. 281.]

BASILEUS [BASILUS, Martyr, p. 298.]

BASILIANI, a name given to the Nestorians from Basil of Irenopolis, the Cilician, in the Scholia on the books of *Eccl. Hierarch.*, and *de Divin. Nom.*, which exist under the name of Dionysius Areiopageita. These Scholia are attributed by Le Quien (*in Joann. Damasc. de Haeres.* § 80, p. 100) to Johannes Scythopolitanus, the zealous opponent of Basil, whom the Scholiast charges with covertly introducing the heresy of Nestorius under the shelter of the names of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, omitting all mention of Nestorius himself. [E. V.]

BASILICUS, a Marcionite of the second century, named with Potitus by Rhodon (ap. Eus. *H. E.* v. 13. 3) as one of those who maintained fully the antagonism of principles taught by Marcion. Volkmar (*Hipp. u. d. Röm. Zeigten.* 27 f.) conjectures that he is the Marcionite BLASTUS named by Theodoret (*H. E.* i. 25). [H.]

BASILIDES (Βασιλίδης), the founder of one of the semi-Christian sects, commonly called Gnostic, which sprang up in the early part of the second century.

I. Biography.—He called himself a disciple of one Glaucias, alleged to be an interpreter (ἐρμηνεύς) of St. Peter (Clem. *Strom.* vii. p. 898). He taught at Alexandria (Iren. p. 100 Mass.; followed by Eus. *H. E.* iv. 7; Epiph. *Haer.* xxiv. 1, p. 68 C; cf. xxiii. 1, p. 62 B; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 2); Hippolytus (*Haer.* vii. 27, p. 244) in general terms mentions Egypt. Indeed Epiphanius enumerates various places in Egypt visited by Basilides; but subsequently allows it to appear that his knowledge of the districts where Basilidians existed in his own time was his only evidence. If the Alexandrian Gnostic is the Basilides quoted in the *Acts of the Disputation of Archelaus and Mani* (c. 55, in Routh, *Rel. Sac.* v. 196; see later, p. 276), he was reported to have preached in Persia. Nothing more is known of his life. According to Epiphanius (62 B, 68 D, 69 A), he had been a fellow-disciple of Menander with Saturnilus at Antioch in Syria; but this is evidently an arbitrary extension of Irenaeus's remarks on the order of doctrines to personal relations. If the view of the doctrines of Basilides taken in this article is correct, they afford no good grounds for supposing him to have had a Syrian education. Gnostic ideas derived originally from Syria were sufficiently current at Alexandria; and the foundation of what is distinctive in his thoughts is Greek.

Several independent authorities indicate the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117–138) as the time when Basilides flourished. To prove that the heretical sects were "later than the Catholic Church," Clement of Alexandria (l. c.) marks out early Christian history into different periods: he assigns Christ's own teaching to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius; that of the apostles, of St. Paul at least, ends, he says, in the time of Nero; whereas "the authors of the sects arose later, about the times of the emperor Hadrian (κατὰ δὲ περὶ τοὺς κ.τ.λ. γεγονόσιν), and continued quite as late as the age of the elder Antoninus." He gives as examples Basilides, Valentinus, and (if the text is sound) Marcion, taking occasion by the way to throw doubts on

the claims set up for the two former as having been instructed by younger contemporaries of St. Peter and St. Paul respectively, by pointing out that about half a century lay between the death of Nero and the accession of Hadrian. Again Eusebius (l. c.) places Saturnilus and Basilides under Hadrian. Yet his language about Carpocrates a few lines further on suggests a doubt whether he had any better evidence than a fallacious inference from their order in Irenaeus. He was acquainted with the refutation of Basilides by Agrippa Castor; but it is not clear, as is sometimes assumed, that he meant to assign both writers to the same reign. His chronicle (Armenian) at the year 17 of Hadrian (A.D. 133) has the note "The heresiarch Basilides appeared at these times;" which Jerome, as usual, expresses rather more definitely. A similar statement without the year is repeated by Jerome, *de Vir. ill.* 21, where an old corrupt reading (*mortuus* for *moratus*) led some of the earlier critics to suppose they had found a limit for the date of Basilides' death. Theodoret (l. c.) evidently follows Eusebius. Earliest of all, but vaguest, is the testimony of Justin Martyr. Writing in or soon after A.D. 145, he refers briefly (*Ap.* i. 26) to the founders of heretical sects, naming first the earliest, Simon and Menander, followers of whom were still alive; and then apparently the latest, Marcion, himself still alive. The probable inference that the other great heresiarchs, including Basilides, were by this time dead receives some confirmation from a passage in his *Dialogue against Trypho* (c. 35), a later but probably not much later book, where the "Marcians," Valentinians, Basilidians, Saturnilians, "and others," are enumerated, apparently in inverse chronological order: the growth of distinct and recognised sects implies at least the lapse of some time since the promulgation of their several creeds. It seems therefore impossible to place Basilides later than Hadrian's time; and, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we may trust Clement's statement that his peculiar teaching began at no earlier date.

II. *Writings*.—According to Agrippa Castor (*Eus. H. E.* l. c.) Basilides wrote "twenty-four books (*βιβλία*) on the Gospel." These are no doubt the *Exegetica*, from the twenty-third of which Clement gives an extract (*Strom.* iv. §§ 83 ff., p. 599 f.). The same work is doubtless intended by the "treatises" (*tractatum*) the thirteenth book of which is cited in the *Acta Archelai*, if the same Basilides is referred to. The authorship of an actual Gospel, of the "apocryphal" class, is likewise attributed to Basilides on plausible grounds. The word "taken in hand" (*ἐπεχείρησεν*) in Luke i. 1 gives Origen occasion to distinguish between the four evangelists, who wrote by inspiration, and other writers who "took in hand" to produce Gospels. He mentions some of these, and proceeds, "Basilides had even the audacity" (*ἥδη δὲ ἐτόλμησεν*, more than *ἐπεχείρησεν*) "to write a Gospel according to Basilides;" that is, he went beyond other fabricators of Gospels by affixing his own name (*Hom. in Luc.* i.). This passage is freely translated, though without mention of Origen's name, by Ambrose (*Exp. in Luc.* i. 1); and is probably Jerome's authority in an enumeration of the chief apocryphal Gospels (*Com. in Matt.*

praef. t. vii. p. 3); for among the six others which he mentions the four named by Origen recur, including that of the Twelve Apostles, otherwise unknown (cf. Hieron. *Dial. cont. Pelag.* iii. 2, t. ii. p. 782). Yet no trace of a Gospel by Basilides exists elsewhere; and it seems most probable either that Origen misunderstood the nature of the *Exegetica*, or that they were sometimes known under the other name (cf. Hilgenfeld, *Clem. Rec. u. Hom.* 123 ff.).

An interesting question remains, in what relation the *Exegetica* stand to the exposition of doctrine which fills eight long chapters of Hippolytus. Basilides (or the Basilidians), we are told (vii. 27), defined the Gospel as "the knowledge of supermundane things" (*ἡ τῶν ὑπερκosμίων γνώσις*), and the idea of the progress of "the Gospel" through the different orders of beings plays a leading part in the Basilidian doctrine (cc. 25 ff.). But there is not the slightest reason to think that the "Gospel" here spoken of was a substitute for the Gospel in a historical sense, any more than in St. Paul's writings. Indeed several passages (p. 238, l. 28 ff.; 239. 42, 58; 240. 79 ff. of Miller), with their allusions to Rom. v. 14; viii. 19, 22, 23; 1 Cor. ii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Eph. i. 21; iii. 3, 5, 10, prove that the writer was throughout thinking of St. Paul's "mystery of the Gospel." Hippolytus states distinctly that the Basilidian account of "all things concerning the Saviour" subsequent to "the birth of Jesus" agreed with that given in "the Gospels." It may therefore be reasonably conjectured that his exposition, if founded on a work of Basilides himself (see sect. III.), is a summary of the opening book or books of the *Exegetica*, describing that part of the redemptive process, or of the preparation for it, which was above and antecedent to the phenomenal life of Jesus. The comments on the Gospel itself, probably containing much ethical matter, as we may gather from Clement, would have little attraction for Hippolytus.

The certain fragments of the *Exegetica* have been collected by Grabe (*Spicil. Patr.* ii. 35-43), followed by Massuet and Stieren in their editions of Irenaeus; but he passes over much in Clement which assuredly has no other origin. A single sentence quoted in Origen's commentary on Romans, and given further on (p. 275), is probably from the same source. In an obscure and brief fragment preserved in a Catena on Job (Venet. 1587, p. 345) Origen implies the existence of Odes by Basilides and Valentinus. No other writings of Basilides are mentioned.

III. *Authenticity of the Hippolytean extracts*.—In endeavouring to form a clear conception of the work and doctrine of Basilides, we are met at the outset by a serious difficulty. The different accounts were never easy to harmonise, and some of the best critics of the first half of this century considered them to refer to two different systems of doctrine. But till recently their fragmentary nature suggested that the apparent incongruities might conceivably be due only to the defects of our knowledge, and seemed to invite reconstructive boldness on the part of the historian. The publication of Hippolytus's *Refutation of all heresies* in 1851 placed the whole question on a new footing. Hardly any one has ventured to maintain the possibility of reconciling its ample statements about Basilides with

the reports of Irenaeus and Epiphanius. Which account then most deserves our confidence?

Before attempting to answer this question, it is well to enumerate the authorities. They are Agrippa Castor as cited by Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, the anonymous supplement to Tertullian, *De praescriptione*, the *Refutation* of Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Philaster, and Theodoret, and possibly the *Acta Archelai*, besides a few scattered notices which may be neglected here. This ample list shrinks however into small dimensions at the touch of criticism. Theodoret's chapter is a disguised compilation from previous Greek writers. The researches of Lipsius have proved that Epiphanius followed partly Irenaeus, partly the lost Compendium of Hippolytus, this same work being also the common source of the Latin authors Pseudo-Tertullian and Philaster. Our ultimate authorities therefore are Irenaeus (or the unknown author from whom he took this section of his work), the Compendium of Hippolytus (represented by Epiphanius [part], Philaster, and Pseudo-Tertullian), Clement, and the *Refutation* of Hippolytus, together with a short statement by Agrippa Castor, and probably a passing reference and quotation in the *Acta of Archelaus*.

It is now generally allowed that the notices of Clement afford the surest criterion by which to test other authorities. Not only does his whole tone imply exact personal knowledge, but he quotes a long passage directly from the *Exegetica*. Is then his account, taken as a whole, consistent with other accounts? And does it agree best with the reports of Irenaeus and Hippolytus in his younger days, or with the elaborate picture drawn by Hippolytus at a later time? This second question has received opposite answers from recent critics. A majority have given the preference to Hippolytus; while Hilgenfeld, (who three years before, in his earliest book, the treatise on the *Clementine Homilies and Recognitions*, pp. 125-149, had described the Basilidian system from the then known records, endeavouring with perverse ingenuity to show their virtual consistency with each other,) has picked himself on not being dazzled by the new authority, whom he holds to be in effect describing not Basilides but a late development of his sect; and Lipsius takes the same view.

It should be observed at the outset that the testimony of Clement is not quite so homogeneous as is generally assumed. Six times he criticises doctrines of "Basilides" himself; eight times he employs the ambiguous plural (of ἀπὸ Β., of ἀμφοῖν τῶν Β.). Are we to suppose a distinction here, or is the verbal difference accidental? Both views might be maintained. The quotation from the *Exegetica* (*Strom.* iv. pp. 599 f.) is a piece of moral argument on Providence, wholly free from the technical terms of Gnostic mythology. In the succeeding discussion Clement eventually uses plurals (ἐἰ . . . τῆς αὐτῶν λέγουσι—ἐκείνησαν ἡ ὑπόθεσις αὐτοῖς—ὡς φάναι, apparently a misreading for ὡς φασὶν—ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν), which might equally imply that he employs both forms indifferently, or that he distinguishes Basilides from his followers within the limits of a single subject. The other references to "Basilides" are likewise of a distinctly ethical character, while several of the passages containing the plural name abound

in technical language. Yet the distinction is not absolute on either side. "Basilides" furnishes the terms "the Ogdoad," "the election," "supermundane;" while such subjects as the nature of faith, the relation of the passions to the animal soul, and the meaning of Christ's saying about eunuchs, occur in the other group, though they remind us rather of Basilides himself. In the last passage moreover (*Strom.* iii. pp. 508 ff.) the ambiguous plural (of ἀπὸ Β. φασὶ—λέγουσι—ἐξηγουῦνται—φασὶ bis) is applied to a quotation intended to shame by contrast the immoral Basilidians of Clement's own time; and a similar quotation from Basilides' son Isidore immediately follows; the authors of the two quotations being designated as "the forefathers of their (the late Basilidians') doctrines." It is hard to believe that mere anonymous disciples, though of an earlier date, would be appealed to in this manner, or would take precedence of the master's own son. On the whole, there can be no reasonable doubt that all the doctrinal statements in Clement concern Basilides himself, when not distinctly otherwise expressed, and depend on direct knowledge of the *Exegetica*. With good reason therefore they may be assumed as a trustworthy basis for the whole investigation. The most doubtful instances are the passages cited presently on the Baptism and (in the *Exo. Theod.*) on the descent of the Minister (διδάκων), i.e. the Holy Spirit.

The range of possible contact between the quotations and reports of Clement and any of the other authorities is not large. His extant writings contain nothing like an attempt to describe the Basilidian system. The *Stromates*, which furnish the quotations from Basilides, expressly limit themselves to moral and practical questions (ὁ ἡθικὸς λόγος); and reserve for a future work, i.e. the lost *Hypotyposes*, the exposition of the higher doctrine (τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐκπαινετὴν θεωρίαν γνώσεως, τὴν τῷ θετῷ γνωστικῷ φυσικολογίαν) belonging to the department of knowledge which the Stoics called Physics, beginning with the Creation and leading up to Theology proper (*Strom.* i. p. 324; iv. pp. 563 f., 637; vi. pp. 735 f., 827; vii. 829, 902; cf. Bunsen, *Anat. Antenic.* i. 159 ff.). Now it is precisely to this latter department that the bulk of Gnostic speculation would belong, and especially such theories as Hippolytus ascribes to Basilides; and moreover Clement distinctly promises that in the course of that loftier investigation he will "set forth in detail the doctrines of the heretics (τῶν ἑτεροδόξων), and endeavour to refute them to the best of his power" (iv. § 3, p. 564). We have therefore no right to expect in the *Stromates* any cosmological or even theological matter respecting Basilides except such as may accidentally adhere to the ethical statements, the subjects treated of in the various books "against all heresies" being formally excluded by Clement. His sphere being thus distinct from theirs, the marked coincidences of language that we do find between him and Hippolytus afford a strong presumption that, if the one account is authentic, the other is so likewise. Within the narrow limits of Clement's information we meet with the phrases "primitive medley and confusion" (σάγχυσις), and on the other hand "separation" (differentiation) and restoration (σοφία φυλοκρινητική, ἀποκαταστατική); with a division of the

universe into stages (*διαστήματα*), and prominence given to the sphere of "supermundane" things; with an "Ogdoad" and an "Archon;" all of these terms being conspicuous and essential in the Hippolytean representation. Above all we hear of the amazement of the Archon on receiving "the utterance of the ministering Spirit" or "Minister" (*διδάκωνος*, cf. *Ecl. Theod.* p. 972) as being that fear of the Lord which is called the beginning of wisdom (*Strom.* ii. p. 448); the utterance itself being implied to be a Gospel (*εὐγγελισμένον*); while Hippolytus describes the same passage as interpreted of the amazement of the Great Archon on receiving "the Gospel," a revelation of things unknown, through his son, who had received it from a "power" within the Holy Spirit (vii. 26). The coincidences are thus proportionately great, and there are no contradictions to balance them: so that it would require strong evidence to rebut the conclusion that Clement and Hippolytus had the same materials before them. Such evidence does not exist. The coincidences between Clement and the Irenæan tradition are limited to the widely-spread "Ogdoad" and a single disputable use of the word "Archon," and there is no similarity of doctrines to make up for the absence of verbal identity. The only tangible argument against the view that Hippolytus describes the original system of Basilides is its Greek rather than Oriental character, which is assumed to be incompatible with the fundamental thoughts of a great Gnostic leader. We shall have other opportunities of inquiring how far the evidence supports this wide generalisation as to Gnosticism at large. As regards Basilides personally the only grounds for expecting from him an Oriental type of doctrine are the quotation in the Acts of Archelaus, which will be discussed further on, and the tradition of his connexion with Saturnilus of Antioch, which we have already seen to be founded on a misconception. The fragmentary notices and extracts in Clement, admitted on all hands to be authentic, are steeped in Greek philosophy; so that the Greek spirit of the Hippolytean representation is in fact an additional evidence for its faithfulness.

It may yet be asked,—did Hippolytus consult the work of Basilides himself, or did he depend on an intermediate reporter? His own language, though not absolutely decisive, favours the former alternative. On the one hand it may be urged that he makes no mention of a book, that occasionally he quotes by the words "they say," "according to them," and that his exposition is immediately preceded by the remark, "Let us then see how openly both Basilides and [his son] Isidore (B. *δμοῦ καὶ Ἰ.*) and the whole band of them not merely calumniate Matthias [from whom they professed to have received records of Christ's secret teaching], but also the Saviour Himself" (c. 20). Against these indications may be set the ten places where Basilides is referred to singly, and the very numerous quotations by the words "he says." It is true that Greek usage permits the occasional use of the singular even when no one writer or book is intended. But in this case the most natural translation is borne out by some of the language quoted. The first person singular (*ἔστιν δὲ λέγω, φησίν, τὸ ἦν, οὐχ ὅτι ἦν λέγω, ἀλλ' ἵνα σημαίνα τοῦτο ὅπερ βούλομαι δεῖξαι, λέγω, φησίν, ὅτι ἦν ὅλως οὐδέν . . . καὶ οὐ δέχομαι, φησίν κ.τ.λ.*) proves the book

in Hippolytus's hands to have been written by an original speculator; yet this very quotation is immediately followed by a comment on it with the third person plural, which here at least can mean no more than that Hippolytus held the Basilidians of his own day responsible for the doctrines of his author. The freshness and power of the whole section, wherever we touch the actual words of the author, strongly confirm the impression that he was no other than Basilides himself. Thus we are led independently to the conclusion suggested by the correspondence with the information of Clement, whom we know to have drawn from the fountain-head, the *Exegetica*. The fancy that the book used by Hippolytus was itself the Traditions of Matthias has nothing to recommend it. The whole form is unlike that which analogy would lead us to expect in such a production. If it was quoted as an authority in the *Exegetica*, the language of Hippolytus is justified. Nor is there anything in this inconsistent with the fact vouched for by Clement (*Strom.* vii. p. 898) that Basilides claimed to have been taught by Glaucias, an "interpreter" of St. Peter.

We shall therefore assume that the eight chapters of Hippolytus (vii. 20-27) represent faithfully though imperfectly the contents of part at least of the *Exegetica* of Basilides; and proceed to describe his doctrine on their authority, using likewise the testimony of Clement wherever it is available.

IV. *Doctrine.*—Basilides asserts the beginning of all things to have been pure nothing. He uses every device of language to express absolute nonentity. He will not allow the primitive nothing to be called even "unspeakable;" that, he says, would be naming it, and it is above every name that is named (20). Nothing then being in existence, "not-being God" (or Deity, *οὐκ ὢν θεός*: the article is omitted here) willed to make a not-being world out of not-being things. Once more great pains are taken to obviate the notion that "willing" implied any mental attribute whatever. Also the world so made was not the extended and differentiated world to which we give the name, but "a single seed containing within itself all the seed-mass of the world," the aggregate of the seeds of all its forms and substances, as the mustard seed contains the branches and leaves of the tree, or the peacock's egg the brilliant colours of the full-grown bird (21). This was the one origin of all future growths; their seeds lay stored up by the will of the not-being God in the single world-seed, as in the newborn babe its future teeth and the resemblances to its father which are thereafter to appear. Its own origin too from God was not a *putting-forth* (*προβολή*), as a spider puts forth its web from itself. (By this assertion, on which Hippolytus dwells with emphasis, every notion of "emanation" is expressly repudiated.) Nor was there an antecedent matter, like the brass or wood wrought by a mortal man. The words "Let there be light and there was light" convey the whole truth. The light came into being out of nothing but the voice of the Speaker; "and the Speaker was not, and that which came into being was not."

What then was the first stage of growth of the seed? It had within itself "a tripartite sonship, in all things consubstantial with the not-

being God." Part of the sonship was subtle of substance (*λεπτομερές*), part coarse of substance (*παχυμερές*), part needing purification (*ἀποκαθάρσεως δεόμενον*). Simultaneously with the first beginning of the seed the subtle sonship burst through (*διέσφουζεν*) and mounted swiftly up "like a wing or a thought" (*Odyss. vii. 36*) till it reached the not-being God; "for toward Him for His exceeding beauty and grace (*ὡραϊότητος*) every kind of nature yearns (*ὀρέγεται*), each in its own way." The coarse sonship could not mount up of itself, but it took to itself as a wing the Holy Spirit, each bearing up the other with mutual benefit, even as neither a bird can soar without a wing, nor a wing without a bird. But when it came near the blessed and unutterable place of the subtle sonship and the not-being God, it could take the Holy Spirit no further, as not being consubstantial or of the same nature with itself. There then, retaining and emitting downwards the fragrance of the sonship like a vessel that has once held ointment, the Holy Spirit remained, as a firmament dividing things above the world from "the world" itself below (22).

The third sonship continued still within the heap of the seed-mass. But out of the heap burst forth into being the Great Archon, "the head of the world, a beauty and greatness and power that cannot be uttered." He too raised himself aloft till he reached the firmament which he supposed to be the upward end of all things. Then he became wiser and every way better than all other cosmical things except the sonship left below, which he knew not to be far better than himself. So he turned to create the world in its several parts. But first he "made to himself and begot out of the things below a son far better and wiser than himself," for thus the not-being God had willed from the first; and smitten with wonder at his son's beauty he set him at his right hand. "This is what they call the Ogdoad, where the Great Archon is sitting." Then all the heavenly or ethereal creation (apparently included in the Ogdoad), as far down as the moon, was made by the Great Archon, inspired by his wiser son (23). Again another Archon arose out of the seed-mass, inferior to the first Archon, but superior to all else below except the sonship; and he likewise made to himself a son wiser than himself, and became the creator and governor of the aerial world. This region is called the Hebdomad. On the other hand in the heap and seed-mass, constituting our own (the terrestrial) stage, "those things that come to pass come to pass according to nature, as having been previously uttered by Him who hath planned the fitting time and form and manner of utterance of the things that were to be uttered (*ὥς φέδραντα λεχθήναι ὑπὸ τοῦ τὰ μέλλοντα λέγεσθαι ὅτε δεῖ καὶ οἷα δεῖ καὶ ὥς δεῖ λελογισμένου*): and these things have no one to rule over them, or exercise care for them, or create them; for sufficient for them is that plan (*λογισμός*) which the not-being One planned when He was making" [the seed-mass] (24).

Such is the original cosmogony as conceived by Basilides, and it supplies the base for his view of the Gospel, as well as of the interval before the coming of the Gospel into the world. When the whole world had been finished, and the things above the world, and nothing was lacking, there remained in the seed-mass the third sonship,

which had been left behind to do good and receive good in the seed; and it was needful that the sonship thus left behind should be revealed (*Rom. viii. 19*) and restored up yonder above the Limitary Spirit to join the subtle and imitative sonship and the not-being One, as it is written, "And the creation itself groaneth together and travaileth together, expecting the revelation of the sons of God." Now we the spiritual, he said, are sons left behind here to order and to inform and to correct and to perfect the souls whose nature it is to abide in this stage. Till Moses then from Adam sin reigned, as it is written; for the Great Archon reigned, he whose end reaches to the firmament, supposing himself to be God alone, and to have nothing above him, for all things remained guarded in secret silence: this is the mystery which was not made known to the former generations. But in those times the Great Archon, the Ogdoad, was king and lord, as it appeared, of all things: and moreover the Hebdomad was king and lord of this stage; and the Ogdoad is unutterable, but the Hebdomad utterable. This, the Archon of the Hebdomad, is he who spoke to Moses and said, "I am the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and the name of God did I not make 'known to them'" (for so, says Hippolytus, they will have it read), that is, of the unutterable God who is Archon of the Ogdoad. All the prophets therefore, that were before the Saviour, spoke from that source (*ἐκείθεν*).

This short interpretation of the times before Christ, which has evidently suffered in the process of condensation by Hippolytus, carries us at once to the Gospel itself. "Because therefore it was needful that we the children of God should be revealed, concerning whom the creation groaned and travailed, expecting the revelation, the Gospel came into the world, and passed through every principality and power and lordship and every name that is named." There was still no downward coming from above, no departure of the ascended sonship from its place: but "from below from the formlessness of the heap the powers penetrated (*διήκουσιν*) up to the sonship" (i.e. probably, throughout the scale the power of each stage penetrated to the stage immediately above), and so thoughts (*νοήματα*) were caught from above as naphtha catches fire at a distance without contact. Thus the power within the Holy Spirit "conveyed the thoughts of the sonship, as they flowed and drifted (*ῥέοντα καὶ φερόμενα*), to the son of the Great Archon" (25); and he in turn instructed the Great Archon himself, by whose side he was sitting. Then first the Great Archon learned that he was not God of the universe, but had himself come into being, and had above him yet higher beings; he discovered with amazement his own past ignorance, and confessed his sin in having magnified himself. This fear of his, said Basilides, was that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom (wisdom to "separate and discern and perfect and restore;" *Clem. Strom. ii. 448 f.*). From him and the Ogdoad the Gospel had next to pass to the Hebdomad. Its Archon's son received the light from the son of the Great Archon, he became himself enlightened, and declared the Gospel to the Archon of the Hebdomad, and he too feared and confessed, and all that was in the Hebdomad received the light (26).

It remained only that the formlessness of our own region should be enlightened, and that the hidden mystery should be revealed to the third sonship left behind in the formlessness, as to "one born out of due time" (*οἶον ἐκ τρώματι*, 1 Cor. xv. 8). The light came down from the Hebdomad upon Jesus the Son of Mary. That this descent of the light was represented as taking place at the Annunciation, and not merely at the Baptism, is clearly implied in the express reference to the words of the angel in Luke i. 35, "A Holy Spirit shall come upon thee," which are explained to mean "that [? spirit] which passed from the sonship through the Limitary Spirit to the Ogdoad and the Hebdomad till it reached Mary" (the interpretation of the following words, "And a power of the Most High shall overshadow thee," appears to be hopelessly corrupt). On the other hand, when it is described as a result of the descent of the light from the Hebdomad "upon Jesus the Son of Mary," that He "was enlightened, being kindled in union with the light (*συνεξαφθεῖς τῷ φωτί*) that shone on Him," the allusion to the traditional light at the Baptism can hardly be questioned; more especially when we read in Clement's *Excerpta* (p. 972) that the Basilidians interpreted the dove to be "the Minister," *i.e.* (see pp. 270, 276) the revealing "power" within the Holy Spirit (26).

From the Nativity Hippolytus's exposition passes on at once to its purpose in the future, and the final consummation. The world holds together as it is now, we learn, until all the sonship that has been left behind, to give benefits to the souls in formlessness and to receive benefits by obtaining distinct form, follows Jesus and mounts up and is purified and becomes most subtle, so that it can mount by itself like the first sonship; "for it has all its power naturally established in union (*συνεστηρικμένον*) with the light that shone down from above" (26). When every sonship has arrived above the Limitary Spirit, "then the creation shall find mercy, for till now it groans and is tormented and awaits the revelation of the sons of God, that all the men of the sonship may ascend from hence" (27).

When this has come to pass, God will bring upon the whole world the Great Ignorance, that everything may remain according to nature, and that nothing may desire aught that is contrary to nature. Thus all the souls of this stage, whose nature it is to continue immortal in this stage alone, will remain without knowledge of anything higher and better than this, lest they suffer torment by craving for things impossible, like a fish desiring to feed with the sheep on the mountains, for such a desire would have been to their destruction. All things are indestructible while they abide in their place, but destructible if they aim at overleaping the bounds of nature. Thus the Great Ignorance will overtake even the Archon of the Hebdomad, that grief and pain and sighing may depart from him: yea, it will overtake the Great Archon of the Ogdoad, and all the creations subject to him, that nothing may in any respect crave for aught that is against nature or may suffer pain. "And in this wise shall be the Restoration, all things according to nature having been founded in the seed of the universe in the beginning, and being restored at their due seasons. And that each thing has its due seasons is sufficiently proved by the Saviour's

CHRIST. BIOGR.

words, 'My hour is not yet come,' and by the beholding of the star by the Magi; for even He Himself was subject to the 'genesis' (nativity) of the periodic return (*ἀποκαταστάσις*, here used in the limited astrological sense, though above as 'restoration' generally) of stars and hours, as foreordained (*προλελογισμένος*: cf. c. 24 s. f.; x. 14) in the great heap." "He," adds Hippolytus, evidently meaning our Lord, "is (in the Basilidian view) the inner spiritual man in the natural (psychical) man; that is, a sonship leaving its soul here, not a mortal soul but one remaining in its present place according to nature, just as the first sonship up above hath left the Limitary Holy Spirit in a fitting place; He having at that time been clothed with a soul of His own" (27).

These last two remarks, on the subjection to seasons and on the ultimate abandonment of the immortal but earth-bound soul by the ascending sonship or spiritual man, taking place first in the Saviour and then in the other 'sons of God,' belong in strictness to an earlier part of the scheme; but they may have been placed here by Basilides himself, to explain the strange consummation of the Great Ignorance. The principle receives perhaps a better illustration from what purports to be an exposition of the Basilidian view of the Gospel, with which Hippolytus concludes his report. "According to them," he says, "the Gospel is the knowledge of things above the world, which knowledge the Great Archon understood not: when then it was shewn to him that there exists the Holy Spirit, that is the Limitary Spirit, and the sonship and a God who is the author (*αἴτιος*) of all these things, even the not-being One, he rejoiced at what was told him, and was exceeding glad: this is according to them the Gospel." Here Hippolytus evidently takes too generally the special form under which Basilides represented the Gospel as made known to the Great Archon. Nor, when he proceeds to say that "Jesus according to them was born in the manner that we have previously mentioned," is it clear that Basilides gave a different account of the Nativity itself from that accepted by the Church, because he gave a peculiar interpretation to the angel's words. "After the Nativity already made known," adds Hippolytus, "all incidents concerning the Saviour came to pass according to them (the Basilidians) as they are described in the Gospels." But all this is only introductory to the setting forth of the primary principle. "These things" (apparently the incidents of our Lord's life) "are come to pass that Jesus might become the first fruits of the sorting of the things confused" (*τῆς φυλοκρινήσεως τῶν συγκεχυμένων*). For since the world is divided into the Ogdoad and the Hebdomad and this stage in which we dwell, where is the formlessness, "it was necessary that the things confused should be sorted by the division of Jesus. That therefore suffered which was His bodily part, which was of the formlessness, and it was restored into the formlessness; and that rose up which was His psychical part, which was of the Hebdomad, and it was restored into the Hebdomad; and he raised up that which belonged to the summit where sits the Great Archon (*τῆς ἀκρωτέρας τοῦ μ. ἄ.*), and it abode beside the Great Archon: and He bore up on high that which was of the

T

Limitary Spirit, and it abode in the Limitary Spirit; and the third sonship, which had been left behind in [the heap] to give and receive benefits, through Him was purified and mounted up to the blessed sonship, passing through them all." "Thus Jesus is become the first fruits of the sorting; and the Passion has come to pass for no other purpose than this (reading γέγονεν ἡ ὑπὲρ for γέγονεν ὑπὸ), that the things confused might be sorted." For the whole sonship left behind in the formlessness must needs be sorted in the same manner as Jesus Himself hath been sorted. Thus, as Hippolytus remarks a little earlier, the whole theory consists of the confusion of a seed-mass, and of the sorting and restoration into their proper places of things so confused (27).

Clement's contributions to our knowledge of Basilides refer chiefly, as has been said, to the ethical side of his doctrine. Here "Faith" evidently played a considerable part. In itself it was defined by "them of Basilides" (οἱ ἀπὸ Β.) as "an assent of the soul to any of the things which do not excite sensation, because they are not present" (*Strom.* ii. p. 443); the phrase being little more than a vague rendering of Heb. xi. 1 in philosophical language. From another unfortunately corrupt passage (v. p. 645) it would appear that Basilides accumulated forms of dignity in celebration of faith. But the eulogies were in vain, Clement intimates, because they abstained from setting forth faith as the "rational assent of a soul possessing free will." They left faith a matter of "nature," not of responsible choice. So again, while contrasting the honour shewn by the Basilidians to faith with its disparagement in comparison with "knowledge" by the Valentinians, he accuses them (οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Β.) of regarding it as "natural," and referring it to "the election," while they apparently considered it to "discover doctrines without demonstration by an intellectual apprehension" (τὰ μαθήματα ἀναποδείκτως εὐρίσκουσιν καταλήψει νοητικῇ). He adds that according to them (οἱ ἀπὸ Β.) there is at once a faith and an election of special character (οἰκέλαν) in each "stage" (διδαστήριον), the mundane faith of every nature follows in accordance with its supermundane election, and for each (? being or stage) the [Divine] gift of his (or its) faith corresponds with his (or its) hope (ii. 433 f.). What "hope" was intended, is not explained: probably it is the range of legitimate hope, the limits of faculty accessible to the beings inhabiting this or that "stage." It is hardly likely that Clement would have censured unreservedly what appears here as the leading principle of Basilides, the Divine assignment of a limited sphere of action to each order of being, and the Divine bestowal of proportionally limited powers of apprehending God upon the several orders, though it is true that Clement himself specially cherished the thought of an upward progress from one height of being to another, as part of the Divine salvation (*Strom.* vii. p. 835, &c.). Doubtless Basilides pushed election so far as to sever a portion of mankind from the rest, as alone entitled by Divine decree to receive the higher enlightenment. In this sense it must have been that he called "the election a stranger to the world, as being by nature supermundane;" while Clement maintained that no man can by

nature be a stranger to the world (iv. p. 639). It is hardly necessary to point out how closely the limitation of spheres agrees with the doctrine on which the Great Ignorance is founded, and the supermundane election with the doctrine of the Third Sonship.

The same rigid adhesion to the conception of natural fixity, and inability to accept Christian beliefs which transcend it, led Basilides (δ Β.) to confine the remission of sins to those which are committed involuntarily and in ignorance; as though, says Clement (*Strom.* iv. p. 634), it were a man and not God that bestowed the gift. A like fatalistic view of Providence is implied in the language held by Basilides (in the 23rd book of his *Exegetica*, as quoted by Clement, *Strom.* iv. pp. 599-603) in reference to the sufferings of Christian martyrs. In this instance we have the benefit of verbal extracts, though unfortunately their sense is in parts obscure. So far as they go, they do not bear out the allegations of Agrippa Castor (ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 7 § 7) that Basilides taught that the partaking of food offered to idols, and the heedless (ἀπαφροδίστως) abjuration of the faith in time of persecution was a thing indifferent; and of Origen (*Com. in Matt.* iii. 856 Ru.), that he depreciated the martyrs, and treated lightly the sacrificing to heathen deities. The impression seems to have arisen partly from a misunderstanding of the purpose of his argument, partly from the actual doctrine and practice of later Basilidians: but it may also have had some justification in incidental words which have not been preserved. Basilides is evidently contesting the assumption, probably urged in controversy against his conception of the justice of Providence, that the sufferers in "what are called tribulations" (ἐν ταῖς λεγόμεναις θλίψεσιν) are to be regarded as innocent, simply because they suffer for their Christianity. He suggests that some are in fact undergoing punishment for previous unknown sins, while "by the goodness of Him who brings events to pass" (τοῦ περιόγοντος) they are allowed the comfort of suffering as Christians, "not subject to rebuke as the adulterer or the murderer" (apparently with reference to 1 Pet. iii. 17; iv. 15, 16, 19): and if there be any who suffer without previous sin, it will not be "by the design of an [adverse] power" (κατ' ἐπιβουλὴν δυνάμεως), but as sufferers the babe who appears to have committed no sin. The next quotation attempts at some length an exposition of this comparison with the babe. The obvious distinction is drawn between sin committed in act (ἐνεργῶς) and the capacity for sin (τὸ ἀμαρτητικόν); the infant is said to receive a benefit when it is subjected to suffering, "gaining" many hardships (πολλὰ κέρδανον δύσκολα). So is it, he says, with the suffering of a perfect man, for his not having sinned must not be set down to himself; though he has done no evil, he must have willed evil; "for I will say anything rather than call Providence (τὸ προνοῦν) evil." He did not shrink, Clement says, and the language seems too conclusive, from applying his principle even to the Lord. "If, leaving all these arguments, you go on to press me with certain persons, saying for instance, 'Such an one sinned therefore, for such an one suffered,' if you will allow me I will say, 'He did not sin, but he is like the suffering babe:' but if you force the argument with

greater violence, I will say that any man whom you may choose to name is a man, and that God is righteous; for 'no one,' as it has been said, 'is clear of defilement' (*ῥύπον*). He likewise brought in the notion of sin in a past stage of existence suffering its penalty here, "the elect soul" suffering "honourably (*ἐπιτιμῶς*) through martyrdom, and the soul of another kind being cleansed by an appropriate punishment." To this doctrine of metempsychosis (*τὰς ἐνσωματώσεις*) "the Basilidians" (*οἱ ἀπὸ Β.*) are likewise said to have referred the language of the Lord about requital to the third and fourth generations (*Exo. Theod.* 976); Origen states that Basilides himself interpreted Rom. vii. 9 in this sense, "The Apostle said, 'I lived without a law once,' that is, before I came into this body, I lived in such a form of body as was not under a law, that of a beast namely, or a bird" (*Com. in Rom.* iv. 549, Ru.); and elsewhere (*Com. in Matt.* l. c.) Origen complains that he deprived men of a salutary fear by teaching that trans-migrations are the only punishments after death. What more Basilides taught about Providence as exemplified in martyrdoms is not easily brought together from Clement's rather confused account. He said that one part of what is called the will of God (*i.e.* evidently His own mind towards lower beings, not what He would have their mind to be) is to love (or rather perhaps, be satisfied with, *ἡγαπημένοι*) all things because all things preserve a relation to the universe (*λόγον ἀποσώζουσι πρὸς τὸ πᾶν ἅπαντα*), and another to despise nothing, and a third to hate no single thing (601). In the same spirit pain and fear were described as natural accidents of things (*ἐπισυμβαίνει τοῖς πράγμασιν*), as rust of iron (603). In another sentence (602) Providence seems to be spoken of as set in motion by the Archon; by which perhaps was meant (see Hipp. c. 24, cited above, p. 272 a) that the Archon was the unconscious agent who carried into execution (within his own "stage") the long dormant original counsels of the not-being God. The view of the harmony of the universe just referred to finds expression, with a reminiscence of a famous sentence of Plato (*Tim.* 31 B), in a saying (*Strom.* v. p. 690) that Moses "set up one temple of God and an only-begotten world" (*μονογενὴ τε κόσμον*: cf. Plut. ii. 423 A, *ἓνα τοῦτον [τὸν κόσμον] εἶναι μονογενὴ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀγαπητόν*).

We have a curious piece of psychological theory in the account of the passions attributed to the Basilidians (*οἱ ἀπὸ τὸν Β.*). They are accustomed, Clement says (*Strom.* ii. p. 488), to call the passions Appendages (*προσάρτηματα*), stating that these are certain spirits which have a substantial existence (*κατ' οὐσίαν ὑπάρχειν*), having been appended (or "attached," or "adherent," various kinds of close external contact being expressed by *προσηρημένα*, cf. M. Aur. xii. 3, with Gataker's note, and also Tertullian's *ceteris appendicibus, sensibus et affectibus*, *Adv. Marc.* i. 25, cited by Gieseler) to the rational soul in a certain primitive turmoil and confusion, and that again other bastard and alien natures of spirits grow upon these (*προσπιφύεσθαι ταύταις*), as of a wolf, an ape, a lion, a goat, whose characteristics (*ιδιόματα*), becoming perceptible in the region of the soul (*φανταζόμενα περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν*), assimilate the desires of the soul to the animals: for

they imitate the actions of those whose characteristics they wear, and not only acquire intimacy (*προσ οικειοῦνται*) with the impulses and impressions of the irrational animals, but even imitate (*ζηλοῦσι*) the movements and beauties of plants, because they likewise wear the characteristics of plants appended to them; and [the passions] have also characteristics of habit [derived from stones], as the hardness of adamant (cf. p. 487 med.). In the absence of the context it is impossible to determine the precise meaning and origin of this singular theory. It was probably connected with the doctrine of metempsychosis, which seemed to find support in Plato's *Timæus* (42, 90 f.), and was cherished by some Neo-Pythagoreans later in the 2nd century (cf. Zeller, *Philos. d. Gr.* v. 198 f.); while the plurality of souls is derided by Clement as making the body a Trojan horse, with apparent reference (as Saumaise points out, on Simplic. *Epict.* 164) to a similar criticism of Plato in the *Theætetus* (184 D). And again Plutarch (*De comm. not.* 45, p. 1084) ridicules the Stoics (*i.e.* apparently Chrysippus) for a "strange and outlandish" notion that all virtues and vices, arts and memories, impressions and passions and impulses and assents (he adds further down even "acts," *ἐνεργείας*, such as "walking, dancing, supposing, addressing, reviling") are not merely "bodies" (of course in the familiar Stoic sense) but living creatures or animals (*ζῷα*), crowded apparently round the central point within the heart where "the ruling principle" (*τὸ ἡγεμονικόν*) is located: by this "swarm," he says, of hostile animals they turn each one of us into "a paddock or a stable, or a Trojan horse." Such a theory may naturally have seemed to Basilides an easy deduction from his fatalistic doctrine of Providence, and of the consequent immutability of all natures.

The only specimen which we have of the practical ethics of Basilides is of a favourable kind, though grossly misunderstood and misapplied by Epiphanius (i. 211 f.). Reciting the views of different heretics on Marriage, Clement (*Strom.* iii. 508 ff.) mentions first its approval by the Valentinians, and then gives specimens of the teaching of Basilides (*οἱ ἀπὸ Β.*) and his son Isidore, by way of rebuke to the immorality of the later Basilidians, before proceeding to the sects which favoured licence, and to those which treated marriage as unholy. He first reports the exposition of Matt. xix. 11 f. (or a similar evangelic passage), in which there is nothing specially to note except the interpretation of the last class of eunuchs as those who remain in celibacy to avoid the distracting cares of providing a livelihood. He goes on to the paraphrase of 1 Cor. vii. 9, interposing in the midst an illustrative sentence from Isidore, and transcribes the language used about the class above mentioned. "But suppose a young man either poor or (?) depressed [*κατηφής* seems at least less unlikely than *κατωφής*], and in accordance with the word [in the Gospel] unwilling to marry, let him not separate from his brother; let him say 'I have entered into the Holy place [*τὰ ἅγια*, probably the communion of the Church], nothing can befall me: ' but if he have a suspicion [?] self-distrust, *ὑπονοίαν ἔχῃ*, let him say, 'Brother, lay thy hand on me, that I may sin not,' and he shall receive help both to mind and to senses (*νοστήν καὶ αἰσθητήν*); let him only have the

will to carry out completely what is good, and he shall succeed. But sometimes we say with the lips, 'We will not sin,' while our thoughts are turned towards sinning: such an one abstains by reason of fear from doing what he wills, lest the punishment be reckoned to his account. But the estate of mankind has only certain things at once necessary and natural, clothing being necessary and natural, but τὸ τῶν ἀφροδισίων natural, yet not necessary" (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 989).

Although we have no evidence that Basilides, like some others, regarded our Lord's Baptism as the time when a Divine being first was joined to Jesus of Nazareth, it seems clear that he attached some unusual significance to the event. "They of Basilides (οἱ ἀπὸ Β.)," says Clement (*Strom.* i. 146, p. 408), "celebrate the day of His Baptism by a preliminary night-service of [Scripture] readings (προδIANVKEPEΛΟΥNTES ἀναγνώσσει); and they say that the 'fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar' (Luke iii. 1) is (or means) the fifteenth day of the [Egyptian] month Tybi, while some [make the day] the eleventh of the same month." Again it is briefly stated in the *Excerpta* (16, p. 972) that the dove of the Baptism is said by the Basilidians (οἱ ἀπὸ Β.) to be the Minister (ὁ δὲ δάκρυος). And the same association is implied in what Clement urges elsewhere (*Strom.* ii. p. 449): "If ignorance belongs to the class of good things, why is it brought to an end by amazement [i.e. the amazement of the Archon], and [so] the Minister that they speak of [αὐτοῖς] is superfluous, and the Proclamation, and the Baptism: if ignorance had not previously existed, the Minister would not have descended, nor would amazement have seized the Archon, as they themselves say." This language, taken in conjunction with passages already cited from Hippolytus (c. 26), implies that Basilides regarded the Baptism as the occasion when Jesus received "the Gospel" by a Divine illumination. The supposed descent of "Christ" for union with "Jesus," though constantly assumed by Hilgenfeld, is as destitute of ancient attestation as it is inconsistent with the tenor of Basilidian doctrine recorded by Clement, to say nothing of Hippolytus. It has been argued from Clement's language by Gieseler (in the *Halle A.L.Z.* for 1823, i. 836 f.; cf. *K.G.* i. 1. 186), that the Basilidians were the first to celebrate our Lord's baptism. The early history of the Epiphany is too obscure to allow a definite conclusion on this point: but the statement about the Basilidian services of the preceding night receives some illustration from a passage of Epiphanius, lately published from the Venice MS. (ii. 483 Dind.; iii. 632 Oehler), in which we hear of the night before the Epiphany as spent in singing and flute-playing in a heathen temple at Alexandria; so that probably the Basilidian rite was a modification of an old local custom. According to Agrippa Castor (Eus. l. c.) Basilides "in Pythagorean fashion" prescribed a silence of five years to his disciples.

The same author, we hear, stated that Basilides "named as prophets to himself Barcabbas and Barceph, providing himself likewise with certain other [?] prophets] who had no existence, and that he bestowed upon them barbarous appellations to strike amazement into those who have an awe of such things." The alleged prophecies apparently belonged to the apocryphal

Zoroastrian literature popular with various Gnostics. [BARCABBAS.]

From Hippolytus we hear nothing about these prophecies, which will meet us again presently with reference to Basilides' son Isidore, but he tells us (*Haer.* vii. 20) that according to Basilides and Isidore Matthias spoke to them mystical doctrines (λόγους ἀποκρύφους) which he heard in private teaching from the Saviour: and in like manner Clement (*Strom.* vii. 900) speaks of the sect of Basilides as boasting that they took to themselves the glory of Matthias. Origen also (*Hom. in Luc.* i. t. iii. p. 933) and after him Eusebius refer to a "Gospel" of or according to Matthias (*H.E.* iii. 25. 6). The true name was apparently the *Traditions of Matthias*: three interesting and by no means heretical extracts are given by Clement (*Strom.* ii. 452; iii. 523 [copied by Eusebius, *H.E.* iii. 29. 4]; vii. 882). In the last extract the responsibility laid on "the elect" for the sin of a neighbour recalls a passage already cited (p. 275, b) from Basilides.

It remains only to notice an apparent reference to Basilides, which has played a considerable part in modern expositions of his doctrine. Near the end of the anonymous *Acts of the Disputation between Archelaeus and Mani*, written towards the close of the third century or a little later, Archelaeus disputes the originality of Mani's teaching, on the ground that it took rise a long time before with "a certain barbarian" (c. 55, in Routh, *Rel. Sac.* v. 196 ff.). "There was also," he says, "a preacher among the Persians, a certain Basilides of great (or 'greater,' *antiquior*) antiquity, not long after the times of our Apostles, who being himself also a crafty man, and perceiving that at that time everything was preoccupied, decided to maintain that dualism which was likewise in favour with Scythianus," named shortly before (c. 51, p. 186) as a contemporary of the Apostles, who had introduced dualism from a Pythagorean source. "Finally, as he had no assertion to make of his own, he adopted the sayings of others" (the last words are corrupt, but this must be nearly the sense). "And all his books contain things difficult and rugged." The writer then cites the beginning of the thirteenth book of his treatises (*tractatum*), in which it was said that "the saving word" (the Gospel) by means of the parable of the rich man and the poor man pointed out the source from which nature (or a nature) without a root and without a place germinated and extended itself over things (*rebus supervenientem, unde pullulaverit*). He breaks off a few words later, and adds that after some 500 lines Basilides invites his reader to abandon idle and curious elaborateness (*varietate*), and to investigate rather the studies and opinions of barbarians on good and evil. Certain of them, Basilides states, said that there are two beginnings of all things, light and darkness: and he subjoins some particulars of doctrine of a Persian cast. Only one set of views however is mentioned, and the Acts end abruptly here in the two known MSS. of the Latin version in which alone this part of them is extant.

It is generally assumed that we have here unimpeachable evidence for the strict dualism of Basilides. It seems certain that the writer of the Acts held his Basilides responsible for the

barbarian opinions quoted, which are clearly dualistic, and he had the whole book before him. Yet his language on this point is loose, as if he were not sure of his ground; and the quotation which he gives by no means bears him out: while it is quite conceivable that he may have had some acquaintance with dualistic Basilidians of a later day, such as certainly existed, and have thus given a wrong interpretation to genuine words of their master (cf. Uhlhorn, 52f.). It assuredly requires considerable straining to draw the brief interpretation given of the parable to a Manichean position, and there is nothing to shew that the author of it himself adopted the first set of "barbarian" opinions which he reported. Indeed the description of evil (for evil doubtless is intended) as a *supervenient* nature, *without root* and without place, reads almost as if it were directed against Persian doctrine, and may be fairly interpreted by Basilides' comparison of pain and fear to the rust of iron as natural accidents (*ἐπισυμβαίνει*). The identity of the Basilides of the Acts with the Alexandrian has been denied by Gieseler with some shew of reason. It is at least strange that our Basilides should be described simply as a "preacher among the Persians," a character in which he is otherwise unknown; and all the more since he has been previously mentioned with Marcion and Valentinus as a heretic of familiar name (c. 38, p. 138). On the other hand, it has been justly urged that the two passages are addressed to different persons. The correspondence is likewise remarkable between the "treatises" in at least thirteen books, with an interpretation of a parable among their contents, and the "twenty-four books on the Gospel" mentioned by Agrippa Castor, called *Exegetica* by Clement. Thus the evidence for the identity of the two writers may on the whole be treated as preponderating. But, the ambiguity of interpretation remains; and it would be impossible to rank Basilides confidently among dualists, even if the passage in the Acts stood alone: much more to use it as a standard by which to force a dualistic interpretation upon other clearer statements of his doctrine.

Gnosticism was throughout eclectic, and Basilides superadded an eclecticism of his own. Antecedent Gnosticism, Greek philosophy, and the Christian faith and Scriptures all exercised a powerful and immediate influence over his mind. It is evident at a glance that his system is far removed from any known form of Syrian or original Gnosticism. Like that of Valentinus, it has been remoulded in a Greek spirit, but much more completely. Historical records fail us almost entirely as to the personal relations of the great heresiarchs; yet internal evidence furnishes some indications which it can hardly be rash to trust. Ancient writers usually name Basilides before Valentinus; but there is little doubt that they were at least approximately contemporaries, and it is not unlikely that Valentinus was best known personally from his sojourn at Rome, which was probably (Lipsius, *Quellen d. ult. Ketzergeschichte*, 256) the last of the recorded stages of his life. There is at all events no serious chronological difficulty in supposing that the Valentinian system was the starting-point from which Basilides proceeded to construct by contrast his own theory, and this is

the view which a comparison of doctrines suggests. In no point, unless it be the retention of the widely spread term *archon*, is Basilides nearer than Valentinus to the older Gnosticism, while several leading Gnostic forms or ideas which he discards or even repudiates, are held fast by Valentinus. Such are descent from above (see a passage at the end of c. 22, and p. 272, b above), putting forth or pullulation (imperfect renderings of *προβολή*, see p. 271, b), syzygies of male and female powers, and the deposition of faith to a lower level than knowledge. Further the unique name given by Basilides to the Holy Spirit, "the Limitary (*μεθόριον*) Spirit," together with the place assigned to it, can hardly be anything else than a transformation of the strange Valentinian "Limit" (*ὅρος*), which in like manner divides the Pleroma from the lower world; though, in conformity with the unifying purpose of Basilides, the Limitary Spirit is conceived as connecting as well as parting the two worlds (cf. Baur in *Theol. Jahrb.* for 1856, 156 f.) The same softening of oppositions which retain much of their force even with Valentinus shews itself in other instances, as of matter and spirit, creation and redemption, the Jewish age and the Christian age, the earthly and the heavenly elements in the Person of our Lord. The strongest impulse in this direction probably came from Christian ideas and the power of a true though disguised Christian faith. But Greek speculative Stoicism tended likewise to break down the inherited dualism, while at the same time its own inherent limitations brought faith into captivity. An antecedent matter was expressly repudiated, the words of Genesis i. 3 eagerly appropriated, and a Divine counsel represented as foreordaining all future growths and processes: yet the chaotic nullity out of which the developed universe was to spring was attributed with equal boldness to its Maker: Creator and creation were not confused, but they melted away in the distance together. Nature was accepted not only as prescribing the conditions of the lower life, but as practically the supreme and permanent arbiter of destiny. Thus though faith regained its rights, it remained an energy of the understanding, confined to those who had the requisite inborn capacity; while the dealings of God with man were shut up within the lines of mechanical justice. The majestic and, so to speak, pathetic view bounded by the large Basilidian horizon was well fitted to inspire dreams of a high and comprehensive theology, but the very fidelity with which Basilides strove to cling to reality must have soon brought to light the incompetence of his teaching to solve any of the great problems. Its true office consisted in supplying one of the indispensable antecedents to the Alexandrine Catholicism which arose two generations later.

V. *Refutations*.—Notwithstanding the wide and lasting fame of Basilides as a typical heresiarch, no treatise is recorded as written specially in confutation of his teaching except that of Agrippa Castor. He had of course a place in the various works against all heresies; but, as we have seen, the doctrines described and criticised in several of them belong not to him but to a sect of almost wholly different character. Hippolytus, who in later years became acquainted with the *Exegetica*, contented himself with

detecting imaginary plagiarisms from Aristotle (vii. 14–20). Even Origen, who likewise seems to have known the work (if we may judge by the quotation on metempsychosis given at p. 275, and by a complaint of “long-winded fabling,” *aut Basilidis longam fabulositatem: Com. in Matt.* xxiv. 23, p. 864 Ru.), shews in the few casual remarks in his extant writings little real understanding even of Basilides’ errors. On the other hand Clement’s candid intelligence enables him to detect the latent flaws of principle in the Basilidian theory without mocking at such of the superficial details as he has occasion to mention. In Hilgenfeld’s work of 1848 on the pseudo-Clementine literature, already noticed at p. 270, a, a singular attempt was made to shew that in one early recension of the materials of part of the *Recognitions* Simon was made to utter Basilidian doctrine, to be refuted by St. Peter, the traces of which had been partly effaced by his becoming the mouthpiece of other Gnostics in later recensions. Ritschl took the same view in the first edition of his *Entstehung d. altkath. Kirche* (1850, pp. 169–174); but the whole speculation vanishes in his far maturer second edition of 1857. The theory lacks even plausibility. The only resemblances between this part of the *Recognitions* and either the true or the spurious Basilidianism are common to various forms of religious belief; and not a single distinctive feature of either Basilidian system occurs in the *Recognitions*. A brief but sufficient reply is given in Uhlhorn’s *Hom. u. Recog. d. Clem. Rom.* 1854, pp. 286 ff.

VI. *Isidorus*.—In a passage already noticed (*Haer.* vii. 20) Hippolytus couples with Basilides “his true child and disciple” Isidore. He is there referring to the use which they made of the *Traditions of Matthias*; but in the next sentence he treats them as jointly responsible for the doctrines which he recites. Our only other authority respecting Isidore is Clement (copied by Theodoret), who calls him in like manner “at once son and disciple” of Basilides (*Strom.* vi. 767). In this place he gives three extracts from the first and second books of Isidore’s *Expositions* (Ἐξηγητικά) of the prophet Parchor. They are all parts of a plea, like so many put forward after the example of Josephus against Apion, that the higher thoughts of heathen philosophers and mythologers were derived from a Jewish source. The last reference given is to Pherecydes, who had probably a peculiar interest for Isidore as the earliest promulgator of the doctrine of metempsychosis known to tradition (cf. Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, i. 55 f., ed. 3). His allegation that Pherecydes followed “the prophecy of Ham” has been perversely urged as a sign that he set up the prophets of a hated race against the prophets of Israel. The truth is rather that the identification of Zoroaster with Ham or Ham’s son, whatever may have been its origin, rendered it easy to claim for the apocryphal Zoroastrian books a quasi-biblical sanctity as proceeding from a son of Noah, and that Isidore gladly accepted the theory as evidence for his argument [BARCABBAS]. “The prophets” from whom he says just before that “some of the philosophers” appropriated a wisdom not their own can be no other than the Jewish prophets. Again, Clement quotes his book *On an adherent soul* (Περὶ προσφύου ψυχῆς) in cor-

rection of his preceding quotation from Basilides on the passions as “appendages” (*Strom.* ii. 488). If the eight lines transcribed are a fair sample of the treatise, Isidore would certainly appear to have argued here against his father’s teaching. He insists on the unity (μονομερής) of the soul, and maintains that bad men will find “no common excuse” in the violence of the “appendages” for pleading that their evil acts were involuntary: our duty is, he says, “by overcoming the inferior creation within us (τῆς ἐλάττωτος ἐν ἡμῖν κτίσεως) through the reasoning faculty (τῷ λογιστικῷ), to shew ourselves to have the mastery.” A third passage from Isidore’s *Ethics* (*Strom.* iii. 510) is intercalated into his father’s argument on 1 Cor. vii. 9, to the same purport but in a coarser strain. Its apparent difficulty arises partly from a corrupt reading (ἀντέχου μαχίμης γυναικός, where γαμετῆς must doubtless be substituted for μαχίμης, ἀντέχου meaning not “Resist,” which would be ἀντέχε, as in the preceding line, but “Have recourse to”); partly from the assumption that the following words ὅταν δὲ κ.τ.λ. are likewise by Isidore, whereas the sense shews them to be a continuation of the exposition of Basilides himself.

Basilides had to all appearance no eminent disciple except his own son. In this respect the contrast between him and Valentinus is remarkable. A succession of brilliant followers carried forward and developed the Valentinian doctrine. It is a singular testimony to the impression created at the outset by Basilides and his system that he remained for centuries one of the *eponymi* of heresy: his name is oftener repeated, for instance in the writings of Origen, than that of any other dreaded foe of the Antenicene Church except Marcion, Valentinus, and afterwards Mani. But the original teaching, for all its impressiveness, had no vitality. The Basilidianism which did survive, and that, as far as the evidence goes, only locally, was, as we have seen, a poor and corrupt remnant, adulterated with the very elements which the founder had strenuously rejected.

VII. *The spurious Basilidian system*.—In briefly sketching this degenerate Basilidianism it will seldom be needful to distinguish the authorities, which are fundamentally two, Irenaeus (101 f.) and the lost early treatise of Hippolytus; both having much in common, and both being interwoven together in the report of Epiphanius (pp. 68–75). The other relics of the Hippolytean Compendium are the accounts of Philaster (32), and the supplement to Tertullian (4). At the head of this theology stood the Unbegotten (neuter in Epiph.), the Only Father. From Him was born or put forth Nûs, and from Nûs Logos, from Logos Phronesis, from Phronesis Sophia and Dynamis, from Sophia and Dynamis principalities, powers, and angels. This first set of angels first made the first heaven, and then gave birth to a second set of angels who made a second heaven, and so on till 365 heavens had been made by 365 generations of angels, each heaven being apparently ruled by an Archon to whom a name was given, and these names being used in magic arts. The angels of the lowest or visible heaven made the earth and man. They were the authors of the prophecies; and the Law in particular was given by their Archon,

the God of the Jews. He being more petulant and wilful than the other angels (*ἰταμώτερον καὶ ἀυθαδέστερον*), in his desire to secure empire for his people, provoked the rebellion of the other angels and their respective peoples. Then the Unbegotten and Innominate Father, seeing what discord prevailed among men and among angels, and how the Jews were perishing, sent His Firstborn Nûs, who is Christ, to deliver those who believed on Him from the power of the makers of the world. "He," the Basilidians said, "is our salvation, even He who came and revealed to us alone this truth." He accordingly appeared on earth and performed mighty works; but His appearance was only in outward show, and He did not really take flesh. It was Simon of Cyrene that was crucified; for Jesus exchanged forms with him on the way, and then, standing unseen opposite in Simon's form, mocked those who did the deed. But He Himself ascended into heaven, passing through all the powers, till he was restored to the presence of His own Father. The two fullest accounts, those of Irenaeus and Epiphanius, add by way of appendix another particular of the antecedent mythology; a short notice on the same subject being likewise inserted parenthetically by Hippolytus (vii. 26, p. 240: cf. Uhlhorn, *D. Basilid. Syst.* 65 f.). The supreme power and source of being above all principalities and powers and angels (such is evidently the reference of Epiphanius's *αὐτῶν*: Irenaeus substitutes "heavens," which in this connexion comes to much the same thing) is Abrasax, the Greek letters of whose name added together as numerals make up 365, the number of the heavens; whence, they apparently said, the year has 365 days, and the human body 365 members. This supreme Power they called "the Cause" and "the First Archetype," while they treated as a last or weakest product (*Hysterema*, a Valentinian term, contrasted with *Pleroma*) this present world as the work of the last Archon (Epiph. 74 A). It is evident from these particulars that Abrasax was the name of the first of the 365 Archons, and accordingly stood below Sophia and Dynamis and their progenitors; but his position is not expressly stated, so that the writer of the supplement to Tertullian had some excuse for confusing him with "the Supreme God."

On these doctrines various precepts are said to have been founded. The most distinctive is the discouragement of martyrdom, which was made to rest on several grounds. To confess the Crucified was called a token of being still in bondage to the makers of the body; (nay he that denied the Crucified was pronounced to be free from the dominion of those angels, and to know the economy of the Unbegotten Father;) but it was condemned especially as a vain and ignorant honour paid not to Christ, who neither suffered nor was crucified, but to Simon of Cyrene. And further a public confession before men was stigmatised as a giving of that which is holy to the dogs and a casting of pearls before swine. This last precept is but one expression of the secrecy which the Basilidians diligently cultivated, following naturally on the supposed possession of a hidden knowledge. They evaded our Lord's words, "Him that denieth me before men," &c., by pleading "We are the men, and all others are swine and dogs." He who had

learned their lore and known all angels and their powers was said to become invisible and incomprehensible to all angels and powers, even as also Caulacau was (the sentence in which Irenaeus, our sole authority here, first introduces CAULACAU, a name not peculiar to the Basilidians, is unfortunately corrupt). And as the Son was unknown to all, so also, the tradition ran, must members of their community be known to none; but while they know all and pass through the midst of all, remain invisible and unknown to all, observing the maxim, "Do thou know all, but let no one know thee." Accordingly they must be ready to utter denials and unwilling to suffer for the Name, since [to outward appearance] they resembled all. It naturally followed that their mysteries were to be carefully guarded, and disclosed to "only one out of 1000 and two out of 10,000." When Philaster (doubtless after Hippolytus) tells us in his first sentence about Basilides that he was "called by many a heresiarch, because he violated the laws of Christian truth by making an outward show and discourse (*proponendo et loquendo*) concerning the Law and the Prophets and the Apostles but believing otherwise," the reference is probably to this contrast between the outward conformity of the sect and their secret doctrines and practices. The Basilidians considered themselves to be no longer Jews, but to have become more than Christians (such seems to be the sense of the obscure phrase *Χριστιανούς δὲ μηκέτι γεγενῆσθαι*, for the *nondum* of the translator of Irenaeus can hardly be right). Repudiation of martyrdom was naturally accompanied by indiscriminate use of things offered to idols. Nay, the principle of indifference is said to have been carried so far as to sanction promiscuous immorality. In this and other respects our accounts may possibly contain exaggerations; but Clement's already cited complaint of the flagrant degeneracy in his time from the high standard set up by Basilides himself is unsuspicious evidence, and a libertine code of ethics would find an easy justification in such maxims as are imputed to the Basilidians. It is hardly necessary to add that they expected the salvation of the soul alone, insisting on the natural corruptibility of the body. They indulged in magic and invocations, "and all other curious arts." A wrong reading taken from the inferior MSS. of Irenaeus has added the further statement that they used "images;" and this single spurious word is often cited in corroboration of the popular belief that the numerous ancient gems on which grotesque mythological combinations are accompanied by the mystic name ABPAΣΑΞ were of Basilidian origin. It has been shown in a previous article (ABRASAX), where Lardner (*History of Heretics*, ii. 14-28) should have been named with Beausobre, that there is no tangible evidence for attributing any known gems to Basilidianism or any other form of Gnosticism, and that in all probability the Basilidians and the heathen engravers of gems alike borrowed the name from some Semitic mythology.

Imperfect and distorted as the picture may be, such was doubtless in substance the creed of Basilidians not half a century after Basilides had written. Were the name absent from the records of his system and theirs, no one would have suspected any relationship between them, much less

imagined that they belonged respectively to master and to disciples. Outward mechanism and inward principles are alike full of contrasts; no attempts of critics to trace correspondences between the mythological personages, and to explain them by supposed condensations or mutilations, have attained even plausibility. Two misunderstandings have been specially misleading. Abrasax, the chief or Archon of the first set of angels, has been confounded with "the Unbegotten Father," and the God of the Jews, the Archon of the lowest heaven, has been assumed to be the only Archon recognised by the later Basilidians, though Epiphanius (69 B, C) distinctly implies that each of the 365 heavens had its Archon. The mere name "Archon" is common to most forms of Gnosticism. So again, because Clement tells us that Righteousness and her daughter Peace abide in substantive being within the Ogdoad, "the Unbegotten Father" and the five grades or forms of creative mind which intervene between Him and the creator angels are added in to make up an Ogdoad, though none is recorded as acknowledged by the disciples: a combination so arbitrary and incongruous needs no refutation. On the other hand those five abstract names have an air of true Basilidian Hellenism, and the two systems possess at least one negative feature in common, the absence of syzygies and of all imagery connected directly with sex. On their ethical side the connexion is discerned with less difficulty. The contempt for martyrdom, which was perhaps the most notorious characteristic of the Basilidians, would find a ready excuse in their master's speculative paradox about martyrs, even if he did not discourage martyrdom himself. The silence of five years which he imposed on novices might easily degenerate into the perilous dissimulation of a secret sect, while their exclusiveness would be nourished by his doctrine of the Election; and the same doctrine might further after a while receive an antinomian interpretation. The nature of the contrasts of principle in the theological part of the two creeds suggests how so great a change may have arisen. The system of Basilides was a high-pitched philosophical speculation, entirely unfitted to exercise popular influence, and transporting its adherents to a region remote from the sympathies of men imbued with the old Gnostic phantasies, while it was too artificial a compound to attract heathens or Catholic Christians. The power of mind and character which the remains of his writings disclose might easily gather round him in the first instance a crowd who, though they could enter into portions only of his teaching, might remain detached from other Gnostics, and yet in their theology relapse into "the broad highway of vulgar Gnosticism" (Baur in the *Tübingen Theol. Jahrb.* for 1856, pp. 158 f.), and make for themselves out of its elements, whether fortuitously or by the skill of some now forgotten leader, a new mythological combination. In this manner evolution from below might once more give place to emanation from above, Docetism might again sever heaven and earth, and a loose practical dualism (of the profounder speculative dualism of the East there is no trace) might supersede all that Basilides had taught as to the painful processes by which sonship attains its perfection. The composite character of the

secondary Basilidianism may be seen at a glance in the combination of the five Greek abstractions preparatory to creation with the Semitic hosts of creative angels bearing barbaric names. Basilidianism seems to have stood alone in appropriating Abrasax: but Caulacau plays a part in more than one system, and the functions of the angels recur in various forms of Gnosticism, and especially in that derived from Saturnilus. Saturnilus likewise affords a parallel in the character assigned to the God of the Jews as an angel, and partly in the reason assigned for the Saviour's mission: while the Antitactæ of Clement recall the resistance to the God of the Jews inculcated by the Basilidians. Other "Basilidian" features appear in the *Pistis Sophia*, viz. many barbaric names of angels (with 365 Archons, p. 364), and elaborate collocations of heavens, and a numerical image taken from Deut. xxxii. 30 (p. 354). The Basilidian Simon of Cyrene is apparently unique.

VIII. *History of the Basilidian Sect.*—There is no evidence that the sect extended itself beyond Egypt; but there it survived for a long time. Epiphanius (about 375) mentions the Prosopite, Athribite, Saite, and 'Alexandriopolite' (read Andropolite) nomes or cantons, and also Alexandria itself, as the places in which it still thrived in his time, and which he accordingly inferred to have been visited by Basilides (68 C). All these places lie on the western side of the Delta, between Memphis and the sea. Nearer the end of the 4th century Jerome often refers to Basilides in connexion with the hybrid Priscilianism of Spain, and the mystic names in which its votaries delighted. According to Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* ii. 46) this heresy took its rise in "the East and Egypt;" but, he adds, it is not easy to say "what the beginnings were out of which it there grew" (*quibus ibi initiis coaluerit*). He states however that it was first brought to Spain by MARCUS, a native of MEMPHIS. This fact explains how the name of Basilides and some dregs of his disciples' doctrines or practices found their way to so distant a land as Spain, and at the same time illustrates the probable hybrid origin of the secondary Basilidianism itself.

IX. *Literature.*—Basilides of course occupies a prominent place in every treatise on Gnosticism, such as those of Neander (including the *Church History*), Baur (the same), Lipsius, and Möller (*Geschichte der Kosmologie in der christlichen Kirche*). Two reviews by Gieseler (*Halle A. L. Z.* for 1823, pp. 835-8; *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1830, p. 395 ff.) contain valuable matter. The best monograph founded on the whole evidence is that of Uhlhorn (*Das Basilidianische System*, Göttingen, 1855); with which should be read an essay by Baur (*Theol. Jahrbücher* for 1856, pp. 121-162): Jacobi's monograph (*Basilidis Philosophi Gnostici sententiae* &c., Berlin, 1852) being also good. Able expositions of the view that the true doctrine of Basilides is not represented in the larger work of Hippolytus against all Heresies will be found in a paper by Hilgenfeld, to which Baur's article in reply is appended (pp. 86-121), with scattered notices in other articles of his (especially in his *Zeitschrift* for 1862, p. 452 ff.); and in Lipsius's *Gnosticismus*. Three articles by Gundert (*Zeitschrift f. d. Luth. Theol.* for 1855, 209 ff., and

1856, 37 ff., 443 ff.) are of less importance. The lecture on Basilides in Dr. Mansel's posthumous book on *The Gnostic Heresies*, published since the greater part of this article was written, is able and independent, and at the same time makes full use of the best German criticisms: it underrates however the influence of Stoical conceptions on Basilides, and exaggerates that of Platonism; and after the example of Baur's *Christliche Gnosis* in respect of Gnosticism generally, though starting from an opposite point of view, it suffers from an effort to find in Basilides a precursor of Hegel. A tract by Hofstede de Groot (*Basilides am Ausgange d. Apost. Zeitalters als erster Zeuge u. s. w.*, Leipzig, 1868) belongs to another kind of literature, and barely deserves mention. [H.]

BASILISCUS, martyr, bishop of Comana, martyred with Lucianus at Nicomedia under Maximin, A.D. 312 (Pallad. *Dial. de V. St. Chrys.* xi., misreading, however, Maximian for Maximin). St. Chrysostom, when exiled, was received upon his journey in a "martyrium," built some five or six miles out of Comana in memory of Basiliscus, and there died and was buried (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 30; Sozom. viii. 28; Pallad. as above; Niceph. xiii. 37). Basiliscus is said to have been shod with iron shoes, red hot, and then beheaded and thrown into the river (*Menol.* in Baron. May 22).

(2) Another of the name is mentioned by Ruinart (172) in connection with a St. Mamas, to whom with Basiliscus a church was dedicated at Constantinople, their day being July 29.

[A. W. H.]

BASILIU (Βασίλειος), a disciple of the Paulician Sergius, mentioned in the Greek form of adjuration *ap. Cotelier's Patres Apost.* i. 545; Photius, *Contra Man.*

[E. B. C.]

BASILIU OF ANCYRA (also called BASILAŞ, Βασίλειον, τὸν καὶ Βασίλιν, καὶ γὰρ οὕτως ὠνομάζετο, Socr. ii. 42), a native of Ancyra, originally a physician (Jerome, *de Vir. ill.* 89; Suidas, s. v.), and subsequently bishop of that city, A.D. 336-360, one of the most respectable prelates of the Semiarian party, whose essential orthodoxy was acknowledged by Athanasius himself, the differences between them being regarded as those of language only (Athan. *de Synod.* tom. i. pp. 915, 619, ed. Morell, Paris, 1627). He was a man of learning, of intellectual power, and dialectical skill, and maintained an unwavering consistency which drew upon him the hostility of the shifty Acacians and their time-serving leader. The jealousy of Acacius was also excited by the unbounded influence Basil at one time exercised over the weak mind of Constantius, and his untiring animosity worked Basil's overthrow. On the deposition of Marcellus, the aged bishop of Ancyra, by the Eusebian party, on the charge of Sabellianism, at a synod meeting at Constantinople, A.D. 336, Basil was chosen bishop in his room. He enjoyed the see undisturbed for eleven years; but in 347, the council of Sardica after the withdrawal of the Eusebians to Philippopolis, reinstated Marcellus, and excommunicated Basil as "a wolf who had invaded the fold" (Socr. ii. 20). Three years later, A.D. 350, the Eusebians were again in the ascendant, through the powerful patronage of Constantius,

and Basil was replaced in his see by the express order of the emperor (Socr. ii. 26). Basil speedily obtained a strong hold over Constantius, who consulted him on all ecclesiastical matters, and did nothing without his cognizance. He and George of Laodicea were now the recognized leaders of the Semiarian party (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxiii. 1). The next year, A.D. 351, Basil took the chief part in the proceedings of the council that met at Sirmium, where Constantius was residing, to depose Photinus the pupil of Marcellus, who was developing his master's views into direct Sabellianism (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxi. lxxiii.; Socr. ii. 30). Shortly after this we find him attacking with equal vigour a heresy of an exactly opposite character, disputing with Aetius, the Anomean, in conjunction with Eustathius of Sebaste, another leader of the Semiarian party. The issue of the controversy is variously reported, according to the proclivities of the historians. Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 16) asserts that Basil and Eustathius were worsted by their antagonist; orthodox writers assign them the victory (Greg. Nyssen. in *Eunom.* lib. i. pp. 289, 296). Basil's representations of the abominable character of Aetius's doctrines so exasperated Gallus against him that he issued an order for his execution; but on having personal intercourse with him pronounced him maligned, and took him as his theological tutor [AETIU]. Basil's influence increased, and just before Easter, A.D. 358, when a number of bishops had assembled at Ancyra for the dedication of a new church that Basil had built, Basil received letters from George of Laodicea speaking with great alarm of the spread of Anomean doctrines, and entreating him to avail himself of the opportunity to obtain a synodical condemnation of Aetius and Eunomius. Other bishops were accordingly summoned, and eighteen anathemas were drawn up. Basil himself, with Eustathius and Eleusius, were deputed to communicate these anathemas to Constantius at Sirmium. The deputies were received with much consideration by the emperor, who ratified their synodical decrees and gave his authority for their publication. Basil availed himself of his influence over Constantius to induce him to summon a general council for the final settlement of the questions that had been so long distracting the church. Nicaea was the place first fixed on. Basil objected that there might be a confusion between the decrees of this and the former council; and Nicomedia was named (Soz. iv. 16). But on the destruction of that city by an earthquake, the Acacian party, who had wormed themselves into the confidence of the fickle emperor, obtained his consent to the specious but mischievous plan of dividing the council into two, and Ariminum was selected for the West, and Basil's see of Ancyra for the East (Hilar. *de Synod.* p. 303, ed. Érasme.). Ancyra being thought unsuitable, Basil wrote letters to the leading Eastern bishops to inquire what place they would desire (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 16). With the same object, in May A.D. 359, he visited Constantius at Sirmium. There he fell in with the Arian bishops Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, George of Alexandria, and others of the same clique. They agreed that the council should be called for Seleuceia in Isauria; and after a lengthened discussion, lasting far into the night of Whitsun

Eve, Basil acquiesced in the adoption of what is known as the third Sirmian, or the dated Creed, as the formula to be laid before the coming councils for their acceptance (Hilar. *Fragm.* xv.; Athan. *de Synod.* 8; Socr. ii. 37). The Eastern council met at Seleuceia, Sept. 27, A.D. 359. Basil did not arrive till the third day. He was soon made aware that his influence with the emperor had been undermined by his Acacian rivals, and that his power was gone. Having ventured to reprove Constantius for the undue favour he was manifesting towards them, he was bidden by the emperor to hold his peace, and charged with being himself the cause of the dissensions that were agitating the church (Theod. ii. 27). When the dissatisfaction felt by all the contending parties at the issue of the proceedings at Seleuceia had led to the convening of another synod at Constantinople under the immediate superintendence of Constantius, the assembled bishops were directed by the emperor to examine into the tenets of Aetius. Aetius was again encountered by his former opponents, Basil and Eustathius, and, being condemned of Atheistic doctrine, was deposed from the diaconate (Theod. u. s.). The Acacians consented to throw Aetius overboard in order to convince the emperor of their own orthodoxy and secure a triumph over their Semiarian rivals. This policy was successful. Acacius found himself master of the situation and deposed whom he would. Basil was one of the first to fall. No doctrinal errors were charged against him. He was condemned on frivolous and unproved grounds, together with Cyril of Jerusalem, Eustathius of Sebaste, and other leading prelates. Banishment followed deposition. Basil was exiled to Illyria (Socr. iv. 24; Philost. v. 1). On the accession of Jovian, A.D. 363, Basil joined the other deposed bishops in a petition to that emperor that he would expel the Anomoeans and restore the rightful bishops to their sees. The perplexity of the honest unlettered soldier as to which of the many rivals were the true occupants of the sees, and which of the many contending creeds was the orthodox faith, may well excuse him for taking no decided action on this petition. He simply replied that he hated controversy and honoured all who kept aloof from it; and Basil seems to have died in exile (Socr. iii. 25).

The works of Basil of Ancyra are all lost. According to Jerome (u. s.) he wrote against Marcellus, and a treatise *De Virginitate*, and "multa alia." Athanasius speaks of his having written *περὶ πλῆθους* (Athan. *de Synod.* u. s.). Ittigius (*De Hæresiarch.* p. 453) defends him from the charge of Arianism. Jerome identifies him, but unjustly, with the Macedonian party. (Tillemont, vol. vi. *passim.*) [E. V.]

BASILIUS OF ANCYRA attended the second council of Nicaea (the so-called seventh general council), A.D. 787. At the first session Basil read a lengthy apology for the tardiness of his arrival, and abjuring the heresy as to image worship he had previously favoured, expressed his acquiescence in the decision of Hadrian of Rome, Tarasius of Constantinople, and the holy apostolic thrones, and signed the decrees of the council. (Labbe, *Concil.* vii. 670, 887; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.*) [E. V.]

BASILIUS OF ANCYRA, a presbyter who

became a martyr for the faith under Julian the Apostate, A.D. 362. Basilus was of Christian parentage and of orthodox faith. During the reign of Constantius, he was a bold and uncompromising opponent of Arianism, and maintained the truth with great courage at the Council of Jerusalem in 335. He was more than once apprehended as a seditious person by the provincial governors, but recovered his liberty. The Arian council under Eudoxius, held at Constantinople in 360, forbade him to hold any ecclesiastical assembly. The zeal of Basilus was still further quickened by the attempts made by Julian to suppress Christianity. Sozomen tells us that he visited the whole of the adjacent district, entreating the Christians everywhere to be constant to the faith and not to pollute themselves with sacrifices to idols (Soz. *H. E.* v. 11). The natural result followed; he was apprehended, and brought before the governor of the city, Saturninus, who put him to the torture, and informed the emperor of the prize he had secured. On the arrival of Julian at Ancyra, Basil was presented to him, and after having reproached the emperor with his apostasy was given over to the Count Frumentinus to be further tortured. Basil's constancy remained unshaken, and after a second interview with Julian, in which he treated the emperor with the greatest contumely, he suffered death by red-hot irons on June 29th. His festival, probably the anniversary of his persecution, is kept both by the Greek and Latin church on March 22nd. (Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 11; *Acta S. Basilii*, Ex. Martio Bollandiano; Ruinart, *Act. Sinc. Martyr.* p. 559, sq.; Tillemont, vii. 375, sq.) [E. V.]

BASILIUS, bishop of ANTIOCH, succeeded Maximus II. as 43rd bishop of the see, A.D. 456. A portion of a letter addressed to him by St. Simeon Stylites is preserved by Evagrius (*H. E.* ii. 10), in which Simeon expresses his thankfulness for the declaration of the faith made at the Council of Chalcedon, and exhorts Basil to play the man in behalf of the truth. He was one of the orthodox bishops to whom a letter was addressed by the Emperor Leo, requesting their counsel with regard to the disturbances caused at Alexandria by Timothy Aelurus. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 890.) [E. V.]

BASILIUS, an ASCETIC, disciple of Marcan, highly commended by Theodoret for his various virtues, especially for his charity and hospitality. He erected a monastery at Seleucobelus in Syria, of which he became abbot (Theodoret, *Relig. Hist.* c. iii.; Tillemont, xv. 341). [E. V.]

BASILIUS, bishop of CAESAREIA in Cappadocia, commonly called **BASIL THE GREAT**, the strenuous champion of orthodoxy in the East, the restorer of union to the divided Oriental Church, and the promoter of unity between the East and the West, was born at Caesareia (originally called Mazaca), the capital of Cappadocia, towards the end of the year 329. His parents were members of noble and wealthy families, and were Christians by descent. His grandparents on both sides had suffered during the Maximian persecution. His maternal grandfather was deprived of his property and life. Macrina, his grandmother on his father's side, and her husband, were compelled

by the severity of the persecution to leave their home in Pontus, of which country they were natives, and to take refuge among the woods and mountains of that province, where they are reported to have passed seven years (Greg. Naz. *Or. xx.* p. 319) [MACRINA]. His father, whose name was also Basil, was an advocate and teacher of rhetoric whose learning and eloquence had brought him a very large practice. He was also celebrated for his Christian virtues. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of this elder Basil in terms of the highest commendation as one who was regarded by the whole of Pontus as "the common instructor of virtue" (*Orat. xx.* p. 324). His mother's name was Emmelia [EMMELIA]. Basil and Emmelia had ten children, five of each sex, of whom a daughter, Macrina, was the eldest, and a son named Peter, whose birth was almost contemporaneous with his father's death, the youngest. Basil was the eldest of the sons, two of whom besides himself, Gregory Nyssen and Peter, attained the episcopate. One son died in infancy. Naucratus, the second son, died a layman when about 27 years of age [NAUCRATIUS]. Four of the daughters were well and honourably married. Macrina the eldest embraced a life of devotion, and exercised a very powerful influence over Basil and the other members of her family [MACRINA, No. 2]. Basil had a paternal uncle named Gregory, who took his father's place after his decease, and was present with other bishops of Cappadocia at his nephew's ordination. Basil was indebted for the care of his earliest years and the formation of his opening mind to his grandmother Macrina, who brought him up at her country house, not far from Neocaesarea in the province of Pontus (Bas. *Ep.* 210, § 1). The rule on which Macrina sought to form her grandson's religious character was the teaching of Gregory Thaumaturgus which she had received from those who had been his auditors. On leaving infancy the boy Basil passed to the hands of his father, probably at Neocaesarea, who was his instructor not only in rhetoric and secular learning, but also in religion and the virtues of a Christian life. The date of Basil's baptism is uncertain, but it hardly admits a doubt that, according to the prevalent custom, his admission into the church was deferred until he reached man's estate, and did not take place until he formally renounced the world after his return from Athens. For the completion of his education, Basil was sent by his father first to his native city of Caesarea, where he soon gained great reputation not only with his tutors and fellow pupils, but also among the people of the city, for the brilliancy of his talents and his virtuous life (Greg. Naz. *Or. xx.* p. 325). From Caesarea he passed to Constantinople where, if the correspondence between Libanius and Basil is genuine, which has been questioned by Garnier on insufficient grounds, he studied under that famous sophist. The letters of Libanius shew that there was a close intimacy between them, and express a high degree of admiration of Basil's eloquence and his life of gravity and self-restraint in the midst of the temptations of such a city as Constantinople (Bas. *Ep.* 335-359; Liban. *Vita*, p. 15). According to Socrates and Sozomen (Socr. iv. 26; Soz. vi. 17) the scene of the intercourse between Libanius and Basil was Antioch. But there is no reason to believe that

Basil ever studied there, and these writers have evidently confounded him with his namesake, Basil of Antioch, Chrysostom's early associate. On leaving Constantinople Basil proceeded to Athens, where he prosecuted his studies from the year 351 to 356, chiefly under the sophists Himerius and Prohaeresius. He had as his fellow-student and inseparable companion Gregory Nazianzen, whom he had known previously at Caesarea, who had entered the university of Athens a short time before. Gregory's report of the eminent qualities and high attainments of his old friend, strengthened by the influence he had already gained over his fellow-students, secured Basil from the boisterous reception and rough practical jokes which were the lot of most freshmen. The acquaintance between the two young men speedily ripened into an ardent friendship which subsisted with hardly any interruption through the greater part of their lives. The painful estrangement that followed Gregory's forced consecration to the see of Sasima will be narrated in its proper place. The feeling was more enthusiastic on the side of Gregory, who looked on his friend with the most absorbing admiration, but it was returned with no degree of coldness by Basil. The most complete union subsisted between them. They occupied the same chamber and ate at the same table. They studied the same books and attended the same lectures, and stimulated each other in the pursuit of the highest Christian philosophy. In the midst of the distractions and excitements, the shows and the games of Athens, they lived a life of sobriety and self-restraint, seldom leaving their lodgings except for the schools or for church. Gregory's funeral oration on his friend (Greg. Naz. *Or. xx.* 328 sq.) and his poem *de Vita Sua* (tom. ii. p. 4, § 15) supply many other interesting details of their joint college career, presenting a curious picture of university-life in the 4th century. Athens afforded Basil the opportunity of familiar intercourse with a fellow-student whose name was destined to become unhappily famous, the nephew of the emperor Constantius, Julian. The future emperor conceived a warm attachment for the young Cappadocian, with whom—as the latter reminds him when the relations between them had so sadly changed—he not only studied the best models of literature, but also carefully read the sacred Scriptures (*Ep.* 40, 41; Greg. Naz. *Orat. iv. adv. Julian.* p. 121 sq.). Basil remained at Athens till the middle or end of the year 355, when with extreme reluctance he quitted the scene of his studies, tearing himself from the fellow-students and friends who by their expostulations, entreaties, and tears endeavoured to retain him. His friend Gregory confesses his own inferior strength of mind in yielding to the urgency of his companions and allowing Basil to depart alone (*Orat. xx.* p. 334). Basil's first object in quitting Athens was to profit by the instructions of a philosopher named Eustathius, a native of Cappadocia, who still adhered to the old pagan faith, probably the same spoken of with high commendation by Eunapius (*de Vit. Sophist.* c. iii. iv.) whom he had hoped to find at Caesarea. He passed through Constantinople without halting, and reached his native city, but was disappointed of meeting Eustathius (*Ep.* 1). By this time his

father was dead. His mother Emmelia was residing at the village of Annesi, Ἀννησοί, near Neocaesarea. Basil's Athenian reputation had preceded him, and he was received with much honour by the people of Caesarea, who, when he consented to settle there as a teacher of rhetoric, are said, in the tumid language of his panegyrist, to have regarded him as "a kind of second founder and protector of their city" (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 334). He practised the profession of a rhetorician with great celebrity for a considerable period (Rufin. ii. 9), and, according to a letter of Libanius, assigned to this period, was not unwilling to undertake the troublesome charge of the education of boys (Basil, *Ep.* 358). So great was Basil's reputation that the people of Neocaesarea sent a deputation of the leading persons of the city to entreat him to remove thither and undertake the education of their youth. Basil declined. But on a subsequent visit to his mother the citizens endeavoured to overcome his objections, and used all measures short of actual force to detain him (*Ep.* 210, §2). Gregory Nazianzen repudiates the idea of either Basil or himself—for by this time he had joined his friend—having been in any degree influenced by ambition or love of human praise, asserting that they had only yielded for a while to the importunities of their fellow-citizens and sacrificed themselves to the world, and the stage, σμικρὰ τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῇ σκηνῇ χαρισάμενοι (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 334). But Basil's excellent sister Macrina judged him less indulgently and more truly. His brother, Gregory Nyssen, reports that she found him on his return from Athens inordinately elated, puffed up with the pride of philosophy and science, and looking down with contempt on his superiors in dignity and rank (Greg. Nyss. *Vit. S. Macr.* p. 181). At this time also, we may gather from an amusing letter of the other Gregory, Basil had adopted something of the airs and habits of a fine gentleman, and without being stained with the vices of the city was not altogether insensible to its pleasures (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 6). It was a period of some peril to the young and ardent rhetorician, the object of universal admiration. Macrina proved his good genius. Her warnings and counsels were effectual to guard him from the seductions of the world, and eventually to induce him to abandon it altogether and devote himself to a religious life (Greg. Nyss. *u. s.*). Basil in a letter to Eustathius of Sebaste describes himself at this period as one awakened out of a deep sleep, and in the marvellous light of gospel truth discerning the folly of that wisdom of this world in the study of which nearly all his youth had vanished. His first care was to reform his life corrupted by long intercourse with evil. He sought eagerly for some one to take him by the hand and lead him into the doctrines of godliness. Finding in the Gospels that nothing tended so much toward perfection as to sell all that he had and free himself from worldly cares, and feeling himself too weak to stand alone in such an enterprise, he desired earnestly to find some brother who might give him his aid (*Ep.* 223). No sooner did his determination become known than he was beset by the remonstrances of his friends entreating him, some to continue the profession of rhetoric, some to become an advocate. But his choice was made, and

his resolution was inflexible. His resolution in favour of a Christian life called forth the admiration of his old instructor Libanius (Bas. *Ep.* 336). Basil's baptism may be placed at this epoch. He was probably baptized by Dianius bishop of Caesarea, by whom not long afterwards he was admitted to the order of reader (*De Sp. Sancto*, c. xxix. 71). Basil's determination in favour of a life of devotion would be strengthened by the death of his next brother, Naucratus, who had embraced the life of a solitary, and about this period was drowned while engaged in works of mercy (Greg. Nyss. *de Vit. S. Macr.* p. 182). About the year 357, when he was still under thirty, Basil left Caesarea to pursue his search after the most celebrated ascetics, who might exhibit a model of the life he had resolved to embrace. For this purpose he visited Alexandria and Upper Egypt, Palestine, Coelesyria, and Mesopotamia. He records his admiration of the abstinence and endurance of the ascetics whom he met with in these countries, their mastery over hunger and sleep, their indifference to cold and nakedness, as well as his desire to imitate them (*Ep.* 223, §2). His feeble health and frequent sicknesses interrupted his journeys, and prevented his pursuing Eustathius, whom he was still anxious to meet, to his place of retirement (*Ep.* 1). The year 358 saw Basil again at Caesarea resolved on the immediate carrying out of his purpose of retiring from the world. He and his friend Gregory had already resolved to abandon the world together, and Basil having fixed on Pontus as his place of retirement wrote to his friend to remind him of his engagement. But Gregory had a father and mother both advanced in years, and filial duty forbade his leaving them (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 334). His eager desire for the companionship of his early associate led Basil to propose to exchange Pontus for the district called Tioerina, in which Gregory's home, Arianzus, was situated. But he found the place on trial cold and damp, and intolerably muddy, "the very pit of the whole earth" (*Ep.* 14), and he quitted it in disgust, and returning to his original destination, selected for his retreat a spot near Neocaesarea, close to the village of Annesi where his father's estates lay, and where he had passed his childhood under the care of his grandmother Macrina. To Annesi his mother Emmelia and his sister Macrina had retired after the death of the elder Basil, and were living a semi-monastic life. Basil's future home was only divided from Annesi by the river Iris, by which and the gorges of the mountain torrents a tract of level ground was completely insulated. A wooded mountain rose behind. There was only one approach to it, and of that he was master. The natural beauties of the spot, with its ravines, precipices, dashing torrents, and waterfalls, the purity of the air and coolness of the breezes, the abundance of flowers and multitude of singing-birds ravished him, and he declared it to be more beautiful than Calypso's island (*Ep.* 14). His glowing description of its charms at length tempted Gregory to visit him. But he did not find the place so much to his taste, and in a bantering epistle addressed to Basil after his return, he reproached him with the wretchedness both of the lodging and the fare, and the severity of the toil he had compelled him

to share. "But for Basil's lady-mother he would have been starved to death" (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 7, 8). A more serious letter written to soothe Basil's somewhat wounded feelings shews that he sojourned some considerable time with his friend and studied the Scriptures with him (*Ep.* 9), together with the Commentaries of Origen and other early expositors. At this time they also compiled their collection of the 'Beauties of Origen,' or 'Philocalia' (Soz. iv. 26; Soz. vi. 17; Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 87). In this secluded spot Basil passed five years, an epoch of no small importance in the history of the church, inasmuch as it saw the origin under Basil's influence of the monastic system in the coenobitic form. Eustathius of Sebaste had already introduced monachism into Asia Minor, but monastic communities were a novelty in the Christian world, and of these Basil is justly considered the founder. To his calm and practical mind the coenobitic life appeared much more conducive to the exercise of Christian graces than that of the solitary. "God," he said, "has made us, like the members of our body, to need one another's help. For what discipline of humility, of pity, or of patience can there be if there be no one to whom these duties are to be practised? Whose feet wilt thou wash—whom wilt thou serve—how canst thou be last of all—if thou art alone?" (Basil. *Reg. Resp.* vii.). His rule, like that of St. Benedict in later times, united active industry with regular devotional exercises, and by the labour of his monks over wide desert tracts, hopeless sterility gave place to golden harvests and abundant vintages. Not the day only but the night also was divided into definite portions, the intervals being filled with prayers, hymns, and alternate psalmody. The day began and closed with a psalm of confession. The food of his monks was limited to one meal a-day of bread, water, and herbs, and he allowed of sleep only till midnight, when all rose for prayer (*Ep.* 2, 207). On his retirement to Pontus Basil devoted all his worldly possessions to the service of the poor, retaining them, however, in his own hands, and by degrees divesting himself of them as occasion required. His life was one of the most rigid asceticism. He had but one outer and one inner garment; he slept in a hair shirt, his bed was the ground; he took little sleep, no bath; the sun was his fire, his food bread and water, his drink the running stream (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 358; Greg. Nyss. *de Basil.* p. 490). The severe bodily austerities he practised emaciated his frame and ruined his already feeble health, sowing the seeds of the maladies to which in later years he was a martyr. His friend describes him as "without a wife, without property, without flesh, and almost without blood" (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xix. p. 311). Basil's reputation for sanctity collected large numbers about him. Monasteries sprang up on every side. He repeatedly made missionary journeys through Pontus, and the result of his preaching was the establishment of many coenobitic industrial communities, and the erection of monasteries for both sexes, by which the whole face of the province was changed, while the purity of the orthodox faith was restored by his preaching (Rufin. ix. 9; Soz. vi. 17; Greg. Nyss. *de Basil.* p. 488). Throughout Pontus and Cappadocia Basil was the means of the erection of numerous

hospitals for the poor, houses of refuge for virgins, orphanages, and other homes of beneficence. His monasteries had as their inmates children he had taken charge of, married persons who had mutually agreed to live asunder, slaves with the consent of their masters, and solitaries convinced of the danger of living alone (Basil, *Regulae*, 10, 12, 15).

After two years spent in these labours Basil was summoned from his solitude in 359 to accompany Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste, who had been delegated by the council of Seleucia to communicate the conclusions of that assembly to Constantius at Constantinople. Basil seems from his youth and natural timidity to have avoided taking any part in the discussions of the council that followed, 360, in which the Anomoeans were condemned, the more orthodox Semiarrians deposed, and the Acacians triumphed. But when Constantius endeavoured to force those present to sign the creed of Ariminum, Basil left the city and returned to Cappadocia (Greg. Nyss. *in Eunom.* p. 310, 312; Philost. iv. 12). Not long after his return George of Laodicea arrived at Caesarea as an emissary of Constantius, bringing with him that creed for signature. To his intense grief the bishop, Dianius, a gentle undecided man, whose creed always inclined to that of the strongest, and who valued peace above orthodoxy, but for whom Basil felt great respect and affection, was persuaded to sign the heretical document. Basil felt it impossible any longer to hold communion with his bishop, and fled to Nazianzus to find consolation in the society of his dear friend Gregory (*Ep.* 8, 51). He denied with indignation the report that he had anathematized his bishop, and when two years afterwards (362) Dianius was stricken for death and entreated Basil to return and comfort his last hours, he at once acceded to his request, and the aged bishop died in his arms, protesting with his last breath that he had never intentionally departed from the faith as declared at Nicea, and had signed the creed of Ariminum in the simplicity of his heart (*Ep.* 51). [DIANIUS.]

The choice of Dianius' successor gave rise to violent dissensions at Caesarea. The clergy were divided into parties, each urging the claims of a favourite candidate. At last the populace, wearied with the indecision, took the initiative, and chose Eusebius, a man of high position and eminent piety, but as yet unbaptized. In spite of his reluctance, they forcibly conveyed him to the church where the provincial bishops were assembled, and compelled the unwilling prelates first to baptize and then to consecrate him. The subsequent desire of the provincial bishops to annul the election on the ground of violence was overruled by the elder Gregory of Nazianzus, and Eusebius occupied the episcopal seat of Caesarea for eight years (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xix. 308, 309).

Shortly before the death of Dianius Julian had ascended the throne (Dec. 11th, 361). It was the desire of the new emperor to surround himself with the friends and associates of his early days (Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv. 120). Among the first whom he invited was his fellow-student at Athens, Basil. Basil at first held out hopes of accepting his old friend's invitation. Julian was delighted at his readiness, and placed the public conveyances at his disposal, begging him

to come as soon as he could and stay as long as possible, but giving him full liberty to leave whenever he might be so inclined (*Julianus Basilio*, Basil. *Ep.* 39). Basil delayed his journey, and Julian's declared apostasy from the Christian faith soon gave him sufficient cause to relinquish it altogether. Julian concealed for a time his indignation at the non-fulfilment of his promise, which however stung him to the quick, as an implied censure from one whom he knew to be worthy of all respect. The following year afforded Julian an opportunity of displaying his irritation. On his progress through Asia Minor to Antioch he received the intelligence that the people of Caesarea, so far from apostatizing with him, and building new temples as he had desired, had pulled down the only one still standing, that of Fortune (Greg. Naz. *Or.* iii. 91; xix. 309; Socr. v. 4). His indignation at this contempt of his authority knew no bounds. He expunged Caesarea from the catalogue of cities, made it take its old name of Mazaca, imposed heavy payments, compelled the clergy to serve in the police force, and put to death two young men of high rank, named Eupychius and Damas, who had taken part in the demolition of the temple. Before reaching Caesarea he despatched a minatory letter to Basil demanding a thousand pounds of gold, for the expenses of his Persian expedition, and threatening in default of payment, to raze the city to the ground. The letter ends with the familiar paranomasia, also (according to Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 18) addressed by him to Apollinaris, who had remonstrated with him on the folly of idolatry, ἀνέγγων ἔργων κατ-ἔργων (Bas. *Ep.* 40). Basil's dauntless reply reminds the apostate emperor of the time when they two studied the Holy Scriptures together, and nothing escaped him. But now Demons had raised him to so proud a height that he exalted himself against God and the church, the nurse and mother of all. He upbraids him with the folly of demanding so vast a sum from him, the poorest of the poor, who had not enough to purchase himself a meal; and concludes by retorting his play upon words on himself—ἀ μέντοι ἀνέγγων οὐκ ἔργων, εἰ γὰρ ἔργων οὐκ ἂν κατ-ἔργων (Bas. *Ep.* 41). The displeasure of Julian against Caesarea was still further exasperated by the election of Eusebius as bishop, a choice which had robbed the state of a valuable magistrate (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xix. 309). The principal responsibility for this election lay with Basil and Gregory. These therefore he reserved with the cruel kindness of the Cyclops (Hom. *Odys.* i. 369, 370) to be the last to suffer on his triumphant return from his Persian campaign (Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv. 132). The death of the apostate (June 26th, 363) delivered Basil from this imminent peril and preserved him for future labours in defence of the orthodox faith and for the promotion of the unity of the church.

It has been remarked that Julian considered Basil to have been one of those chiefly responsible for the choice of Eusebius as bishop of Caesarea. Nor is it at all improbable that his belief was well grounded. Basil, keeping in the background, may have secretly directed the popular movement, hoping thereby to secure a triumph for the cause of orthodoxy, and promising himself to have in the new bishop, suddenly raised from the ranks of the laity to an office of such great difficulty,

a pliant instrument for carrying out his own purposes. The result will shew how far his anticipations were realised.

One of the first acts of Eusebius was to compel the reluctant Basil to be ordained priest. His friend Gregory had been ordained a little before, and his language seems to indicate that, as was by no means uncommon, both had been the victims of artifice, if not of violence (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 11, p. 775). Eusebius was very naturally desirous to avail himself of the theological knowledge and intellectual powers of Basil to compensate for his own deficiencies. At first he employed him very largely. But when he found himself completely eclipsed he became jealous of his popularity and treated Basil with a marked coldness, amounting almost to insolence, which awoke a feeling of hostility to himself in the majority of the Christians of Caesarea, of whom Basil was the idol. A rupture was the consequence. We are ignorant of its immediate cause, but probably both parties were more or less to blame. If Eusebius's personal dignity was wounded by Basil's too evident superiority, Basil himself fretted under the official priority of his intellectual inferior, and yielded unwilling submission to his claims to obedience (cf. Bas. in *Isaiam*, i. 57). A schism was imminent, which Basil might have easily precipitated. It happened that at this time some western bishops, Eusebius of Vercelli being probably among them, were at Caesarea. They warmly espoused Basil's cause. A word from him was only wanted, and they would have ordained him bishop, a step which would have been received with enthusiasm not only by the populace, but by the chief inhabitants of the city. But Basil had strength of mind to resist the temptation. He refused to strengthen the hands of the heretical party by creating divisions among the orthodox, and retired with his friend Gregory to Pontus, where he devoted himself to the care of the monasteries he had founded (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 336, 337; Soz. vi. 15).

Basil had passed about three years in his Pontic seclusion when, in 365, the blind zeal of the emperor Valens for the spread of Arianism brought him back to Caesarea. As soon as it was known that Valens was approaching that city, the popular voice demanded the recall of Basil as the only bulwark against the attack on the true faith and its adherents meditated by the emperor. Eusebius sought to make a compromise by inviting Gregory to his side. But Gregory, true to his friendship, refused to come so long as Basil was rejected. He acted the part of a wise mediator. Soothing the irritation of Eusebius, softening Basil's offended feelings, leading each to regard the conduct of the other in a more friendly light, he finally brought about a complete reconciliation (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 19, 20, 169; *Or.* xx. p. 339). Nothing could surpass the Christian temper and wisdom manifested by Basil on his return to Caesarea. He treated Eusebius with the honour due to his position and his age, and by his deferential conduct dissipated the unworthy suspicions he had entertained. He was always at his side as his counsellor and sympathizing friend. He proved himself, in the words of Gregory, the staff of his age, the support of his faith; at home the most faithful of his friends; abroad the most efficient

of his ministers (*ib.* 340). The consequence was that while the one had the name, the other had the reality of power, and while all was being really done by him, with happy adroitness he persuaded his superior that he was doing all himself (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 340).

The first designs of Valens against Caesareia were interrupted by the news of the revolt of Procopius (Amm. Marc. 26, 27). He left Asia to quell the insurrection which threatened his throne. Basil availed himself of the breathing-time thus granted in organizing the resistance of the orthodox against the Eunomians or Anomoeans who were actively propagating their pernicious doctrines through Asia Minor; supporting the weakness of some, awakening the consciences of others, healing divisions, and uniting the Cappadocians in loyal devotion to the truth. The year 368 afforded Basil occasion of displaying his large and universal charity. The whole of Cappadocia was desolated by drought and famine, the visitation pressing specially on Caesareia on account of the largeness of its population and its distance from any seaport. The poor were the chief sufferers, and Basil devoted his whole energies to their maintenance. Some rich merchants having sought to turn the famine to their own profit by buying up all the remaining corn, Basil employed all his powers to bring them to a better mind, never ceasing from his expostulations until he had led them to open their stores to the famishing multitude. Setting an example himself, he sold the property he had inherited at the recent death of his mother, and devoted the sum thus realised to feeding the poor. Not content with this, he raised a large subscription in the city with which he purchased stores of provisions, the distribution of which he regulated himself. None were refused. He gave his own personal ministrations to the wretched, feeding them with his own hand and washing their feet, and while he fed their bodies he was careful to nourish their souls also with the bread of life (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 340-342; Greg. Nyss. *in Eunom.* i. 306).

Eusebius died towards the middle of the year 370, breathing his last in the arms of Basil (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xix. 310; xx. 342). Basil persuaded himself, and not altogether unwarrantably, that the cause of orthodoxy in Asia Minor was involved in his becoming his successor. His election must be ensured at all risks. Unable to assert his claims personally, he at once sent for his friend Gregory, by whose influence and exertions he hoped his election would be put beyond doubt. But fearing lest Gregory, if apprised of the real nature of the business for which his services were required, would decline to undertake a task of so much delicacy, Basil employed artifice to cloke his design. He happened to be suffering from one of the attacks of illness to which he was subject, and he wrote to his friend begging him to come and see him before he died, and receive his last commands. The affectionate heart of Gregory allowed no delay. He started instantly, before the news of Eusebius's death had reached him. But halfway to Caesareia the sight of the bishops hastening to that city for the election of a new prelate disclosed the deceit that had been put upon him. With very natural indignation, instead of pursuing his journey, he wrote a letter of earnest

remonstrance to Basil, not only refusing to come to Caesareia himself, but urging him, if he wished to avoid unfriendly suspicions, to leave the city until the election was over. Such affairs were not managed by men of piety, but by men of power and popularity: nor could it be fitting that Gregory should be prominent in a business in which Basil was unwilling to appear. When all was over he would visit his old friend, and upbraid him as he deserved (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 21). Basil, disappointed of the assistance he had confidently anticipated from the younger Gregory, now betook himself to his father, the aged bishop of Nazianzus of the same name. The momentous importance of the juncture was more evident to the elder man. Orthodoxy was at stake in Basil's election. "The Holy Spirit must triumph" (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 342). No exertion therefore was spared by him; no means of influence left untried. Using his son as his scribe, he dictated a letter to the clergy, monks, magistrates, and people of Caesareia, calling on them earnestly to lay aside all party feeling and choose Basil as bishop, and followed this up by another to the electing prelates, exhorting them not to allow Basil's weakness of health to counterbalance his marked pre-eminence in spiritual gifts and in learning (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 22, 23). He felt himself too old to venture on so long a journey, while he clearly saw that the delicate temperament of his son was unsuited for the guidance of a factious constituency and a successful resistance to cabals and intrigues. No orthodox prelate had at that time a deservedly greater influence than Eusebius of Samosata. Gregory wrote to him and persuaded him to visit Caesareia and undertake the direction of this difficult business (Bas. *Ep.* 47). On his arrival, Eusebius found the city divided into two opposite factions. All the best of the people, together with the clergy and the monks, warmly advocated Basil's election, which was as vigorously opposed by other classes. The bishops were jealous of his superior powers: the rich were uneasy at his uncompromising preaching of charity: the authorities looked with alarm on a prelate of his resolute will, and dreaded the displeasure of Valens. The influence and tact of Eusebius overcame all obstacles. The people warmly espoused Basil's cause; the bishops were compelled to give way, and the triumph of the orthodox cause was consummated by the arrival of the venerable Gregory, who on learning that one vote was wanting for the canonical election of Basil, while his son was still hesitating full of scruples, and refused to quit Nazianzus, left his bed for a litter, and had himself carried to Caesareia at the risk of expiring on the way, and with his own hands consecrated the newly elected prelate, and placed him on his episcopal throne (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 29, p. 793, *Or.* xix. 311, xx. 343). Basil's election filled the orthodox everywhere with joy. Athanasius, the veteran champion of the faith, congratulated Cappadocia on possessing a bishop whom every province might envy (Athan. *ad Pullad.* p. 953, *ad Joann. et Ant.* p. 951). At Constantinople it was received with far different feelings. Valens regarded it as a serious check to his designs for the triumph of Arianism. Basil was not an opponent to be despised. He must be either forced to bend to the emperor's will, or be got rid of.

As bishop of Caesareia Basil's power extended

far beyond the limits of the city itself. He was metropolitan of Cappadocia, and exarch of Pontus. In the latter capacity his authority, more or less defined, extended over more than half Asia Minor, and embraced as many as eleven provinces. Antiochia, Neocaesarea, Tyana, among other metropolitan sees, acknowledged him as their ecclesiastical superior.

Basil's first disappointment in his episcopate arose from his inability to induce his dear friend Gregory to join him as his coadjutor in the government of his province and exarchate. He wrote to Basil expressing his exceeding delight at his election, but excusing himself from coming to him both on Basil's account, lest he should seem to be collecting his partisans about him with indecency and heat, and for his own peace and reputation. He feared that he should excite jealousy, and only increase his friend's difficulties (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 24, *Or.* xx. 344). When at last he yielded to Basil's importunities, he sedulously kept himself in the background, and declined all the public attentions and marks of dignity which Basil was anxious to confer on him. He refused all that Basil offered, and made Basil approve his refusal (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 344). His sensitive and retiring disposition unfitted him for life in a large city, and Eusebius's affection for Basil and the sense of the services he might render him in his difficult charge, were insufficient to retain him long at Caesarea, and he returned to Nazianzus.

Difficulties soon thickened round the new exarch. The bishops who had opposed his election, and who had manifested their ill-feeling by refusing to take any part in his consecration, now exchanged their open hostility for secret opposition. While professing outward union, they withheld their support in everything. They treated Basil with marked slight and shewed a complete want of sympathy in all his plans (*Ep.* 98). He complains to Eusebius of Samosata that they refused to help him, and were of no real use to him in anything. It was impossible to please them. They were angry if he neglected to invite them to the commemoration of the martyrs, and if he did invite them they would not come. On one occasion the report of his death having got abroad, they hastened to Caesarea to choose a successor. But finding him alive, they had to receive from him a sharp admonition. They manifested extreme contrition and lavished promises of amendment; but no sooner had they got back to their dioceses than they resumed their former opposition (Bas. *Ep.* 48, 141, 282). This disloyal behaviour filled Basil with despondency, and was the cause of repeated attacks of illness. It is true he overcame all his opponents in a few years by firmness and kindness, but their secret opposition and half-hearted support greatly increased the difficulties of the commencement of his episcopate. The alienation of his uncle Gregory, whom he had reason to regard with affection and respect as a second parent, who had superintended the completion of his education after the death of his father, was extremely painful to him. The aged bishop for some unknown cause took offence and joined the party of opposition. Basil's brother, the simple-minded but unadroit Gregory Nyssen, tried to put an end to the estrangement, but only made matters worse. With an almost inconceivable want of

judgment he wrote forged letters to Basil in his uncle's name. Basil acted on them, and when they were repudiated by the aged bishop the estrangement was deepened. Each heartily desired reconciliation, but neither would take the first step. The uncle refused to humble himself to his nephew: the metropolitan to his suffragan. Basil, on discovering the deception that had been practised, wrote with just indignation to his brother upbraiding him with his unbrotherly conduct. He does not refuse to visit his uncle, but he declines to come until he has been properly invited (Bas. *Ep.* 58). At last the love of peace and a sense of the scandal of a quarrel between such near relations prevailed with Basil, and he wrote a letter breathing affection and duty to his uncle. The old Gregory had only waited for this. He at once sent back his other nephew with a pacific reply. Basil answered thanking him for his forgiveness, and leaving all arrangements as to the time and place of the interview to him (Bas. *Ep.* 59, 60). The misunderstanding was thus happily healed and peace restored.

Basil had been bishop little more than twelve months, when he was brought into open collision with the emperor Valens, who was traversing Asia Minor with the fixed resolve of exterminating the orthodox faith and establishing Arianism. No part of Basil's history is better known, and in none do we more clearly discern the strength and weakness of his character. While every unprejudiced reader will repudiate Gibbon's offensive verdict, that Basil's assertion of "the truth of his opinions and the dignity of his rank" was due to "inflexible pride," rather than to an uncompromising zeal for the truth as declared by the Nicene Fathers, a calm review of the circumstances may lead him to accept the judgment of a later historian. "The memorable interview with St. Basil," writes Dean Milman, "as it is related by the Catholic party, displays, if the weakness, certainly the patience and toleration of the sovereign—if the uncompromising firmness of the prelate, some of that heaven of pride with which he is taunted by St. Jerome" (Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. 45).^a Four years before, A.D. 367, the designs of Valens against the Catholics of Caesarea had been interrupted by the revolt of Procopius. But he had never relinquished them, and he was now approaching with the determination of reducing to submission one whom he knew to be the chief champion of orthodoxy in the East. The progress of Valens hitherto had been one of uniform victory. The Catholics had everywhere fallen before him. Bithynia had resisted and had become the scene of horrible tragedies. The fickle

^a The passage of St. Jerome referred to by Milman is quoted from the *Chronicle*, A.D. 380. It is not found in Scaliger's edition, but was exhumed by Isaac Vossius who, to quote Gibbon's words, "found it in some old MSS. which had not been reformed by the monks." The Benedictine editor allows the genuineness of the passage, but asserts that the words refer not to Basil but to Photinus. Jerome, however, was no friend to Basil, who had incurred his displeasure by espousing the cause of Meletius against that of Paulinus, the favourite with the Western church, and by want of deferential behaviour towards pope Damasus. The passage as given by Gibbon from Vossius runs thus: "Basilius Caesariensis Episcopus Cappadociae clarus habetur . . . qui multa continentiae et ingentibus bonis uno superbiae malo perdidit."

Galatia had yielded without a struggle. The fate of Cappadocia depended on Basil. His house, as the emperor drew near, was besieged by ladies of rank, high personages of state, even by bishops, who entreated him to bow before the storm and appease the emperor by a temporary submission. Their expostulations were rejected with indignant disdain. A band of Arian bishops headed by Euippius, an aged bishop of Galatia and an old friend of Basil's, preceded Valens' arrival with the hope of overawing their opponents by their numbers and unanimity. Basil took the initiative, and with prompt decision separated himself from their communion (*Bas. Epist.* 68, 128, 244, 251). These prelates were followed by the members of the emperor's household, who indulged in the most violent menaces against the archbishop. One of the most insolent of these was the eunuch Demosthenes, the superintendent of the kitchen. Basil met his threats with quiet irony, bidding him go back to his kitchen fire. The archbishop was next confronted by Modestus, the prefect of the Praetorium, commissioned by the emperor to offer Basil the choice between deposition or communion with the Arians. This violent and unscrupulous imperial favourite accosted Basil with the grossest insolence. He refused him the title of bishop: he threatened confiscation, exile, tortures, death. But such menaces, Basil replied, were powerless on one whose sole wealth was a ragged cloak and a few books, to whom the whole earth was a home, or rather a place of pilgrimage, whose feeble body could endure no tortures beyond the first stroke, and to whom death would be a mercy, as it would the sooner transport him to the God to Whom he lived. Modestus expressed his astonishment at hearing such unusual language (*Greg. Naz. Orat.* xx. 351; *Soz.* vi. 16). "That is," replied Basil, "because you have never before fallen in with a true bishop." Modestus finding his menaces useless changed his tone. He counselled prudence. Basil should avoid irritating the emperor, and submit to his requirements, as all the other prelates of Asia had done. If he would only yield he promised him the friendship of Valens, and whatever favours he might desire for his friends. Why should he sacrifice all his power for the sake of a few doctrines? (*Theodoret*, iv. 19.) But flattery had as little power as threats over Basil's iron will. The prefect was at his wit's end. Valens was expected on the morrow. Modestus was unwilling to meet the emperor with a report of failure. The former interview had been a private one. The aspect of a court of justice with its official state and band of ministers prepared to execute its sentence, might inspire awe. But judicial terrors were equally futile (*Greg. Nyss. in Eunom.* p. 315). Modestus, utterly foiled, had to announce to his master that all his attempts to obtain submission had been fruitless. "Violence would be the only course to adopt with one over whom threats and blandishments were equally powerless" (*Greg. Naz. Orat.* xx. p. 350). Such Christian intrepidity was not without effect on the feeble impressionable mind of Valens. He refused to sanction any harsh measures against the archbishop, and moderated his demands to the admission of Arians to Basil's communion. But here too Basil was equally inflexible. To bring matters to a decided issue, the emperor

presented himself among the worshippers, in the chief church of Caesarea on the Feast of the Epiphany, A.D. 372. The service had commenced when he arrived, and he found the church flooded with "a sea" of worshippers whose chanted psalms pealed forth like thunder, uninterrupted by the entrance of the emperor and his train. Basil was at the altar celebrating the eucharistic sacrifice, standing, according to the primitive custom, behind the altar with his face to the assembled people, supported on either hand by the semicircle of his attendant clergy. "The unearthly majesty of the scene," the rapt devotion of the archbishop, erect like a column before the holy table, the reverent order of the immense throng, "more like that of angels than of men," overpowered the weak and excitable Valens, and he almost fainted away. When the time came for making his offering, and the ministers were hesitating whether they should receive an oblation from the hand of a heretic, his limbs failed him, and but for the aid of one of the clergy he would have fallen. Basil, it would seem, pitying his enemy's weakness, came forward himself and accepted the gift from his trembling hand (*Greg. Naz. Orat.* xx. p. 351). The next day Valens again visited the church, and listened with reverence to Basil's preaching, and made his offerings, which were not now rejected. The sermon over, Basil graciously admitted the emperor within the sacred veil, and discoursed with him at considerable length on the orthodox faith. He was rudely interrupted by the cook Demosthenes, who was in attendance on the emperor. Demosthenes was guilty of a gross solecism. Basil smiled and said, "We have, it seems, a Demosthenes who cannot speak Greek; he had better attend to his sauces than meddle with theology." The retort amused the emperor, who retired so well pleased with his theological opponent, that he made him a grant of lands for the poorhouse Basil was erecting (*Theod.* iv. 19; *Greg. Naz. Orat.* xx. 351; *Basil. Epist.* 94). The vacillating mind of Valens was always influenced by the latest and most imperious advisers, and when Basil remained firm in his refusal to admit them to his communion, the Arians about the emperor had little difficulty in persuading him that he was compromising the faith by permitting Basil to remain, and that his banishment was necessary for the peace of the East and the maintenance of the faith. The emperor yielded to their importunity, and ordered Basil to leave the city. Basil at once made his simple preparations for departure, ordering one of his attendants to take his tablets and follow him. He was to start at night to avoid the risk of popular disturbance. The chariot was at his door, and his friends, Gregory among them, were bewailing so great a calamity, when his journey was arrested by the sudden and alarming illness of Galates, the only son of Valens and Domitica. The empress attributed her child's danger to the divine displeasure at the treatment of Basil. The emperor in abject alarm sent the chief military officials of the court, Terentius and Arinthaeus, who were known to be his friends, to entreat Basil to come and pray over the sick child. Galates was as yet unbaptized. On receiving a promise that the child should receive that sacrament at the hands of a Catholic bishop and be instructed in the orthodox faith, Basil

consented. He prayed over the boy, and the malady was alleviated. On his retiring the Arians again got round the feeble prince, reminding him of a promise he had made to Eudoxius, by whom he himself had been baptized, and the child received baptism from the hands of an Arian prelate. He grew immediately worse, and died the same night (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xx. 352, 364; Theod. iv. 19; Socr. iv. 26; Soz. iv. 16; Eph. Syr. *apud* Cotel. *Monum. Eccl. Græc.* iii. 63; Rufin. xi. 9). Once more the unwearied enemies of Basil returned to the attack, and with the usual result. Valens always yielded to pressure. Again Basil's exile was determined on, but the pens with which Valens was preparing to sign the decree refused to write, and split in his agitated hand, and the supposed miracle arrested the execution of the sentence. Valens left Caesareia, and Basil remained master of the situation (Theod. iv. 19; Ephr. Syr. *u. s.* p. 65). Before long his old enemy Modestus, attacked by a severe malady, presented himself as a suppliant to Basil, and attributing his cure to the intercessions of the saint, became his fast friend. So great was Basil's influence with the prefect that persons came from a distance to secure his intercession with him. We have as many as six letters addressed by Basil to Modestus in favour of different individuals (Basil. *Epist.* 104, 110, 111, 279, 280, 281; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xx. pp. 352, 353). Another striking evidence of Basil's power is recorded by his friend Gregory. A rich widow, whose hand had been vainly demanded in marriage by the judge's assessor, took refuge from his violence in Basil's cathedral. The vicar of Pontus demanded the fugitive, and ordered a domiciliary visit of the archbishop's residence. Failing to discover the lady he commanded Basil to be brought before him, and menaced him with tortures and a horrible death. On his threatening to tear out his liver, Basil calmly replied that he should be very much obliged to him to do so, since where it was it gave him a great deal of trouble. The news of Basil's danger spread through the city. The populace rushed to the prefect's court to rescue their beloved bishop. So violent was the commotion that Basil had to calm the mob and rescue the vicar by his intercessions from the consequences of his own rash insolence (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xx. pp. 353, 354; Greg. Nyss. *de Bas.* p. 435).

The issue of these unsuccessful assaults was to place Basil in a position of inviolability, and to leave him at leisure for the internal administration of his diocese and exarchate, where there was much that needed his firm and unflinching hand. In the course of his visitation many irregularities were discovered which he sternly repressed. The chorepiscopi were in the habit of admitting men to the lower orders of the ministry who had no intention of proceeding to the priesthood, or even to the diaconate, merely to purchase immunity from military service (*Epist.* 54). Too many of his suffragans were guilty of simony in receiving a fee for ordination (*ib.* 55). Men were raised to the episcopate from motives of personal interest, and to gratify private friends (*ib.* 290). The perilous custom for unmarried priests to have females (*συνοικεταί, συνintroductæ*) residing with them as "spiritual sisters" called for animadversion (*ib.* 55). A fanatic

deacon, named Glycerius, who had collected a band of professed virgins, whom he forcibly carried off by night, and wandered the country dancing and singing to the scandal of the faithful, caused him much trouble (*ib.* 169, 170, 171). To heal the fountain-head, he made himself as far as possible master of episcopal elections, and steadily refused to admit any but those whom he deemed worthy of the office. So high was the reputation of his clergy that other bishops sent to him for presbyters who might be their coadjutors and become their successors (*ib.* 81). Marriage with a deceased wife's sister he denounced as prohibited both by the laws of scripture and of nature (*ib.* 160). Feeble as his health was, Basil's activity was unceasing. He was to be found in every part of his exarchate, and maintained a constant intercourse by letter with confidential friends who kept him informed of all that passed, and were ready to carry out the instructions they received. He pushed his episcopal activity to the very frontiers of Armenia. In 372 he made an expedition by the express command of Valens, obtained by the urgency of his fast friend the count Terentius, to strengthen the episcopate in that country by the appointment of new bishops and the infusion of fresh life into those already in office (*ib.* 99). He was very diligent in preaching, not only at Caesareia and other cities, but in the country villages. The details of public worship occupied his attention. Even while a presbyter he arranged forms of prayer (*εὐχῶν διατάξεις*), probably a liturgy, for the church of Caesareia (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 340). He established nocturnal services, in which the psalms were chanted by alternate choirs, which, as a novelty, gave great offence to the clergy of Neocaesareia (*ib.* 207). These incessant labours were carried out by one who, naturally of a weak constitution, had so enfeebled himself by austerities that, "when called well, he was weaker than persons who are given over" (*ib.* 136). His chief malady, a disease of the liver, caused him repeated and protracted sufferings, which often hindered him from travelling when most needful, the least motion bringing on a relapse (*ib.* 202). The severity of the winter often kept him a prisoner not only to his house but even to his room (*ib.* 27). A letter from Eusebius of Samosata arrived when he had been fifty days ill of a fever. "He was eager to fly straight to Syria, but he was unequal to turning in his bed. He hoped for relief from the hot springs" (*ib.* 138). He speaks of himself as having received "sickness upon sickness, so that his shell must certainly fall unless God's mercy extricate him from evils beyond man's cure" (*ib.* 136). At forty-five he calls himself an old man. The next year he had lost all his teeth. Three years before his death all remaining hope of life had left him (*ib.* 198). He died prematurely aged at the age of fifty. Seldom did a spirit of so indomitable activity reside in so feeble a frame, and, triumphing over its weakness, make it the instrument of such vigorous work for Christ and His church.

The year 372 saw Basil plunged into a harassing dispute with Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, touching ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which led to the chief personal sorrow of his life, the estrangement of the friend of his youth, Gregory of Nazianzus. The circumstances were these. Towards

the close of the year 371 Valens determined on the division of Cappadocia into two provinces. Podandus, a miserable little town at the foot of Mount Taurus, was named at first as the chief city of the new province, to which a portion of the executive was to be removed. The inhabitants of Caesareia, who would thus lose much of their gains, and be subjected to double civil burdens, were stunned with the blow. They entreated Basil to go to Constantinople himself, and petition the authorities to rescind the edict. The weakness of his health prevented Basil from acceding to their desire, and he wrote letters to Sophronius, a native of Caesareia, who held a high official position about the court, and a man of influence named Aburgius, begging them to employ all their power to alter the emperor's decision. They could not, however, prevent the division of the province. All they could obtain was the substitution of Tyana for Podandus (Bas. *Ep.* 74, 75, 76).

This was only the commencement of Basil's troubles. Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, insisted that the ecclesiastical division should follow the civil, and claimed the rights of a metropolitan over several of Basil's suffragans. Basil appealed to ancient usage in vain. The new metropolitan called a council of the bishops who having opposed Basil's election continued secretly his enemies, and were not indisposed to exalt his rival. Anthimus strengthened his faction partly by flattery, partly by intimidation, and partly by the removal of those who opposed his wishes. Basil's authority was at a blow reduced to a nullity in one-half of his province (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 355, *Ep.* 31, 33; Bas. *Ep.* 259). In his difficulty Basil at once summoned his friend Gregory. He replied that he would come to his assistance, though Basil wanted him no more than the sea wanted water. He warned Basil at the same time that his difficulties were increased by the suspicions created by his intimacy with Eustathius of Sebaste and his friends, whose reputation for orthodoxy was not undeservedly low (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 25). On Gregory's arrival the two friends started together for the monastery of St. Orestes on Mount Taurus, in the second Cappadocia, the property of the see of Caesareia, to collect the produce of the estate. This roused Anthimus's indignation, and notwithstanding his advanced age, he occupied the defile through which the train of mules had to pass with his armed retainers, and a serious affray took place, in which Gregory fought bravely in his friend's defence (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 356, *Ep.* 31, *Curm.* i. 8). To strengthen himself against his rival, Basil determined to erect several new bishoprics as defensive outposts. One of the new sees chosen was Sasima, a miserable little posting station, and seat of a frontier custom-house at the junction of three great roads not far from the source of the disputed revenues, St. Orestes; hot, dry, and dusty, vociferous with the brawls of muleteers, travellers, and excisemen. No place could have been more distasteful to one of Gregory's delicate temperament; but here Basil, with disregard to his friend's sensitive nature, determined to place him. Gregory's weaker character bowed to the iron will of Basil, and he was most reluctantly consecrated bishop of Sasima. Basil's object, however, was not gained. Anthimus appointed a rival bishop, and Gregory

took the earliest opportunity of escaping from a position into which he had been thrust by the despotic will of a friend from whom he had expected far other treatment, and which he could only maintain at the risk of continual contest and even bloodshed [GREGORY NAZIANZEN, ANTHIMUS]. A peace was ultimately patched up between the contending bishops, apparently through the intercession of Gregory, assisted by the mediation of Eusebius of Samosata, and the senate of Tyana. Anthimus was recognized as metropolitan of the new province, each province preserving its own revenues (Bas. *Ep.* 97, 98, 122). Basil's conduct at this juncture Gregory could never forgive or forget. He attributed it to a high sense of duty, and admired and revered him even more than before. But the wound inflicted on their mutual attachment was never healed, and even after Basil's death he reproaches him with his unfaithfulness to the laws of friendship, and laments the perfidy of which he had been the victim. "This lamentable occurrence took place seven years before Basil's death. He had before and after it many trials, many sorrows; but this probably was the greatest of all."^b

The *Ptochotropheion*, or hospital for the reception and relief of the poor, which Basil had erected in the suburbs of Caesareia, afforded his untiring enemies a pretext for denouncing him to Helias, the new president of the province. This establishment, which was so extensive as to go by the name of the "New Town," *ἡ καινὴ πόλις* (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. p. 359), and subsequently the "Basileiad" after its founder (Soz. vi. 34) included a church, a palace for the bishop, and residences for his clergy and their attendant ministers; *hospices* for the poor, sick, and wayfarers; and workshops for the artisans and labourers whose services were needed, in which the inmates also might learn and practise various trades. There was a special department for lepers, with arrangements for their proper medical treatment, and on these loathsome objects Basil lavished his chief personal ministrations. By such an enormous establishment Basil, it was hinted, was aiming at undue power and infringing on the rights of the civil authorities. But Basil adroitly parried the blow by reminding the governor that apartments were provided in the building for him and his attendants, and suggesting that the glory of so magnificent an architectural work would redound to him^c (Bas. *Ep.* 84).

Far more harassing and more lasting troubles arose to Basil from the double dealing of Eustathius, the unprincipled and time-serving bishop of Sebaste. Referring the reader to his own article for further particulars [EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE], it will be enough here to state that the heretical antecedents and connexions of Eustathius, who had been a pupil of Arius at Alexandria, and had been ordained at Antioch by the Arians, failed to close the large heart of Basil against him. The austerity of his life, his seeming holiness, his strict adherence to truth, his zeal against more developed Arianism, gave him a high place in Basil's esteem, which after-

^b J. H. Newman's *Church of the Fathers*, p. 144.

^c Basil had established similar almshouses in the country dioceses of his province, one in each *συνοχία*, placed under the care of a *chorepiscopus* (*Epist.* 142, 143).

intercourse warmed into real friendship. Eustathius visited Basil at his monastery on the Iris, where, as well as during the journeys they took together to visit various religious communities, he acquired an intimate knowledge of Basil's mind and character, which he afterwards employed against him. Eustathius was one of those who are always found on the side of those in authority. A semi-Arian under Constantius, he professed Arian doctrine under Valens. Basil was slow to believe evil of one to whom he was so much attached, and maintained his intimacy with him notwithstanding the suspicions it caused of his own heterodoxy, and the hindrances created in the effective management of his diocese. He attributed his heterodoxy to over-subtlety or want of clearness of mind, not to unsoundness of belief—sought to detach him from his old Arian connections, and to confirm him in the true faith.

Basil's intercourse with Eustathius was productive of many mortifications and disappointments in his episcopal work. Towards the middle of June 372, the venerable Theodotus, bishop of Nicopolis, a metropolitan of Lesser Armenia, a prelate of high character and unblemished orthodoxy, deservedly respected by Basil, had invited him to a festival at Phargamon near his episcopal see. Meletius of Antioch, then in exile in Armenia, was also to be there. Sebaste was almost on the road between Caesareia and Nicopolis, and Basil, aware of the suspicion entertained by Theodotus of the orthodoxy of Eustathius, determined to stop there on his way, and demand a definite statement of his faith. Many hours were spent in fruitless discussion until, at three in the afternoon of the second day, a substantial agreement appeared to have been attained. To remove all doubt of his orthodoxy, Basil requested Theodotus to draw up a formulary of faith for Eustathius to sign. To his mortification not only was his request refused, but Theodotus plainly intimated to Basil that he had no wish that he should visit him at Nicopolis. Basil had already felt hurt at the want of due formality in the invitation, and the absence of the usual escort. While hesitating whether he should still pursue his journey, he received letters from his friend Eusebius of Samosata stating his inability to come and join him. This at once decided Basil. Without Eusebius' help he felt himself unequal to face the controversies his presence at Nicopolis would evoke, and he returned home full of despondency at the ill-fortune which for his sins rendered his labours for the peace of the church unavailing (*Epist.* 98, 99). A few months later the sensitive orthodoxy of Theodotus prepared another mortification for Basil. In carrying out the commands of Valens, mentioned above, to supply Armenia with bishops, the counsel and assistance of Theodotus as metropolitan was essential. As a first step towards cordial co-operation, Basil sought a conference with Theodotus at Getsa, the estate of Meletius of Antioch, in whose presence he made him acquainted with what had passed between him and Eustathius at Sebaste, and his acceptance of the orthodox faith. But Theodotus could tell him of the effrontery with which Eustathius had denied that he had come to any agreement with Basil. To bring the matter to an issue, Basil again proposed that a confession of faith should be prepared

on his signing which his future communion with Eustathius would depend. This apparently satisfied Theodotus, who invited Basil to visit him and inspect his church, and promised to accompany him on his journey into Armenia. But on Basil's arrival at Nicopolis he spurned him with horror (*ἑβδελύξατο*) as an excommunicated person, and refused to join him at either morning or evening prayer. Thus deserted by one on whose co-operation he relied, Basil had little heart to prosecute his mission, but he continued his journey to Satala, where he consecrated a bishop, established discipline, and promoted peace among the prelates of the province. Basil well knew how to distinguish between the busy detractors who rejoiced to find a pretext for their malevolence in his intercourse with Eustathius, and one like Theodotus animated with a true zeal for the orthodox faith. Generously overlooking his former rudenesses, he reopened communications with him the following year, and visiting Nicopolis employed his assistance in once more drawing up an elaborate confession of faith embodying the Nicene creed, for Eustathius to sign (*Bas. Ep.* 125). Eustathius did so in the most formal manner in the presence of witnesses whose names are appended to the document. But no sooner had this slippery theologian satisfied the requirements of Basil than he threw off the mask, broke his promise to appear at a synodical meeting called by Basil to seal the union between them and their respective adherents, and openly assailed him with the most unscrupulous invectives (*Ep.* 130, 244). He went so far as to hold assemblies in which Basil was charged with heterodox views, especially on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and with haughty and overbearing behaviour towards his chorepiscopi and other suffragans. At last Eustathius pushed matters so far as to publish a letter written by Basil 25 years before to the heresiarch Apollinaris. It was true that at that time both were laymen, and that it was merely a friendly letter not dealing with theological points, and that Apollinaris had not then developed his heretical views and stood high in the esteem of Athanasius. But its circulation served Eustathius's ends in strengthening the suspicion already existing against Basil as a favourer of false doctrine, by proving that he had not scrupled to hold communion with an acknowledged heretic. The letter as published by Eustathius had been disgracefully garbled, and was indignantly repudiated by Basil. By a most shameful artifice some heretical expressions of Apollinaris, without the author's name, had been appended to Eustathius's own letter accompanying that attributed to Basil, leading to the supposition that they were Basil's own. Basil was overwhelmed with distress at being represented in such false colours to the church, while the ingratitude and treachery of his former friend stung him deeply. He restrained himself, however, from any public expression of his feelings, maintaining a dignified silence for three years (*Bas. Ep.* 128, 130, 224, 225, 226, 244). During this period of intense trial Basil was much comforted in 374 by the appointment of his youthful friend Amphilochius to the see of Iconium [AMPHILOCHIOS]. But the same year brought a severe blow in the banishment of his intimate and confidential counsellor

Eusebius of Samosata. At the end of this period (375) Basil, impelled by the calumnies heaped upon him on every side, broke a silence which he considered no longer safe, as tending to compromise the interests of truth, and published a long letter nominally addressed to Eustathius, but really a document intended for all the faithful, in which he briefly reviews the history of his life, describes his former intimacy with Eustathius, and the causes which led to the rupture between them, and defends himself from the charges of impiety and blasphemy so industriously circulated (Bas. *Ep.* 223, 226, 244). It was time indeed that Basil should take some public steps to clear his reputation from the reckless accusations which were showered upon him. He was called a Sabellian, an Apollinarian, a Tritheist, a Macedonian, and his efforts in behalf of orthodoxy in the East were continually thwarted in every direction by the suspicion with which he was regarded. Athanasius, bishop of Ancyra, misled by the heretical writings that had been fathered upon him, spoke in the harshest terms of him (*Ep.* 25). The bishops of the district of Dazimon in Pontus, giving ear to Eustathius's calumnies, separated themselves from his communion, and suspended all intercourse; and were only brought back to their allegiance by a letter of Basil's, written at the instance of all the bishops of Cappadocia, characterized by the most touching humility and affectionateness (*Ep.* 203). The alienation of his relative Atarbius and the church of Neocaesarea of which he was bishop, was more difficult to redress. To be regarded with suspicion by the church of a place so dear to Basil, his residence in youth, and the home of many members of his family, especially his sainted grandmother, Marcellina, was peculiarly painful. But the tendency of the leading Neocaesareans was Sabellian, and the emphasis with which he was wont to assert the distinctness of the Three Persons was offensive to them. They took umbrage also at the favour he showed to monasticism, and the nocturnal services he had established. To heal these offences Basil wrote in terms of affectionate expostulation to the church of Neocaesarea, and took advantage of the existence of his brother Peter's monastic community at Annesi to pay the locality a visit. But as soon as he was known to be in the neighbourhood a strange panic seized the whole city; some fled, some hid themselves; Basil was everywhere denounced as a public enemy. Atarbius abruptly left the synod at Nicopolis which he was attending, on hearing of Basil's approach. [ATARBIUS.] Basil returned from his visit mortified and distressed (*Ep.* 126, 204, 207, 210). Among other charges Basil was widely accused of denying the proper divinity of the Holy Spirit. Gregory Nazianzen tells an amusing story of an old monk who at a feast at Nazianzus, while the rest of the company were lauding Basil to the skies, vehemently charged him with unsoundness on this point, inasmuch as at the recent festival of St. Eupsychius he had passed very superficially over the Godhead of the Spirit while declaring that of the Father and Son most explicitly. Gregory warmly defended his friend's orthodoxy. But the company at table declared themselves against him, and mockingly applauded Basil's discreet silence (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 26, 27; Bas.

Ep. 71). This charge which when made by some Cappadocian monks had been already sternly reprobated by Athanasius (Athanasius *ad Pall.* ii. 763, 764) was revived at a later time on the plea that he had used a form of the doxology open to suspicion, "Glory be to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit"^a (*De Sp. Sanct.* c. 1, vol. iii. p. 3). Self-defence was again reluctantly forced on the victim of calumny. He prayed that he might be deserted by the Holy Ghost for ever if he did not adore Him as equal in substance and in honour (*δοξοῦσιον καὶ ὁμότιμον*) with the Father and the Son (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 365). Similar charges made at the festival of St. Eupsychius in the year 374 were the occasion of Amphilochius requesting him to declare his views on this subject, which led to his writing his treatise *de Spiritu Sancto* (§ 1; *Ep.* 231). Maligned, misrepresented, regarded with suspicion, thwarted, opposed on all hands, few champions of the faith have had a heavier burden to bear than Basil. The history of the Eastern church at this period is indeed little more than a history of his trials and sufferings.

Basil's was not a nature, however, to give way before difficulties the most tremendous and failures the most disheartening. The great object he had set before himself was the restoration of orthodoxy to the Eastern church, and the cementing of its disorganized fragments into one compact body capable of withstanding the attacks of hostile powers. And this object he had pursued with undaunted perseverance notwithstanding the constant interruptions caused by his feeble health, "which might rather be called the languor of a dying man." Cut to the heart by the miserable spectacle which surrounded him, the persecution of the orthodox, the triumphs of false doctrine, the decay of piety, the worldliness of the clergy, the desecration of the episcopate by ambition and covetousness, rival bishops rending asunder the venerable church of Antioch, Christians wasting in mutual strife the strength that should have been spent in combating the common foe, feeling himself utterly insufficient in his isolation to work the reformation he desired, Basil had looked round eagerly for effectual aid and sympathy. He naturally turned first to that "great and apostolic soul who from boyhood had been an athlete in the cause of religion," the great Athanasius (*Ep.* 69, 80, 83). In the year 371 he begged his assistance in healing the unhappy schism of Antioch by inducing the Western church to recognize Meletius, and persuading Paulinus to withdraw. He called on him

^a Compare Hooker's remarks on this subject (*Ecl. Polity*, V. xlii. 12), "Till Arianism had made it a matter of great sharpness and subtilty of wit to be a sound believing Christian, men were not curious what syllables or particles of speech they used. Upon which when St. Basil began to practise the like indifferency, and to conclude public prayers, glorifying sometime the Father *with* the Son and the Holy Ghost, sometime the Father *by* the Son *in* the Spirit, whereas long custom had inured them to the former kind alone, by means whereof the latter was new and strange in their ears; this needless experiment brought afterwards upon him a necessary labour of excusing himself to his friends, and maintaining his own act against them, who because the light of his candle too much drowned theirs, were glad to lay hold on so colourable a matter, and exceedingly forward to traduce him as an author of suspicious innovation."

to stir up the orthodox of the East by his letters, and cry aloud like Samuel for the churches (*Ep.* 66, 69). In his request about Antioch, Basil "was inviting Athanasius to what was in fact impossible even to the influence and talents of the primate of Egypt; for being committed to one side in the dispute he could not mediate between them. Nothing then came of the application" (J. H. Newman, *Church of the Fathers*, p. 105). Basil had other requests to urge on Athanasius. He was very desirous that a deputation of Western prelates should be sent to help him in combating the Eastern heretics and reuniting the orthodox, whose authority should overawe Valens and secure the recognition of their decrees. He asked also for the summoning of a council of all the West, which should confirm the decrees of Nicaea, and annul those of Ariminum (*Ep.* 66, 69).

Basil next addressed himself to the Western churches. His first letter in 372 was written to Damasus, bishop of Rome, lamenting the heavy storm under which almost the whole Eastern church was labouring, and entreating of his tender compassion, as the one remedy of its evils, that either he, or persons like-minded with him, would personally visit the East with the view of bringing the churches of God to unity, or at least determining with whom the church of Rome should hold communion (*Ep.* 70). Basil's letters were conveyed to Athanasius and Damasus by Dorotheus, a deacon of Antioch, in communion with Meletius. He returned by way of Alexandria in company with a deacon named Sabinus (afterwards bishop of Piacenza) as bearer of the replies of the Western prelates. These replies were eminently unsatisfactory. They abounded with expressions of sympathy, but held out no definite prospect of practical help. Something, however, was hoped from the effect of Sabinus's report on his return to the West, as an eye-witness of the lamentable condition of the Eastern church. Sabinus was charged with several letters on his return to Italy. One bearing the signatures of thirty-two Eastern bishops, including besides Basil, Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Gregory Nyssen, &c., was addressed to the bishops of Italy and Gaul; another was written in Basil's own name to the bishops of the West generally. There were also private letters to Valerian of Aquileia and others. These letters give a most distressing picture of the state of the East. "Men had learnt to be theorists instead of theologians. The true shepherds were driven away. Grievous wolves, spoiling the flock, were brought in instead. The houses of prayer were destitute of preachers, the deserts full of mourners. The faithful laity avoided the churches as schools of impiety. Priestly gravity had perished. There was no restraint on sin. Unbelievers laughed, the weak were unsettled. . . . Let them hasten to the succour of their brethren, nor allow the faith to be extinguished in the lands whence it first shone forth" (*Ep.* 93, 93). No help, however, came. A Western priest named Sanctissimus, who visited the East towards the end of 372—whether travelling as a private individual or deputed by Damasus is uncertain—again brought assurances of the warm attachment and sincere sympathy of the Italian church; but words, however kind, were ineffectual to heal their wounds, and Basil and his

friends again sent a vehement remonstrance beseeching their Western brethren to make the emperor Valentinian acquainted with their wretched condition, and to depute some of their number to console them in their misery, and sustain the flagging faith of the orthodox (*Ep.* 242, 243). These letters transmitted by Dorotheus—probably a different person from the former—were not more effectual than those which had preceded them. The only point gained was that a council—confined, however, to the bishops of Illyria—was summoned in 375 through the instrumentality of Ambrose, by which the constableness of the Three Persons of the Trinity was declared, and a priest named Elpidius despatched to publish the decrees in Asia and Phrygia. Elpidius was supported by the authority of the emperor Valentinian, who at the same time promulgated a rescript in his own name and that of his brother Valens, who dared not manifest his dissent, forbidding the persecution of the Catholics, and expressing his desire that their doctrines should be everywhere preached (Theodor. iv. 8, 9). But the death of Valentinian on November 17th of that same year frustrated his good intentions, and the persecution revived with greater vehemence.

The secret of the coldness with which the requests for assistance addressed by the Eastern church were received by the West, was partly the suspicion that was entertained of his orthodoxy in consequence of his friendship with Eustathius of Sebaste, and other doubtful characters, and the large-heartedness which led him to recognise a real oneness of belief under varying technical formulas, but principally the refusal of Basil to recognize the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. His letters were usually addressed to the bishops of the West, and not to the bishop of Rome individually. In all his dealings, Basil treats with Damasus as an equal, and asserts the independence of the East. In his eyes the Eastern and Western churches were two sisters with equal prerogatives; one more powerful than the other, and able to render the assistance she needed; but not in any way her superior. The want of deference in his language and behaviour offended not Damasus only, but Jerome and all who maintained the supremacy of Rome over all churches of Christendom. Jerome accused Basil of pride, and went so far as to assert that there were but three orthodox bishops in the East, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Paulinus (*ad Pammach.* 38). The most impassioned appeals proving ineffectual, and no heed being paid to his warnings that heresy unchecked might spread and infect the West also, Basil's tone respecting Damasus and the Western prelates underwent a change. He began to suspect the real cause of the apathy with which his entreaties for aid had been received, and to feel that no relief could be hoped from their "Western superciliousness" (τῆς δουρικῆς ἀφροσύνης), and that it was in vain to send emissaries to "one who was high and haughty and sat aloft and would not stoop to listen to the truth from men who stood below; since an elated mind, if courted, is sure to become only more contemptuous" (*Ep.* 215, 239). But while his hope of assistance from the West lessened, the need for it increased. The persecution of the orthodox by the Arians grew fiercer. "Polytheism had got possession. A greater and a lesser God were worshipped. All

ecclesiastical power, all church ordinances were in Arian hands. Arians baptized; Arians visited the sick; Arians administered the sacred mysteries. Only one offence was severely punished, a strict observance of the traditions of the fathers. For that the pious were banished, and driven to deserts. No pity was shewn to the aged. Lamentations filled the city, the country, the roads, the deserts. The houses of prayer were closed; the altars forbidden. The orthodox met for worship in the deserts exposed to wind and rain and snow, or to the scorching sun" (*Ep.* 242, 243). In his dire extremity he determined once more to make trial of an appeal to the West. He now adopts the language of indignant expostulation. "Why," he asks, "has no writing of consolation come to us, no visitation of the brethren, no other of such attentions as are due to us from the law of love? This is the thirtieth year since the war with the heretics burst upon us. Will you not now at last stretch out a helping hand to the tottering Eastern church, and send some who will raise our minds to the rewards promised by Christ to those who suffer for Him?" (*Ep.* 242). These letters were despatched in 376. But still no help came. His reproaches were as ineffectual as his entreaties. A letter addressed to the Western bishops the next year (377) proves that matters had not really advanced a single step beyond the first day. We find him still entreating his Western brethren in the most moving terms to grant him the consolation of a visit. "The visitation of the sick is the greatest commandment. But if the Wise and Good Disposer of human affairs forbids that, let them at least write something that may comfort those who are so grievously cast down." He demands of them "an authoritative condemnation of the Arians, of his enemy Eustathius, of Apollinaris, and of Paulinus of Antioch. If they would only condescend to write and inform the Eastern churches who were to be admitted to communion and who not, all might yet be well" (*Ep.* 263). The reply brought back by the faithful Dorotheus overwhelmed him with sorrow. Not a finger was raised by the cold and haughty West to help her afflicted sister. Dorotheus had even heard Basil's beloved friends Meletius, and Eusebius of Samosata, spoken of by Damasus and Peter of Alexandria as heretics, and ranked among the Arians. What wonder if Dorotheus had waxed warm and used some intemperate language to the prelates? If he had done so, wrote Basil, let it not be reckoned against him, but put down to Basil's account and the untowardness of the times. The deep despondency which had seized Basil is evidenced by his touching words to Peter of Alexandria: "I seem for my sins to prosper in nothing, since the worthiest brethren are found deficient in gentleness and fitness for their office from not acting in accordance with my wishes" (*Ep.* 266).

Poiled in all his repeated demands; a deaf ear turned to his most earnest entreaties; the council he had begged for not summoned; the deputation he had repeatedly solicited unsent; Basil's span of life drew to its end amid blasted hopes, and apparently fruitless labours for the unity of the faith. It was not permitted him to live to see the Eastern churches, for the purity of whose faith he had devoted all his powers,

restored to peace and unanimity. "He had to fare on as he best might—admiring, courting, but coldly treated by the Latin world, desiring the friendship of Rome, yet wounded by her superciliousness—suspected of heresy by Damasus, and accused by Jerome of pride."*

Some gleams of brightness were granted to cheer the last days of this dauntless champion of the faith. The invasion of the Goths in 378 gave Valens weightier cares than the support of a tottering heresy, and brought his persecution of the orthodox to an end on the eve of his last campaign, in which he perished, after the fatal rout of Hadrianople (Aug. 9, 378). One of the first acts of the youthful Gratian was to recall the banished orthodox prelates, and Basil had the joy of witnessing the event so earnestly desired in perhaps his latest extant letter, the restoration of his beloved friend Eusebius of Samosata (*Ep.* 268). Basil died at Caesareia, an old man before his time, Jan. 1st, 379, in the fiftieth year of his age. Though so far from advanced in years, his constitution was worn out by labours and austerities, as well as by the frequent severe diseases from which he had suffered. He rallied before his death, and was enabled to ordain with his dying hand some of the most faithful of his disciples. "His death-bed was surrounded by crowds of the citizens, ready," writes his friend Gregory, "to give part of their own life to lengthen that of their bishop." He breathed his last with the words "into Thy hands I commend my spirit." His funeral was attended by enormous crowds, who thronged to touch the bier or the hem of his funeral garments, or even to catch a distant glimpse of his face. The press was so great that several persons were crushed to death; almost the object of envy because they died with Basil. Even Jews and Pagans joined in the general lamentations, and it was with some difficulty that the bearers preserved their sacred burden from being torn to pieces by those who were eager to secure a relic of the departed saint. He was buried in his father's sepulchre, "the chief priest being laid to the priests; the mighty voice to the preachers; the martyr to the martyrs" (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 371, 372).

In person Basil is described as tall and thin, holding himself very erect. His complexion was dark; his face pale and emaciated with close study and austerities; his forehead projecting, with retiring temples. A quick eye, flashing from under finely arched eyebrows, gave light and animation to his countenance. His speech was slow and deliberate. His manner manifested a reserve and sedateness which some of his contemporaries attributed to pride, others to timidity. Gregory, defending him from the former charge, which seems to have been too commonly urged to be altogether groundless, says that he supposes "it was the self-possession of his character, and composure and polish which they called pride," and refers not very convincingly to his habit of embracing lepers as a proof of the absence of superciliousness (*Or.* xx. p. 360). Basil's pride, indeed, was not the empty arrogance of a weak mind; but a well-grounded confidence in his own powers. His reserve arose partly from natural shyness—he

* J. H. Newman, *Church of the Fathers*, p. 115.

jestingly charges himself with "the want of spirit and sluggishness of the Cappadocians" (*Ep.* 48)—partly from an unwillingness to commit himself with those of whom he was not sure. It is curious to see the dauntless opponent of Modestus and Valens charged with timidity. The heretic Eunomius after his death accused him of being "a coward and a craven skulking from all severer labours," and spoke contemptuously of his "solitary cottage and close-shut doors, and his flustered look and manner when persons entered unexpectedly" (Greg. Nyssen, *adv. Eunom.* i. p. 318). Philostorgius also speaks of Basil as "from timidity of mind withdrawing from public discussions" (*H. E.* iv. 12). The fact seems to be that Basil was like many who, while showing intrepid courage when once forced into action, are naturally averse from publicity, and are only driven by a high sense of duty to leave the silence and retirement in which they delight. Basil was a great lover of natural beauty; his letters display abundant proofs of his delight in scenery. The playful turn of his mind is also shewn in many passages of his familiar letters, which sufficiently vindicate him from the charge of austerity of character. In manner he united Oriental gravity with the finished politeness of the Greeks, and was the charm of society from his happy union of sedateness and sweetness: his slightest smile was commendation, and silence was his only rebuke (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 260, 261).

The voice of antiquity is unanimous in its praise of Basil's literary works. To adopt the words of Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 239) "plenae sunt omnium paginae, totus veneratur antiquitatis chorus, plaudit tota eruditum caeva." His former tutor, Libanius, acknowledged that he was surpassed by Basil, and generously rejoiced that it was so, as he was his friend (*Bas. Ep.* 338). Nor has the estimate of modern critics been less favourable. "The style of Basil," writes Dean Milman, "did no discredit to his Athenian education. In purity and perspicuity he surpasses most of the heathen as well as Christian writers of his age" (*Hist. of Christianity*, iii. 110).

The works of Basil which have come down to us may be classed under the heads of; (I.) Expository, (II.) Dogmatic, (III.) Moral, (IV.) Epistolary, (V.) Liturgical.

(I.) *Expository*.—Cassiodorus records that Basil wrote Commentaries on almost all the books of Holy Scripture. The greater part of these are lost. Those that remain are—

(1) *Hexameron*. Nine Homilies on the Six Days' Work of Creation as contained in the opening chapters of Genesis. This is the most celebrated of all his works. It is commended by Photius, and Suidas says it was the most admired of all his writings. These homilies were very early translated into Latin by Eustathius Afer (Cassiod. *Div. Lect.* c. i. p. 445). This translation is found in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Paris, 1644, and the Paris edition of Basil, 1603. The names of other translators may be seen in Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* Two additional homilies, the 10th and 11th, on 'the Creation of Man,' have been claimed for Basil by Combefis, but are almost certainly spurious. They have been commonly attributed to his brother Gregory Nyssen, who we know from Socrates (*H. E.* iv. 26) finished the work which had been left in-

complete by Basil. But they are probably by a later hand.

(2) *Seventeen Homilies on the Psalms*. These were sermons preached *ad populum*. The first, a prefatory homily on the psalms generally, was translated by Rufinus, and is also found prefixed to St. Augustine's Commentaries. The only homilies that have reached us are those on Ps. 7, 14 (two), 28 (two), 29, 32, 33, 37, 44, 45, 48, 59, 61, and 114 (two).

(3) *Commentaries on the first Sixteen Chapters of Isaiah*, a continuous work not divided into homilies. This work was rejected by Erasmus who thought it unworthy of Basil, and its genuineness has been called in question by others. But there is no reasonable doubt that it is rightly ascribed to him. Garnier brings forward evidence to prove that it was written in Cappadocia while Basil was still a presbyter.

(II.) *Dogmatic*.

(1) *Five books against Eunomius*. These are spoken of with commendation by Jerome (*egregii libri*), Gregory Nazianzen, and Photius (*ἐξαιρετοὶ λόγοι*). The two last books, which are wanting in some of the earliest MSS., containing a spicilegium, first, of texts alleged in their favour by Eunomius and his followers, and, secondly, of those by which they are refuted, have been groundlessly doubted by some, including Garnier.

(2) *On the Holy Spirit*, addressed to Amphilocheus and written at his request. The work is divided into thirty chapters, from which it is called the *τριάκοντα κεφάλαια* by Joann. Damascenus. Its authenticity was called in question by Erasmus, who translated it into Latin, but was satisfactorily established by Isaac Casaubon.

(3) *On Baptism*, two books. The first, treating of the qualifications for baptism and the duties of the baptized, and of preparation for the eucharist, is chiefly made up of quotations from the N. T. The second contains answers to various questions that had been put to Basil.

(4) *Homilies*. Eleven of the thirty-one *Homilies on various Subjects* are dogmatical, viz. *Hom.* 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 25, 27, 29, 31.

III. *Moral and Ascetic*.

(1) *Homilies*. A large number of the thirty-one homilies just named treat of moral and practical subjects; against envy, drunkenness, anger, on fasting, &c. A very sensible admonition to a young man how to read the books of heathen writers with profit (*Homil.* 24), included among these homilies, has been frequently translated and separately published, among others by Abp. Potter, 1694. Several of the homilies are in honour of local martyrs, St. Julitta, St. Barlaam, St. Mammias, &c.

(2) *On true Virginity*, a treatise addressed to Letoius, bishop of Melitene, rejected by Garnier on internal evidence, but generally accepted.

(3) *Ascetic Writings*,[†] including—(a) *Prefatory Discourse*; (b) *Discourse on the Renunciation of Worldly Goods*; (c) *On the Ascetical Life*; (d) *On Faith*; (e) *On the Judgment of God*, a prologue to the *Ethics*; (f) *Ethics or Morals*, under eighty heads compiled from the

[†] Sozomen informs us that in his day the ascetic writings commonly attributed to Basil were ascribed by some to his, at one time, friend and companion Eustathius of Sebaste.

N. T.; (g) *On the Monastic Institutions*, including λόγος ἀσκητικός, and ὑποτάξεις ἀσκήσεως; (h) *The Greater Monastic Rules*, ὑποὶ κατὰ πάρος, fifty-five in number, with a proem; they are in the form of Basil's answers to the questions of his monks; (i) *The Lesser Rules*, ὑποὶ κατὰ ἐπιτροπὴν, 313 in number, in the same form of question and answer; (k) *Animadversions on delinquent Monks and Nuns*, a very early example of a *Poenitential*; (l) *Monastic Constitutions*, ἀσκητικὰ διατάξεις, in thirty-four chapters.

To these may be added the following letters belonging to the same subject: (4) *A Letter to Chilo*, a disciple of Basil's, who was proposing to embrace the life of an anchorite; and *A brief Admonition to younger Anchorites*. (5) *Two Letters to lapsed Monks*, and one *To a lapsed Virgin*. (6) *Three Canonical Letters to Amphilocheus*, containing eighty-five canons or constitutions, in the form of a *Poenitential*.

(IV.) *Epistolary*. In addition to those just mentioned we have a collection of no fewer than 365 letters addressed by Basil to his private and official correspondents, including two attributed to the emperor Julian and twelve to Libanius.

(V.) *Liturgical*. There is no reason to call in question the universal tradition of the East, that Basil was the composer of a Liturgy. Those offices, however, which have come down to us under his name have been so largely interpolated at many different periods, that it is impossible to ascertain the correct text of the liturgy as drawn up by him. There are three chief editions of the Liturgy bearing Basil's name, (1) the Greek or Constantinopolitan, (2) the Syriac, translated into Latin by Masius, (3) the Alexandrian, found in Coptic, Greek, and Arabic, which versions concur in establishing one text. Of these the Constantinopolitan furnishes the surest materials for ascertaining the genuine form.

Occupying the debateable land between the genuine and supposititious writings of Basil is a collection of twenty-four *Moral Discourses*, made up of a cento out of Basil's works by Simeon Metaphrastes towards the beginning of the 10th century.

Supposititious. Among the writings falsely attributed to Basil we may mention, (1) *De Grammaticâ Exercitatione* (really by Manuel Moschopolus, towards the end of the 14th century). (2) *De Consolatione in Adversis* (by Victor bishop of Cartenna in Mauritania). (3) *De laudibus solitariae Vitae* (a fragment of Peter Damian). (4) *Admonitio ad Filium spiritualem*. (5) *Two Letters to Apollinaris*, and one *to the Emperor Theodosius*. (6) *Rationes syllogisticæ contra Arianos*.

Editions.—Various tentative editions more or less imperfect appeared in Greek at Venice 1535, Basil. 1532; and in Latin, Basil. 1528, 1540, Antw. 1568, Paris 1571. The first complete edition in Greek and Latin, with the notes of Fronto Ducaeus, appeared at Paris in 1618, in two volumes, folio, and in 1638 in three volumes, folio, but not so well or so correctly printed. In 1678 Combefis published his *Basiliius recen-*

situs at Paris, in two octavo volumes, with an amended text. The standard edition is the Benedictine, published at Paris, 1721–1730, by Julian Garnier, in three volumes, folio, reprinted by Migne, *Patrolog. Græc.* vol. 29–32.

(Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xx.; Greg. Nyssen, *Orat. funebr.*, *Vita S. Macrinae*; Ephr. Syr. *Encomium in Magn. Basil.*; Socr. *H. E.* iv. 26; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 15–17; Theod. *H. E.* iv. 19; Philost. *H. E.* viii. 11–13; Hieron. *de Eccl. Script.* c. 116; Photius, *Cod.* 141; Fabric. *Bibl. Græc.* viii. 60 sq.; Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* ix.; Schröckh, xiii.; Garnier, *Vit. S. Basil.*; De Broglie, *l'Église et l'Empereur*; Eugène Fialon, *S. Basile, Étude Historique*; J. H. Newman, *Church of the Fathers.*)

[E. V.]

BASILIIUS, the friend of CHRYSOSTOM, with whom he lived on terms of the closest and most affectionate intimacy. The friends were equal in age, in rank, in property, read the same books, and studied under the same masters, Diodorus, afterwards bishop of Tarsus, and Carterius. They simultaneously resolved on adopting an ascetic life. Basil was the first to put the purpose into execution, living in solitude and devotion in his paternal home. On Chrysostom following his example the two friends prepared to take a house and live together, but were prevented by the entreaties of Anthusa, Chrysostom's mother. The circumstances attending Basil's elevation to the episcopate, and the pious fraud by which his scruples were overcome, are narrated in the article CHRYSOSTOM. We do not know the name of his see, but as Chrysostom promised to give him his presence and counsel frequently, it could hardly have been far from Antioch. Baronius thinks it was Raphanea (Chrysost. *de Sacerdot.* i. 1–3, vi. 13).

[E. V.]

BASILIIUS OF CILICIA, a presbyter of the church of Antioch, and afterwards bishop of Irenopolis, in Cilicia; flourished c. 500. He was the author of an *Ecclesiastical History* in three books, from the year 450 to the close of the reign of Justin. According to Photius (*Cod.* 42) the style of this work was careless, and he swelled its bulk by the insertion of a large number of episcopal letters which wearied the reader without imparting much historical information. Basiliius also wrote against Joannes Scythopolitanus. An anonymous writer, whom Photius, *Cod.* 95, identifies with Basiliius, had published a book craftily entitled κατὰ Νεστορίου, *Adversus Nestorium*, with the view of leading the unwary to read it. Joannes Scythopolitanus replied to this. On which Basiliius in his own name wrote a most abusive rejoinder, full of bitter invective, charging him among other things with being a Manichaean, with restricting Lent to three weeks, and not abstaining from the flesh of birds even for that period, &c. This work was in sixteen books, the first thirteen in the form of a dialogue, the last three a continuous attack on Scythopolitanus, and his tenets. The object of the book according to Photius, *Cod.* 107, was to oppose the union of the two natures in Christ.

He may probably be identified with the writer mentioned by Suidas *sub voc.* who attacked Archelaus, bishop of Colonia in Armenia. (Photius,

g The Penalties of delinquent Monks, in fifty heads, "incerti authoris," found in some MSS. of Basil and printed in his works, are of later date.

Cod. 42, 95, 107, *Suidas* s. v.; *Cave, Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 466.) [E. V.]

BASILIUS, MARTYR, called also **BASILEUS**, bishop of Amasea in Pontus, cited by St. Athanasius (*Orat. i. c. Arian.*) as sound in the faith against Arianism, present at the Council of Ancyra in 314, and shortly afterwards at that of Neo-Caesarea, but not at that of Nice (as *Niceph. viii.* 14 affirms), inasmuch as he was martyred under Licinius, A.D. 319 (Euseb. in *Chron.*, and see Euseb. *H. E.* x. 8). He was brought from Amasea to Nicomedia, according to some not, however, trustworthy Acts, in the first instance, because he had given refuge to one Glaphyra, an attendant of the empress, whose virtue Licinius sought to assail, and was finally martyred there, because he refused to sacrifice. His body was alleged to have been cast ashore at Sinope, carried thence to Amasea, and buried there near a church that he had built. See also Assemani, *Actt. Martt.* ii. 216. [A. W. H.]

BASILIUS, bishop of **PARIUM** in Mysia, on the Hellespont, and confessor. A hymn in the *Menaee*, assigned by Harless (ap. Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.*) to April 12, but by Le Quien to March 12, commemorates his sufferings for the faith. The language employed leads Le Quien to the conclusion that he suffered in the persecutions of the Monothelite, or Iconoclast Emperors (Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* i. 788; Fabric. lib. v. c. 29). [E. V.]

BASILIUS, bishop of **SELEUCIA**, in Isauria, and metropolitan, succeeded Dexianus, who attended the council at Ephesus, and therefore after 431. He is erroneously identified by Photius with the early friend of Chrysostom, who must have been considerably his senior (Tillemont, xv. p. 340). He is very unfavourably known to us from the weakness and vacillation he displayed with regard to the condemnation of Eutyches. He took a leading part in the council held at Constantinople, in 448, at which Eutyches was condemned; and the next year when the fidelity of the acts of the council were called in question, was one of the commission appointed to verify them (Labbe, *Concil.* vol. iv. 182, 230). But at the "Robbers' Synod" held at Ephesus a few months later his courage gave way, and he acquiesced in the rehabilitation of Eutyches, and retracted his obnoxious language. Before long he returned to orthodoxy, and in 450 affixed his signature to the famous *Tome* of Pope Leo, on the Incarnation. At the council of Chalcedon, 451, the imperial commissioners proposed his deposition, together with the other prelates who had aided in restoring Eutyches. But he made his submission, concurred in the condemnation of Eutyches, and his offence was condoned (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 553, 604, 787).

His extant works comprise 39 Homilies; 17 on the O. T., and 22 on the N. T., the titles and subjects of which are given by Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 19, 10. Four on John xi. which had been published as his, prove to be the work of St. Chrysostom. A *Homily on the Transfiguration* was added to the series in the edition of the Jesuit Dausqueius, in 1604. A prose work on *The Life and Miracles of S. Thecla* has been attributed to him; but not only does the style differ, and savour of a later age; but we learn from Photius that Basilius wrote S. Thecla's

life in verse. Another supposititious work is the *Demonstratio contra Judaeos*, which appears in the Heidelberg edition of 1596. Basil's Homilies shew much oratorical power and skill in the use of figurative language. But though he does not lose sight of perspicuity, he overburdens his style with metaphors till his readers are surfeited. He not unfrequently reminds us of Chrysostom, though greatly his inferior in real power.

The Homilies of Basilius were first published in Greek, by Commelin, Lugd. Bat. 1596, 8vo; and in Latin by Claud. Dausqueius, 1604, 8vo. They are found in the *Bibl. Patr.* Colon. v. and Lugd. Bat. viii. 1677. They were also printed at the end of the works of Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paris, 1672, fol. (Photius *Cod.* 168, Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* xv. 340, sq. *et passim*, *Cave, Hist. Litt.* 441). [E. V.]

BASILIUS, bishop of **TIBERIAS**, at the end of the eighth century. He was originally an inmate of the monastic college (*σπουδαίον*) of the Resurrection, at Jerusalem, of which he afterwards became abbot. Here he was intimate friend of the intruding patriarch of Jerusalem Theodore, who, while still a monk, took him as his companion on the visit paid by him to St. Stephen at the monastery of St. Saba, with the view of learning from him the future issue of his ambitious designs. Basilius afterwards visited St. Stephen on his own account, and received from him an assurance that he would attain the episcopal dignity, together with a warning of the difficulties of the office. He subsequently administered the affairs of the see of Jericho, and finally became bishop of Tiberias (Leontius, *Vita S. Steph.* apud Le Quien *Or. Christ.* iii. 306 sq., 665 sq., 708 sq.). [E. V.]

BASILIUS, bishop of **TRAJANOPOLIS**, in the province of Rhodope, in Thrace, and metropolitan. He took part in the "Robbers' Synod" at Ephesus in 449, when he gave his verdict in favour of the orthodoxy of Eutyches and against Flavian (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 118, 265, 310). He was present in 451, at the council of Chalcedon, when he joined the noisy adversaries of Theodoret, and appears on the orthodox side consenting to the deposition of Dioscorus, and accepting the same of Leo (*Ibid.* 430, 486). He was one of the bishops to whom the Emperor Leo wrote in 458, requesting their opinions on the disordered state of ecclesiastical matters at Alexandria, after the murder of Proterius and the usurpation of Timothy Aelurus (*Ibid.* 889-891). [E. V.]

BASSIANUS, bishop of *Laudae*, and a saint of the Roman calendar. He was one of the bishops who condemned the Arian Palladius at the council of Aquileia (*Gesta Conc. Aqu.* in Ambrose's *Epp.*), and is mentioned as a friend of Ambrose, in *Ep.* 4, and by Paulinus (*Vit. Amb.* § 47). [J. Ll. D.]

BASSIANUS, bishop of Ephesus, A.D. 444-448, finally deposed at the council of Chalcedon, 451. Bassianus was originally a presbyter of Ephesus, where, according to his own statement, he devoted himself to the service of the poor, for whose benefit he erected a hospital of seventy beds. The popularity he thus gained excited the jealousy of Memnon, then bishop of Ephesus, who having failed in his attempts to drive him from the city, forcibly ordained him bishop of

Evaza or Theodosiopolis in the province of Asia. Memnon spent nine hours, from 3 A.M. to noon, in endeavouring to overcome the resistance of Bassianus, whose "nolo episcopari" was so determined that the altar and the gospels were stained with the blood spilt in the struggle. The new bishop refused to recognise any tie to the see into which he had been thrust, and never once visited the place. The circumstances of his ordination becoming known to Basil, Memnon's successor, he declared the see vacant, and appointed a new bishop to it, and admitted Bassianus to communion. Basil's episcopate was short. On his death in 444 the clergy of Ephesus requested Olympus, bishop of Theodosiopolis, to come and assist in the ordination of a new prelate. He came and waited three days for the arrival of other bishops to take part in the consecration. None, however, appeared. On his representing that he was powerless to act alone and that he must return home, a tumult arose, he was hurried by a mob of armed men to the church, and compelled to give his aid to the enthronization of the popular candidate Bassianus. Irregular as his ordination had been, Bassianus visited Constantinople, and succeeded in obtaining its recognition by the emperor Theodosius II., by whom his election was formally confirmed, and through whose influence Proclus of Constantinople was induced to sanction the appointment which he had at first regarded with serious disapprobation. Bassianus enjoyed the episcopate undisturbed for four years. At the end of this period for some unexplained reasons—there are vague hints at his having neglected the poor—he had become so odious to his flock, that immediately after the Easter festival, those who had just been receiving the Eucharist at his hands rose against him, dragged him from the church, violently thrust him into prison, pillaging his goods and maltreating his adherents. After four months spent in prison the emperor Theodosius II., to whom he had appealed, sent Eustathius, the chief Silentiary, to investigate the matter. The case was laid before the chief bishops of the Christian world, Leo of Rome, Flavian of Constantinople, and Domnus of Antioch, who unanimously pronounced for his deposition on the ground of forcible intrusion. On the receipt of this sentence Bassianus was treated with the greatest indignity. His sacerdotal habit was violently torn from him, and a presbyter of Ephesus, named Stephen, was ordained bishop in his room, while he was still kept a prisoner. On the assembling of the council of Chalcedon in 451, Bassianus laid a formal complaint before the collected bishops, and demanded to be replaced in his see. On October 29th he appeared in person, attended by a faithful presbyter named Cassianus, who had undergone many hardships in his cause. The bishops gave both him and Stephen a calm hearing, and pronounced sentence for his restoration. The intervention of the imperial officers prevented this sentence taking effect. They declared the appointment of both the rivals invalid on the ground of illegal violence, and advised the election of a new bishop. After some diversity of opinion the council accepted this advice, and declared the see vacant. Both Bassianus and Stephen were allowed to retain episcopal rank, and a pension of two hundred gold pieces was granted them

from the episcopal revenues. The whole proceedings are fully detailed in the Acts of the council of Chalcedon (*actio undecima*), where the "libellus" of Bassianus to Valentinian and Marcian may be found. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 684-705; Tillemont xv. 460-465, 690-692, 895; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 442.) [E. V.]

BATH-ENOS. [BARTHENOS.]

BATRACHITAE. Philaster (11) mentions a sect who worshipped the frogs of the plague before the Exodus, thinking so to appease God's anger. Later writers added the name. Probably an obscure and misunderstood heathen superstition. [H.]

BAUDEMUNDUS, a monk of the monastery of Elno (St. Amand) in Hainault, c. 680. He was a disciple of the sainted bishop of Maestricht, St. Amand (d. 679), and wrote his life, which is to be found in Surius, and also in Bollandus under Feb. 6, as well as in Mabillon, *Saec. Benedict.* ii. 709. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 597.) [E. V.]

BAYA, V.—Nov. 1 or 3. St. Baya, or Beya, or Vey, who is venerated at Dunbar in Lothian, is said to have inhabited the island of Little Cumbrae in the Clyde, where she lived in solitude, surrounded by beasts and birds, and where she received the visits of St. Maura. St. Beya died in her island, where a chapel—"capella satis decenter extructa"—was raised over her remains, and may be the one now in ruins, bearing her name (*Old Stat. Acc. Scot.* xi. 415; *New Stat. Acc. Scot.* Ayr, 272). King places her in the 9th century. The love of solitude that distinguished her in life is said to have been attested by miracle after death, for the rector of the church of Dunbar, attempting to carry off her relics, encountered so great a storm that he was obliged to desist. (*Brev. Aberd. pars aestiv.* f. cxlvi; *Regist. S. Egid.* 224; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 276-7.) [A. P. F.]

BEADUHEARD (1), an officer of Brihtric, king of Wessex, killed at Dorchester in 787 by the Danes (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* M. H. B. 509).

(2) Badoheard, a Kentish witness in 747 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 115), and 764 (*ib.* 137, 140), in 774 (*ib.* 149). [S.]

BEADURN. [BADUVINI.]

BEAN, B. and C.—Oct. 26. Except that this saint was venerated at Wester Foulis and at Kinkell in Strathearn, Scotland, nothing is known of him; he is not to be identified with St. Bean of Mortlach, but he probably is St. Bean, the uncle of St. Cadroë, or St. Beoan of Tamhlacht-Menan. [See BEOAN (2).] (*Mart. Donegal*, by Todd and Reeves, 337-9, n.; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 113; Gordon, *Monast.* ii. 270; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 277, 293.) [A. P. F.]

BEATUS, presbyter and abbot in Spain, an opponent of the Adoptionism of Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, in the 8th century. [ADOPTIONISTA.] [P. S.]

BECAN. There are several saints of this name.

(1) April 5. The son of Cula ("nomen matris ejus," *Mart. Tall.*) was of the race of Eoghan Mor, the son of Oilill Olum. He was a contemporary of St. Columba and Diarmaid, king of Erin and lived at Imlech-Fiaich, now Emlagh,

a parish near Kells, co. Meath. He was so famous in his day, that some place him among the twelve Apostles of Ireland. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 95.)

(2) Of Cluain-aird-mobecog—May 26. He was son of Eoghan, son of Murchadh, descended from Oilill Olum. He was brother of St. Corbmac (Mar. 26), in whose Life his monastery is called Killbrecain or Cluainaird-Mobecóc, in Munster. (Colgan's *Acta SS.* 728, 751, c. 1, 2.) O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 139) puts the site of this church in Muscraige Breoghain (a district now comprised in the territory of Clanwilliam, in the south-west of the county of Tipperary), and attaches him also to Tigh Chonaill in Uí-Briúin Cualann (in barony of Rathdown, cos. Dublin and Wicklow), adding from the Life of St. Abban, that he himself built a church at Cluainaird-Mobecóc, and left Becan in it with the office of the holy church as in every church he blessed: this is said to have been when St. Abban had commenced to build churches in Ireland after his pilgrimage to Rome. In this church with its large and most regular monastery, at the foot of Mount Crotte in Muskerry, St. Becan continued till death, in prayers and tears and holy observances. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 615, c. 20. 728, 751.) He died A.D. 689 or 690, and in the *Annals of Ireland* is known by the diminutives Dabec and Dabecoc (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 21, 129; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 294-95).

(3) Surnamed Ruim or Ruiminn—March 17. He was son of Ernan, the son of Fiachna, of the race of Conall Gulban, chiefs of Tyrconnel. He was nearly related to St. Columba and to the early abbots of Hy. Leaving Ireland, he went first to Iona, and then into a solitary place, possibly near to the monastery, where he could devote himself to meditation and prayer, without breaking the fraternal bond. There he lived for several years while his uncle Segenius was abbot of the island, and about A.D. 633 his brother Cumineus addressed the well-known Paschal letter to Segenius, "Becanoque solitario, caro carne et spiritu fratri." On March 17th, A.D. 677, this monk, "candidus et benignus," died "in loco solitario." (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 277-8; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 408, c. 4, 630; *Tr. Thaum.* 482; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, 284-5; Reeves' *St. Adamnan*, 366.) [A. P. F.]

BECC or BEG, son of De—Oct. 12. His father was De, Deaghaidh, or Dagaueus, but his race is disputed. He seems to have been attached to the court of the monarch Diarmait of Tara about A.D. 550, when his prophecies appear to have had a wide reference and acceptance. (O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* iii. 173.) In the Fifth Life of St. Columba (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 403, c. 87) St. Becc is represented as one day meeting with St. Columba, when he went twice astray in prophesying with regard to his own life, so that instead of seven years, as he said, or seven months, he really had only seven hours to live. At once, confessed and contrite, he was absolved by St. Columba, and refreshed "sacro viatico Christi corpore:" thus he died, and by the prayers of St. Columba passed into the heavenly joys. The *Four Masters* (by O'Donovan, i. p. 197) place at A.D. 557 the death of this "celebrated prophet." Colgan (*Acta SS.* 713, c. 4, § 3)

gives his genealogy from Colla-da-chrioch; but the ancient pedigree represents him as eighth in descent from Niall of the Nine Hostages (*Mont. Dong.* by Todd and Reeves, 272). [A. P. F.]

BECGA or BEGGA, d. of Gabhran, V.—Feb. 10. It is said (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 121) that when St. Patrick was in East Meath, he left at the church of Techlaisran, in that county two of his disciples, Bega a virgin and Lugaid a priest (April 17), probably brother and sister, the children of Gauran. Near the church-door were a well and a tomb, the latter having the name of Feart-Bige, or Bega's tomb.

[A. P. F.]

BEDA, more correctly BAEDA. (1) THE VENERABLE. Bede was born on the estate given by Egfrith, king of Northumbria, to Benedict Biscop for the foundation of his sister monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, probably however before the lands were so bestowed; for the Wearmouth estate was given in 674 and the Jarrow one in 682, whilst the birth of Bede seems satisfactorily fixed to 673. The place of his birth is uncertain, for whilst tradition and local history fix it at Jarrow, there is no positive evidence. Nor are the names of his parents preserved. He himself, writing, as it may be reasonably concluded, immediately on the completion of his History in 731, describes himself then as in the 59th year of his age; this would fix his birth in 673; but as he lived until 735, and the passage in question may have been added at any time between 731 and 735, the year has been sometimes fixed as late as 677. Mabillon, however, whose arguments are sound and whose conclusion has been generally received, accepts the earlier date. At the age of seven he was handed over by his relations to the care of Benedict Biscop, who had not then, in 680, begun the buildings at Jarrow, but had just returned from Rome bringing with him the arch-chanter John. Under Benedict's care Bede was educated in one or both of the sister monasteries, and after the death of Benedict he passed under the rule of Ceolfriith. At the age of 19 he was ordained deacon by John of Beverley, at that time bishop of Hexham, and in his thirtieth year he received the priesthood from the same prelate; as John ceased to be bishop of Hexham in 705, and the later date for Bede's birth would place his ordination as priest in 706 at the earliest, this may be regarded as conclusively in favour of the earlier date; in which case he was ordained deacon in 691 and priest in 702. From the date of his admission to the joint monastery to his death he remained there employed in study and devotional exercises, and there is no evidence that he ever wandered from the banks of the Wear further than to York, which he visited shortly before his death. In the valuable MS. Cotton, Tiberius A. xv. fo. 50; which is not later than the 10th century, is preserved a letter of Pope Sergius to Ceolfriith, desiring him to send to Rome, "religiosum famulum Dei N. venerabilis monasterii tui," to assist in the examination of some points of ecclesiastical discipline. This letter was very early believed to refer to Bede; and by the time of William of Malmesbury had begun to be read, "religiosum Dei famulum Bedam, venerabilis monasterii tui presbyterum;" the name of Bede resting on the authority of William of Malmesbury only,

and the word *presbyterum* on an interlineation in the Cotton MS. as well. If the word *presbyterum* be authentic it is a strong argument against the identification of Bede, for he was not ordained priest until 702, and Sergius died in 701; on the other hand, it is not essential to the sense, rests apparently on an interpolation, and even if genuine may be accounted for as a mistake on the part of the pope. Intercourse between Wearmouth and Rome was nearly continuous at this period, and there would not seem to have been any monk under Ceolfrith's rule, to whom the reference would be more likely than to Bede. Some monks of the monastery went to Rome in 701 (Bede, *de Temporum Ratione*, c. 47), and brought a privilege from Sergius on their return (*Hist. Abbat.* c. 12), but Bede was not among them. On the whole, probability is in favour of the supposition that the invitation was meant for Bede, and the acceptance of it was perhaps prevented by the death of Sergius. Whether Bede's studies were mainly carried on at Wearmouth or at Jarrow is not an important question; as he died and was buried at the latter place, it is probable that he also lived there chiefly, but the two houses were in the strictest union, and he was as much at home in one as in the other. Under the liberal and enlightened administration of Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrith, Bede enjoyed advantages which could not perhaps have been found anywhere else in Europe at the time; perfect access to all the existing sources of learning in the West. Nowhere else could he acquire at once the Irish, the Roman, the Gallican, and the Canterbury learning; the accumulated stores of books which Benedict had bought at Rome and at Vienne; or the disciplinary instruction drawn from the monasteries of the continent as well as from the Irish missionaries. Amongst his friends and instructors were Trumbert, the disciple of St. Chad, and Sigfrid, the fellow pupil of St. Cuthbert under Boisil and Eata; from these he drew the Irish knowledge of Scripture and discipline. Acca, the bishop of Hexham and pupil of St. Wilfrid, furnished him with the special lore of the Roman school, martyrological and other; his monastic learning, strictly Benedictine, came through Benedict Biscop from Lerins and the many continental monasteries his master had visited; and from Canterbury, with which he was in friendly correspondence, he probably obtained instruction in Greek, in the study of the Scriptures, and other more refined learning. His own monastery was a place of rest and welcome for all learned strangers such as was abbot Adamnan (Bede, *H. E.* v. 21). And Bede seems to have lost no opportunity of increasing his stores.

He himself describes the nature of his studies, the meditation on Scripture, the observance of regular discipline, the care of the daily singing in church, "semper aut discere, aut docere, aut scribere dulce habui." These were the occupations of his youth. From the time of his ordination he devoted himself to selecting from the works of the Fathers passages suitable for illustration and edification, and, as he adds modestly, he even busied himself with adding contributions of his own after the pattern of their explanations and interpretations.

The list of his works given at the conclusion of his History, Bede seems to have arranged in

the order of their relative importance, not of their composition; and most of them afford only very slight indications of the dates at which they were written. It is probable that the earliest of his writings are the more elementary ones, on Orthography, the *Ars Metrica* and the *De Natura rerum*. The *Ars Metrica* is dedicated at the conclusion to Cuthbert, a "conlevita" which seems to fix the date of writing earlier than 702 (*Opp.* ed. Giles, vi. 78). The *De Temporibus*, the latest date of which is 702, may have followed almost immediately, and the *De Natura Rerum* has been referred to the same date. The *De Sex aetatibus Saeculi* was written five years later to be read to Wilfrid. The whole of the Commentaries are of later date; they are all dedicated to bishop Acca, who succeeded his master Wilfrid in 709. The Commentary on the Apocalypse, that on the Catholic epistles, and that on the Acts, came first. Then the Commentary on St. Luke; that on Samuel followed, three books of it being written before the death of Ceolfrith in 716: that on St. Mark many years after. The treatise *De Temporum Ratione* is assignable on internal evidence to 726. Before the composition of the History comes that of the life of Cuthbert and of the abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow which are referred to in the greater work. The History itself was completed in 731, after which only the *Epistola ad Egbertum* seems to have been written. If these indications are trustworthy, it will follow that the author gives the list of his works, with some important exceptions however, in the reverse order of their composition. The last work on which he was employed at the time of his death was the translation into English of the Gospel according to St. John.

The attainments of Bede were very great. He certainly knew Greek (*H. E.* v. 24) and had some knowledge of Hebrew. Among the classical writers of antiquity he knew Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Lucretius, Terence, and a host of smaller poets. Homer he quotes once, and may have taken his authority at second-hand. He knew nearly all the second-rate poets, using them for the illustration of the *Ars Metrica*. The earlier fathers were of course in familiar use. The diversity as well as the extent of his reading is remarkable; grammar, rhetoric, poetry, hagiography, arithmetic, chronology, the holy places, the Paschal controversy, epigrams, hymns, sermons, pastoral admonition and the conduct of penitents: even speculations on natural science, on which he specially quotes Pliny, furnished work for his pen, besides his great works on history and the interpretation of Scripture. On all these points his knowledge was thoroughly up to the learning of the day; his judgment independent and his conclusions sound. He must have had good teachers as well as a good library and an insatiable desire of learning.

These qualifications fitted him for the remarkable place he holds in literature. Having centred in himself and in his writings nearly all the knowledge of the day, he was enabled before his death, by promoting the foundation of the school of York, to kindle the flame of learning in the West at the moment that it seemed both in Ireland and in France to be expiring. The school of York transmitted to Alcuin the learning of Bede, and opened the way for culture on the

continent, when England under the terrors of the Danes was relapsing into barbarism. It is impossible to read the more popular writings of Bede, especially the Ecclesiastical History, without seeing that the great knowledge of the scholar was coupled with the humility and simplicity of the purest type of monasticism. Employed on a theme which, in the prevailing belief of miraculous stories, could scarcely be treated of without incurring the charge of superstition, he is eminently truthful. The wonders that he relates on his own account are easily referred to very conceivable natural causes; and scarcely in any case is a reputed miracle recounted without an authority. Gentleness is hardly less universally found than truthfulness. He is a monk and politician of the school of Benedict Biscop, not of that of Wilfrid. The soundness and farsightedness of his ecclesiastical views would be remarkable in any age, and are especially remarkable in a monk. His letter to Egbert contains lessons of wisdom, clear perception of abuses, and distinct recommendation of remedies, which in the neglect or observance of them might serve as a key for the whole later history of the Anglo-Saxon church. And the same letter breathes the purest patriotism and the most sincere love of the souls of men. There is scarcely one of the fathers of whose personal history so little is known, and whose personal character comes out in his writings so clearly as that of Bede in this letter, and in his wonderful History.

Loved and honoured by all alike, Bede spent his life in his monastery in a period which, at least for Northumbria, was one of very varied character. The wise Aldfrid reigned during his youth and early manhood, but many years of disquiet followed his death, and even the accession of his friend Ceolwulf in 731 did not assure him as to the end of the evils, the growth of which since king Aldfrid's death he had watched with misgivings. His bishops, first John of Beverley, and after the few years of Wilfrid's final restoration, Acca his friend and correspondent, and his abbots, first Ceolfrith and then Huetbert, were men to whom he could look up and who valued him. His fame, if we may judge from the demand for his works immediately after his death, extended wherever the English missionaries or negotiators found their way; and both in England and on the continent it must have been widely spread during his life. Nearly every kingdom of England furnished him with materials for his History: it was a London priest who searched the records at Rome for the monk of Jarrow; abbot Albanus transmitted to him the details of the history of the Kentish church; bishop Daniel, the patron of Boniface, supplied the West Saxon; the monks of Lastingham, the depositories of the traditions of Cedd and Chad, reported how Mercia was converted; Esi wrote from East Anglia, and Cynibert from Lindsey.

Soon after his visit to Egbert at York in 734 his health began to fail; and by Easter, 735, he had become asthmatic. But he laboured to the last, and, like Benedict Biscop, spent the time of unavoidable prostration in listening to the reading and singing of his companions. When he could, he continued the work of translation, and had reached the 9th verse of the 6th chapter of

St. John on the day he died. As the end approached, he distributed the few little treasures that he had been allowed to keep in his chest, a little pepper, incense, and a few articles of linen; then, having completed the sentence which he was dictating, he desired to be propped up with his face towards his church. He died repeating the *Gloria Patri*. The day is fixed by the letter of Cuthbert, who details the events of his death, in a letter to his friend Cuthwin, May 26, 735. He was buried at Jarrow where he died; his relics were in the 11th century removed to Durham, and in 1104 were found in the same coffin with those of St. Cuthbert. The story of his epitaph and the tradition of the bestowal of the title of Venerable is too well known and too apocryphal to be repeated here. For the subsequent fate of his remains see CUTHBERT.

His death was in perfect harmony with his devout and studious life. Alcuin has preserved one of his sayings relative to the singing of the hours in church, "I know that the angels visit the canonical hours and gatherings of the brethren: what if they find not me there among the brethren? Will they not say, Where is Bede: why does he not come with the brethren to the prescribed prayers?" (*Alc. Epist.* 16, ed. Migne.)

Of the legendary or fictitious statements about Bede, the following are the most important; his personal acquaintance with Alcuin, which is impossible, see ALCUIN; his education and sojourn at Cambridge, on which see Giles, *Bede Opp.*, i. lxx., sq.; his visits to Italy and burial at Genoa or at Rome, which seem to belong to another person of the same name (*ib.* i. cvi.), and the legendary statements about his title of Venerable (*ib.* i. ci.). For a detailed investigation of these, and the alleged authorities on which they have been supposed to rest, see Gehle (*Disp. Hist. Theol. de Bed. Ven. Leyden*, 1838, pp. 2-4, 17-21); and the same learned monograph may be referred to for the fallacies as to the date of Bede's death, pp. 31, sq.

Bede's list of his own works may be arranged as follows:—

I. Commentaries on the Old Testament; viz. Genesis, 4 books, derived chiefly from Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine; the Tabernacle, 3 books; Samuel, 3 books; the Building of the Temple, 2 books; on Kings, 30 questions dedicated to Nothelm; Proverbs, 3 books; Canticles, 7 books; on Isaiah, Daniel, the twelve minor prophets and part of Jeremiah, extracts from Jerome; on Ezra and Nehemiah, 3 books; on the song of Habakkuk, 1 book; on Tobit, 1; chapters of lessons on the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges; Kings, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Isaiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

II. Commentaries on the New Testament: St. Mark, 4 books; St. Luke, 6 books; 2 books of homilies on the Gospel; on the Acts, 2 books; a book on each of the Catholic Epistles; 3 books on the Apocalypse, chapters of Lessons on the whole New Testament except the Gospels.

III. Letters: *de sex Aetatibus; de Mansionibus filiorum Israel; de eo quod ait Esaias "et clauduntur, &c.;" de ratione Bissexti; de Aequinoctio.*

IV. Hagiographies: on St. Felix, rendered from the poem of Paulinus; on Anastasius, a

revised translation from the Greek; on St. Cuthbert, in verse and prose; the abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow; the History of the English Church; the Martyrology.

V. Hymns and epigrams.

VI. Scientific books: *de Natura rerum*, *de Temporibus*, *de Temporibus Ratione*.

VII. Elementary books: on *Orthography*, *Arts Metrica*, *Schemata*, and *Trope*.

Besides these we know that he wrote translations into his own language, none of which are extant, from the Scriptures; *Retractationes* on the Acts; the Letter to Egbert; and a book on penance on which more will be found below.

In the default of a critical edition of the works of Bede, which can hardly be looked for at the present day, a general reference may be given to Gehle's disputation on the subject, which furnishes materials for most of the following notes.

Bede's collected works, including many that are not his, have been published at Paris, 1544; at Basel, 1563; at Cologne, 1612, 1688; and by Dr. Giles, at London and Oxford, in 1843; and in Migne's *Patrologia*, xc.-xcv.

The several editions of the separate extant works, whether singly or conjointly, are as follows:—

I. The Commentaries on the Old Testament: (1.) Genesis, partly in the Basel and Cologne editions, completed by Henry Wharton from a Lambeth MS. in *Opera quaedam Historica*, London, 1693; and by Martene and Durand, *Thesaurus Anecd.* v. 115. (2.) The Tabernacle. (3.) Samuel. (4.) On the Temple. (5.) Questions on Kings; these are in all the editions. (6.) Proverbs; published among the works of St. Jerome, and in all the collective editions. (7.) On Canticles, against Julian, bishop of Celano. (8.) Ezra and Nehemiah, founded on St. Jerome. (9.) On the Song of Habakkuk, first published by Wharton in the *Opera Historica*, 1693; by Martene and Durand, *Thesaurus*, v. 295. (10.) Tobit, in the collective editions. (11.) The Pentateuch; the *Quaestiones*, published in the Basel edition, vol. viii., are not Bede's; and the *Expositiones* in vol. iv. of the same edition are questioned, and are not contained in Giles's edition. (12.) Kings and the *Verba Dierum*, rest on the same evidence as the *Expositiones* (No. 11), and are in all the editions except Giles's. (13.) The book on Job, published as Bede's in the collective editions of Basel and Cologne, belongs to an earlier writer, Philip, a pupil of St. Jerome. The works called by Bede *Distinctiones Capitulorum*, on the Prophets, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, Ezra and Nehemiah, are not known to exist; but it is probable that they were merely an arrangement of these books for reading, rather than commentaries; a theory which, if true, will account for the appearance of the works of other writers under the name of Bede.

II. Commentaries on the New Testament: (1.) St. Mark, and (2.) St. Luke are in all the editions. (3.) The Homilies; 140 are printed in the Basel and Cologne editions, and also separately at Paris and Louvain; and 11 more by Martene and Durand, *Thesaurus*, v. 317. But of these a large number are either spurious or mere fragments; and Dr. Giles, having obtained an early

and sound MS., prints only 59 of the best authenticated.

(4.) The *Apostolus* (Epistles), drawn chiefly from Augustine, published by Boussard in 1499, and in the collected editions, except Giles's; this, however, is rejected as not being Bede's by Mabillon, who knew another MS. containing the authentic work (*Analecta*, p. 18).

(5.) The Acts, (6.) the Catholic Epistles, (7.) the Apocalypse, are in all the editions. (8.) The *Capitula Lectionum* are not known to exist, but they were probably the mere *Distinctiones Capitulorum*, on which remark has been made above. (9.) The *Retractationes* on the Acts, not mentioned by Bede in the list of his works, are in all the editions.

III. The Epistles: (1.) *De sex Aetatibus saeculi*, to Plegwin; ed. Ware, Dublin, 1664; Wharton, London, 1698; and in Giles. (2.) *De Pascha Celebratione*, to Wichred; in all the collective editions.

(3.) *Ad Albinum*; sent with a copy of the History; ed. Mabillon, *Analecta* (ed. nov.), p. 398. (4.) *Ad Egbertum*; ed. Ware 1664, Wharton, 1693; edd. Smith, Hussey, Moberly, &c. (5.) *Ad Accam, de Mansionibus filiorum Israel*; first printed by Giles. (6.) *Ad Accam de eo quod ait Esaias*; also first printed by Giles. Of the other letters printed in his edition, No. 7, addressed to Nothelm, is the preface to the Questions on Kings, and No. 12 to Eusebius, is the dedication of the Commentary on the Apocalypse; the rest, Nos. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, are the introductory letters to Acca prefixed to the several books of the Commentaries. In another collection of *Anecdota*, Dr. Giles has printed for the first time the *Epistola de Bissexto ad Helmwaldum*, mentioned by Bede in the list of his works (*Anecdota Bedae*, &c., London, 1851).

IV. The Lives of the Saints: (1.) *St. Felix*; *AA. SS. Bolland.* Jan. i. 943; Smith, Appendix to the *Eccl. Hist.* (2.) *St. Cuthbert*; Canisius, *Lectt. Antiqq.* v. 492 (ed. Basnage, ii. 1-24). Mabillon, *AA. SS. O.S.B.* saec. ii. 877-937; Smith, Stevenson; (3.) *Vitae Abbatum*; Ware, 1664, Wharton, 1693; Smith and Stevenson.

4. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Esslingen, 1471; Strasburg, 1473; Esslingen, 1475; Strasburg, 1500; Hagenau, 1506; Strasburg, 1506; Paris, 1514; Cologne, 1537; Antwerp, 1550; Paris, 1554; Basel, 1563; Louvain, 1566; Cologne, 1601, 1612; Heidelberg, 1587; Cambridge, ed. Wheloc, 1643, 1644; Paris, ed. Chifflet, 1681; Cologne, 1688; Cambridge, ed. Smith, 1722; London, by Stevenson (English Hist. Soc.) 1838; in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, ed. Petrie and Hardy, 1848; Oxford, ed. Hussey, 1846; Oxford, ed. Moberly, 1869; and in the collected editions. It has been translated into English by Stapleton, 1565; Stevens, 1723; Hurst, 1814; Giles, 1840; and Gidley, 1871.

5. *Martyrologium*; first published by Henschenius, in *AA. SS. Bolland.* Jan. i. 40; Mar. ii. § 5; the works given under the name in the earlier editions being discarded as not authentic; also in Smith and Giles.

6. *Liber Hymnorum*; ed. Cassander, Paris, 1556, 1616. Wernsdorf, *Poetae Lat. Min.* ii. 239-244.

7. *Libellus de Situ urbis Jerusalem*; in the collective editions and in Smith.

V. The Scientific works: (1) *de Naturarum*; Basel, 1529; and edd.; (2) *de Temporibus*, by Colomiés, *Paralipomena de Script. Eccl.* and edd.; (3) *de Temporum Ratione*; edd. The portion known as the *Chronicon* was published separately, and appears by itself in Smith, and in the *Mon. Hist. Brit.*

VI. The elementary works: (1) *Orthographia*, ed. Putsch, Hanau, 1605. (2) *De Arte Metrica*; ed. Putsch, 1605; Cassander, 1616, and edd. (3) *Schemata*, &c., ed. Pithou, *Rhetores*, pp. 342-355; ed. Venice, 1522; Basel, 1536; Paris, 1599.

VII. The *Penitential* of Bede, in its genuine form, is printed by Martene and Durand, *Amplissima Collectio*, vii. 37; Wasserschele, *Bussordnungen*, pp. 220-230; *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 326, sq. The *Liber de Remediis Peccatorum*, ascribed to Bede, is not genuine, but a compilation from his work and that of Egbert.

A list of all the works ascribed to Bede will be found in Wright's *Biographia Britannica Literaria*. (See Gehle's *Disputatio Hist. Theolog. de Ven. Beda*, Leyden, 1838; Wright, *Biogr. Brit. Lit.* ii. 263-283. The preface of Dr. Giles to the collected works, Potthast, *Bibl. Med. Aev. Hist.*, 159, 160. Mabillon, *AA. SS. O.S.B.* saec. iii. pt. i. 500-524. *AA. SS. Boll.* May, vi. pp. 718-723.)

(2) A name occurring in the pedigree of the kings of the Lindisfar, as father to Biscop. [See BENEDICTUS BISCOP.]

(3) Beda Major; a priest mentioned by Bede himself, as present with S. Cuthbert at his death (*V. S. Cuthb.* c. 37). His epitaph, written by his pupil Luting is given by Mabillon in the *Analecta* (ed. nov.) p. 381; he fixes the date by the notes of time in the Epitaph to A.D. 681, Feb. 9: but as Cuthbert died after this in 687, the epitaph must belong to some other Bede.

(4) A monk contemporary with Charles the Great, sometimes confounded with the Venerable Bede. Mabillon (*Iter Italicum*, p. 144) gives an epitaph recorded by Romanus, as existing formerly in the church of St. Peter at Rome; and Ware refers to Raphael of Volaterra for the story that his tomb was at Genoa. A life of *Beda junior*, who died at Genoa about 883, is given in the *AA. SS. Boll.* April, i. 867-873. It is probable that the name was not very uncommon, and that traces of the Venerable Bede were eagerly sought for and even fabricated. [S.]

BEDWINI, a Celtic bishop, whose name occurs in the stories about Arthur, is said to have lived at Cellwig. He is conjecturally connected with Bodmin (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 238; Whitaker, *Cathedral of Cornwall*, i. 45, ii. 234).

[C. W. B.]

BEGA; BEZA, BEYA, BEGGA, BEE, S. A. Cumbrian saint of whom nothing is clearly known, and whom the endeavours of the hagiographers have only succeeded in investing with a history which belongs to several other saints. According to Alban Butler (Sept. 6), she was an Irish virgin who lived as an anchoress in the 7th century, and founded a nunnery in Copeland. He also mentions a place in Scotland called Kilbeas after her. This is the most reasonable account. According to the life of her seen by Leland (Coll. iii. 36), after founding her monas-

tery in Cumberland she removed into Northumberland and founded another north of the Wear; then to Hert, where she becomes identical with St. Heiu [HEIU], and then to Tadcaster; winding up her career at Hackness, as identical with St. Begu [BEGU]. (*Mon. Angl.* iii. 576). Begu and Heiu are well known from Bede, and were two different persons, neither of them possibly identical with the Cambrian saint; yet Suysken in his commentary on St. Bega (*AA. SS. Boll.* Sept. ii. 694-700) accepts this version as true. In default of an English career for the saint, she is next sought in Ireland and Scotland, and the Aberdeen Breviary contains lessons for two saints, with either of whom she might be identified. (1.) St. Bega, venerated at Dunbar, who lived in an island called Cumbria in the Ocean Sea, as an anchoress, visited occasionally by St. Maura; and dying, Sept. 3rd, was buried in her island, whence the rector of Dunbar, attempting to fetch her remains, was driven back by a storm. (2.) St. Begga, an Irish princess, given in marriage by her parents against her will, hears of the Gospel as preached in England; flies to England to Oswald and Aidan, and becomes the first abbess of nuns in England. She has her home in a desert island, and in her old age resigns her abbacy to St. Hilda, under whose rule she ends her days, Oct. 31. After 460 years her remains are removed to Whitby (*Brev. Aberd.* pars aestiv. fo. 145 and 136). Here are probably some reminiscences of St. Heiu. She was probably a local saint of the 8th century. The monastery bearing her name was founded as a cell to St. Mary's at York, in the reign of Henry I. [S.]

BEG-BILE, son of Tigernach - Oct. 12. Being descended from Conall Gulban, this Irish saint was related to St. Columba, and lived at the close of the sixth century. He was brother of St. Conan-dil (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 563; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 275).

[A. P. F.]

BEGHA V. - Oct. 31, circ. A.D. 660 - also called St. Bez and St. Begagh. She left her home in Ireland on hearing of the flourishing state of Christianity in Britain, and, in order to avoid a marriage intended for her, fled into Scotland in a ship that was in waiting. She received the veil at the hand of Bishop Aidan, in the reign of King Oswald in Britannia, and ruled a community in a cell constructed by him in a certain desert island. When St. Hilda returned from Gaul (Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* iv. c. 23), St. Begha prayed that she might be freed from the burden of government, and that St. Hilda might be consecrated abbess in her stead, and this was accordingly done. After many years she died in the odour of sanctity, attested by many miracles at her tomb, especially by the miraculous cure of the two sons of a Frenchman from Chartres. (*Brev. Aberd.* pars aestiv. f. cxxxvi.) Bede mentions a nun called Begu, in the monastery of Hacnos, thirteen miles from Whitby, to whom the death of St. Hilda was revealed in a vision (*Eccl. Hist.* iv. c. 23). St. Begha is honoured at Kilbagie and Kilbucho in Scotland; but her greatest foundation was within the kingdom of Strathclyde, at St. Bees, which takes its designation from her. It was founded in A.D. 656. Afterwards a priory was endowed on its foundation by William de Meschines, Lord of Copeland, temp.

Henry I. There was a cell of this house at Nendrum or Mahee Island, in Down county. (See *Description of Nendrum*, by Rev. William Reeves, D.D., 1845, and his *Ecol. Antiq.* 163, 190, sqq. for the grant of the island of Nendrum or Nendrum, by Sir John de Courcy, in 1178, to the priory of St. Bega de Coupland. Bishop Forbes, *Kal. of Scott. Saints*, p. 278.) In treating of the Anglo-Saxon nuns, Montalembert (*Monks of the West*, Edinb. iv. 58-9 and v. 248-52) deals with the difficulties connected with S. Begha, giving a concise account of the traditions and historical speculations regarding her, but without deciding whether she is the Begu of Bede, or whether the traditions do not really belong to two or more individuals. (See also *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 177; Bolland, *Acta SS.* Sept. tom. ii. 694; Faber, *Life of S. Bega*, 1844; Tomlinson, *Vit. S. Begae in Carlisle Hist. Tracts*; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 257-58.) [BEGA.] [A. P. F.]

BEGU, a nun of Hackness, in Yorkshire, for more than thirty years, who is said to have had a supernatural intimation of the death of S. Hilda in 674 (*Bed. H. E.* iv. 23). She has been sometimes supposed to be identical with S. Bega. [BEGA.] [S.]

BELLATOR, fl. c. 550, a presbyter, friend of Cassiodorus, at whose request he wrote commentaries on Ruth, appended by Cassiodorus to Origen's exposition to complete a comment on the Octateuch. He also wrote commentaries on Tobit, Esther, Judith, Maccabees, and Wisdom, the whole of which have perished. He translated two books of Origen's Homilies on Esdras, and Huet regards him as the author of the extant Latin version of some of the works of that father. (Cassiod. *de Inst. Div.* c. i. 540, c. v. 542, c. vi. 543; Siebert, *de Ill. Ecol. Script.* c. 89; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 525.) [E. V.]

BEMA. [MANES.]

BENEDICTUS OF ANIANE. This "second founder" of monasticism in Europe, or "second Benedict," as he has been called [see BENEDICTUS OF NURSA, p. 309], was born in Languedoc (Occitania, Septimania) about the middle of the 8th century. His father Aigulfus, count of Maguelone (Magalona, Magdalona), a cathedral city till the 16th century (Baillet, *Vie des Saints*), was cup-bearer in the court of Pepin and his son, and is described as of Gothic extraction (Ardo, *Vit. Bened. Anian.* c. 4); the Goths, according to Mabillon (*ad loc. cit.*), having settled about Toulouse (Tolosa) early in the 5th century. Benedict was brought up to arms and courtly exercises, as a young nobleman of the time; but even then he cherished an idea of strict self-discipline (*Vit.* c. 5), which before long ripened into his taking the monastic vow. An accident which befell him was the immediate occasion. While serving in the army of the great Karl in Italy, about A.D. 774, he had a narrow escape from drowning, in saving his brother's life, in the river Ticino (Ticinus), near Pavia (*Vit.* c. 6; cf. Mabill. *ad loc.*). He resolved, without his father's knowledge apparently, to become a monk, and by the advice of a blind old hermit whom he consulted, betook himself to the monastery of St. Seine (Sequanus), in a forest of Burgundy, and there, after probation, was duly admitted (*Vit.* c. 6). It was then probably that he assumed the name

CHRIST. BIOGR.

of Benedict. Here he remained for the space of two years and a half; or, according to another reading, five years and a half (*Vit.* cc. 10, 58; cf. Mabill. *ad loc.*), voluntarily taking upon himself the most menial offices (*Vit.* c. 7). But though the abbat showed his appreciation of the new brother, by appointing him "cellarer," or house-steward, an office almost next to his own, Benedict's austerities made him unpopular with the monks generally, who derided his emaciation and dirty habits (c. 9), and resented his strictures (c. 10). Indeed, Benedict at this period of his life, seems, in the fervour of a convert, to have aimed too high; even disparaging the wisely tolerant rule of his great namesake, as fit only for "novices and weak brethren," and preferring the sterner rule of the ascetics of the East (c. 8). However, his intense earnestness prevailed, and on the death of the abbat, the monks unanimously (c. 10) invited Benedict to be their head. But he declined, being conscious of an incompatibility in spirit; and returning to his own native district, built a "cell" in the gorge of the stream Aniane (Anianus), for himself and one or two monks who accompanied him thither (cc. 10, 14).

From this insignificant beginning arose the monastery which Ardo, the biographer of Benedict early in the 9th century (cf. *Vit.* c. 40), calls "the head not only of the monasteries in Gothia, but of many others" (c. 27). Before long many persons flocked to the spot, attracted by the fame of Benedict's sanctity; of these some went away disgusted by the scantiness of the fare doled out (c. 11), others attached themselves to him. With their aid Benedict raised the walls of a small monastery, himself working with the rest. Everything was on a very simple scale, the only possession, at first, of the little brotherhood being an ass and some utensils for grinding their corn; their food chiefly bread and water, with milk supplied by the peasant women of the neighbourhood (cc. 12, 13). Even for divine service Benedict at this time declined the gift of anything costly, preferring to use vessels of wood, or of glass, such as were subsequently forbidden by a council near Mainz (*Conc. Triburiense*), in A.D. 893 (c. 14; cf. Mabill. *ad loc.*). Slaves he refused to accept, or at once set them free (c. 14). As was inevitable, the property of the monastery gradually increased; and the depredations of his lawless neighbours put Benedict's patience often to the test (cc. 13, 19). Still the work of the monastery went on and prospered. In the famine which visited those parts about A.D. 779 (c. 18; cf. Mabill. *ad loc.*) the monks gave relief freely, and the example of their self-abnegation was contagious; other monastic communities sprung into existence all around (c. 15).

A larger and statelier building was erected about A.D. 782 (*Vit.* c. 26; cf. Mabill. *ad loc.*), to accommodate 1000 monks (c. 34), with all its appurtenances of proportionate grandeur. To this were affiliated, as usual, numerous "cellae" or priories as dependencies in the district (c. 34). Benedict meantime was diligently acquiring books for the library of the monastery, and forming that collection of "Rules" which he subsequently turned to good account in his reformation of the monastic system (c. 27). He welcomed to his monastery the visit of any

monk eminent for piety, specially from Monte Cassino, the head-quarters of Western monachism, in order to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the various usages. His influence as a Reformer began to make itself felt perceptibly. He formed classes in his monastery, under competent teachers, for training monks and clergy in his rules (c. 36); and these, his pupils, went forth, as colonists, to found new monasteries or to resuscitate those in which the monastic spirit was dying away. He was frequently consulted from all quarters. The archbishop of Lyons and the bishop of Orleans sent to ask for some of his monks to aid in rebuilding monasteries in their dioceses (c. 36). Alcuin, then presiding over the great monastery of St. Martin at Tours, was his intimate correspondent (c. 36). He was fortunate, too, in royal favour. Louis, at that time king of Aquitaine, a devoted patron of monachism, and his queen, were his constant friends (c. 43 *et pass.*). Benedict had placed his monastery under the royal jurisdiction, that it might be in no danger from the claims of his own relatives (c. 27). Louis proved himself worthy of this confidence. He enriched the monastery largely (Mab. *Obs. Praev. in Vit.*; cf. c. 45), and gave Benedict authority as Visitor to regulate all the monasteries in his kingdom (c. 43). Benedict's munificence seems to have made him acceptable in this capacity (c. 43).

Towards the close of the 8th century the heresy of the "Adoptionists" or "Adoptians," who maintained that Christ, according to His human nature, is the Son of God by adoption only, made its way across the Pyrenees from Spain northwards. At the head of this party were Elipandus, archbishop of Toletum (Toledo), and Felix, bishop of Urgella (Urgel). Their teaching was condemned, as tending to Nestorianism, at the councils of Ratisbon (*Conc. Ratispon.* A.D. 792), Frankfort (*Conc. Francofurt.* A.D. 794), and Aachen (*Conc. Aquisgran.* A.D. 799). Benedict's friend Alcuin wrote strenuously against the Adoptionists, and Benedict himself, by his reputation for sanctity and learning, was drawn into the controversy (Alcuin, *Ep. Praev. Libr. IV. contr. Elipand.*). He was sent more than once into Spain on this business, and was present at the synod of Urgel (*Conc. Urgell.* A.D. 799) (Baluz. *Not. ad Agobard.* cited by Mab. on *Bened. Anian. Vit.* c. 17). But controversy was not his forte (Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* s. v.), and the controversial writings attributed to him, and which, if his, owe their existence, perhaps, to this controversy, are the least important of his works (cf. Baluz. *Misc.* ii. 85).

The accession of Louis, on the death of his father, to the imperial throne increased the influence of Benedict, and gave a yet wider scope to his energies as a reformer. The new emperor at once invited his favourite counsellor to follow him to his new dominions, assigning for his residence a monastery near Saverne (Tabernae), in Elsass (Alsatia), Maurum-Monasterium by name (*Vit.* cc. 47, 48). But this was inconveniently far from the court (c. 48), and leaving an abbat in his place at Maurum-Monasterium, he was soon induced to fix his residence in close proximity to Aachen, on the banks of the river Inde (Inde), where his imperial patron built for him the famous monastery, known subsequently

as Cornelius-Münster, from the relics of Pope Cornelius deposited there (*Vit.* cc. 48, 58; cf. Herzog, *l. c.*). Here Benedict continued on a larger scale the work commenced on the banks of the Aniane, collecting from every quarter materials for a thorough re-organization of the monastic system, prosecuting his inquiries in every direction, especially in regard to the observances of Monte Cassino, the head-quarters of Western monachism, and labouring to make his own monastery a model to all others (cc. 50, 53). He took an active part in the council held at Arles in A.D. 813 (*Conc. Arelat.*), at which various questions of ecclesiastical discipline were settled (c. 31), and presided over the more important council at Aachen (*Conc. Aquisgran.*) four years later (Mab. *AA. SS. O.S.B. Saec. iv.*). Amid all these public duties Benedict found time to plead the cause of the poor and oppressed at court (c. 49), even at the cost of provoking against himself the hostility of the nobles. But his imperial patron stood by him to the last (c. 43). Benedict closed his laborious and self-denying life in peace, "full of years and full of honours," within the walls of his abbey, surrounded by his faithful monks, not a few of whom had followed him from the Aniane to the Inde, A.D. 821, having completed the three score and ten years assigned to man by the psalmist (c. 57). He was buried at Inde, and is commemorated on Feb. 11 (Mab. *ad loc.*).

Benedict's character strongly resembles that of the founder of Wesleyanism. In both there was the same methodical austerity, the same sombre earnestness, the same determination to regulate even the most trivial minutiae (cf. c. 28 *et pass.*). In all these features Benedict of Aniane is much nearer to John Wesley, than to his great namesake, Benedict of Nursia. It is no wonder that at first Benedict was no favourite at court generally. The monks as a class resented his interference with their ease and laxity, the nobles his uncompromising resistance to their encroachments on monastic property (c. 41). But the single-mindedness of his aim bore down all opposition, and more than one of the Frankish nobility, attracted by Benedict's teaching and example, renounced the world for a monk's cell, and became a munificent benefactor to the order (cc. 42, 46). In later life Benedict grew more lenient to the infirmities of others, but he never spared himself. While his bodily strength permitted, he took his share with the brethren in mowing, reaping, &c. (c. 31), and he persisted to the last in his habits of rigid asceticism, denying himself all but the very poorest fare, and being continually in tears for his own sins and those of others (c. 56). It was a character that could not fail to impress itself vividly, by the very force of contrast, on a lawless and licentious age.

But, after all, Benedict's influence as a reformer of abuses was only transient. There was a want of elasticity, a stiffness and an angularity about his reforms, which unfitted them for general acceptance. Their success depended exclusively on himself, and he attempted to define precisely points which would have been more wisely left undefined, prescribing even, for example, whether or not the hood should hang down to the knees (c. 52). His task, indeed, as he proposed it to himself, was an impossi-

bility. It was the first and last attempt ever made at a thorough and sweeping reformation of the whole monastic system, even in its minutest details, throughout the Carolingian empire. Benedict of Aniane attempted for the Franks what the greater Benedict had done in Italy three centuries before; he failed comparatively, because he wanted the wise forbearance of his predecessors. "De minimis non curat lex."

A reformation was urgently needed, but not on his plan. The Rules of Benedict and Columban had long contended for mastery in the monasteries of the Franks, sometimes existing side by side in the same monastery, until, usually, the milder code ousted its rival (Holsten. *Praef.*; Bened. Anian. *Cod. Regul.*). Sometimes various rules were professed in the same monastery (Mab. *Praef. Ann. O. S. B.*; tom. i. §18), and this diversity of usages was made more glaring in the latter part of the 8th century by the intrusion of the canonical rule into some regular monasteries (Ardo. *Vit. Ben. An. c.* 40; cf. Mab. *ad loc.*). Practically each monastic community was a law to itself, and in many cases great laxity of morals was the natural consequence of this vagueness and uncertainty of rule. The facility of migrating from one monastery to another gave rise to frequent scandals (cf. *Reg. Bened. c.* 61; Mab. *Ann. O. S. B. l.* viii. 18, &c.).

Benedict's great aim was to tighten the reins of discipline, to obliterate these inconsistencies of usage, to make the Nursian rule sole and supreme everywhere, and to draw the line sharply between monks on the one hand and canons and secular clergy on the other. In these his efforts, he had to face the strong and active opposition of the party at the head of whom stood the brothers Adalard and Wala.

Beside the danger from the want of coherence and organisation among themselves, danger threatened the monks from without. Not a few of the great nobles seized the opportunity with avidity for enriching themselves from the monastic revenues. Benedict's influence with the Crown was a great safeguard for the monasteries against the rapacity of their neighbours. Louis excused the monasteries generally from the imposition of oppressive services (*Vit. c.* 54), and relieved the smaller and less wealthy from all duty except that of praying for their sovereign.

The culminating point in this work of reformation was the great council at Aachen (*Conc. Aquisgran.*), A.D. 817. This was convoked by Louis at Benedict's suggestion; Benedict presided, with Arnulf, an abbat from Anjou, appointed by the emperor as vice-president ("adjutor;" Mab. *AA. SS. O. S. B. Saec. iv.*); and Benedict's was the guiding spirit which directed the deliberations of the abbats there assembled. So early as in the 6th century the old Benedictine rule had been formally sanctioned in the Gallic monasteries (*Conc. Matiscon. A.D.* 525); but profession in this instance was by no means tantamount to practice (cf. *Conc. Turon. iii. A.D.* 813). Benedict and his colleagues set to work vigorously. More than 70 canons were enacted. The pre-eminence of the old Benedictine rule was declared; and, in order to ensure complete uniformity, whatever had been left ambiguous by the founder was determined precisely, on the minutiae of dress, diet, divine service, &c. These

regulations were enforced throughout his dominions by the emperor's fiat, who also appointed visitors ("inspectores") to see them carried out fully (*Vit. c.* 50). They were observed even in Italy, and incorporated at Monte Cassino with the original ordinances (Bulteau, *Hist. de l'Ordre de S. Benoist, v.* 4). But the effects of this "peaceful revolution" (Dantier, *Les Monast. Benedict. ii.* 18) were only transient. Not many years elapsed after the death of Benedict, before his opponents regained the ascendancy; and Odo of Clugny, Bernard of Cîteaux, and the other monastic reformers of the mediæval period had to do the work over again in their several spheres. In one respect, however, the advantages resulting to the monastic life and to Europe generally from the labours of Benedict were more lasting. Even through the dark and turbulent ages which ensued, the monasteries, as a rule, were schools for the young and oases of peaceful study.

Benedict's most important writings are (1) his *Codex Regularum*; a collection of various rules (α) Eastern, (β) Western, for monks, nuns, and canons, with an appendix of treatises on the monastic life. *Codex Regularum Monast. et Canonic. &c.*, juxta edit. Luc. Holsten (Paris, 1663) recusam August. Vindelicor. 1759, et a R. P. Mariano Brockie obs. crit. hist. illustratam. (2) *Concordia Regularum*; a digest, or harmonised catena of these rules under their respective headings. *Concordia Regularum*, ed. Hugo Menard, Paris, 1638.

The following minor treatises are ascribed to Benedict by Mabillon (v. s.):—*Testimoniorum Nubecula Benedicti Levitæ de Incarnat. Dom. &c.* (Baluz. *Misc. Sacr. ii.* 85). (2) *Disputat. Benedicti Levitæ ad Felician. Impietatem (ib.)*. (3) *Epistol. Guarnario (ib.)*. (4) *Confessio Fidei Benedicti Levitæ (ib.)*. (5) *Excerptus divers. Mod. Poenitent.* (Baluz. ii. 1385). (6) *Benedicti Abbatis Forma Fidei* (a "Summa Theologica"); and (7), *Benedicti Libellus ex divers. Patr. Sentent. al. Collectio ex Homiliis Patrum*.

The *Nubecula*, *Disputatio*, and *Confessio*, are attributed to Benedict on the hypothesis of his being only a deacon when they were written.

Mabillon is inclined to identify Benedict of Aniane with an abbat Euticius, mentioned by Joannes Monachus in his life of Odo, the famous Clunian reformer, as "Founder of the Customs of Clugny," and explains, that it was by no means unusual at that time for ecclesiastics to have an "ascetic" name as well as the name by which they were known ordinarily. (Mab. *AA. SS. O. S. B. Saec. iv.*)

The principal source of our information about the life of Benedict is the biography of him by Ardo or Smaragdus, one of his pupils. It is written sensibly and in an agreeable style, and with every indication of being trustworthy. The greater part is the testimony of eye-witnesses (e.g. cc. 31, 35, 36, 37, &c.), and the miraculous element is less obtrusive than in most biographies of the kind. (*S. Benedicti Anianensis Vita*, auct. Ardono seu Smaragdo discip. ap. Mabill. *AA. O. S. B. Saec. iv. i.* Venet. 1733; cf. Mabill. *AA. SS. O. S. B. Praef. Saec. iv.*; see also *AA. SS. Bolland. Feb. 12*; Cave, *Hist. Liter.*; Bulteau, *Abrégé de l'Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoist*, Paris, 1684; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, iv. pp. 447–459, Paris, 1738; Baillet, *Vie des Saints*,

Paris, 1739; *Der heilige Benedict, Gründer von Aniane u. Cornelimünster (Inda)*, &c., P. J. Nicolai. Köln, 1865.) [I. G. S.]

BENEDICTUS BISCOP, called by Eddius (*V. Wilfridi*, c. 3) Biscop Baducing, was, by birth, a noble Englishman, descended—if he be identical with Biscop, the son of Beda, who is mentioned in the Genealogies appended to Florence of Worcester—from the royal house of the Lindisfari, or people of Lincolnshire (*M. H. B.* 631). He appears, however, first as a *minister* or thegn of Oswy, king of Northumbria. Born about 628, he determined, at the age of twenty-five, to renounce the world. He visited Rome in 653, being accompanied as far as Lyons by Wilfrid whom he left there (Bede, *H. E.* v. 19; Edd. *V. Wilfr.* c. 3). Having informed himself of the minutiae of ecclesiastical discipline, he returned to Northumbria, and there remained for several years endeavouring to promote religion and learning. His second visit to Rome is placed by Florence of Worcester in 665; Alchfrith, the son of Oswy and friend of Wilfrid, was to have accompanied him, but was prevented by his father. Bede (*Vit. Abb.* c. 2) says that this visit took place during the pontificate of Vitalian (657–672). It was broken by a visit to Lerins, then the seat of monastic discipline in its purest form. There Benedict became a monk, received the tonsure, and studied the monastic institute for several months, returning to Rome just at the moment at which Wighard, who had been chosen archbishop of Canterbury, arrived, in 667. After the death of Wighard, Vitalian commended Theodore, whom he had consecrated in March, 668, to the guidance of Benedict, who conducted him through France, where they remained for several months [see THEODORUS], to Kent, arriving at the end of May, 669. After spending two years in monastic work at Canterbury, he made a third journey to Rome, this time, apparently, to buy books, of which he procured a large number in that city and at Vienne. He returned to England in 672, intending, it would seem, to visit Wessex, where the king, Coinwalch, was his friend. But hearing of Coinwalch's death, he proceeded to Northumbria, where Egfrith, in 670, had succeeded his father Oswy, and Alchfrith was in disgrace or dead. He now set himself to the work of planting reformed monachism in Northumbria; Egfrith gave him seventy hides of land of royal demesne, on the north of the river Wear, near the mouth. There he built, by Egfrith's wish, the monastery of St. Peter's, Wearmouth, in 674. In building the church and other parts of the monastery he employed French masons, whom he himself fetched from France; the architecture was an imitation of what he had seen at Rome, and the windows, we are expressly told, were filled with glass and lattice-work, the makers of which were brought from abroad. In order to make the furniture of his church complete he made his fourth journey to Rome, during the pontificate of Agatho, and, therefore, not earlier than 678. On this occasion he purchased a large collection of books, procured a quantity of relics, obtained the services of John the archchanter and abbot of St. Martin's at Rome, who returned with him to instruct his monks in music and ritual; and, with the consent of Egfrith, received from Agatho a formal

privilege, exempting his monastery from all external interference. He obtained, also, a large supply of images and pictures. Whether he is the Benedictus mentioned in the acts of the council at Rome, in 679 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 131), is uncertain, but he was, most probably, present at the council, John the archchanter being commissioned by it to bring the Lateran Canons of 649 to England. In 679 he returned, and obtained from a Northumbrian synod a recognition of pope Agatho's privilege. Egfrith was so much pleased with the monastery of Wearmouth that he determined to promote the foundation of a sister monastery, to be dedicated to St. Paul. For this purpose he gave forty hides of land; and the indefatigable Benedict planted his new foundation at Jarrow, sending seventeen monks, with Ceolfrid as their abbot, thither in 682. The abbacy of Wearmouth he himself shared with Easterwin his cousin, who undertook the coadjutorship about the same year. Having so far freed himself from the necessity of staying at home he started a fifth time for Rome, to procure pictures and books for Jarrow. His stay this time was somewhat prolonged. On his return he found that Egfrith had been killed in 685, and that his monasteries had been thinned by pestilence, which had carried off abbot Easterwin in 686. He ratified the election of Sigfrid as successor of Easterwin, and purchased of king Aldfrid, the successor of Egfrith, three hides of land south of the Wear, with two magnificent *pallia* which he had brought from Rome. The rigour of his life and his great labours now began to tell upon him; he became paralysed in the lower limbs, and remained so for three years before his death. Sigfrid, too, fell into consumption, of which he died in 689; and Benedict made over both his monasteries to Ceolfrid. Benedict spent his last months in urging on his disciples the importance of maintaining the monastic rule in the pure Benedictine form, to which he had brought it after visiting seventeen of the continental monasteries; the preservation of his precious libraries, and, especially, the duty of disregarding the claims of nobility or consanguinity in the choice of spiritual rulers. His sleepless nights he spent in listening to the reading of the bible and repetition of the psalms, in which his weakness only now and then permitted him to join. He died on the 12th of January, 690, whilst his attendants were repeating the 83rd Psalm (*Deus quis similis*). He was buried in the church of St. Peter at Wearmouth. The interesting and circumstantial account of his life is furnished by Bede, who was born on the monastic estate, and committed to Benedict's care at the age of seven years. He would be about eighteen at the time of Benedict's death, and may have received from him some account of his five pilgrimages. The character of Benedict is one of great sanctity, energy, and foresight. As a promoter of learning and cultivation he stands far higher than Wilfrid, although his work lay in a much smaller sphere. The line which he took in the ecclesiastical politics of the time is not signified by the historian; Eddius, however, remarks on his austerity as connected with his early separation from Wilfrid; and it would seem certain that although strongly attached to Rome, as his ideal of the church and the resting-place of the apostles, he stood aloof

from Wilfrid's later policy, and accepted the position of Egfrith and Theodore, with both of whom he stood, as we have seen, in the most friendly relations. He was, probably, opposed to a certain extent to Wilfrid, at all events to the ambitious projects of the latter; and his spirit of self-sacrifice is in strong contrast with Wilfrid's habit of self-assertion. However this may have been, the debt which England owes to Benedict Biscop is a very great one, and has scarcely ever been fairly recognized; for it may be said that the civilisation and learning of the 8th century rested on the monastery which he founded, which produced Bede, and through him the school of York, Alcuin and the Carolingian school, on which the culture of the middle ages was based.

(Mabillon, *AA. SS. O.S.B. Saec. ii.* 1000-1012; *AA. SS. Boll.* Januar. i. 745, 746.) [S.]

BENEDICTUS FOSSATENSIS (Benedict of St. Maur), abbat of the monastery of St. Maur des Fossees (Monasterium Fossatense), was one of the monastic reformers in the latter part of the 8th, and commencement of the 9th century, and is sometimes confounded with his more famous namesake of Aniane. But Benedict of Aniane is never styled "Fossatensis," and died A.D. 821, whereas Benedict of St. Maur was alive A.D. 829 at the dedication of the church of the monastery of St. Vandrille (Monasterium Fontanellense) (Mabill. *AA. SS. O.S.B. Saec. iv.*). The monastery over which he presided, called "des Fossees," or "de Saint Maur des Fossees," near Paris, was the final resting-place of the relics of St. Maur, after frequent translations to escape the ravages of Norman marauders (Bulteau, *Hist. de l'Ordre de S. Benoist*, v. 12). It must not be confounded with the monastery "de Fosse" (Monasterium Fossense), in the diocese of Maestricht, between the Meuse and the Sambre. Benedict took an active part in the reformation of the monastery of St. Vandrille, near Rouen, founded about 648 A.D. by one of the great nobles of the Court of Dagobert (Bult. iii. 23, v. 24).

[I. G. S.]

BENEDICTUS MEDIOLANENSIS (Benedict of Milan) was a contemporary of Benedict of Aniane, and, like him on a smaller scale, was instrumental in the restoration of the old Nursian rule. He was made abbat in A.D. 784 of the monastery of St. Ambrose at Milan by Peter, archbishop of Milan, and founder of the monastery; and his appointment was confirmed by Karl the emperor (Mabill. *AA. SS. O.S.B. Saec. iv.*). The monastery stood by one of the six gates of the city; at each of which was a monastery with hospital attached to it. (Bulteau, *Hist. de l'Ordre de S. Benoist*, v. 76.) [I. G. S.]

BENEDICTUS OF NURSIA. St. Benedict, abbat of Monte Cassino ("Abbas Casinensis"), called "Patriarch of the monks of the West," lived during the troubled and tumultuous period after the deposition of Augustulus, when most of the countries of Europe were either overrun by Arians or still heathen. There were many monks in southern Europe, but without much organization till Benedict reformed and remodelled the monastic life of Europe. (Mab. *Ann. I. i.*) The principal, almost sole, authority for the life of St. Benedict are the Dialogues of Gregory the

Great. Their genuineness has been questioned; chiefly on the ground of the Latin being inelegant and the narrative so largely interspersed with miracles. On this theory the Dialogues have been attributed to Pope Gregory II., more than a century later (Cave, *Hist. Litt. s. voce*). But there is nothing in style or matter really inconsistent with the reputed authorship. Gregory the Great had planned to write something of the kind "de miraculis patrum in Italiâ" (*Ep. ad Maximin. Siracus*, iii. 51): and he is said to have sent the Dialogues to Teudelinda the Lombard queen (Sibeg. Gemblac. c. 42 ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.*). Cave thinks them interpolated (cf. Mab. *AA. SS. O.S.B. Praef.*) The writer professes to quote from four of Benedict's disciples, three subcontemporary, the other his successor at Monte Cassino. (Greg. M., *Praef. Dial.*)

Benedict was born about A.D. 480 at Nursia (Noceria), anciently belonging to the Sabines (frigida Nursia, Virg.), an episcopal city in the duchy of Spoleto in Umbria. His parents were of the higher class ("liberiori genere," *Praef. Dial.*). A later writer gives their names, Euproprius and Abundantia (Petr. Diac. *de Vir. Ill. i.*). The ruins of the ancestral palace are shown at Noceria, with a crypt, the reputed birthplace of Benedict (Mab. *Ann. i. 4*). He was sent as a boy to be educated at Rome; but soon, shocked by the immorality of his companions, fled, followed by his nurse (Cyrilla; Petr. D., *de Vir. Ill. i.*), to Afle (Efide), on the Anio (Teverone), about forty miles from Rome (*Dial. ii. 1*). Thence he retired to a cave at Sublaqueum (Subiaco), where he lived as a hermit in almost utter isolation for some years, visited only from time to time by a priest of the neighbourhood, Romanus (*Dial. ii. 1*). The cave, the well-known "il Sagro Speco," is shown about three miles of very steep ascent above the town of Subiaco, and the traditional spot marked by a monastery, once famous for its library and for the first printing press in Italy, where the youthful anchoret rolled naked in the thorn-bushes to overcome sensual temptations (Mab. *Ann. i. 8*). The fame of his sanctity spreading abroad, Benedict was invited, his youth notwithstanding, by the monks of a neighbouring monastery (at Vicovarro), to preside over them, and very reluctantly consented. Soon however their laxity rebelled against his attempts at reformation (he seems thus early to have shown the organizing faculty for which he became afterwards so remarkable), and he abdicated, after miraculously escaping being poisoned by them (*Dial. ii. 3*). He retired to his cave; and undertook the superintendence of youths, among whom were two who became foremost among his followers, Maurus and Placidus, sons of Roman patricians (*Dial. ii. 4*). Here he founded, it is said, twelve monasteries, each of twelve monks with a "father" at the head of them (*Dial. ii. 3*). Of these only two remain, "il Sagro Speco" and "Sta. Scholastica"; the rest being in ruins, or merely oratories (Mab. *Ann. ii. 1*). That of "Sta. Scholastica," so named after Benedict's sister, enjoys especial privileges, and takes precedence among the Benedictine foundations even of Monte Cassino, as of older date (Alb. Butler, *Lives of the Saints*). Several of the miracles ascribed to Benedict are connected with Subiaco. But, after some time, finding his work continually hindered by the

machinations of a dissolute priest, Florentius, he removed with some of his disciples to Monte Cassino (*Dial.* ii. 8), destined to become illustrious as the headquarters of the great Benedictine order, and as a stronghold of learning and liberal arts even in the darkest ages.

It was probably about A.D. 530 that Benedict transferred himself to Monte Cassino (Mab. *Ann.* iii. 5). The mountain with a town and stream at its base, all of the same name, stands on the borders of what were formerly Latium and Campania, nearer to Naples than Rome: a few miles from the birthplace of the great Dominican, Thomas Aquinas. Some ruins of an old Roman amphitheatre mark the site of the town, near the modern S. Germano; the little stream flows into the Rapido, a tributary of the Garigliano (Liris). The summit of the mountain three miles above the town, and, even at the present time inaccessible to carriages, was crowned, before the arrival of Benedict by a temple of Apollo; frequented even then by the rustics (*Dial.* i. 8), although the existence of a bishop of Casino is indicated by the list of bishops present at the Roman Council A.D. 484 (Mab. *Ann.* iii. 5). On this precipitous eminence, looking down on the plains washed by the peaceful Liris ("taciturnus amnis" Hor.), and backed by the wild crags of the Abruzzi, Benedict set himself with new vigour to carry out his plans of a revival of monasticism. The miraculous intervention of which Gregory hands down the story (*Dial.* ii. 9, 10) is not necessary to explain, how the missionary spirit of Benedict and his monks overthrew the image and altar of Apollo, and reared shrines of St. John Evang. and St. Martin, the founder of monasticism in France, within the very walls of the Sun-god's temple—it was customary to reconsecrate, not to destroy, Pagan edifices (Greg. M. *Ep.* xi. 76)—where now stands one of the most sumptuous of Italian churches. Here Benedict commenced the monastery destined to a world-wide reputation. Here for some twelve years or more Benedict presided over the followers who remained with him—here he is believed to have composed the Benedictine Rule, in the same year, it is said, in which the schools of Athens were suppressed, and his famous Code was promulgated by Justinian—and from this sequestered spot he sent forth his emissaries not only to Anxur (Terracina, *Dial.* ii. 22), but beyond the borders of Italy, to the neighbouring isle of Sicily (Mab. *Ann.* iii. 25). Mabillon considers the narrative in Greek by Gordianus of the Mission of Placidus into Sicily spurious, but the mission itself beyond doubt. As an instance of the rapid growth of this monastery, the Benedictine editor notes that there was even then land attached to it; but the passage only speaks of land immediately adjacent (*Dial.* ii. 33). Not many years however elapsed before this and other similar foundations were richly endowed with lands and other offerings (Greg. M. *Ep.* iii. 3).

It was in the vicinity of Monte Cassino, that Benedict confronted and rebuked the ferocious Totila (A.D. 542) at the head of his victorious Ostrogoths (*Dial.* ii. 14, 15); and that he was wont to cheer his solitude by brief interviews at very rare intervals with his beloved sister, Scholastica, herself a recluse at no great distance (*Dial.* ii. 33). He is said to have been summoned

to a Synod at Rome (A.D. 531) by Boniface II. (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* on the authority of a codex in *Bibl. Vat.* by Ant. Scip. Mon. Cas., *Eleg. Abb. Cas.* p. 25). His death is variously computed from 539 (*Schol. Bened.* in Honor. August. iii. 30, ap. *Fabr. Bibl. Eccl.*) to A.D. 543 (Trithem. *de Vir.* Ill. c. 300, ap. *Fabr.*; cf. *Clint. Fast. Rom.* and Mabill. *AA. SS. O.S.B. Praef.*). Some few writers assign a yet later date. His sister (his twin-sister according to Trithemius, but cf. Mab. *Ann.* iii. 14) shortly preceded him. She is called Abbess by Bertharius, Abb. Cas. in the 8th century (Mab. *Ann.* iii. 14); but probably lived alone (cf. Greg. M. *Dial.* iii. 7, 14), or as one of a sisterhood. The words "ad cellam propriam recessisset" are ambiguous (*Dial.* ii. 34; cf. *Act. Sanct.* Feb. 10).

The character of St. Benedict may be best estimated from his *Regula Monastica*, if, as indeed is reasonable to suppose, it was his composition. In contrast to monastic rules already in existence, chiefly of Eastern origin, it breathes a spirit of mildness and consideration, while by the sanction for the first time given to study, it opened the way for those literary pursuits which afterwards developed themselves so largely within convent walls. Unlike many ardent Reformers, Benedict appears to have led a consistent life from the first, without any violent and convulsive disruption of existing ties. He is more like the "judicious" Richard Hooker or the George Herbert of the English church, than the S. Francesco di Assisi, or the S. Domenico of his own communion. The traditionary account, too, of the great Reformer's tender affection for his sister, as well as of his withdrawal before the opposition which he had to encounter at Subiaco, seem to give verisimilitude to the traditionary portraits of him, as of gentle though dignified aspect. At the same time his demeanour before Totila, the strict rule under which he kept others as well as himself (*Dial.* ii. 23, &c.), and his severity in repressing the slightest disobedience (*Dial.* ii. 24, 28, &c.) testify to his practical insight into character, (*Dial.* ii. 20), as well as to his zeal and courage. In another book of the *Dialogues* (iii. 161) he is said (like Antony) to have reprov'd a hermit who had chained himself to a rock, in these words, "Brother, be bound only by the chain of Christ!" The character of the Benedictine Order, by the specialities which have always distinguished it from other religious orders, attests the sagacious and liberal character of its founder.

"Through mists of years behold him yet!

The garb severe, the aspect meek,

Serene yet firmly set,

And lips that seem to speak.

With power to draw heaven's lightning down,

And stay or raise the tempest's rain.

So kings doff robe or crown,

Won o'er to swell his train."

It is doubtful whether Benedict was ordained. Fleury thinks not, although he preached (*Ecc. Hist.* xxxii. 15). The idea of his being a priest is modern (Mab. *Ann. O. S. B.* v. 122; Murat. *Sor. Ital.* iv. 27).

The miracles, with which the life of St. Benedict abounds, are such as are very common in the mediaeval biographies of famous ascetics. In many cases the alleged fact plainly requires no such explanation, e.g.—the broken cord by which the Saint's basket was drawn up, and the exceed-

ingly heavy stone which resisted the efforts of his disciples to move it, may obviously be accounted for without any supernatural intervention (*Dial.* i. 9). Similarly the apparition so frequently occurring, of the devil in bodily form, may be but an embodiment to the senses of the assaults of temptation (*Dial.* 2, &c.). Sometimes the supposed miracle seems to be only a metaphorical expression, as the snake in the stolen flask, or the dragon which encumbered the recreant monk (*Dial.* 18, 24); sometimes it seems only to represent Benedict's keenness of insight into character, and extraordinary power of influencing those with whom he came in contact, as in his interviews with Totila (*Dial.* 14) and with an Arian Goth (26); in his detection of acts of disobedience, though done out of his sight (12, 13, 19); and in his prediction about a demoniac who wished to be ordained (16). The money unexpectedly provided for the poor debtor, and the flour in the famine, were not of necessity miraculous (*Dial.* 21, 27); while the highly wrought imagination of the recluse may suffice to account for his vision of his sister's soul ascending to heaven, and of his own speedy dissolution (*Dial.* 35, 37). Some of St. Benedict's miracles seem taken almost literally from the narrative of the prophets Elijah and Elisha in the Old Testament, e.g. the floating iron, the cruse of oil, and the raven (*Dial.* 6, 8, 29). It is important also to observe the legendary character of the evidence for these wonders. Marcus Poeta, a Benedictine monk, in the beginning of the 7th century, adds to those recorded in the Dialogues a story of angels guiding St. Benedict to Monte Cassino (Petr. D. de Vir. III. ap. Fabr. *Biblioth. Eccles.*) and the story is repeated as authentic by Paulus Diaconus (Mab. *Ann.* iii. 5); in this manner the love and reverence of admiring disciples were continually embellishing the fame of their founder with new prodigies. Mabillon thinks that the story of a girl sent by Benedict to be healed by Remigius, bishop of Rheims, arose from a misunderstanding of the word "benedictus," as if it were a proper name (Mab. *Ann.* iii. 16).

Some, probably not all, of the remains of St. Benedict, were transferred from his shrine at M. Cassino to the Benedictine Abbey at Floriacum (Fleury), on the Loire, in the 7th century or at a later date (Mab. *Acta*, ii. 339). The question is discussed at length in *AA. SS. Boll.* 21 Mar. iii. 299-301, and in Mab. *AA. SS. O.S.B. Saec.* ii. 337-352.

Besides the famous *Regula Monachorum*, the following shorter and less important writings are generally attributed to Benedict: *Sermo in Decessu St. Mauri et sociorum*, and *Epistola ad S. Maurum*. The *Epistola ad S. Remigium*, the *Sermo in Passione S. Placidi et sociorum*, and the *De Ordine Monastico* are probably spurious (Migne, *Bibl. Patr.* s. voce; Cave, *Hist. Litt.*; Gueranger, *Enchirid. Benedict.*). Some Sententiae are ascribed to him in the *Sententiae Patrum*, Col. 1531, 8vo (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* s. voce).

For the life of St. Benedict, see Gregor. M. *Dialog.* lib. ii. in Migne's *Patrol.* lxxvi., also in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctorum O.S.B. Saec. i.*, in Muratori *Script. Rer. Italic.* iv., and elsewhere. *Vita S. Benedicti* (in verse), by Marcus Poeta, said to be a disciple of St. Benedict, in Mab. *AA. SS. Saec. i.*; cf. Pauli Diac. *Histor. Langobard.* i. 26; see also Grégoire le Grand, *la vie de S.*

Benoit, &c., par Jos. Mege, Par. 1734, 4to; Mabillon *Annales O.S.B.* i. viii., *Acta Sanctorum* (Bolland.), 21 Mar. iii., Bened. Haefteni *Commentar. in Vit. S. Bened.* For a more complete catalogue of hymns, sermons, &c. on St. Benedict see Polthast s. voce. Among modern biographies see *Le pitture dello Zingaro nel chiostro di S. Severino in Napoli pubblicate per la prima volta e dilucidate da Stanislao d'Alce*, Napoli, 1846, 4to. A life of St. Benedict by Gueranger, abbat of Solesmes, is in preparation. [I. G. S.]

BENEDICTUS I., POPE, called by the Greeks BONOSUS (Evagr. Sc. H. E. v. 16), son of Boniface a Roman, was elected successor to John III. on the 3rd of June 574 (Jaffé, *Regesta Pont.*; the dates given by Baronius are erroneous; cf. Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 543, on the causes of discrepancy in the pontifical chronology). During his pontificate Italy was harassed by the invasion of the Lombards. Though they never actually penetrated into the city of Rome, they ravaged the suburbs, violated the cemeteries, and persecuted the Christians. Misery and famine ensued, and Rome was only relieved eventually by a corn fleet from Egypt, despatched at the pope's request by the emperor Justin. Benedict died in July 578, and was buried on the last day of that month in St. Peter's. He was succeeded by Pelagius II. (Anastas. *Liber Pontif.*; cf. Paul. Diac. *De gestis Long.* ii. 10, ap. Muratori, i.). According to Ciacconius (*Vita Pont. Rom.*) his memory was eulogized by Gregory the Great. His restoration of certain lands to the abbot of San Marco at Spoleto rests on the same authority (Greg. *Op.* ii. 950, ed. Bened.). The story given by the author of the 'Vita S. Gregorii,' that Benedict ordained Gregory deacon and sent him on a mission to convert the English is without foundation (Baronius, *sub anno* 581, §§ 2 and 5). No writings of Benedict are extant. The two letters given by Migne (*Patrologia*, vol. 72, pp. 683, sq.) are spurious (cf. Hirschius, *Decret. Pseudo-Isidorianae*, pp. 718, 719; see generally Baronius, *sub annis* 573-577; Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. v.). [T. R. B.]

BENEDICTUS II., POPE, son of John, a Roman, descended from an illustrious Sabine family (Ciacconius, *Vit. Pont.*), described by Anastasius (*Lib. Pont.*) as a "lover of poverty, humble, gentle, long-suffering, and generous," was elected successor to Leo III. during the latter part of the year 683. It was not however till the 26th of June 684 that he was consecrated, the confirmation of the election by the emperor not arriving till that time. Thus, in the letter to Peter the papal commissary in Spain, written in 683, Benedict only styles himself "presbyter et in Dei nomine electus Sanctae Sedis apostolicae" (Mansi, xi. 1085). So it is as "elect" that he orders the restoration of Wilfrid to the see of York (Jaffé, *Regesta*). To obviate the inconvenience of such delay Benedict obtained permission from the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, that in future the bishop elect should forthwith proceed to ordination. By so doing the emperor by no means renounced his right of imperial confirmation,* as has often been alleged; still less did he

* Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* i. § 129 and notes, p. 374 Eng. Tr. The same emperor had, a few years previously, in the case of Agatho, remitted the customary tribute; cf. *Gesch. der Stadtverfassung in Italien*, by Carl Hegel, i. 239.

"restore" to the Roman see a privilege which had been unjustly taken from it, as Baronius supposes. The exact words in Anastasius are—"Concedit ut qui electus fuerit in sede apostolica e vestigio absque tarditate pontifex ordinetur." Constantine endeavoured further to bind over the ever doubtful allegiance of the pope by sending locks of hair of his two sons, Justinian and Heraklius, to Rome, thereby making them the adopted children of St. Peter and his successor. Little else is known of Benedict. He restored and adorned several of the churches at Rome. (Anastasius.) At the beginning of May 685 he died, and was buried on the 8th in St. Peter's. An epitaph is given in Ciaconius. He was afterwards canonized (Jaffé does not give him the title of Saint, *Reg. Pont.*). His successor was John V. (Baronius *sub annis*: Labbe, *Conc.* vi. 1276-79). [T. R. B.]

BENIGNUS. This name appears in both Scotch and Irish hagiography.

(1) Dempster, at August 9, A.D. 436, gives a Benignus, presbyter at Lesmahago, on the authority of the long-lost *Collectanea* of Gilbert Brown, abbot of Sweetheart. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 278.)

(2) Colgan gives an account of another who was brother of S. Cethechus; he was also disciple of St. Patrick, and put by him as abbat over the monastery of Drumlias (now Drumlease, in the barony of Drumahaire, co. Leitrim), where he ruled for 20 years. His father is said to have been from Connaught, and descended from the race of Kien, son of Oillill Olum; but Colgan doubts whether this Benignus may not be the Benignus, Dabona, or Beon, who is venerated at Glastonbury, in England, according to William of Malmesbury (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 788; *Tr. Thaum.* 130, c. 9; 176, n. 84; 177, n. 109). Some at the same time imagine that it was Benignus of Armagh who went to Glastonbury. (Ussher, *de Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Dublin 1639, p. 876; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 318.)

(3) But the most famous is St. Benignus or Benen, son of Sescuen, and Primate of Armagh—Nov. 9. It is said, that when St. Patrick landed at the mouth of the Boyne, at Colp, he came first to the house of Sescuen or Sescen, and, in baptizing him and his house, gave the name of Benignus to one of his sons, whom he also took along with him. (Ussher, *de Brit. Eccl. Prim.*, Dublin 1639, p. 848; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 220.) St. Benen succeeded to Armagh A.D. 455, and in the lists of the Coarbs of St. Patrick is usually placed third after St. Patrick; he is sometimes designated "Benen, son of Sescuen, Patrick's Psalm-singer." The *Leabhar Breac* says he was of the Cianachta Glinne Gaínen, of the race of Taidg, son of Cian of Cashel. Most Irish authorities date the arrival of St. Patrick, and baptism of St. Benen, at A.D. 432, the year of Pope Celestine's death; but Dr. Todd prefers A.D. 441. (*Life of St. Patrick*, 130, 174 sq., 391 sq., 412 n. An account of St. Benignus's family and miracles is given in *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 301; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 203-5.) He died A.D. 468, and thus was bishop at Armagh during the lifetime of St. Patrick, who died in 493; in fact, St. Patrick seems to have had charge of the whole church there, and to have left bishops at Armagh and

other centres, while he was engaged in his missionary labours. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 307, cc. 5, 6, and notes; Todd, *St. Patrick*, pass.; Lanigan, *Ib.* i. 257, 323 sq., 374.) He was counted the special Apostle and Patron of Connaught, and is said to have had among his disciples St. Jarlath, bishop of Tuam, though there is no little difficulty in the chronology. (Colgan, *Ib.* 308, c. 2-3, and notes; Lanigan, *Ib.* ii. 42.) If he wrote any account of St. Patrick (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 6, n. 8), it is now lost; but he is said to have been the original compiler of the Psalter of Cashel, and of the *Leabhar na-gCeart* or Book of Rights (published by the Celtic Society in 1847, under the editorship of Dr. O'Donovan), though his traditional connection with the Seanchus Mor or Cain-Phadruig is embarrassed by the chronology. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 134; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* ii. 25, 46, 66; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 109, 114.) [A. P. F.]

BENJAMIN, a monk of Scetis, in the 4th century, of great repute for effecting miraculous cures. (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 13; Soz. *Hist.* v. 29; Niceph. *Hist.* xi. 35.) [I. G. S.]

BENJAMIN, succeeded Tobias as sixth bishop of Jerusalem; one of the fifteen enumerated by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 5, before Hadrian's days "all of the circumcision." [E. V.]

BENUS, an abbat among the monks of Tabenna, in the 4th century. He was famed for his gentleness. (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 49; Ruff. *de Mon.* 2; Soz. *Hist.* vi. 28; Niceph. *Hist.* xi. 34.) [I. G. S.]

BEOAEDH (BEDA, BEATUS), bishop of Ard-carna, in Roscommon. March 8, A.D. 524. He was the son of Olean, son of Coman, of the race of Lugaidh, son of Ith and noted for his active kindness and hospitality (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 71). He lived in the end of the 5th century, and was a disciple of St. Patrick, being possibly the St. Beatus, bishop of Duncruithen, of whom St. Evinus writes in his Tripartite Life of St. Patrick (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 146, c. 125, and notes): yet though imagining this, Colgan will not certainly affirm it, and Lanigan also has doubts as to the identity (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 265-267). He died A.D. 524, on the 7th or 8th of March; and his bell "Ceolan-Beoaidh," covered with gems, and kept in a silver case, is said to have been preserved with great veneration, as a relic in the church of Bailena-gCleireach, in Breifny (now Ballynaglearagh), on the confines of the counties of Leitrim and Cavan. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 562-3, and *Tr. Thaum.* 156, c. 32; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* ii. 130; *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. 170-1; Kelly, *Cal. Ir.* SS. 89.) [A. P. F.]

BEOAN. In his Life of St. Fursey, Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 90) refers to several saints of this name, but only two can be treated with any detail.

(1) Son of Nesson, and bishop of Fidh-chuillim (now Feighcullen, county Kildare). August 8th. He was one of the seven sons of Nesson, son of Erc, &c. of the race of Cathaoir Mór, of Leinster (*Mart. Doneg.*). He was Abbot of Ard-cuillin, and of Feighcuillin (if they were not identical), and at the latter his feast was celebrated. (See Colgan, *Acta SS.* 609, n. 2)

(2) Bishop of Tamlacht-Menainn—Oct. 26th. *Mart. Doneg.*, at this date, associates him with "Meallan," and locates them at "Loch Bricrenn in Ui-eath-Uladh" (Ireagh, Down county). The other martyrologies call him a Briton, but the writer of St. Fursey's life says that the "two venerable men (Beoan and Meldan) were of that province in which Fursey, that man of God, was born," i.e. South Munster (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 455, 457; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 112-14). Girald. Cambrensis (*Topogr. Hib. Dist.* ii. c. 40) gives an account of the great reverence shewn to St. Beoan's name after his death around the church which he built in the more distant parts of Ulster, where the birds and wild beasts found a safe and quiet home in memory of the love and kindness of St. Beoan to animals. He is frequently mentioned in the Irish Life of St. Patrick, and Meldan, his companion, was "synedrus seu pater spiritualis" of St. Fursey (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 79, c. 21; 90, n. 19). St. Fursey took their relics with him when he left Ireland and deposited them in the chapel dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul on the top of the hill of Cignes, at Peronne, in France (Colgan, *Ib.* 290, 295, and 300, n. 25). SS. Meldan and Beodan, bps., flourished in A.D. 580, but they must have died before 626, as they appear in St. Fursey's vision. [FURSEY.] He may be S. Bean of Strathearn. [BEAN.] [A. P. F.]

BEOG or BEOCC—Oct. 25. This is probably the St. Dabeoc (latinized Beoanus) who, when living in a "penal cave" on the island in Lough Derg, afterwards made famous as the scene of St. Patrick's Purgatory, saw a bright light in the north and told the disciples who were watching with him, that this represented the glory of St. Columba, who was afterwards to be born in that region. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 157, 285; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 390, c. 10, 449, n. 19.) His life is given by O'Hanlon (*Lives Ir. SS.* i. 11-16). [DABHEOG.] [A. P. F.]

BEOGHN, abbat of Bangor, in the county of Down, Ireland—Aug. 22. He succeeded St. Comgall A.D. 600, and died A.D. 605, when St. Silvanus was appointed. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 423-4.) In the *Four Masters* (by O'Donov. i. p. 201, n. *) is given a wild legend from the Leabhar-na-hUidri, where SS. Comgall and Beoan are engaged in the capture of a salmon, which proves to be Liban, the daughter of Eochaidh, who had been drowned in Lough Neagh with her father and brothers. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 1-3; Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq.* 55, 265, 376; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 149.) [FAINCHE.] [A. P. F.]

BEONNA (BINNA, BYNNA) (1), a Mercian witness to charters about 730 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 101). (2) A Mercian abbat, who attests charters from 767 onwards (*K. C. D.* i. 143, 147, 187, 190, 203, 204, 211). He appears to have been abbat of Peterborough (*K. C. D.* i. 201), and attended the great Council of Clovesho of 803, in attendance on the bishop of Lichfield, and continues to sign charters until 805; it is just possible that he is the Beonna who became bishop of Hereford in 823, and died in 830. His relics were, according to Hugh Candidus (ed. Sparke, 39) preserved at Bredon. [S.]

BEORCHTGYTH, BERTHGYTH, an abess who addresses two letters to a man named Balthard, probably her brother, desiring to see him. If the Balthard in question be the Kentish nobleman of that name, Berthgyth would seem to have been in a German monastery. (S. Bonif. *Epistt.* ed. Würdtwein, no. 150, 151.) She was a daughter of the missionary abess Chunihilt, aunt of Lullus, and sent by Boniface into Thuringia. (Othlon. *V. Bonif.* ed. Jaffé, p. 490.) [S.]

BEORHTRIC, BRIHTRIC, BRITHRIC, BYRHTRIC, king of Wessex (786-802, or, according to the Chronicles, 784-800, which requires to be corrected by two years). He succeeded, on the death of Cynewulf, as a descendant of Cerdic, but his pedigree is not preserved. In the fourth year of his reign (789) he married Eadburh, the daughter of Offa (H. Hunt. *M. H. B.* 731), a connexion which strengthened his position for the time, and enabled him to drive into exile Egbert, son of Ealhmund, king of Kent, who had hereditary claims on the kingdom of Wessex. His reign is chiefly marked by the first invasion of Wessex by the Northmen, who landed in Dorsetshire and slew the reeve Beadoheard in 789, or, according to Ethelwerd (*M. H. B.* 509), in 787. What little is known of Beorhtic's character is unfavourable; for, although Ethelwerd speaks of him as most pious, his pride is mentioned especially in the contemporary chronicle preserved by Simeon of Durham. He was poisoned in 802 by his wife, in mistake for the ealdorman Wor, of whose influence with her husband she was jealous. Two grants of Beorhtic to Abingdon (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 191, 217; *Chron. Abingd.* i. 16, 28) are preserved, one of which may be genuine. [S.]

BEORWALD, abbat of Glastonbury, early in the 8th century. He has been confounded with Beorhtwald or Brihtwald, archbishop of Canterbury, very erroneously. All that is certainly known of him is in connexion with St. Boniface. He is mentioned by Willibald, in his life of Boniface (ed. Jaffé, p. 439), as taking part in a West Saxon synod, in which Boniface was sent to the archbishop of Canterbury to make certain inquiries, between 710 and 716. And there is a letter of archbishop Brihtwald to Forthere, bishop of Sherborne, begging him to order Beorwald to release a captive girl, which he had refused to do at the archbishop's personal request (*S. Bonif. Epist.* ed. Würdtwein, No. 155). In the list of the abbats of Glastonbury, given by William of Malmesbury (ed. Gale, p. 328), he appears twice, first as Beorhtwald the sixth, and, again, as Beorwald the seventh abbat; and his abbacy is dated 705 to 712. But in the more ancient list (MS. Cotton, Tiberius, B. V.) he is placed fourth, between Coengils and Cealdhun. His name is attached only to very questionable charters (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 47, 56, 58), one of which, however, if genuine, dates him as early as 702 (*ib.* 56); and if Aldberht, as William of Malmesbury says, succeeded him, he must have died before 712 (*ib.* 73). [S.]

BERACH. This name is interpreted by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 346, n. *) as "directe et punctualiter ad scopam collimans, vel quasi alicujus mucrone punctum attingens." The Latin equivalent is Verutus. (1) April 21.

The abbat of Bangor, co. Down, succeeded Segan, son of O'Conn, in the year 663, and died of the great plague in 664. (*Four Mast.; Ann. Tigernach*; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 204 n., iv. 56 n.)

(2) A better known Berach, Breagh, or Barry (Latinized Barrachius) was abbat of Cluain-cairpthe, now Kilbarry, near Termonbarry, county of Roscommon, Connaught. Feb. 15 is the day observed in his memory, but the dates of his Acts are uncertain. He was of the race of Dobhtha, of the posterity of Brian, son of Eochaidh Muighmhedhoin (A.D. 358-365). (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 13.) His father was Nemnald or Nendalus, and his mother, Finmaith, sister of St. Fregius or Cruimther Fraech, of Cloon, in Leitrim. He was born at Gortnaluaehra, near Cloon, and his name is said in the Irish Life to have been Fintan at first, and then changed to Berach, on account of the greatness and unerring aim of his power, though in this the Bollandist writer naïvely remarks that his wonders have been exaggerated. His birth is put on Feb. 15, A.D. 521, by Herman Greven, on the authority of Ussher; he was baptized by his uncle St. Fregius, who flourished about A.D. 570, and was educated by him, though the Bollandist declines to accept Colgan's tradition of his drawing nourishment from the lobe of St. Fregius's ear as from his mother's breast. He was successively under St. Daigh and St. Kevin; the place of his monastery was pointed out by a stag which carried his baggage; and a dispute in which he was engaged with a Druid, and which was referred to Aidan, son of Gauran, king of the Albanian Scots (A.D. 571-605), gives us something like an historical standpoint. In this last Colgan (*Acta SS.* 347, n. ³⁰) allows that, as regards the particulars of the contest, there must be no little exaggeration, yet he tries to show that from a consideration of the dates, and of the names of persons and places, there must be a large substratum of truth, fixing it about the year 560 or 570. The date of Berach's death is uncertain, but it probably took place before the close of the 6th century. Baring-Gould (*Lives of the Saints*, ii. 307-9) gives A.D. 615. St. Aengus counts him among the bishop-saints of Ireland. (See Colgan's *Life of St. Berach, Abb.*, by an anonymous writer, "ex MS. Monasterii Insulae omnium SS.," with the "Supplementum ex Codice MS. Hib. Eccl. ejusdem sancti," given in *Acta SS.* 340-348; and the Two Lives given by the Bollandists in *Acta SS.* Feb. tom. ii. 833 sq.; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 323-5.) He was ordained by Bp. Etochen, and is the Berach who was attacked by the whale between Iona and Tiree, when he neglected St. Columba's prophetic directions to avoid it. (Colgan, *Ib.* 342, c. 19, 488; Reeves, *St. Adamn.* p. 48 and note.) In the Supplement to his Life in Colgan he is said to have received a staff (Bacullh-gear) and a bell (Clogberaigh) from St. Daigh on leaving his monastery: staff and bell are still preserved. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Sc. SS.* 278-79; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 330, 444.) [A. P. F.]

BERCHAN (Latinized Berchanus and Barachianus). In Irish hagiology we find several of this name, attached to different days; some have little more than the place of dedication given, and possibly their genealogy, while others are

better known. Of the former class are such as Berchan of Cluain-Aedha-Aithmet, in Luighnè (Lune, in Meath), June 5 (*Mart. Doneg. and Toll.*); Berchan of Cluain-caoi, May 24 (*Mart. Doneg. and Toll.*; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 73, c. 2); Berchan of Inis-rochla, in Loch Erne, and of the race of Colla-da-Chrioch, Nov. 24 (*Mart. Doneg.*; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 713, c. 4); Berchan, son of Neman, and brother of St. Sedna of Killaine in Mount Brech, great-grandson of Loarne: he thus lived in the 6th or beginning of the 7th century (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 565).

Of the second class are, (1) BERCHAN, of Cluain-sosta—Dec. 4. *Mart. Doneg.* calls him "bishop and apostle of God, of Cluain-sosta, in Ui-Failghe (Clonsast or Cloonsost in Offaly or Ophaly, King's county). He was the son of Muiredhach, of the race of Cairbre Righfoda, son of Conaire, of the seed of Heremon. Fer-da-leithe (the man of two portions) was another name for him, as he spent half his life in Alba, and the other half in Erin. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 327; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 279; Reeves, *Adamn.* 314 n., 462.) Ussher (in *De Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Ind. Chron. at A.D. 570) notices a Berchan as belonging to the second order of Irish saints, "quem sensu oculorum privatum, sed spiritu prophetico praeditum fuisse aiunt:" it may perhaps belong to Berach of Cluain-cairpthe, but the name Byrchinus or Berchanus suggests Berchan. At Clonsast, in King's county, Ireland, there is St. Braghan's Well. (*Ord. Survey*, s. 27, as referred to in Reeves, *Adamn.* p. 314, n.) The Scotch Kalendars place this saint's day at April 6, and make him bishop in the Orkneys. Camerarius (p. 127) says that he was celebrated in the province of Stirling, and passed his youth in the celebrated monastery of St. Columba, not far from thence. He has several places in Scotland named after him, and in Inishmore, in Galway Bay, his grave was said to be. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 715, n. ¹⁰; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.*, iii. 66; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scot. SS.* 279. For forgeries in Berchan's name, see *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. xxxii.; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, xxxix. sq. 79 sq.; O'Curry, *Lect. MS. Mat. Ir. Hist.* 412, sq.)

(2) Of Echdruim—May 7. This Echdruim is apparently not Aughrim, co. Galway, but a place now unknown on the confines of Dal-Riada and Dal-Araidhe (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 783; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 335). From the dates and other circumstances, this Berchan seems to be the Becanus, Bercanus, or Brecanus, son of Saran, of the race of Colla Dachrioch, whom Colgan (*Acta SS.* 782-3 and notes) gives as brother of St. Cairnech (28th March) and St. Ronan (27th May). His mother was Pompa or Bebona, daughter of Loarne, king of the Dalriads in Argyleshire (Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 52, 316); his father Saran is said to have lost his proper position in Dalriada for his opposition to St. Patrick (Colgan, *Ib.* 376, c. 7 and notes).

(3) Of Eago or Egg—April 10. The Irish Kalendars give Berchan as one of the saints specially venerated in Egg or Eig in the Hebrides of Scotland (Reeves, *Adamn.* 308); and this may be the Berchan "cujus cognamentum Mesloen," whose inquisitive disposition was so troublesome

to St. Columba, and who was saved from its consequences in time and eternity by the special intercession and merit of that saint. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 328, c. 27, 368, c. 21, 429, c. 110, 488, n. 11.)

(4) Abbot of Glas Naoidhen in Fine-Gall, on the brink of the river Liffey, on the north side—Oct. 12. He is more generally known as Mobhi Clairenech, i.e. of the flat face, and the place of his dedication is now Glasnevin, to the north of the Liffey and near Dublin. (On the position of Glasnevin, see *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. 183, n. 1; Reeves, *Adamn.* lxxii-iii.) The Drummond Kalendar at Oct. 12 has the festival of "beatissimi et venerabilis viri Mobhi, qui absque naso et oculis planâ facie natus de mortuâ, ut fertur, feminâ et conceptus!" (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 25, 400). He was of the race of Finn Fuathairt, of whom St. Brigida is descended; and Uanfinn, daughter of Finnbarr, was his mother. He is said to have been at Derry (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 275). His monastery at Glasnevin, consisting "of a group of huts or cells, and an oratory, situate on either bank of the Finglass," is said to have received at the same time, among the fifty students of theology then at this great school, SS. Columba, Comgall, Ciaran, and Cainnech (O'Curry's *Lect. Anc. Irish*, ii. 81, 91). But the "extraordinary universal plague through the world, which swept away the noblest third part of the human race," broke up this community, and carried Mobhi with it to the eternal mansions. This took place in A.D. 544 or 545. (*Four Masters*, by O'Donov. i. 183 and notes; Reeves, *Adamn.* lxxii-iii. 160; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 613, c. 3; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* Ir. ii. 76, 78, 223, 226.) Mageoghegan states, in his translation of *The Annals of Clonmacnoise*, that he is supposed "to be (the same as the prophet) called in English Merlin." In Archdall's *Monast. Hibern.* 119, there is mentioned among the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, "Glasena-Oidhean, St. Mobyens, alias Boetius, or Mobyteus. This house was called also the Abbey of St. Boetius." Archdall evidently looking to another Mobhi. [See BIREUS.] [A. P. F.]

BERCHTHUN. (1) (BRIHTHUNUS.) The deacon of John of Beverley, bishop of York. He was abbot of John's monastery of "Inde-raunda," or Beverley, when Bede wrote; and it was from him that the historian received the miraculous stories which he tells about John. According to the fragments of the history of Beverley preserved by Leland (*Collectanea* iii. 155) he died on the 15th of May, 733; and Smith, in a note on Bede, mentions his name as occurring in Martyrologies on that day. He was buried at Beverley near his master (*Mon. Angl.* ii. 127, 128). His death is placed by Capgrave in 740.

(2) A bishop of Lichfield, the 13th in the ancient lists (*M. H. B.* 623). He succeeded Cuthfrith, whose death is placed in some MSS. of Florence in 767; and his name appears in charters from 774 to 777; his successor Higbert being elected in 779. The text of Florence erroneously calls him bishop of Dorchester (*M. H. B.* 546). The Lichfield writer, Chesterfield, gives him an episcopate of four years, from 755 to 759; but this is clearly an error. Little or nothing can be said to be known of his history;

but his name is known from the mention of it by Matthew Paris in his *Lives of the Offas*. He is there made archbishop of Lichfield and confounded with bishop Humbert, who lived half a century later. See Wharton (*Ang. Sac.* i. 429), who is himself mistaken in his treatment of the archiepiscopate of Lichfield. [HIGBERT.] [S.]

BERCTGILS, also named Bonifacius, a Kentish man, appointed by archbishop Honorius, of Canterbury, the third bishop of the East Angles, with his see at Dunwich. The year of his consecration was probably 652 (*Bede. H. E.* iii. 20; *Flor. Wig. M. H. B.* 530; Wharton, *Ang. Sac.* i. 403). He ruled for seventeen years (*Bede. H. E.* iv. 5; W. Malmesb. *G. P.* p. 147). [S.]

BERECTUS (BERETCHERT, BERIKTUS).

(1) A saint of the name of Berectus—Feb. 24, A.D. 720—in the reign of Mordac, the fifth-ninth king of the Scots, is mentioned by Wion. He is said to have died in 720 (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 107). Wion (*Lignum Vitae*, pars 2, lib. iii. p. 57, 1598) says, "In Scotia Sancti Berecti Monachi et Confessoris, qui profuit et vitæ sanctissimæ exemplo et predicatione," and adds in a note, "De eodem Galesinus hac die, ex MS. Kalendaris: de cujus rebus gestis nihil reperii." (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 279.)

(2) On Dec. 6, the Irish-hagiologists place Beretchert or Berectus of Tulachleis, now Tulachlease, county Cork. He is given as brother of SS. Gerald (March 13), Balanus (Sept. 3), and Hubrit (April 24), and thus son of an unknown Cusperius, king of England. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. tom. ii. 833 sq.) in their Life of St. Berach (Feb. 15) would identify Berectus with Berach; otherwise, they say, there is nothing known of him. *Four Masters* give the obit of "Berichtir of Tulachleis" on Dec. 6, A.D. 839, and, supposing that to be correct, Dr. Reeves (*St. Admann*, p. lv.) says St. Gerald must come down to about A.D. 800; but the *Four Masters* put St. Gerald's death at A.D. 726, March 13, and Ussher in *Chronol. Index* at 697. (See the date of St. Gerald's death discussed in Colgan, *Acta SS.* 604; Ussher, *de Brit. Ecol. Prim.*, *Dubl.* 1639, pp. 964, 1169.) [A. P. F.]

BERHTWALD, BEORTHTWALD (BRIHTWALD, BEORHTWALD, BEORHTWALDUS), the 8th archbishop of Canterbury. According to Bede he was abbot of Reculver, and although not to be compared with his predecessor Theodore, a man well instructed in ecclesiastical and monastic discipline. A charter of Hlothari, king of Kent, is preserved, dated at Reculver in May, 679, in which lands in Thanet are bestowed upon him and his monastery (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* i. 20); and he is likewise mentioned in a spurious charter of 689, as an abbot in Kent (*ibid.* 34). The Glastonbury writers claim him as abbot of that monastery (Will. Malmesb. *de Antiq. Glast.* ap. Gale, p. 308, &c.), but they have confounded him with Beorwald. [BEORWALD.] He was chosen archbishop of Canterbury, July 1, 692, and went to Lyons for consecration, which he obtained from Godwin, the archbishop of Lyons, June 29, 693 (*Bede, H. E.* v. 8). Two letters of pope Sergius are given in William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* ed. Hamilton, pp. 52-55) respecting him; one ad-

dressed to the kings Ethelred, Aldfrith, and Ealdulf, exhorting them to receive Berhtwald as primate; the other to all the bishops of Britain, urging them to obedience to him. Both are of somewhat questionable authenticity. In 693 Berhtwald attests an act of Oshere, king of the Hwiccas, done in a Mercian Witenagemot (Kemble, *C. D. i.* 41); in 696 he took part in the legislation of Wihtried, king of Kent, at the council of Berghamstede or Bersted (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 233); between that year and 716 obtained, in a council at Baccanceld or Bapchild, the famous privilege of Wihtried, which secured the liberties of the Kentish monasteries. In 702 he joined the Northumbrian king Aldfrith in the condemnation of Wilfrid, and in his excommunication (Heddius, *V. Wilfr.* cc. 45-47); and in 705, at the command of the pope, attended the council at Nidd, in which Wilfrid was reconciled (*ib. c.* 58). The same year he held a synod at Brentford (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 274) for the pacification of Essex and Wessex, having, the year before, taken measures for the division of the West Saxon diocese. A letter of Waldhere, bishop of London, to him, on these subjects, is extant (*ibid.*). The division of Wessex being accomplished, he consecrated Aldhelm as bishop of the new see of Sherborne (Will. Malmesb. *G. P.* p. 385). In 706 he attests a charter founding the monastery of Evesham, in relation to which two forged letters of pope Constantine, addressed to him, are extant; and, according to the life of St. Egwin, he attended a council at Alcester, on the same business, in 709. Shortly after, between 709 and 712, we find him writing to Forthere, bishop of Sherborne, to obtain the release of a captive girl from Beorwald, abbat of Glastonbury (Bonif. *Epist.* ep. 155). About this time we find him receiving Winfrith [BONIFACIUS], in Kent, on a mission from the West Saxon clergy, possibly connected with the institution of the new see of Selsey, which was instituted about 711. In 716, in a council at Clovesho, he obtained a confirmation of Wihtried's privilege (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300, 301). With the exception of his connexion with the affairs of Wilfrid, and his consecration of successive bishops of Rochester, Bede does not say much about Berhtwald; he records his death as happening Jan. 13, 731, and mentions that he was buried near his predecessor, within the church of St. Peter at Canterbury (*H. E.* ii. 3, v. 23). Having presided over the Anglo-Saxon church at a critical period of its growth for so many years and with so steady a hand, Berhtwald may safely be credited with considerable ability and moderation. That he was not regarded as a saint is, probably, owing to the line that he took with respect to Wilfrid, which, although approved by the best men of the time, was not likely to commend itself to the hagiographers. The life of St. Egwin, ascribed to him, belongs, unquestionably, to a later Berhtwald. [S.]

BERNACHUS, ST. (Brynach), of Wales, in the 5th century, said to have been the instructor of Brychan, king of Brecknock. His life is given in the Cotton MS. Vesp. A. 14 of the 12th century, and is printed in W. T. Rees' *Lives of the Cambro-Briton Saints* (1853); an abridgment of it occurs in Capgrave's *Legenda Angliæ*, 36. The details are fabulous, but we find the

usual connection between South Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany. The saint comes from Brittany to South Wales, and his disciple St. Clether (the father of twenty children) retires to Cornwall, to lead the life of a devotee there. The parish of St. Clether, in Cornwall, is just east of Davidstow and north of Alternun—so named from the celebrated Welsh Saint David and his mother Nonna. The life says that St. Bernachus died April 7. (Sir H. Nicolas adds "July 7," and Ritson "March 9," as his feast-days.) Giraldus Cambrensis (*Itin. Kambricæ*, ii. 2) refers to his famous spring situated just north of the Presseleu mountains in Pembroke. There is probably some confusion between Clether's twenty sons, and the twenty-four assigned to king Brychan, perhaps owing to the names Brynach and Brychan being confused (see under Brychan). R. Rees (*Welsh Saints*, 156) enumerates several churches named after Brynach, in or near Pembroke and Brecknock. Another account makes Brynach contemporary with Maelgwn, and, if so, he must be placed in the first half of the 6th century. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 158; Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 91-92.) [C. W. B.]

BERNUINI, BERWIN. (1) A nephew of Wilfrid and a clerk to whom he commended the Isle of Wight, giving him the priest Hiddila to preach to and baptize the people: cir. 686. (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 16; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 537.)

(2) An English priest to whom Alcuin writes, professing his attachment to Offa and the English. The letter was probably written during a coolness between Charles and Offa, the cause of which is obscure, and the date of the letter, although fixed by Froben to 793, is very uncertain (Alc. *Opp.* ed. Froben, i. 11). [S.]

BERON. [HIPPLYTUS.]

BERONICIANUS, bishop of Tyre, appointed on the deposition of Cyrus by the dominant party at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. At his request Cyril wrote to the Oriental bishops, urging on them the necessity of their anathematizing Nestorius. (Cyril, *Ep. ad Aristolaum*; Baluz. *Nov. Coll.* 889; *Tragoed. Iren.* c. 194.) [E. V.]

BERTHA, BERCTA, wife of Ethelbert, king of Kent. She was daughter of Caribert, king of Paris, by his wife Ingoberga (Greg. Turon. iv. 26; ix. 26), and lost her father in 575, her mother in 589. The date of her marriage is unknown, but it was probably after the death of her mother, although Bede speaks of the king receiving her "a parentibus." Ethelbert was still a heathen, and on his marriage it was made a condition that his wife should be allowed to enjoy the exercise of her own religion, and should be attended by a bishop. Luidhard, or Letard, who is called by the Canterbury historians bishop of Senlis (Thorn, ed. Twysden, 1767), was chosen to accompany her, and the remains of the church of St. Martin, at Canterbury, were allotted for Christian worship (Bede, *H. E.* i. 26). It was partly, no doubt, by her influence that Ethelbert was induced to receive the Roman mission and to be baptized. Pope Gregory, in 601, when sending Mellitus to reinforce Augustine's company, addressed a letter to Bertha, in which he compliments her highly on her faith

and knowledge of letters, and urges her to make still greater efforts for the spread of Christianity. He also ascribes the conversion of the English mainly to her, and compares her to the empress Helena (S. Greg. *Epistt.* xii. 29; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 17, 18). The date of her death is unknown. She was buried in the porch of St. Martin, in the church of SS. Peter and Paul (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5). Ethelbert seems to have married again after her death. She was the mother of Eadbald, who succeeded to the throne on Ethelbert's death, and of Ethelburga, who, in 625, was married to Edwin, king of Northumbria. As her son was unbaptized in 616, it is probable that she found considerable difficulty in promoting Christianity in her own family, or else that she died whilst her children were very young. Elmham (ed. Hardwick, p. 110) says that she took part in the foundation of the monastery of St. Augustine, at Christmas, 604, but this is merely traditional; and the latest trustworthy trace of her is St. Gregory's letter of 601. [S.]

BERTHWYN, an early bishop of Llandaff. (Liber Landavensis, 166, 431, 626; but see Stubbs's *Registrum Sacrum*, 156 on these lists.)

[C. W. B.]

BERWYN, ST. (or GERWYN), a son of Brychan, who is said to have settled in Cornwall, but the name is difficult to identify, unless he is the same as St. Guronus, a hermit who preceded St. Petrock at Bodmin. Another account (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 142) makes Gerwyn a son of Brynach by Brychan's daughter, and gives him three sisters, Mwynau, Gwennan, and Gwenlliw, and two of the saints who have given names to Cornish parishes are St. Mawnan and St. Wenn, who may possibly be identified with two of the sisters. [C. W. B.]

BERYLLUS, bishop of Bostra,* in Arabia, in the middle of the 3rd century, known in his day as one of the most learned teachers of the church. Beryllus conceived heretical views with respect to the person of our blessed Lord, to consider which a synod was assembled at Bostra, A.D. 244. The assembled bishops were unanimous in condemning his teaching, and declared that Christ at His incarnation was endowed with a human soul (Soc. *H. E.* iii. 7), but they were unable to convince Beryllus of his error. Origen however, who, having been recently degraded from Holy Orders and excommunicated at Alexandria, was then residing at Caesarea, had been invited to the synod, and by his intellectual superiority, dialectical skill and friendly moderation succeeded in proving to Beryllus the unsoundness of his tenets, and in leading him back to the orthodox faith. For this, according to Jerome, he received the thanks of Beryllus in a letter extant in his time, together with many others relating to this synod. Our only authority as to the tenets of Beryllus is a somewhat obscure passage of Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 33, and a fragment of Origen's commentary on the Epistle to Titus, found in the apology of Pamphilus, Orig. *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 22, edit. Bened., which have led to very opposite conclusions. These may be seen in Dörner, where the whole

question is discussed at length. His views were Monarchian, and are identified by Schleiermacher with those of the Patripassians, and by Baur with those of Artemon and the Neo-Ebionites. According to Dörner, Beryllus occupies a middle place, forming a connecting link between the Patripassians and Sabellius. The leading ideas of his teaching as developed by Dörner from Eusebius were as follows: (1) there existed a *πατρική θεότης* in Christ, but not an *ἰδία θεότης*; (2) Christ had no independent existence in a circumscribed form of being of His own (*κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν*), before His Incarnation (*ἐπιδημία*). (3) Subsequently to His Incarnation, He who had been identified with the *πατρική θεότης* became a circumscribed Being possessed of an independent existence; the being of God in Christ being a circumscription of the *θεότης* of the Father, i.e. of God Himself. According to Eusebius *H. E.* vi. 20, Beryllus was the author of epistles and treatises displaying considerable elegance. (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* No. lx.; Niceph. *H. E.* v. 22.; Neander, ii. p. 350, ff.; Gieseler, v. p. 219; Dörner, *Person of Christ*, First Period, Second Epoch, sect. i. c. 2, Div. i. vol. ii. pp. 35-45, Clark's Translations; Schröckh, iv. 38; Mosheim, *de reb. Christ. ante Constant.* p. 699; Ullman, *Comment. de Beryll.* Bost. Hamb. 1835; Fock, *Diss. de Christolog. Beryll.* Bost. 1843.) [E. V.]

BESCNA, priest, and chaplain to St. Patrick. "The priest Bescna, sweet his verses, the chaplain of the son of Alprann," is given in the list of St. Patrick's household in the *Four Masters*, A.D. 448. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 188, n. 123) says, he was called in Irish Cruimther (priest) Bescna, and would wish to identify him with the "Cruimther, of Domhnaach-mor," given in *Mart. Doneg.* at Nov. 11. [A. P. F.]

BESSARION (BISARION), an Egyptian monk in the 4th century. Very many sayings and wonders are recorded of him. (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 116; Ruf. *de Verb. Sen.* 122, *et alibi pass.* Rosw. V. P.) [I. G. S.]

BETTI, an Englishman, one of the four priests sent by Finan to the Middle Angles as missionaries, after the baptism of Peada in 653 (Bed. *H. E.* iii. 21). [S.]

BEUNO, ST., son of Hywgi, or Bugi, and a contemporary of St. Kentigern, to whom he was nearly related. He founded a religious society at Clynnog Fawr, in Carnarvonshire, before or about A.D. 616 (but see Haddan and Stubbs, i. 160, on the date), on land granted by Cadfan, prince of North Wales, to whom Beuno gave a small golden sceptre in acknowledgment, which was worth sixty cows—the Welsh (like the Irish up to the English invasion) then reckoning value by cattle. In his old age Beuno was the instructor of St. Gwenfrewi or Wenfred. Eleven churches are dedicated to him, and his festival is on April 21 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 268). In his life (printed in *Cumbro-Briton Saints*, 299), it is said that he quitted Berriew, near Welshpool, in Montgomeryshire, because he heard a Saxon saying to his dogs "Cergia." Beuno at once said to his disciples, "let us leave this place, for the nation of this man has a strange language, . . . they have invaded this place and it will be theirs, and they will keep it in their possession." Just before his death Beuno saw a vision of the

* Soc. *H. E.* iii. 7, erroneously makes Beryllus bishop of Philadelphia.

dressed to the kings Ethelred, Aldfrith, and Ealdulf, exhorting them to receive Berhtwald as primate; the other to all the bishops of Britain, urging them to obedience to him. Both are of somewhat questionable authenticity. In 693 Berhtwald attests an act of Oshere, king of the Hwiccas, done in a Mercian Witenagemot (Kemble, *C. D. i.* 41); in 696 he took part in the legislation of Wihtred, king of Kent, at the council of Berghamstede or Bersted (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 233); between that year and 716 obtained, in a council at Baccanceld or Bapchild, the famous privilege of Wihtred, which secured the liberties of the Kentish monasteries. In 702 he joined the Northumbrian king Aldfrith in the condemnation of Wilfrid, and in his excommunication (Heddius, *V. Wilfr.* cc. 45-47); and in 705, at the command of the pope, attended the council at Nidd, in which Wilfrid was reconciled (*ib. c.* 58). The same year he held a synod at Brentford (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 274) for the pacification of Essex and Wessex, having, the year before, taken measures for the division of the West Saxon diocese. A letter of Waldhere, bishop of London, to him, on these subjects, is extant (*ibid.*). The division of Wessex being accomplished, he consecrated Aldhelm as bishop of the new see of Sherborne (Will. Malmesb. *G. P.* p. 385). In 706 he attests a charter founding the monastery of Evesham, in relation to which two forged letters of pope Constantine, addressed to him, are extant; and, according to the life of St. Egwin, he attended a council at Alcester, on the same business, in 709. Shortly after, between 709 and 712, we find him writing to Forthere, bishop of Sherborne, to obtain the release of a captive girl from Beorwald, abbat of Glastonbury (Bonif. *Epist.* ep. 155). About this time we find him receiving Winfrith [BONIFACIUS], in Kent, on a mission from the West Saxon clergy, possibly connected with the institution of the new see of Selsey, which was instituted about 711. In 716, in a council at Clovesho, he obtained a confirmation of Wihtred's privilege (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 300, 301). With the exception of his connexion with the affairs of Wilfrid, and his consecration of successive bishops of Rochester, Bede does not say much about Berhtwald; he records his death as happening Jan. 13, 731, and mentions that he was buried near his predecessor, within the church of St. Peter at Canterbury (*H. E.* ii. 3, v. 23). Having presided over the Anglo-Saxon church at a critical period of its growth for so many years and with so steady a hand, Berhtwald may safely be credited with considerable ability and moderation. That he was not regarded as a saint is, probably, owing to the line that he took with respect to Wilfrid, which, although approved by the best men of the time, was not likely to commend itself to the hagiographers. The life of St. Egwin, ascribed to him, belongs, unquestionably, to a later Berchtwald. [S.]

BERNACHUS, ST. (Brynach), of Wales, in the 5th century, said to have been the instructor of Brychan, king of Brecknock. His life is given in the Cotton MS. Vesp. A. 14 of the 12th century, and is printed in W. T. Rees' *Lives of the Cambro-Briton Saints* (1853); an abridgment of it occurs in Capgrave's *Legenda Angliæ*, 36. The details are fabulous, but we find the

usual connection between South Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany. The saint comes from Brittany to South Wales, and his disciple St. Clether (the father of twenty children) retires to Cornwall, to lead the life of a devotee there. The parish of St. Clether, in Cornwall, is just east of Davidstow and north of Alternun—so named from the celebrated Welsh Saint David and his mother Nonna. The life says that St. Bernachus died April 7. (Sir H. Nicolas adds "July 7," and Ritson "March 9," as his feast-days.) Giraldus Cambrensis (*Itin. Cambriæ*, ii. 2) refers to his famous spring situated just north of the Presseleu mountains in Pembroke. There is probably some confusion between Clether's twenty sons, and the twenty-four assigned to king Brychan, perhaps owing to the names Brynach and Brychan being confused (see under Brychan). R. Rees (*Welsh Saints*, 156) enumerates several churches named after Brynach, in or near Pembroke and Brecknock. Another account makes Brynach contemporary with Maelgwn, and, if so, he must be placed in the first half of the 6th century. (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 158; Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 91-92.) [C. W. B.]

BERNUINI, BERWIN. (1) A nephew of Wilfrid and a clerk to whom he commended the Isle of Wight, giving him the priest Hiddila to preach to and baptize the people: cir. 686. (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 16; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 537.)

(2) An English priest to whom Alcuin writes, professing his attachment to Offa and the English. The letter was probably written during a coolness between Charles and Offa, the cause of which is obscure, and the date of the letter, although fixed by Froben to 793, is very uncertain (Alc. *Opp.* ed. Froben, i. 11): [S.]

BERON. [HIPPLYTUS.]

BERONICIANUS, bishop of Tyre, appointed on the deposition of Cyrus by the dominant party at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. At his request Cyril wrote to the Oriental bishops, urging on them the necessity of their anathematizing Nestorius. (Cyril, *Ep. ad Aristolaum*; Baluz. *Nov. Coll.* 889; *Tragoed. Iren. c.* 194.) [E. V.]

BERTHA, BERCTA, wife of Ethelbert, king of Kent. She was daughter of Caribert, king of Paris, by his wife Ingoberga (Greg. Turon. iv. 26; ix. 26), and lost her father in 575, her mother in 589. The date of her marriage is unknown, but it was probably after the death of her mother, although Bede speaks of the king receiving her "a parentibus." Ethelbert was still a heathen, and on his marriage it was made a condition that his wife should be allowed to enjoy the exercise of her own religion, and should be attended by a bishop. Luidhard, or Letard, who is called by the Canterbury historians bishop of Senlis (Thorn, ed. Twysden, 1767), was chosen to accompany her, and the remains of the church of St. Martin, at Canterbury, were allotted for Christian worship (Bede, *H. E.* i. 26). It was partly, no doubt, by her influence that Ethelbert was induced to receive the Roman mission and to be baptized. Pope Gregory, in 601, when sending Mellitus to reinforce Augustine's company, addressed a letter to Bertha, in which he compliments her highly on her faith

and knowledge of letters, and urges her to make still greater efforts for the spread of Christianity. He also ascribes the conversion of the English mainly to her, and compares her to the empress Helena (S. Greg. *Epist.* xii. 29; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 17, 18). The date of her death is unknown. She was buried in the porch of St. Martin, in the church of SS. Peter and Paul (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5). Ethelbert seems to have married again after her death. She was the mother of Eadbald, who succeeded to the throne on Ethelbert's death, and of Ethelburga, who, in 625, was married to Edwin, king of Northumbria. As her son was unbaptized in 616, it is probable that she found considerable difficulty in promoting Christianity in her own family, or else that she died whilst her children were very young. Elmham (ed. Hardwick, p. 110) says that she took part in the foundation of the monastery of St. Augustine, at Christmas, 604, but this is merely traditional; and the latest trustworthy trace of her is St. Gregory's letter of 601. [S.]

BERTHWYN, an early bishop of Llandaff. (*Liber Landavensis*, 166, 431, 626; but see Stubbs's *Registrum Sacrum*, 156 on these lists.) [C. W. B.]

BERWYN, ST. (or GERWYN), a son of Brychan, who is said to have settled in Cornwall, but the name is difficult to identify, unless he is the same as St. Guronus, a hermit who preceded St. Petrock at Bodmin. Another account (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 142) makes Gerwyn a son of Brynach by Brychan's daughter, and gives him three sisters, Mwynau, Gwennan, and Gwenlliw, and two of the saints who have given names to Cornish parishes are St. Mawnan and St. Wenn, who may possibly be identified with two of the sisters. [C. W. B.]

BERYLLUS, bishop of Bostra,* in Arabia, in the middle of the 3rd century, known in his day as one of the most learned teachers of the church. Beryllus conceived heretical views with respect to the person of our blessed Lord, to consider which a synod was assembled at Bostra, A.D. 244. The assembled bishops were unanimous in condemning his teaching, and declared that Christ at His incarnation was endowed with a human soul (Soc. *H. E.* iii. 7), but they were unable to convince Beryllus of his error. Origen however, who, having been recently degraded from Holy Orders and excommunicated at Alexandria, was then residing at Caesarea, had been invited to the synod, and by his intellectual superiority, dialectical skill and friendly moderation succeeded in proving to Beryllus the unsoundness of his tenets, and in leading him back to the orthodox faith. For this, according to Jerome, he received the thanks of Beryllus in a letter extant in his time, together with many others relating to this synod. Our only authority as to the tenets of Beryllus is a somewhat obscure passage of Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 33, and a fragment of Origen's commentary on the Epistle to Titus, found in the apology of Pamphilus, Orig. *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 22, edit. Bened., which have led to very opposite conclusions. These may be seen in Dörner, where the whole

question is discussed at length. His views were Monarchian, and are identified by Schleiermacher with those of the Patripassians, and by Baur with those of Artemon and the Neo-Ebionites. According to Dörner, Beryllus occupies a middle place, forming a connecting link between the Patripassians and Sabellius. The leading ideas of his teaching as developed by Dörner from Eusebius were as follows: (1) there existed a *πατρική θεότης* in Christ, but not an *ἰδία θεότης*; (2) Christ had no independent existence in a circumscribed form of being of His own (*κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν*), before His Incarnation (*ἐπιδημία*). (3) Subsequently to His Incarnation, He who had been identified with the *πατρική θεότης* became a circumscribed Being possessed of an independent existence; the being of God in Christ being a circumscription of the *θεότης* of the Father, i.e. of God Himself. According to Eusebius *H. E.* vi. 20, Beryllus was the author of epistles and treatises displaying considerable elegance. (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* No. 1x.; Niceph. *H. E.* v. 22.; Neander, ii. p. 350, ff.; Gieseler, v. p. 219; Dörner, *Person of Christ*, First Period, Second Epoch, sect. i. c. 2, Div. i. vol. ii. pp. 35-45, Clark's Translations; Schröckh, iv. 38; Mosheim, *de reb. Christ. ante Constant.* p. 699; Ullman, *Comment. de Beryll. Bost.* Hamb. 1835; Fock, *Diss. de Christolog. Beryll. Bost.* 1843.) [E. V.]

BESCNA, priest, and chaplain to St. Patrick. "The priest Bescna, sweet his verses, the chaplain of the son of Alprann," is given in the list of St. Patrick's household in the *Four Masters*, A.D. 448. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 188, n. 123) says, he was called in Irish Cruimther (priest) Bescna, and would wish to identify him with the "Cruimther, of Domhnach-mor," given in *Mart. Doneg.* at Nov. 11. [A. P. F.]

BESSARION (BISARION), an Egyptian monk in the 4th century. Very many sayings and wonders are recorded of him. (Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 116; Ruff. *de Verb. Sen.* 122, *et alibi pass.* Rosw. V. P.) [I. G. S.]

BETTI, an Englishman, one of the four priests sent by Finan to the Middle Angles as missionaries, after the baptism of Peada in 653 (Bed. *H. E.* iii. 21). [S.]

BEUNO, ST., son of Hywgi, or Bugi, and a contemporary of St. Kentigern, to whom he was nearly related. He founded a religious society at Clynnog Fawr, in Carnarvonshire, before or about A.D. 616 (but see Haddan and Stubbs, i. 160, on the date), on land granted by Cadfan, prince of North Wales, to whom Beuno gave a small golden sceptre in acknowledgment, which was worth sixty cows—the Welsh (like the Irish up to the English invasion) then reckoning value by cattle. In his old age Beuno was the instructor of St. Gwenfrewi or Wenefred. Eleven churches are dedicated to him, and his festival is on April 21 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 268). In his life (printed in *Cambro-Briton Saints*, 299), it is said that he quitted Berriew, near Welshpool, in Montgomeryshire, because he heard a Saxon saying to his dogs "Cergia." Beuno at once said to his disciples, "let us leave this place, for the nation of this man has a strange language, . . . they have invaded this place and it will be theirs, and they will keep it in their possession." Just before his death Beuno saw a vision of the

* Soc. *H. E.* iii. 7, erroneously makes Beryllus bishop of Philadelphia.

Trinity, and Peter and Paul and the Druids ("Dindevirion") and Deiniol—a statement which strongly contrasts with the denunciations of the Druids (or Magi) in other lives of Celtic saints. [C. W. B.]

BIGSECH, V. of Cill-bigsáiche (Kilbixy), in West Meath—June 28 (*Mart. Doneg.*)—but *Mart. Tall.* calls her "Bigesgi Virg." She was of the race of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh Muighmheadhoin. In Colgan (*Acta SS.* 248, c. 2), among the saints of the family of St. Colman, and house of Hi-Fiachra, is mentioned "S. Bigsecha filia Bressalii, colitur 28 Junii." [A. P. F.]

BILLFRITH, an anchorite and goldsmith, who bound the copy of the Gospels written by bishop Eadfrith (Sim. Dun. *Hist. Dun.* ii. 12; *AA. SS. Boll.* March, i. 448–452). He is made a contemporary of St. Balthere; and although nothing else is known of him, must have lived about 740. [S.]

BIRINUS, ST., the first bishop of the West Saxons. He is said by Bede (*H. E.* iii. 7) to have undertaken, by the advice of pope Honorius, to attempt the conversion of the interior of England, which had, as yet, been unvisited by missionaries; and for this work he was consecrated by Asterius, bishop of Genoa. On landing in Wessex in 634 he found the people still heathen, and determined that it was better to stay among them and preach to them than to go further into the country. One of his first proselytes was the king, Cynegils, whose conversion was aided by the persuasions of Oswald of Northumbria, and was followed by that of his whole people. Under the protection of the two kings he fixed his see at Dorchester in Oxfordshire, on the border of Wessex and Mercia; the latter kingdom, then under Penda, affording a field for his missionary labours. The death of Cynegils, and the indecision and defeat of Coenwalch his successor, do not seem to have affected the position of Birinus, who, however, lived to see Coenwalch restored in 648, and a church founded at Winchester, which was consecrated to St. Peter. He died in or before 650 (*Chr. S. M. H. B.* 311), and his obit was kept on the 3rd of December. He was buried at Dorchester, and his remains were translated by bishop Haedde to Winchester about 686. (See Rudborne, *Ang. Sac.* i. 193.) This much is known from Bede; the Winchester historians add that he was a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Andrew at Rome, that he dedicated the church of the Holy Trinity at Winchester in the twelfth year of his pontificate, and died in the fourteenth (Rudborne, *Ang. S.* i. 190, 191). The honour of possessing the relics of Birinus was claimed, however, in the 13th century, by the canons of Dorchester, who maintained, in contradiction to Bede and the Winchester tradition, that Birinus had never been translated, but Bertinus or Birstan, who, according to their account, was the tenth of his successors. This of course is untrue; Byrstan living long after the death of Bede. Honorius III. inquired into the matter, but came to no conclusion, miracles being alleged on both sides. Surlus (Dec. 3) has preserved the particulars in a life of Birinus (vi. 219–221, ed. 1581). [S.]

The parish of Kilbirnie in Scotland is named

from St. Birinus, but no fair marks his day (*N. S. A.* "Ayrshire," p. 689). There is a Kilbirnie Loch, at the west end of the parish of Beith (*O. S. A.* viii. 326); and probably the parish of Dumbarny, in the most beautiful part of Strath-earn, takes its name from this saint. (*O. S. A.* viii. 404; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 279–280.) [A. P. F.]

BISI, the fourth bishop of the East Angles at Dunwich; consecrated by Theodore, as successor to Boniface, in 669 or 670. He was present at the council of Hertford in 673; and was soon after obliged by bad health to retire from the government of his diocese, which was immediately divided between the sees of Dunwich and Elmham (*Bed. H. E.* iv. 5). [S.]

BITEUS, i.e. Mobiu, abbat of Inis-cumsaigh (Inishcourcey, Ines, and now Inch, co. Down; Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.*, pp. 44, 92)—July 22. He was of the race of Eochaidh, son of Muiredach, who was of the race of Heremon (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 199); and O'Gorman calls him Bute or Byte. He was one of the 350 disciples of St. Patrick mentioned by Tirechan, as given by Usher (*De Ecol. Brit. Prim.* Dublin 1639, 950–1; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 378, n. 2^a). It is said, that, when St. Patrick built a church at Elphin, he left there Assicus, Biteus the son or Assicus, and Cipia the mother of Bishop Biteus, St. Assicus being St. Patrick's worker in brass (Petrie's *Round Towers of Ireland*, p. 202). Biteus is counted one of the "tres fabri aerarii vasorumque sacrorum fabricatores;" but Colgan (*in Tr. Thaum.* 176, nn.) says that he was son of Assicus only by spiritual birth or education, being by natural descent his brother's son. Working with his uncle Assicus, he made altars, and square covers for the service-books, and square patens. One of these little shields (scutellae) was kept (says Colgan, *ib.* 134, c. 39) at Armagh, another at Elphin, and a third at St. Felart's church, at Domnachmor, to the west of Elphin; and Petrie says it is not improbable that specimens of the work of Biteus and his fellow-artificers may still remain. He is often classed among the bishops assisting St. Patrick, and is said to have been buried at Rath-cunga, where his uncle's remains were deposited (*ib.* c. iii. 144), but Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 341, 343) is doubtful as to his having been a bishop during the lifetime of the Apostle of Ireland. [A. P. F.]

BLADUS, ST., said to have been a bishop in the Isle of Man. His day was July 3. (*Acta Sanctorum* Oct., viii. 890; see Stubbs, *Registrum Sacrum*, 154.) [C. W. B.]

BLAECCA, the "praefectus" or reeve of Lincoln, converted, with all his family, by Paulinus in 627 or 628 (*Bed. H. E.* ii. 16). Smith, in his note on the passage, mentions an apocryphal statement that Blaecca was descended from Woden and was lord of Thong Castle. [S.]

BLAISE. [BLASIUS.]

BLANDINA, martyr, a female slave, reckoned as the chief among the martyrs of Lyons, in that, although weakest in body, she suffered longest and most bravely the most various and prolonged torture. Among other things she was stretched upon a cross and thrown to wild

beasts, which however refused to touch her; and, finally, she was tied up in a net and gored to death by a bull. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1; Eucher. Lugdun. *Hom. inter Hom. Euseb. Emesen.* xi.; Greg. Tur. *de Glor. Martt.* xlix.; Baron. June 2.) [A. W. H.]

BLANE—Aug. 10, A.D. 590. The Irish Kalendars record Blaan, bishop of Ceann-garadh, in Galghaidheln (*i.e.* Kingarth in Bute, which was included in ancient Galloway, Scotland). Camerarius calls him "episcopus Sidorensis." His Life was compiled by George Newton, archdeacon of Dunblane, and from it Colgan cites freely, in his Life of St. Cathan (*Acta SS.* p. 233-34, and notes). When St. Cathan forsook his native country of Ireland, and sought for the eremitic life in the island of Bute, his sister Erca, or Ertha, accompanied or followed him thither from Ulster. In the cell he built at Kilcathan, in Bute, he educated his sister's son, Blane, who was the fruit of violence done to Erca by an unknown man; the mother and infant are said to have been put into an earless boat at sea, and to have been carried by the tide to the shore where SS. Comgall and Cainnech found them, and gave St. Blane his education for seven years. St. Blane was next under his uncle in Bute, (who is always known as Cathanus "Sti. Blaani educator sive magister,") and then was sent back to St. Comgall and St. Cainnech, to receive priest's orders. He was raised to the episcopate, went to Rome, and after receiving the Pope's blessing, returned on foot through Anglia, in a northern city of which he performed the extraordinary miracle of restoring a blind wicked boy to sight (*Orig. Par. Scot.* i. p. xxiv.; C. Innes, *Sket. Ear. Scot. Hist.* 7; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 280-1). From his connection with St. Cainnech (Kenneth), and St. Comgall, St. Blane could scarcely have been born before A.D. 550; and King Aidan, his father, or grandfather, the son of Gauran, died in A.D. 605. Dempster says, he flourished in A.D. 446, and in this date Alban Butler follows him (*viii.* 176); but the true time is at the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century. He was buried at Dunblane, and had several dedications in Bute and Argyleshire. (*Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. 210-2; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 145, 164, 167; Fordun, *Scotich.* xi. c. 21; Bolland, *Acta SS.* Aug. tom. ii. d. 10; Reeves, *Culdees*, 46.) [A. P. F.]

BLASIUS, martyr, bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, whose flesh was scored with iron combs, and who was finally beheaded, with two boys, under Agricolaus the praefect, A.D. 316 (Baed. &c. *Acta*, in Surius, Baron. Feb. 3). He is the patron saint of the city of Ragusa; and also (probably from the combs above mentioned) of the guild of woolcombers. [A. W. H.]

There is little doubt it is the same person, who in the Scotch Kalendars is called St. Blaise, patron of the island of Pladay, on the south coast of Arran, and having altars in the cathedral church, Glasgow, and St. Giles, Edinburgh. (*Regist. Glasg.* 414; Maitland, *Hist. Edin.* 271; Fordun, *Scot.* i. c. 6, ii. c. 10; *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 3, 138, ii. 254.) [J. G.]

BLASTUS, a Quartodeciman Montanist at Rome about the reign of Commodus (180-192).

Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 15) names him at this time as having drawn away many from the church at Rome by his novelties. Irenaeus wrote to him a letter on *Schism* (Eus. v. 20. 1). The Appendix to Tertullian's *Præscriptione*, written not long after by a Roman author, as Lipsius has shewn, adds to his article on the Montanists a statement (22) that Blastus "wished secretly to introduce Judaism, saying that the Pasch must be kept only on the 14th of the month according to the law of Moses." Pacianus in the 4th century (*Ep. i. ad Symp.* in Gall. B. P. vii. 257) speaks of him as a Greek, whom he believed to be one of the many authorities to whom the Cataphrygians (*secundum Phrygas*), *i.e.* Montanists, appealed: some indications, however, such as the inclusion of Theodotus and Praxeas among the authorities, suggest that he may possibly have had all Phrygian heretics in view indiscriminately. See Massuet, *Diss. de Iren.* ii. 59; Schwegler, *Montanismus*, 243, 252; Gieseler, *K. G. I.* i. 292 f. [H.]

BLASTUS, named by Theodoret (*H. F.* i. 25) in a list of Marcionites. Volkmar, with much probability, suggests that the name is a careless transcript of **BASILICUS** from Eusebius: it must however be remembered that Theodoret wrote a treatise against Marcion, now lost (*Epp.* 116, 145) and may conceivably have had access to Marcionite literature now lost. In an earlier chapter (i. 23) he has set down the Quartodeciman Blastus as a Valentinian by a careless misunderstanding of another passage of Eusebius, where he is named in the same sentence with Florinus, but pointedly distinguished from him. [H.]

BLATH, the Irish for a flower, a beautiful thing, or grace, favour. Martyrologies give several virgins of this name. Thus on Jan. 18 is "Scoth, Feammor, Blath, and Ana, four virgins of Cluain-greenach" (*Mart. Doneg.*; *Mart. Talk.*; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 323). And on Jan. 29, another Blath appears in *Mart. Doneg.*, while Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* App. v. c. 13, p. 623, "De discipulis S. Brigidae") has "S. Blathnata seu Blatha, Latine Flora, coqua Sanctae Brigidae, de qua vita Hibern. S. Brig. c. 33, et Mar. Gorm. ad 29 Jan." She flourished about A.D. 523 (Colgan, *Ib.* p. 629; O'Hanlon, *Ib.* i. 495-6). [A. P. F.]

BLATHMAC (**BLAITHMAIC**). In the 8th and 9th centuries this appears to have been a common name in Ireland. (See the *Annals of the Four Masters*, *Ulster*, and *Tighernach*; Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 129, n. 3.) The festival of Blathmac, son of Flann, is given in the *Martt. of Doneg.* and *Tall.* on July 24; but Colgan puts the "depositio" of St. Blathmac and his companions, in Iona, on Jan. 19 (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 332). Colgan (*Acta SS.* 127-9) gives Hugo Menard's Life of St. Blathmac the Martyr in the Benedictine Martyrology, and also Walafrid Strabo's Poetical Life of the same. (See Grub's *Ecol. Hist. of Scotland*, i. 125, sq.) Blathmac was the son of an Irish prince, probably of the O'Neils of Meath, among whom Blathmac and Flann seem to have been names of common occurrence. In the Table of the *Mart. Doneg.* he is called also Florigenius, or Florus, as the synonym of Blathmac. He became in early life a monk, though his relatives tried to prevent it,

and after being made abbat in an Irish monastery, he fled to Scotland, in his desire for martyrdom, and came to Iona, where his desire was soon gratified. He was distinguished by the gift of prophecy, and when thus made aware of his coming martyrdom, he set himself to strengthen those who were prepared to suffer with him, and warned the weaker brethren to flee in time. When the Danes attacked Iona in search of the treasures believed to be deposited there, and especially of the shrine of St. Columba, "Ad sanctum venere patrem, pretiosa metalla reddere cogentes, quæ sancta Columbae ossa jacent." As he was celebrating the Mass, and "ante sacram vitulus stetit integer aram," the heathen hordes rushed in, and slew his companions; and when he refused to accede to their demands for the shrine, which was hidden in the earth, they barbarously killed him, and his remains were afterwards buried in the place where he died. Menardus conjectures that his death was about A.D. 793, and on Jan. 19; and D. Camerarius (Bolland. *Acta SS.* Jan. tom. ii. p. 601), on Dec. 4. But the more correct date seems to be A.D. 825, as fixed upon by Dr. Grub and Dr. Reeves (*Adamnan*, pp. xxii. 315, 388-9). For the place of his burial, and the subsequent preservation of his relics, see the learned and interesting Additional Note M, in Reeves, *Adamnan*, 312 sq.; *Ecol. Antiq.* 226. His life is celebrated in verse by Walafrid Strabo, abbat of Augia Dives or Reichenau, A.D. 823. It is given by Colgan as above, by Pinkerton in his *Vitæ Antiquæ SS.* 459; by Messingham in *Flor. Sanct. Hib.* 399-402; and in D'Achery, and Mabillon's *Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti*, pars iii. 98. See Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 280; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* 253, 255; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 326-30.) [A. P. F.]

BLESILLA, eldest daughter of Paula and sister of Eustochium, a Roman lady in the latter part of the 4th century, who lost her husband very soon after marriage, and ere long was induced by Jerome to become an ascetic. She was an accomplished linguist, speaking Greek fluently, and knowing something of Hebrew. She died in early youth, and her funeral caused a tumult against the monks, her death being attributed to her austerities. It was at her request that Jerome began his translation of Ecclesiastes, which had been instrumental in persuading her to become a recluse (*Hier. Epp.* 23, 25, *et al.*).

[I. G. S.]

BOBOLENUS, a German monk, c. 690. He wrote the life of St. German the abbat of Grandval in the diocese of Basle, who suffered martyrdom at the hands of duke Boniface, A.D. 666. This biography is given by Bollandus under Feb. 21, iii. 263, and by Mabillon, *Sæc. Benedict.* ii. 511. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 600.)

[E. V.]

BODFAN, ST., to whom a church in Carnarvonshire is dedicated. His festival is on June 2 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 302). [C. W. B.]

BOETHIUS, Ep. Monasteriensis (**BOETIUS**, **BUIE**, **BRODE**, **BOICH**)—Dec. 7. He was the son of Bronach, of Mainister-Buite (now Monasterboice, county Louth), of the race or Comla, and descended from Oilill Olum: he is said to have been like to Beda the Wise,

in habits and life. (For the etymology of his name, which means "Fire," or "Living to God," "God-living," see *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 329.) He died upon the day on which St. Columba was born, whose birth he foretold, and who afterwards came to the monastery, disinterred his remains, and gave the whole place and its members his blessing. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* c. 14, p. 391; c. 65, p. 400; App. II. i. c. 8, p. 457; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 158 n., 329; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 170 n.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 461.) The *Four Masters* give the obit of Buite Mac-Bronaigh, bishop of Mainister, at A.D. 521, and this is generally accepted as the true date. (See Reeves, *Adamnan*, pp. lxxvii-xix, and most valuable notes, fixing the date of St. Columba's birth, and St. Buite's death.) A poor copy of St. Buite's Life, in Latin, is preserved in one of the Ware MSS. in the British Museum, Cod. Clar. xxxix. (Add. No. 4788), and a good one in the Bodleian (MS. Bodl. Rawl. B. 505). This states, that after thirty years' peregrination in Italy, he returned with St. Codrus, and some devout persons who joined him in Germany; that he restored to life the daughter of the king of Dalriada, and Nectan, king of the Picts, from whom he received a grant of the Castrum in which he had performed the miracle, and where he afterwards founded a church. This is, according to Mr. Skene, probably Carbadu, in Angus, *quasi* Castrum Boethii. There are still the remains of a Castrum there, not far from Dunnichen. He went to the Kyanactel, but was repelled as a foreigner (Skene, *Chron. of Picts and Scots*, pp. lxxiv. 410). [A. P. F.]

BOËTHIUS (**Boëtios**, Procop.), **ANICIUS MANLIUS SEVERINUS**.^a This honourable name, invested by the church for so many centuries with a halo of sanctity, can hardly be excluded from a Dictionary of Christian Biography, though the criticism of modern times has tended more and more to distinguish the Roman senator, the author of the *Consolatio Philosophiæ*, from the writer of certain theological treatises which bear his name, and upon the genuineness of which depends his claim to be enrolled among the martyrs of Christendom. These works, (i.) *De sancta Trinitate*, (ii.) *Utrum Pater et Filius substantialiter prædicentur*, (iii.) *De duobus naturis et una persona Christi, contra Eutychem et Nestorium*, (iv.) *Fidei confessio seu brevis institutio religionis Christianæ*, based upon the Aristotelian Categories, and compiled in great measure from the writings of St. Augustine, being concerned entirely with abstract questions of dogma, offer but little to compare with the *Consolatio*, into which the mind and heart of its author were manifestly thrown: nevertheless Hand (*Encyclopædie*, v. Ersch u. Gruber, in voce) has endeavoured to shew that they are alien in point of philosophy as well as in the method of thought and expression from the undoubted writings of Boëthius. For instance, although philosopher and theologian alike demonstrate the *substantial* as opposed to the *accidental* nature of God, Boëthius (*ad Arist. Categ.* c. 4) maintains Aristotle's distinction of substances,

^a The additional name of *Torquatus* does not occur before the 16th century. Bertius is the only commentator who ventures upon the prænomen *Flavius*.

whereas the author of the first theological treatise insists upon the substantial *indifference* of the three persons in the Trinity. Again, while Boëthius translates the *οὐσία* of Aristotle by *substantia*, the author of the third treatise adopts the later rendering *essentia*, while he also follows ecclesiastical writers in his use of the words *substantia* (*ὕποστασις*), and *persona* (*πρόσωπον*). The arguments of Hand have been controverted by Gustave Baur (*de Boëth. Christianae fidei assertore*, c. 1), but the theory of a second Boëthius, whom Hand supposes to have been confounded at an early age with the philosopher, so far from being refuted, has suggested the still more plausible conjecture of Obbarius (*Proleg. ad Consol. Phil.* p. xxxvii. Jena, 1843) that another Severinus was the author of the works in question, and that to this person, and not to the author of the *Consolatio*, belong the honours of martyrdom in defence of the Catholic faith. In support of this conjecture there are the facts, (i.) That no author is known to mention the theological works of Boëthius before Alcuin (*de Proc. Spir. Sancti*, p. 752), who flourished nearly three centuries after his death. (ii.) That although the tradition was current in the middle ages, from Paulus Diaconus (8th cent.) downwards, that Boëthius laid down his life in his zeal for the Catholic faith against the Arian invaders of Italy, this is not his own account of his fall from court favour, nor is it supported by any contemporary writer. (iii.) That in the epitaph of Gerbertus, bishop of Ravenna, afterwards pope Sylvester II., inscribed upon the monument raised in his honour by Otto III., A.D. 996, no mention is made of martyrdom or of canonization (Migne, *Patrol. vol.* 139, p. 287). (iv.) That while the Church of Rome knows nothing of St. Boëthius, the festival of St. Severinus has been held on the 23rd Oct., ever since the 8th cent., in the neighbourhood of Ticinum, where Boëthius is popularly believed to have been executed. It is singular, in our opinion, that criticism has been so slow to perceive the double clue which runs throughout the history of Boëthius, as derived from various sources. It is not merely a single instance of confusion that is noticeable; the same twofold character, half secular, half ecclesiastical, pervades the whole; and hence the unusual number of so-called fables that are mixed up with or set alongside of the best authenticated facts: for instance—

(1.) The wife of Boëthius was unquestionably Rusticiana, the daughter of the senator Symmachus (*Cons. Phil.* ii. 3, 4; Procop. *Goth.* iii. 20), by whom he had two sons, Aurelius Anicius Symmachus and Anicius Manlius Severinus, who were consuls A.D. 522 (*Cons. Phil.* ii. 3, 4): but tradition makes him to have been also the husband of *Elpis*, a Sicilian lady and the authoress of two hymns in the breviary [*ELPIS*], and by her to have had two sons, Patricius and Hypatius, Greek consuls A.D. 500.

(2.) According to his own statement Boëthius was imprisoned (*Cons. Phil.* i. ii. *metr.* 24) at a distance of 500 miles from Rome (*ib.* i. 4): according to other accounts he was simply exiled, a confusion which no doubt arose from the epitaph of the said *Elpis*, in which she is said (Burm. *Anth. Lat.* tom. ii. epigr. 138) to have followed her husband into banishment.

(3.) His fall and death is mixed up by Paulus

Diaconus and other writers, who are followed among modern writers by Bähr (*Rom. Lit.* p. 162) and Heyne (*Censar. ingenii, etc. Boëth.*), with the constrained embassy of pope John to Constantinople on behalf of the Arians of the East, which is said to have resulted in the suspicion of his treachery and finally in his death; whereas Boëthius was put to death, according to others (Anonym. Vales. &c.), before the embassy, or at least before the return of the pope, A.D. 525, and as he himself implies (*Cons. Phil.* i. 4), on suspicion of conspiracy, not against Arianism, but for the restoration of the liberty and power of the senate.

(4.) Two distinct accounts exist of his execution, one stating that he was beheaded at Ticinum (Anast. *Vit. Pontif.* in Johanne I.; Aimoin, *Hist. Franc.* ii. 1), where he was imprisoned, according to popular tradition, in a tower still standing at Pavia in 1584 (Tiraboschi, iii. l. 1, c. 4). Another relating (Anonym. Vales. p. 36, in Gronov. ed. Amm. Marcell.) that he was confined along with Albinus in the baptistry of a church, and soon afterwards executed "in agro Calventiano," being first tortured by a cord tightly twisted round his forehead, and then beaten to death with a club.

(5.) He is claimed by the church as a saint and martyr under the name of Severinus, the friend of St. Benedict (Tritenheim, *ap. Fabric. Bibl. Lat.* iii. 15), and the worker of a miracle at his death (Marianus Rota, *vid. Boëth.* in usum Delphin.), but of all this his contemporaries knew nothing, and no hint of it appears until three centuries after his death, when he also becomes the author of four dogmatic treatises on the mysteries of the Trinity.

Whether or not this double tradition has grown out of the history of two distinct individuals, there can be little doubt that to obtain a true estimate of the character and writings of Boëthius, the author of the *Consolatio* must be distinguished from Severinus, saint and martyr, or whoever else was the writer of the above-mentioned theological works; and, the accretions of later times being thus removed, it remains for us briefly to notice the most authentic facts of the philosopher's life, and to inquire how far his thoughts were coloured by the contemporaneous influence of Christianity, or exercised an influence in their turn upon the religious thought of the middle ages.

Boëthius was born between the years A.D. 470–475, as is inferred from his contemporary Ennodius (*Eucharisma de vitâ suâ*), who says that he himself was sixteen when Theodoric invaded Italy, A.D. 490. As a wealthy orphan (*Cons. Phil.* ii. 3) he inherited the patrimony and honours of the Anician family, was brought up under the care of the chief men at Rome (*ib.* ii. 3) and became versed not merely in the erudition of his own country but in that of Greece likewise. In the words of his friend Cassiodorus, "The geometry of Euclid, the music of Pythagoras, the arithmetic of Nicomachus, the mechanics of Archimedes, the astronomy of Ptolemy, the theology of Plato, and the logic of Aristotle," were translated and illustrated for the benefit of the Romans by his indefatigable pen (*Var. i. Ep.* 45). Nor was he less distinguished for his virtue. His purse was ever open to the poor of Rome (Procop. *Goth.* i. i.). He exerted his authority and

eloquence on behalf of the oppressed provincials (*Cons. Phil.* i. 4). Such conspicuous merit was at first appreciated by Theodoric. He received the title of patrician while still a youth (*Ib.* i. 3), became consul A.D. 510, and princeps senatus (Procop. *Goth.* i. i.), was employed in the important station of master of the offices (Anonym. Vales. p. 26), in which post his scientific knowledge and mechanical skill were turned to ample account (Cassiod. *Ep.* i. 10, 45, ii. 40), and reached the summit of his fortune on the day when supported by his two sons, who had just been inaugurated in the consulship, he pronounced a panegyric upon Theodoric and gratified the populace with a largess (*Cons. Phil.* ii. 3). But a reverse was at hand. The philosopher had exerted himself to rescue the state from the usurpation of ignorance; the senator had opposed his integrity to the tyranny and avarice of the barbarians who did not in general share the moderation of their leader. His expression, "palatini canes" (*Cons. Phil.* i. 4), shews the uncompromising spirit in which he must have set his face against their iniquities; and it is not surprising that the courage and sympathy he shewed in pleading the cause of Albinus, a senator who was accused of "hoping the liberty of Rome" (*Ib.* i. 4), joined to other similar conduct, and misrepresented by his foes, at length poisoned the mind of Theodoric, who seems to have appointed one Decoratus, a man of worthless character, to share and control the power of his favourite (*Cons. Phil.* iii. 4). As to the existence of any wide-spread conspiracy to overthrow the Ostrogothic rule there is but very faint evidence, and against this accusation must be set his own indignant self-justification (*Cons. Phil.* i. 4). A sentence of confiscation and death was passed upon him by the senate without a trial; he was imprisoned in the Milanese territory, and ultimately executed in one or other of the ways described above, probably about the 50th year of his age, A.D. 520-524. His father-in-law, Symmachus, was involved in his ruin (Procop. *Goth.* i. i.), and his wife, Rusticiana, reduced to beggary (*Ib.* iii. 20). The remorse of Theodoric, which came too late to save "the last of the Romans," is the natural and tragic finish to a story that cannot fail to suggest many parallels in history.

It was during his imprisonment that Boëthius composed his "Consolation of Philosophy," a work described by Gibbon as "a golden volume, not unworthy of the leisure of Plato or Tully." It is a dialogue in prose and verse (a species of composition suggested probably by the medleys of Petronius and Capella) between the author and his visitant, Philosophy, whom he represents as a woman of reverend mien and varying stature, upon the borders of whose vesture were woven the letters Π and Θ, symbolizing no doubt the Platonic division of philosophy into *πρακτική* and *θεωρητική*. Those who regard the "Consolation" as the work of a Christian, have not unnaturally been surprised and perplexed by its total silence as regards the distinctive faith of Christianity, and have been forced to take refuge either in the supposed incompleteness (Bertius, Lips. 1753), or in the allegorical interpretation of the dialogue (Gervais, vid. Schröckh, *Hist. Eccles.* xvi. 118). It breathes a spirit of resignation and hope, but

so does the Phædo. It is based upon a firm belief in Providence, but it is only in his poetic flights that the author's language seems to savour of a belief in a personal God (*Cons. Phil.* iii. metr. 9), his faith never elsewhere rising higher than Theism, and occasionally passing into Pantheism (*Ib.* iii. 12, et pass.). He asserts the efficacy of prayer, but the injunction thereto is drawn from the Timæus and not from the New Test. (*Ib.* iii. ix.), while the object of his aspiration is not the *στέφανος ζωής* or *δικαιοσύνης* of the Apostles, but the *summum bonum* of the Greek philosopher. He has been thought to betray an acquaintance with the Christian idea of heaven (*Ib.* i. 5, iii. 12, iv. 1, v. 1), but his *patria* is the peace of the philosophic mind, not the *πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανῷ ὑπαρχον*. In short, the whole work, with the exception of words and phrases (e. g. *adunatio*, *angelicâ virtute*, *cœternus*, *purgatoriâ clementiâ*), which imply nothing more than an acquaintance with Christian writers, might have been written, so far as theology is concerned, by Cicero himself. And it is only as the work of a pagan that it can be said to have merited the high respect so long paid to it by the church or the devotion of its many translators (vid. *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biograph.*, in voc.). Even this respect was due rather to the position of Boëthius as standing at the close of classical and before the rise of scholastic philosophy, than to any originality he possessed either as a thinker or a poet. His works not only prove that he had an intimate knowledge of Greek literature, but were for centuries the only vehicle by which Greek philosophy penetrated to the West; but at this distance of time, while the greater part of his writings are forgotten, the chief of them is of value only as a stately prose-poem serving, along with the poetry of Claudian and Ausonius, to mark the point of contact between the thought of Heathendom and the faith of Christianity. That from the 6th to the 14th century its author was invested with a monopoly of philosophic greatness was natural in the utter decay of learning, but at most he can only be said to have shone by virtue of the light he reflected from his masters, and it was the excess of darkness which made that light of brightness sufficient to shine across the ages till it paled in the rising splendour of the revival of letters.

The works of Boëthius are as follows:—*De Consolatione Philosophiæ libri v.*; *In Porphyrii Isagogen a Victorino translata dialogi ii.*; *In eandem a se ipso Latine translata libri v.*; *In Categorias Aristotelis libri ii.*; *In ejusdem librum περὶ ἑρμηνείας lib. i.*; *Editionis secundæ libri vi.*; *Analyticorum Aristotelis priorum et posteriorum libri iv.*; *Topicorum Aristotelis libri viii.*; *In Aristotelis Topica libri viii.* (not extant); *Introductio in Syllogismos Categoricos*; *De syllogismis hypotheticis libri ii.*; *De Divisione*; *De Definitione*; *De Differentiis Topicis libri iv.*; *In Topica Ciceronis libri vi.*; *Elenchorum Sophisticorum libri ii.*; *De Arithmetica libri ii.*; *De Musica libri v.*; *De Geometria libri ii.*; also two short treatises entitled respectively "*De rhetoricæ cognatione*," and "*Locorum rhetoricorum distinctio*," discovered by Cardinal Mai in a MS. of the 11th century. Doubtful works:—*De unitate et uno*; *De Bono*; *De Hebdomadibus*; all of which are dedicated to pope John.

The first edition of his collected works was published at Venice, 1497, fol. The most complete is that contained in Migne's "Patrologia," which is a collation of the best editions, the principal being those of Glareanus, Basil. fol. 1570, and Vallinus, Lugdun. 1656. It includes the commentaries of Glareanus on the "Consolatio Philosophiae," those of Gilbert de la Porée on the above-mentioned theological works, condemned by the Council of Rheims 1148, and the *Vie de Boèce* by Gervais. The best edition of the *Consolatio* is that of Theod. Obbarius, Jenae, 1843. The most important translation, that into Anglo-Saxon by Alfred the Great (vid. preface to Cardale's edition, 1829).

The chief ancient authorities for the life of Boëthius are the epistles of his contemporaries Cassiodorus and Ennodius, and the History of Procopius. The best modern authorities are Hand, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*; and for an opposite view of his religious faith, Gustave Baur, *de Boëth. Christianae fidei assertore*, Darmst. 1841; Heyne, *Censura Boëth. de Cons. Phil.*, Gotting. 1805, in Opusc. Academ. vi. 142; and the "Prolegomena de Boëthii vitâ et scriptis," to the edition of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* by Obbarius. [E. M. Y.]

BOETIUS, disciple of St. Fursey, and probably one of the three companions of St. Foillan, the brother of St. Fursey, who were killed along with St. Foillan, and buried with him in the church of the canons of St. Gertrude, on the bank of the Sambre, in South Brabant, i.e. at Fossae, in Belgium. (See Colgan, *Acta SS.* 99, sq. in his Collections on St. Foillan, Jan. 16; Kelly's *Cal. Ir. SS.* 57.) [A. P. F.]

BOGHA (BOGA), V. of Leitir in Dalaradia —Jan. 22. In *Martii. Doneg.* and *Tallaght* are given the three daughters, i.e. foster-children or pupils in religion, of Comhgall, son of Fianghalach, &c. abbat of Bangor, in Down. (See COMGALL.) In Dr. Todd's note to *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 24, he says that Aengus in the *Felire* mentions "The decease of the daughters of Comhgall." Among the saints descended from the family of Maccarthennus and the race of Eochaidh, are given SS. Boga, Colma or Columba, and Lassara, virgins, with their genealogy, and "coluntur in ecclesia Litterensi in Dalriada [*recte Dalaradia*], Jan. 22." (Colgan, *Acta SS.* App. c. 3, 741; Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* 237.) [A. P. F.]

BOISIL, praepositus or prior of the monastery of Mailros, under abbat Eata. He is described by Bede as a man of great virtues and of a prophetic spirit (*Bed. H. E.* iv. 27); and of his power of predicting events several instances are given, which Bede seems to have learned from Herefrith, abbat of Lindisfarne, and from Sigfrid, a monk of Jarrow, who had been educated at Mailros (*V. S. Cuthberti*, c. 6). Most of these are connected with the history of St. Cuthbert, whose future sanctity he recognized at their first interview (*V. S. Cuthb.* c. 6), who he foretold would be a bishop (*Bede, H. E.* iv. 28), and to whom, during the last week of his life, he revealed much of the future (*V. S. Cuthb.* c. 8). Whatever may be the truth of these stories, it seems certain that it was through Boisil that Cuthbert obtained admission at Mailros and the tonsure (*V. S. Cuthb.* c. 6), that he was his fa-

vorite pupil, and the companion of his last hours. Cuthbert succeeded him as praepositus. Another of his pupils was the famous Egbert, to whom, according to Bede, he appeared after his death, twice, in dreams; in one of which he dissuaded him from a missionary journey to Friesland, whilst in the second he urged him to go to Iona to attempt the conversion of the Scottish monks to the English or Catholic customs (*Bed. H. E.* v. 9). The exact date of Boisil's death is uncertain; it was after the expulsion of the Scottish monks from Ripon (cir. 662), and some years before Cuthbert's promotion to Lindisfarne, possibly in the great sickness of 664, which he is said to have foretold. Boisil was not only a scholar, but an indefatigable preacher in the villages of the north (*Bede, V. S. Cuthb.* c. 9). Relics of him were preserved at Durham (Smith's *Bede*, pp. 741, 742, 744). See also *Act. SS. Boll. Martii* 20, and Jan. 23. His memory was observed on Sept. 9; Mabillon, *Act. SS. O.S.B.* Saec. ii. p. 850. [S.]

BOLCAN or OLCAN.

(1) Bishop of Derkan or Airthirmuge—Feb. 20 (*Martii. Doneg.* and *Tallaght*). About A.D. 440, according to Joceline, in the north of Ulster, where it was formerly Dalriada, and now Reecta or the Route, there lived a man, "Deo et hominibus dilectus," named Bolcan or Olcan. In infancy he had been found beside his dead mother by Darius, a regulus or chief, of Carsedna, which is near Airthirmuge, and a few miles from Dunluce. He was called "misellus," or in Irish, "Olcan," or Bolcan. St. Patrick baptized him, and, on seeing him advance in learning and piety, put him over the church of Rath-mugia, or Airthirmugia, the chief town of Dalriada, where he had baptized him, but the legend is probably erroneous which makes him nephew of St. Patrick. After educating him, and probably before giving him the church of Airthirmuge, St. Patrick sent him to Gaul, and Ussher (*De Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Dublin. 1639, p. 951, and *Ind. Chron.*) gives A.D. 450 as the date of his return, which Colgan and Lanigan think much too early, if he was born about A.D. 443; but he was in all probability a bishop in A.D. 480, when he had one of the most distinguished schools in the north of Ireland. Ussher makes him be consecrated bishop of Derkan, or Clonderkan, in Dalriada, in A.D. 474, and the place for his church given him by Fergus, the younger son of Erc, whose posterity were promised by St. Patrick to have great power among his brethren, and who afterwards extended their sway into Scotland. A story is told of his having been induced by menaces against himself and others to baptize Saran, a chief in Dalriada, and father of St. Berchan (or Becan) of Echdruim [see BERCHAN (2)], and of St. Patrick, hearing of his weak compliance, and being filled with anger, foretelling that for his indiscretion his church would be thrice destroyed in after ages. Whatever foundation there may be for the legend, Reeves notes a curious circumstance, that the church of Armoey (Airthirmuge) has had its property gradually merged in the episcopal property of Connor, so that three-fourths of the parish have been from time immemorial the property of that see. (See Colgan, *Acta SS.* 375-8; *Tr. Thaum.* 85, 95, 146, Y 2

147, 231, col. 2; Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* 80, 90, 238, 243-5, 321, 376; Ussher, *Ecol. Br. Antiq.* Publ. 1639, pp. 610, 951, A.D. 450, 474; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 256, 265, 341, sq. 403.)

(2) July 4. In speaking of St. Bolcan of Airthimuge, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 377, n.^s) says, there is another saint in Ireland called Bolcan, who is venerated in the parish church of Kill-chule (Kilcooley, co. Roscommon), in the diocese of Elphin, in Connaught; and again (*Ib.* p. 377, c. 10), that he is always enumerated by Tirechan and Aengus among the presbyters and abbats who were disciples of St. Patrick, being in fact a presbyter and worshipped on July 4 in the church of Kill-chuille, in Connaught, possibly the Olcan mentioned by Ussher, from Tirechan (*De Brit. Ecol. Prim.* Publ. 1839, pp. 950-1; Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* p. 244). Alb. Butler (vii. 61) says his relics remain at Kilmore, where his monastery stood, and Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 256, 344) calls him Olcan of Kilmoyle. [A. P. F.]

BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS. St. Boniface of Maintz, called "the Apostle of Germany," was the greatest, though not the first in time, of the missionaries who christianized Germany. He was born of noble parents in Wessex,^a at Crediton (Crediodunum), in the last quarter of the 7th century, and was educated as a child within the walls of a monastery, apparently in or near the neighbouring city of Exeter (Adestancastrum) (Willibaldi *Vit. Bonif.* c. 1; Bonif. *Epist.* 10). His name then was Winfried. He soon evinced a longing for the life of a monk; his father reluctantly consenting he was received into the monastery of Nutsall (Nhutscellense), near Winchester (Netley?), was ordained priest at the age of thirty, and, being eminent among the brethren for his learning and ability, had the prospect of future greatness before him, learned men being scarce at that time in England. On the recommendation of the assembled abbats of Wessex, he was deputed by Ina, king of Wessex, to attend a council convoked by Bretwald (Brietwaldus), archbishop of Canterbury (*Vit.* cc. 2, 3, 4; *Ep.* 3).

But Winfried longed to exchange the peace and security of the cloister for the toils and perils of a missionary. The conversion of his own country was accomplished; even Wessex, "the most pagan of the Saxon kingdoms" (Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, ii. p. 67), had embraced the Christian faith; his longings naturally turned to the old country, the fatherland of the English. Willibrod, like himself, an English monk, had recently preached the gospel to the Frisii (parts of Holland and Hanover), and two other English monks, the brothers Ewald, among the Saxons (North Germany, S. of the Elbe).

Early^b in the 8th century Winfried embarked with only two or three of his brother monks with him, crossed from London to Dorstat, near Utrecht, and commenced operations. But his attempt was singularly inopportune. Ratbod

(Ratbodus), king of the Frisii, at war with Karl Martel, was devastating the churches and monasteries in Friesland which had been founded by the Franks, was restoring the worship of idols, and was altogether in no mood to receive overtures of Christianity. After an unsuccessful interview with Ratbrod, Boniface returned home, nothing done (*Vit.* c. 4).

After a short stay, whether of one winter or more is uncertain, in his old quarters at Nutsall, and, after declining, according to his biographer Willibald, the honour of succeeding Winbert as abbat,^c Winfried renewed his attempt, with the same intrepidity as before, but with more preparation (*Vit.* c. 6). It was his farewell for ever to the shores of England. Fortified with a commendatory letter from his friend and patron Daniel (*Ep.* 33), bishop of Winchester, he made his way, no easy journey in those days, to the city which was then emphatically the centre of the organization of Christendom. At Rome he was welcomed cordially by the Pope, Gregory II. (*Vit.* c. 6; *Ep.* 10). There, too, he formed a friendship for life with Eadburga, an English princess (*Ep.* 14), who, like many others in England of royal blood, had retired to the cloister (Montalemb. *Les Moines de l'Occid.* v. 5). Then and there, according to some writers, but more probably on being made bishop during his next visit to Rome, he assumed the name Bonifacius (Mab. *ad Vit.* c. 7).

The winter past and the snow melting, he recrossed the Alps, after a friendly reception at the court of the Lombards, bearing a general authorisation from the pope to evangelize central Europe (*Vit.* c. 6; *Epp.* 119-124). He found the duchy of Bavaria, extending from the Alps to the old Roman frontier, in a state of great disorganization. It had received Christianity as a Roman province, and more recently Rupert, Corbinian and others had laboured there; but the clergy as well as the people were demoralised. Winfried appears to have made only a brief stay among them, passing on into Thuringia (Saxony), which had been in part christianized by the disciples of Columban; but some of the tribes had relapsed into heathenism, and the Christianity of the others was not in conformity with the Christianity of the Roman see. His missionary efforts, however, in this district were interrupted by tidings of the death of Ratbod (A.D. 719, Mab.). Perhaps Winfried was disappointed of the success which he had anticipated in Thuringia, or seized with a craving to revisit the scene of his earliest enterprise; perhaps he felt that he had yet much to learn under one older and more experienced than himself; anyhow he turned his steps at once to Friesland, and there assisted Willibrod, archbishop of Utrecht (Trajectum), for three years. At the end of that time, declining to become coadjutor first and afterwards successor of Willibrod, he returned to Thuringia in the wake of Karl Martel's victorious troops, and then prosecuted his mission northwards in the territory of the Hessi, a heathen tribe between the middle-Rhine and the Elbe. Here he made many converts (*Vit.* cc. 6, 7).

So far in Winfried's career it has been only

^a Trithemius calls him "Scotus natu," evidently mistaking him for a Kelt from Ireland (Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.* s. v.).

^b 704 A.D. Cave and others; not before A.D. 716, Mabillon (on Willib. *Vit. Bonif.* c. 4).

^c But it is argued from *Ep.* 33 that Winbert died later (Wright, *Biog. Brit. Liter.* p. 310).

the skirmishing before the battle, or the athlete's training for the race. From this date his work becomes more systematic, and the link closer which binds him to Rome.

In A.D. 723 he made his second visit to Rome, to receive Pope Gregory's directions on various complications arising from the unsettled relations of Christianity and heathenism in Germany. On St. Andrew's day in that year he was consecrated bishop, without a see ("regionarius"), and probably on that occasion assumed the name by which he is known in history. Boniface had learned by experience how essential was the support which Rome alone could give to the success of his labours, and bound himself, apparently without any reluctance, by a stringent oath of fealty to the pope, similar to that which was imposed on the Italian (suburbicarii) bishop. (Othlo. *Vit. Bonif.* c. 14). As early as was possible in the spring he started again from Rome northwards, armed with the pope's commendatory letters to Karl Martel (Othlo. *Vit.* c. 15) and others, clergy and lay people, with whom he was likely to be brought into contact (Willib. *Vit.* c. 7).

Evidently the conversion of the Saxons, to whom Boniface felt himself drawn by the ties of blood and race, had been from the first very near his heart (*Ep.* 36). But experience had taught him to work his way gradually to his end. Before returning to his mission among the Hessi, he attached himself for a time to the court of Karl Martel, and gained the sanction of that prince, then vigorously pushing forward his schemes of conquest in that direction (*Vit.* c. 8). The position of the Hessi was important, ecclesiastically as well as politically, on the frontier between Christendom and paganism, between the Frankish kingdom and the Saxons. It was necessary to strike a telling blow; and Boniface had both the courage and the tact for the emergency. With his own hands, in the presence of an assembled crowd, he felled to the ground the sacred and inviolable oak of Thor at Geismar (Gaesmara); and, subsequently, his monks assisting, built an oratory with the planks (*Vit.* c. 8). Conversions followed rapidly: and he appears, notwithstanding much opposition from the clergy as well as the laity, to have been successful now in controlling the disorder in Thuringia. In the midst of his labours he kept up a constant correspondence with old friends in England, who sent him from time to time a plentiful supply of monks and nuns, willing recruits for his missionary campaign, as well as books and other things which he needed. Here and there, as occasion offered, he planted his monastic colonists, to hold the territory which had been reclaimed from heathenism. It was about this time, or rather later, that he founded monasteries, inconsiderable of course, at first, in size, but invaluable as mission stations, at Ordorp (Ordorf), near Erfurt, Fritzlar (Fridislar), near the scene of his exploit with the oak, and at a place called "Hamanaburg," in all probability Homburg in Hesse (*Vit.* c. 8).

The death of Gregory II., and the accession of Gregory III. to the papal throne (A.D. 731) brought only fresh honours to Boniface. The new pope lost no time in raising the devoted emissary of Rome to the dignity of archbishop (as before, without a see) and legate, thus enabling him to coerce the refractory bishops

who thwarted his efforts (*Vit.* c. 8). In the same year (A.D. 732), Karl Martel's decisive victory at Tours, which rolled back the Saracenic tide that threatened to submerge Christendom, gave a new impetus to Christian missions. In A.D. 738 Boniface made his third and last pilgrimage to Rome, not now as an obscure priest, but with a great retinue of monks and converts, and received the pope's authority to call a synod of bishops in Bavaria and Alemannia (Württemberg); circumstances however appear to have deferred this synod for some years. Returning through Bavaria, Boniface, acting in concert with Duke Odilo, founded four bishoprics in the eastern part of the duchy, Salzburg (Sala Franconica), Freisingen (Frisium), Passau (Patau), and Ratisbon or Regensburg (Reginae civitas), with a view to remedy the ecclesiastical lawlessness which still prevailed (*Vit.* c. 9; cf. Miraeus, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.* s. v.).

After a quarter-century of all but incessant missionary activity, the influence of Boniface was now at its zenith. The accession of a new pope, Zacharias (A.D. 741) made no change in the consideration with which he was regarded at Rome. On the contrary, his letters to Zacharias shew, that after being the trusted friend and counsellor of the two previous popes, Boniface could address their successor, if he thought it necessary, in a tone, if not of reproof, at least of earnest expostulation (*Ep.* 143). The death of Karl Martel also in the same year was rather a gain than a loss to Boniface, for the comparatively pacific policy of the sons was a more congenial atmosphere for his missionary plans than the restless pugnacity of their father, which often compromised the preaching of the gospel even by co-operation. Karloman, as the close of his career shewed, was predisposed to submit to the direction of a monk; and Pepin welcomed so potent an ally as Boniface in his efforts to reduce the Gallic clergy to obedience, and to correct the licentiousness which prevailed under the degenerate Merovingians, by eliminating the Keltic element from among the clergy and by consolidating the fabric of church and state with Rome, as the keystone of the arch. The influence of Boniface as legate extended southwards and westwards in Austrasia and Neustria. In the previous pontificate, probably A.D. 739, Boniface had held a council, vaguely designated "on the bank of the Danube" ("ad Danubium"), perhaps at Ratisbon (Miraeus, s. v. ap. Fabr. *Bibl. Eccles.*; cf. *Ep.* 122), at which he created the four Bavarian bishoprics (Willib. *Vit.* c. 9, *Ep.* 4). In A.D. 742 he presided at what is called still more vaguely a "Germanic council," perhaps as being the earliest provincial council in Germany (cf. Mab. ad Willib. *Vit.* c. 9). The decrees then enacted were confirmed by a council held, A.D. 743, in a palace or villa of Karloman (Miraeus, v. s.) at Estines (*Conc. Lepitins.* or *Liftins.*), in the diocese of Cambrai, on the southern frontier of Austrasia (*Ep.* 124). At this synod Gewillieb (Gervilius) was deposed, with Karloman's consent, from the see of Maintz (Moguntum) for the indulgence of his sporting propensities, and for the graver offence of homicide in battle. Boniface was installed in his stead, the bishopric being elevated into an archbishopric, with jurisdiction over a district from Köln to Strasburg, and from Coire to Worms

(Othl. *Vit. Bonif.* cc. 33, 36, 39; cf. Willib. *Vit. c.* 9, where Boniface is styled "*Archiep. Mogunt.*" at this date). Apparently, Boniface would have preferred Köln (Colon. Agripp.) for the seat of his archbishopric. But the repugnance of the clergy of Köln, who dreaded his strictness in enforcing discipline, coinciding with the opportune vacancy of Mainz, determined it otherwise (*Epp.* 138, 140). Two other synods, of which the traces are lost, seem to have taken place about this time (Willib. *Vit. c.* 10). In A.D. 744 a more important council was held at Soissons (Suessiones), on the confines of Neustria and Austrasia, apparently by the joint authorisation of Pepin and Carloman (*Vit. c.* 9), under the mock sovereignty of Childeric, at which, among other things, Adalbert (or Elbercht) and Clemens, two of Boniface's most energetic opponents, Adalbert, apparently, a fanatic with a strong following among the lower classes, Clemens an adherent of the old British church, were formally condemned (*Vit. cc.* 9, 10). Their condemnation was subsequently ratified by a synod at Rome (*Epp.* 134, 135, 148). Meantime, Boniface was not neglectful of his missionary work in central Germany. In A.D. 742 (probably, but A.D. 746 *Annales Fuldenses*) he founded the sees of Würzburg (in Franconia), Buraburg (in Hesse), Erfurt (in Thuringia); and a few years later the see of Eichstädt, where he placed his nephew and faithful companion Willibald, who is not to be identified with his biographer (*Vit. c.* 10; Bulteau, *Hist. de l'Ordre de St. Benoist*, iv. xii.).

In A.D. 744 Boniface founded the great monastery with which his name is especially connected, of Fulda, in the wild forest of Buchenau (Buchonia), between Hesse and Bavaria, destined to become among the Benedictine monasteries of Germany what Monte Casino was already in Italy (*Ann. Fuld.*; cf. Trithem. ap. Fabric. *Bibl. Eccles.* s. v. Bonif.). Finding it impossible himself to exercise a constant superintendence over it, he appointed Sturm (or Stürmio), a Bavarian, who had long worked under him in Thuringia, to be abbat, but from time to time he resorted thither for rest and retirement (*Gloria Fuldae*, pp. 3, 8, 66, 67).

In 751 the shadowy sovereignty of the Merovingians faded utterly away. That Boniface was present at Soissons and consecrated Pepin to be king in name, as he and his fathers had long been in deed, is affirmed by Bulteau and Matter, following the mediaeval annalists. (Bult. *Hist. de l'Ord. de St. Ben.* iv. xii.; Matter, *Hist. de l'Egl.* ii. p. 33; Trithem. s. v. ap. Fabric. *Bibl. Eccles.*; Marian. Scot. *Chronicon*, A.D. 750; *Ann. Fuld.* A.D. 752.) Rettberg, however, and the able writer of the biography of Boniface in Herzog (*Real Encycl.* s. v.), argue satisfactorily from Boniface's letters that he took no part in Pepin's coronation, dreading a relapse into the aggressive policy of Karl Martel. It may be argued, that one whose influence had made itself felt so constantly on the politics of Christendom, would hardly be content to stand by, a passive spectator of the extinction of the old dynasty. But probably Boniface estimated the importance of what was being done at its true value, thinking with pope Zacharias, that he, who was already king for all practical purposes, might as well wear the crown (Marian. Scot. *Chron.* A.D. 750).

In the following year Karloman abdicated his throne and retired to Monte Casino, leaving his brother sole king. It has been supposed that Boniface prompted this step; on the other hand it is to be noted that after Karloman's abdication, Boniface began to withdraw from public life, requesting the pope to depute some one else as papal commissary at the synods.

Boniface's indefatigable labours were drawing to their close. The increasing infirmities of age (Willib. *Vit. c.* 12) admonished him to hand over to younger men the completion of the work so well inaugurated by himself. In A.D. 753, or in the following year, he named Lull or Lullus, with consent of Pepin, his successor in the see of Mainz, intimating his presentiment that the end was near (Willib. *Vit. c.* 10; A.D. 753 Riddle, *Eccles. Chronol.*; A.D. 754 Cave, *Hist. Liter.*; A.D. 755 Mar. Scot. *Chron.*, who makes Lull succeed after the death of Boniface; A.D. 781 *Ann. Fuld.*). But the veteran missionary was as unwilling as any of his warrior forefathers to die peacefully and ingloriously. He would die as he had lived, in harness. After hastily revisiting the scene of his labours in Thuringia, he started on his last journey, to make one more effort for the conversion of the heathen among whom he had first tried his powers as a preacher of the gospel. Infirm and decrepit in body (Willib. *Vit. c.* 12), but dauntless as ever in spirit, he embarked on the Rhine, with Eoban (or Doban), a coadjutor bishop, and a handful of devoted followers, clergy, acolytes, and others, threading his way through the villages scattered here and there among the marshes of Frisia ("pagi divisi," Willib. *Vit. c.* 12).

On a summer's day (June 4, *Ann. Fuld.*; June 5, Bult. *Hist. de l'Ord. S. Benoist*, iv. xii.), the messengers of peace, a little company of some fifty in all, planted their tents on the banks of a river near Dockum or Dorkum, there awaiting the arrival on the morrow of a large number of converts to be confirmed by the missionary bishop. But the early morning witnessed a strangely different sight. Boniface and his companions found themselves beset by a concourse of armed pagans, eager to stop the progress of these destroyers of their idols, and to seize the vessels of gold and silver supposed to be in their keeping. Some attempt at self-defence was made by the younger Christians, but in vain. Boniface, with characteristic fortitude, checked this ineffectual resistance, and met the fate, which doubtless he had long anticipated if not longed for, with the calmness of one of the early Christians in a Roman amphitheatre. Scarcely any of his followers escaped. His assailants fought among themselves over the scanty booty which disappointed their expectations; and Pepin availed himself of the excuse for invading Frisia by way of avenging their massacre of the bishop and his companions. The bones of the martyr, after the usual contention between Utrecht, Mainz, and Fulda, were finally deposited in the monastery of Fulda, according to the wish expressed by Boniface before setting off on his last journey. (Willib. *Vit. c.* 12; *Ann. Fuld.* A.D. 781.)

It is improbable that Boniface ever occupied the see of Utrecht. Willibald is silent about it. A canon of Utrecht, writing in the 14th century, claims this honour for his cathedral, alleging

that Boniface succeeded Willibrod or Clemens (A.D. 744). But the same writer represents Boniface as the founder at Utrecht of a church of "canonici;" an apparent anachronism which discredits his testimony, even apart from this not intrinsically trustworthy (Joann. de Beka, *Hist. Vet. Episc. Ultraject.* pp. 8, 9, 10). Bulteau thinks that Boniface was made archbishop of Utrecht after resigning Maintz (Bult. *Hist. de l'Ord. de S. Benoist*, iv. xii.). It is more likely that Boniface superintended the see of Utrecht as papal legate for a short time when it became vacant in A.D. 753, appointing as his coadjutor or subordinate ("co-episcopus," al. "chorepiscopus." Willib. *Vit.* c. 12), Eoban or Doban, one of his missionary fellow-labourers; an arrangement all the more likely, if Utrecht was still a see "in partibus infidelium." The long-standing rivalry between Utrecht and Cologne probably helped to foster the idea that Boniface was ever formally appointed archbishop of Utrecht.

Boniface was statesman and scholar as well as missionary, an able administrator as well as an earnest preacher; and his aim was to civilise as well as to christianize the heathen of his fatherland. The sanction of the papal see was almost indispensable for the success of his efforts; for the helpless feebleness of the Merovingians and the strong self-assertion of the Carolingians were alike unfavourable to the growth and development of the church. Boniface was wise in seeing this. But he never allowed himself to be made a mere puppet in the hands of the popes; he appealed for guidance and direction in his perplexities to England as often as to Rome; he was not afraid even, if necessary, to expostulate reprovingly with the pope himself.

The extent and multifariousness of his labours is amazing. Besides the more directly missionary work of journeyings and preachings beyond the right bank of the Rhine, there were monasteries of his own founding to be visited and superintended, councils, latterly one or more in a year, to be presided over, questions without end to be settled on points ranging from abstruse doctrine to small trivialities of ceremonial or of social propriety. His work was, also, embarrassed by many complications, by the controversies between the Roman church and the Christians not in communion with it, between the Frankish monarchy and the Gallican bishops, and by that which is the standing difficulty of missionaries, the difficulty of deciding when to allow and when uncompromisingly to prohibit old heathen customs not altogether in accordance with Christianity, yet very deeply rooted in the hearts of the people. Among all these conflicting interests a firm hand and a discriminating eye were needed to hold the balance steadily. Boniface was a man who could say "No," and a strict disciplinarian; but his letters shew the kindness and geniality of his nature, and the number of his devoted personal followers proves that he could win and retain men's hearts. And thus, which is indeed the surest test of true greatness, his work survived him. In every department of it he left disciples willing and able to carry it on to completion. It is no exaggeration to say, that since the days of the great Apostle of the Gentiles no missionary of the gospel has been more eminent in

labours, in perils, in self-devotion, and in that tenacity yet elasticity of purpose, which never loses sight of its aim, even while compelled to approach it by some other route than that which it proposed to itself originally—than Winfried, known in the annals of Christendom as Boniface, "the Apostle of Germany."

Boniface's letters are important in their bearing on the history of his age, as well as on his own life. *Epistolae S. Bonifacii Mart. Prim. Mogunt. Archiep. German. Apost.* etc.; per Nic. Serarium, Soc. Jes. Presb. Mogunt. 1605. These were re-edited by Würdtwein, Mogunt. 1790. Dowling (*Notitia*, s. v.) and Cave (*Hist. Liter.* s. v.) attribute to him *Statuta Quaedam S. Bonif. Archiep. Mogunt. et Mart. (Dacherii Spicilegium)*. There are also sermons bearing his name (Martene et Durandus, *Ampliss. Collectio*, ix.; Pezii *Thesaur. Anecd.* ii.). The *Vita S. Livini* is assigned to him by Serarius, but this is disputed; Mabillon assigns it to an older Boniface (*Ann. O.S.B.* xiv. vii.).

The earliest life of Boniface is the memoir of him by Willibald (not the nephew of Boniface, the bishop of Eichstädt), apparently a constant companion of Boniface, and an eyewitness of much which he relates. This was rewritten, with slight additions, by Othlo, a German monk, in the 11th century. See also in Freher, *German. Rer. Scriptores*, Francof. 1600, the *Annales Fuldenses* (scanty and incorrect); Letzner, *Hist. Bonif.* Erfandt, 1603; Beka, *Hist. Episcop. Ultraject.* Franquerde, 1612 (faulty); Fabricius, *Gloria Fuldae*, Giesse, 1655; Bulteau, *Hist. de l'Ordre de S. Benoist*, Paris, 1684; Cave, *Hist. Literar.* Lond. 1688; Mabillon, *Annal. O. S. B.* Paris, 1703; AA. O. S. B. 1733; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Eccles.* Hamb. 1718; Pistorius, *Rer. German. Script.* Ratisb. 1726; Loeffler, *Bonifacius*, Gotha, 1812; Matter, *Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise*, Strasbourg, 1829; Gfrörer, *Allgemein-Kirchengeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1841; Wright, *Biogr. Brit. Literar.* Lond. 1842; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* Göttingen, 1846; Cox, *Life of Boniface*, Lond. 1853; Hope, *Boniface*, 8vo. Lond. 1872; Werner, *Bonifacius, der Apostel der Deutschen*, Leipzig, 1875. [I. G. S.]

BONIFACIUS, bishop of the East Angles. [See BERCTGILS.] [S.]

BONIFACIUS I., POPE and saint, successor of Zosimus, a Roman, son of a priest, Jocundus, has been identified with Boniface the priest, the papal representative at Constantinople during the time of Innocent I. (Baronius s. a. 405, § 15; cf. Bianchi-Giovini, *Storia dei Papi*, i. 353). Zosimus died on the 26th of December 418. On the 28th Boniface was elected bishop in the church of St. Theodora by a majority of the clergy and people, and consecrated next day in the church of St. Marcellus. Previously, however, a small body of the clergy, contrary to the command of the prefect Symmachus, had shut themselves up in the Lateran, and as soon as the burial of Zosimus took place, proclaimed Eulalius the archdeacon pope. Three bishops (including the bishop of Ostia) assisted at the consecration of Eulalius, nine at that of Boniface. Symmachus reported to the emperor Honorius in favour of Eulalius. Honorius decided accordingly, and ordered Boniface to quit the city. Boniface went no farther than the church of St. Paul

without the walls. He made an attempt to return by force, but was repulsed. The people, however, espoused his cause, and maltreated the officers of Symmachus. A petition was addressed to the emperor by the clergy of Boniface's party to annul the previous decree, and to cite both candidates to the imperial presence. Honorius agreed, and at the same time summoned a council of bishops to Ravenna to decide upon the question. The synod met, but came to no decision. Meantime Easter was approaching, and Achilles bishop of Spoleto was commissioned by the emperor to conduct the services of the feast at Rome. Eulalius, perhaps enraged at the approach of Achilles, rashly returned to the city in defiance of the prefect. Symmachus complained, and Honorius decided that Eulalius had by his conduct condemned himself, and that Boniface, as a reward of his moderation, should be received into the city and accepted as bishop. This was the third disputed election. (See full account, with all the documents, in Baronius s. a. 419; Jaffé, *Regesta*). Personally Boniface is described as an old man at the time of his appointment, which he was unwilling to accept, of mild character, given to good works (Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.*). Prostrated by sickness shortly after his accession, the fear of another contest in case of his death prompted him on recovery to obtain from Honorius a rescript by which it was decreed that, in case of a double election neither rival should be bishop, but that the clergy and people should proceed to a new choice (Baronius). In the contest against Pelagius, Boniface was an unswerving supporter of orthodoxy and Augustine. [PELAGIUS.] Two letters of the Pelagians had fallen into the pope's hands, in both of which Augustine was calumniated. Boniface sent them promptly by the hands of Alypius to Augustine himself, that he might reply to them. His reply, contained in the "Quatuor libri contra duas Epp. Pelagianorum" (*Opp.* x. 411, Ben. ed.; cf. *Repr.* ii. 61 in vol. i.) is addressed to Boniface, and bears testimony to the kindness and condescension of his character. Boniface was strenuous in enforcing the discipline of the church. Thus he insisted that Maximus bishop of Valence should be brought to trial for his misdemeanours before the bishops of Gaul (see letter in Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1584). So also in the case of the vacancy of the see of Lodève he insisted on a rigid adherence to the decrees of the council of Nicaea, that each metropolitan, and in this case the metropolitan of Narbonne, should be supreme within his own province, and that the jurisdiction conferred by his predecessor Zosimus on the bishop of Arles should be of none effect (Labbe, *ib.* 1585). On the significance of this transaction as regards the history of the relation of the pope to the metropolitans, see Gieseler, *Ecc. Hist.* i. § 92 (p. 265, Eng. trans.). Nor was he less strenuous in his assertion of the rights of the Roman see. Following the policy of his predecessors Siricius and Innocent, he vindicated the supremacy of his patriarchate over the province of Eastern Illyria. The people of Corinth had elected a certain Perigenes bishop, and sent to Rome to ask the pope to ratify the election. Boniface refused to entertain their request unless sent through the hands and with the consent of the papal legate, Rufus archbishop of Thessalonica. Rufus wrote a letter recommendatory of

Perigenes, and Boniface confirmed the appointment. Meantime, however, the party in Corinth opposed to Perigenes had appealed to the Eastern emperor. Theodosius decreed that canonical disputes should be settled by a council of the province with appeal to the bishop of Constantinople. Boniface immediately complained to Honorius, that this law infringed the privileges of his see, and Theodosius on the request of his uncle annulled it. Proposals however had actually been made for the convocation of a provincial council to consider the Corinthian election. To check this tendency to independence, and to defeat the rival claims of Constantinople, Boniface forthwith addressed letters to Rufus, to the bishops of Thessaly, and to the bishops of the entire province. Rufus was exhorted to exercise the authority of the Roman see with all his might; and the bishops were commanded to obey him, though allowed the privilege of addressing complaints concerning him to Rome. "No assembly was to be held without the consent of the papal vicar. Never had it been lawful to reconsider what had once been decided by the Apostolic see." (See documents in Labbe, iv. 1702 sqq.) Among the lesser ordinances attributed to him by Anastasius the most important is that whereby he forbade slaves to be ordained without the consent of their masters. Boniface died on the 4th of September 422, and was buried, according to the *Martyr. Hieronym.* (ap. Jaffé, *Reg.*), in the cemetery of St. Maximus, according to Anastasius in that of St. Felicitas (cf. Ciacconius, *Vit. Pont.* who gives several epitaphs). He was succeeded by Celestine I. His letters are given by Labbe, vol. iv.; Migne, *Patr.* vol. xx.; Baronius. (Compare Jaffé, *Regesta* and *App.* pp. 932, 933, where spurious letters and decrees attributed to Boniface are given.) [T. R. B.]

BONIFACIUS II., POPE, successor to Felix IV., of Roman birth but Gothic parentage, son of Sigisbald or Sigismund, was elected bishop of Rome on the 17th day of September 530, and consecrated five days afterwards in the basilica of Julius (Jaffé, *Regesta Pont.*). At the same time a rival party in the basilica of Constantine elected and consecrated Dioscorus. The Roman church was saved from schism by the death of Dioscorus a few weeks afterwards; but Boniface carried his enmity beyond the grave, and anathematized his dead rival for simony (cf. Cassiodorus, *Var.* 9, *Ep.* 5). This anathema was subsequently removed by Agapetus I. It has been conjectured (by Baronius, Labbe, Cave, &c.) that the double election was brought about by Athalaric the Gothic king, that he might have an opportunity to intervene after the example of Theodoric, and place a partisan of his own upon the papal throne. [THEODORIC, FELIX III. (cf. Gieseler, *Ecc. Hist.* i. § 115, p. 340, E. Tr. and reff.)] The pontificate of Boniface is chiefly remarkable for the bold measure proposed and carried by him at a council at St. Peter's, by which he was empowered to nominate his own successor. Accordingly he nominated the deacon Vigilius (subsequently pope, 537), and obtained the consent of the clergy thereto. Shortly afterwards, however, another council met and annulled the previous decree as contrary to the canons. Boniface acknowledged his error and publicly burned the document with his own hands. Some (e.g.

Bianchi-Giovini, *Storia dei Papi*, ii. 165) have conjectured that Boniface acted throughout as the tool of the unprincipled Vigilius; others (e.g. Baronius, Milman, &c.) that the object of Boniface was to prevent for the future the interference of the Gothic king, and that it was the Gothic king that compelled him to rescind the decree. It would have been equally difficult, however, to have brought the clergy and people of Rome to tolerate such a scheme. Of the pontificate of Boniface there is little else to record. A petition was presented to him (in which he is styled "universal bishop") by Stephen archbishop of Larissa, metropolitan of Thessaly, complaining of the encroachments of the patriarch of Constantinople who had suspended Stephen from his office. The result of the council held is unknown, but there can be little doubt that Boniface followed the policy of his predecessors in this matter and asserted the authority of the Roman see over the whole of the province of Illyria (see documents in Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1690 sq. also BONIFACIUS I.). According to Ado (quoted by Baronius and Labbe) Boniface dedicated the church of St. Michael the archangel "in summitate Circi." He died in October 532, and was buried on the 17th in St. Peter's. An epitaph is given by Ciacconius (*Vit. Pont.*). He was succeeded by John II. Two epistles are attributed to Boniface, one spurious addressed to Eulalius of Alexandria (cf. Hinschius, *Decc. Ps.-Isid.* p. 703), the other genuine addressed to Cesarius of Arles, confirming the decrees of the second council of Orange. (See generally Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.*; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1682 sqq.; Baronius, *sub annis*; Migne, *Patr.* lxxv.) [T. R. B.]

BONIFACIUS III., POPE, son of John a Roman, was elected whilst deacon, after an interregnum of nearly a year, to succeed Sabinianus. He was consecrated on the 19th of February 607. (So Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*; there is considerable difficulty in the chronology of this and the next three popes.) He had filled the office of apocrisiarius or legate at Constantinople during the pontificate of Gregory the Great, by whom he had been highly recommended to the emperor Phocas (Greg. *Épp.* xiii. 38). With that tyrant he is said to have been on terms of intimate friendship, of which friendship, and of the grudge of Phocas against Cyriacus, bishop of Constantinople, he took advantage, when pope, to obtain an edict by which it was decreed that the bishop of Rome alone had the right to assume the title of "Universal Bishop." Several modern authorities have called in question the authenticity of the edict, but apparently on insufficient grounds. (Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. 159, note; Lorenz and Schröckh *ap.* Gieseler, *Ecccl. Hist.* i. § 115, p. 344, note, E. Tr.) Its importance, however, has been much exaggerated. The papal supremacy has been supposed to date therefrom, and such was the orthodox view in mediæval times, as is expressed by Godfrey of Viterbo (*ap.* Gieseler, *l. c.*)

"Tertius est Papa Bonifacius ille benignus
Qui petit a Phoca munus per secula dignum
Ut sedes Petri prima sit; ille dedit.
Prima prius fuerat Constantinopolitana;
Est modo Romana, meliori dogmate clara."

By the title of "Universal Bishop" the predecessors of Boniface had at times suffered them-

selves to be addressed (Labbe, iv. 1690, where Stephen of Larissa so calls Boniface II.), and the bishops of Constantinople had openly assumed it and have arrogated it ever since. The edict therefore merely affected to ratify the assumption in the case of the former bishop as against the latter, and was only binding in so far as the edicts of such an emperor had any validity. The earliest actual assumption as opposed to tacit acceptance of the title by the bishop of Rome is in the *Liber Diurnus*, the date of which is supposed to be about 682-5 (Gieseler, *ib.* p. 375, note). During his short pontificate Boniface held a council at Rome which forbade and anathematized the evil custom of intriguing for the appointment of successors to bishoprics during the lifetime of the occupants. Three days were to elapse between the burial of the deceased and the next election. Boniface died within the year, and was buried on the 12th of November 607 in St. Peter's. He was succeeded by Boniface IV. No writings of his are extant, but certain letters written by him to Gregory from Constantinople are said by Ciacconius (*Vit. Pont.* i.) to be deposited in the Vatican. (See Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.*; Baronius; Labbe, *Conc.* v. 1615, 16.) [T. R. B.]

BONIFACIUS IV., POPE and saint, successor to Boniface III., son of John the Doctor, a Marsian of the city of Valeria, was elected and consecrated on the 15th of September 608 (Jaffé's dates are most to be depended on; but the chronology of Boniface III. and IV. is specially obscure; Jaffé does not style Boniface saint). A priest at the time of his election, immediately afterwards he turned his house into a monastery. From the emperor Phocas he obtained leave to convert the Pantheon into a Christian church, which he dedicated to the Virgin and Martyrs (Gregorovius, *Gesch. d. Stadt Rom*, bk. iii. c. 4). Twenty-eight cart-loads of relics, it is said, were conveyed thither for its sanctification, and from the magnificent dedication services dates the origin of the festival of All Saints (Wetzer, *Kirchen-Lexicon*). During his pontificate Mellitus, bishop of London, came to Rome on the affairs of the newly-founded English church. Boniface gave him a seat at a council then being held concerning certain monastic questions, and on his departure intrusted him with the decrees of the council to take to England, together with letters to Laurentius archbishop of Canterbury, to the English clergy, to Ethelbert, and to the English people (Beda, ii. 4). The decrees of the council (in Labbe, v. 1618) are spurious. The letter to Ethelbert which alone is extant (Labbe, *ib.*; Will. Malm. *G. P.* i. § 30) is considered by Haddan and Stubbs as of very questionable genuineness (*Councils*, &c. iii. 65, 66); two letters to Florian of Arles and to Theodoric king of the Franks are referred to by Jaffé in *Rass und Weis* (*Leben der Väter und Martyrer*, iii. 381, 382). His gift of privileges to the monastery at Canterbury is spurious (Jaffé, *Reg. P.*). The letter from Columban to Boniface on the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" (cf. Gieseler, *Ecccl. H.* i. 363, Eng. Tr., and Milman, *Lat. Chr.* i. 435 sq.) is looked on as unauthentic by Clinton (*F. R.* ii. App. 485). Famine, pestilence, and inundation are said (Anast. *Lib. Pont.*) to have rendered miserable the pontificate of Boniface. He

died and was buried in St. Peter's on the 25th of May 615, and was succeeded by Deusededit. Two epitaphs are given by Baronius and Ciacconius (*Vit. Pont.*). The latter further says that his tomb was opened and the remains removed to the new St. Peter's on the 21st of October 1603, where they now lie (cf. Gregorovius, *Grabmäler d. Römischen Papste*, 209). See generally Labbe, v. 1616 sq.; Baronius, s. a. 607-14; Migne, *Patr. lxxx.* [T. R. B.]

BONIFACIUS V., POPE, a native of the city of Naples, was elected successor to Deusededit, and consecrated on the 23rd of December 619 (Jaffé, *Regesta*). There is little recorded of him. According to Anastasius he was a man of mild character, and the same authority mentions certain ordinances chiefly ceremonial enacted by him. He is said to have completed and consecrated the cemetery of St. Nicomedes. During his pontificate Italy was disturbed by the rebellion of Eleutherius the eunuch, exarch of Ravenna. Fortunately for Rome the pretender was assassinated by his own soldiers before he reached the city. Boniface died and was buried in St. Peter's on the 25th of December 625. He was succeeded by Honorius I. Three genuine letters of his are extant. One is directed to Justus of Canterbury sending him the pallium, and conferring on him the right of ordaining bishops. The other two relate to the conversion of Northumbria. One, directed to king Edwin, urges him to become a Christian; the other, to Ethelberga, his affianced bride, exhorts her to the conversion of her husband (see letters in Bede, *E. H.* ii. 8, 10, and 11; also in Labbe, Baronius, and *Councils*, &c. by Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 72, 75-79). It appears from Bede (*Ib.* ii. 7) that Boniface had sent a previous hortatory letter to Mellitus and Justus which has not been preserved. The letter to Justus given by William of Malmesbury (*Gest. Pont.* i. 31) assigning the primacy to Canterbury, is of questionable authenticity. (*Councils*, &c. iii. 73; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* treats it as genuine. See generally Labbe, *Concilii*, v.; Baronius, s. a.; Migne, lxxx. 429 sq.) [T. R. B.]

BONIFACIUS QUERETINUS—March 16, circa A.D. 630. St. Bonifacius, surnamed Queritinus, by others called Albanus Kiritinus surnamed Bonifacius, as he is termed in the Utrecht MSS. used by the Bollandists, has his real history so mixed up with fable, that it seems impossible to disentangle the truth from the falsehood. According to the legend he was the Pope of that name, of a Jewish stock descended from a sister of St. Peter and St. Andrew, and born at Bethsaida; he was ordained priest by John, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in his 36th year; four years after he came to Rome, where he reigned more than seven years; with seven bishops, two abbesses, and a retinue of seven priests, seven deacons, and of all the minor orders by sevens, he came to Pictland, and founded churches at Invergowrie, and Restinoth, Forfarshire. He baptized King Nectan and all his court. After evangelizing and building churches among the South Picts, he went to Ross-shire, founded a church at Rosemarkie and dedicated it to St. Peter: and at the age of eighty and upwards, he died at Rosemarkie, and was buried in the

church of St. Peter. This legend has doubtless a certain amount of truth, and points to the entrance into Scotland of a strong Italian influence, which was displacing the Irish or Columban: the names of St. Boniface's companions are familiar in Scotch hagiology, and there may be also an engrafting of certain Irish elements. But a closer determination appears to be beyond our reach, than to say that he was an Italian, who, in the beginning of the seventh century, came to Scotland to induce the Scotish church to conform to the Roman customs, and probably closed his labours at Rosemarkie, as the legend says. (*Brev. Aberd. Prop. SS. pro temp. hyem. ff. lxx. lxx.*; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, pp. clviii. sq. 421-3; Reeves, *Culd.* 48; Bolland, *Acta SS.* tom. ii. 444; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* i. 281-82; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. ii. 567; *Edinb. Mag.* July 1794, p. 39; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 281-83.) [J. G.]

BONOC, B. In the Register of the Great Seal, book 36, No. 72 (MS. General Register House, Edinburgh), there is a confirmation by King James VI. of Scotland of a charter granted "per dominum Thomam Wemis capellani capellanie Sancti Bonach situate et fundate intra villam de Lucheris." In the original charter, which is engrossed, the saint is called Bonoc, "capellanus capelle Sancti Bonoci," and is probably St. Bonifandus B. who accompanied St. Boniface to Pictland [BONIFACIUS]. His relics were at Leuchars, Fifeshire. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 282, 283.) [A. P. F.]

BONOSUS, the founder of the sect of the BONOSIANI, was bishop of Sardica in Illyria at the end of the 4th century. Some authorities make him bishop of Naissus in Upper Moesia, but there is little doubt that that was another bishop of the same name (Tillemont, x. 754). Bonosus is only known to us as holding the same views with Helvidius with regard to the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, and as to his brethren, whom he affirmed to have been the natural offspring of Joseph and Mary. At the synod of Capua, convened by Valentinian, A.D. 391, to settle the rival claims of Flavian and Evagrius to the see of Antioch, opportunity was taken to lay an accusation against Bonosus. The synod was unwilling to consider the question, and transferred it to Anysius the bishop of Thessalonica and metropolitan, and his suffragans, who, as a neighbour of Bonosus, might be supposed to be more fully acquainted with the merits of the case. From a letter of pope Siricius, erroneously attributed to Ambrose, and printed among his epistles (*Ep.* 79), it is evident that Anysius and his brethren were reluctant to undertake the decision, and that the pope's authority was required to induce them to do so (Labbe, ii. 1033). Bonosus was on this condemned of heretical teaching, deposed, and his church closed against him. Bonosus consulted Ambrose whether he should employ force to obtain admission. Ambrose recommended patience and submission. This prudent counsel was not followed, and the difference was exaggerated into a schism, which lasted into the 7th century. The Illyrian bishops, while they deposed Bonosus, recognised the orders of those who had been ordained by him, in the hope of avoiding the

greater evil of schism. This proceeding was displeasing to pope Innocent, who addressed a letter to them, c. 414, stating that even if such a course had been necessary at first, that necessity had passed, and the evil had arisen of men who would have been likely to be rejected by the orthodox bishops getting ordained by Bonosus, and then presenting themselves for recognition by the church without formal recantation of their errors. (Innocent. *Epist.* xxii. c. 5; Labbe, ii. 1273.) At this time Bonosus seems to have been dead. Bonosus and his followers were widely accredited with heretical views respecting the conception and person of Christ. Mercator calls him an Ebionite, and a precursor of Nestorius (*Dissert. i. de haeres. Nestor.* § 6, ii. 315). But the Bonosians were more usually charged with Photinianism. (Gennadius de *Eccl. dogm.* c. 52. "Photiniani qui nunc vocantur Bonosiaci.") Whether these charges were well grounded, or were based on the general unpopularity of the sect, it is impossible to determine. Their baptism was pronounced valid by the 17th canon of the second synod of Arles, A.D. 445, on the ground that, like the Arians, they baptized in the name of the Trinity. (Labbe, iv. 1013.) But Gregory the Great in a letter to the Irish bishops (*Ep. lib. ix.* 61), includes them in those whose baptism the church rejected because the name of the Trinity was not invoked (cf. Gennadius de *Eccl. dogm.* u. s.). The truth probably is that the Bonosians were an obscure and unpopular sect, of whom little was really known, and of whom it was safe to believe all that was bad. They on their part rebaptized those who joined them. The 3rd council of Orleans, A.D. 538, ordained that they who did so should be arrested by the royal officers and punished. The Bonosians, with other heretics, are anathematized by pope Vigilius. (*Ep. xv.*: Labbe, v. 333.)

[E. V.]

BORBORIANI, one of the names given to certain Ophitic Gnostics, derived by Epiphanius (i. 85 A) from *βόρβορος*, "mire," as expressing their unclean living; so also Philaster (c. 73). It is probably an accidental coincidence that Clement (*Strom.* ii. p. 491), as Lipsius points out, describes certain unworthy Nicolaitans as "sunk in a mire of vice" (*ἐν βόρβόρῳ κακίας*). In another place (i. 77 A in Dindorf's text, omitted by Petau) Epiphanius calls them *Borboritae*, and in reality the name is probably only BARBELITAE with a different vocalisation. Epiphanius once (92 A) has *Βαρβηρώς*; and conversely one text of Nicetas (*Thes. Orth. Fid.* iv. 2) ap. Oehler in Addenda to Epiph. t. iii. p. 605), who follows Epiphanius, has *Βορβορίται*. A law of 428 (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5. 65) forbids the Borboriani (among other heretics) to meet for prayer.

[H.]

BOSA, bishop of York. He was a pupil of St. Hilda at Streoneshall (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 23), and on Wilfrid's exile in 678, when his great diocese was divided, was appointed by king Egfrith and archbishop Theodore to the bishopric of Deira (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 12), with his see at York. In 686, on Wilfrid's restoration, Bosa was expelled from York (Edd. *V. Wilfr.* c. 43), but returned on the second exile of Wilfrid in 691, and retained his see until his death. He is men-

tioned by Eddius as alive in 704 when pope John VI. directs that he shall be summoned to a synod on Wilfrid's business (Edd. *V. Wilfr.* c. 52). He died, probably, in that year or the following, leaving York open to John of Beverley, whose translation left Hexham open to Wilfrid on his return. His death is frequently placed by mistake in 686, the year of Wilfrid's first return, instead of that of his second. (See Raine, *Fasti Eboracenses*, i. 84.) He is highly praised by Alcuin (Gale, 718), who says that he was a monk, and organized the worship in his church on the principles of the monastic, or, at least, the "common" life. Acca, afterwards bishop of Hexham, was brought up in his household (Bed. *H. E.* v. 19). He was honoured as a confessor on the 13th of March (Raine, l. c.). He probably represented the mediatizing school of discipline, promoted by Theodore, in opposition to the vagaries of the Irish scholars on one side, and to those of Wilfrid, with the Gallican and Roman influences, on the other.

[S.]

BOSEL, the first bishop of Worcester. That see having been created by the division of the great Mercian diocese in 679 or 680, Tatfrith was nominated bishop but died before consecration. Bosel was then appointed, and governed until the year 691, when, his health having given way, Oftfor was appointed to succeed him (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 23; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 536, 538). His name is attached to a Malmesbury charter of 681 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 26), and to one of 685 (W. Malmesb. *G. P. v.* 352), both of questionable authenticity.

[S.]

BOSPHORIUS, bishop of Colonia in Cappadocia Secunda, a confidential friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great. His episcopate was prolonged through at least 48 years (Pallad. c. 20, p. 203), and must have commenced in 360. From the letters of Gregory we learn that he and Bosphorius had lived together in youth, laboured together, and grown old together (Greg. *Epist.* 141, 227). He had great influence over the gentler nature of Gregory, whom he did not scruple to address in very strong, almost vituperative language, when he appeared to be shrinking through timidity from public duty. Gregory, however, speaks of Bosphorius in terms of the highest respect, both for the purity of his faith and the sanctity of his life, as well as for his successful exertions in bringing back wanderers to the truth, acknowledging the benefit he had derived both as a hearer and a teacher from his instructions (*Epist.* 164, 225). His influence was powerful with Gregory at the chief crises of his life. He persuaded him to remain at Nazianzus after his father's death, and to accept the unwelcome charge of the see of Constantinople. Gregory bitterly complained of his unscrupulous importunity, but yielded (*Epist.* 14, 15). In 383 Bosphorius was accused of unsoundness in the faith; a charge which greatly distressed Gregory, who wrote urgently in his behalf to Theodore of Tyana, Nectarius, and Eutropius (*Ep.* 225, 227, 164). Basil addressed to him a letter denying the charge of having excommunicated his bishop Dianius (*Ep.* li.). He attended the Second Oecumenical Council at Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, ii. 956). Palladius speaks with gratitude of the

sympathy shewn by him towards the bishops banished in 406 for adhesion to Chrysostom's cause (Pallad. c. 20, p. 203). [E. V.]

BOTOLPHUS (BOTULF), a holy man, who, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, founded a monastery at Ikanho in 654 (*M. H. B.* 312). The place is identified, very probably, with Boston, or Botulfstow, in Lincolnshire. He is not mentioned by Bede; but Mabillon found in a MS. at Ouche a life of him written, not as he thinks by a contemporary, but by Folcard, abbot of Thorney, soon after the Conquest (*Acta SS. O.S.B.* iii. pt. 1, 1-7). From this we learn that Botulf and his brother Adulf were Englishmen, who went into Germany to learn the Gospel more fully, and there became monks. Adulf became a bishop, according to the biographer, at Utrecht, in which case he must have preceded St. Willibrord, who is generally regarded as the first bishop there. Botulf returned to England after acting as guardian, in a French monastery, to two sisters of Ethelmund, king of the South Angles, a person otherwise unknown. Ethelmund, with his kinsmen Ethelhere and Ethelwold, kings of the East Angles (*Flor. Wig. M. H. B.* 636), and his mother Siwara, offered him an endowment from the royal demesnes; but he preferred a piece of public, uncultivated land, and this was granted him. He took possession of Ikanho, expelling, as usual, the evil spirits, and built his monastery, instituting the rule of St. Benedict. The anonymous life of abbat Ceolfrith, of Wearmouth, mentions a visit paid by him to Botulf, who had taught the Benedictine discipline in the East Anglian church. His death was commemorated on the 17th June. His relics were removed by St. Ethelwold to Thorney (*Orderic. Vit.* xi. 33). Brompton mentions St. Pegia as sister to Botulf (ed. Twysden, 868), and accounts for the distribution of his relics. The life by Folcard, although it contains some difficulties is, possibly, founded on an earlier tradition. (See Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials for British History*, i. 373-375; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scot. Saints*, 283-84.) Upwards of fifty churches in England are dedicated to him, ten of which are in Norfolk (Parker, *Calendar Illustrated*, p. 311).

(2) A reputed bishop, whose remains, with those of St. Germinus or Jarminius, the brother of St. Etheldreda, were buried at St. Edmunds (W. Malmesb. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, p. 156). This is probably the same person as (1), the title being a mistake. [S.]

BOTWINE. (1) Abbat of Medeshamstede or Peterborough, mentioned in a grant of Offa to Eardulf, bishop of Rochester, in 765 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 139). He attests many charters of Offa, in 774, 779, and for the last time in the council of Cealchyth in 789 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 188; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 466).

(2) Abbat of Ripon; he died in 786 (*Sim. Dun. M. H. B.* 666), and was succeeded by Albert. A letter addressed by an abbat Botwine to Lullus, archbishop of Mentz (*S. Bonif. Epp.* ep. 119), may have been written by either of the two Botwines; and some confusion between them may have prevailed very early, as, according to Hugo Candidus, the relics of abbat Botwine, of Ripon, were preserved at Peterborough (H. Cand. ed. Sparke, p. 38). [S.]

BRADANUS, ST., gave name to Kirk Bradan, near Douglas, in the Isle of Man (*Acta Sanctorum*, Oct. 20, viii. 887) in the 7th century. [C. W. B.]

BRAN was apparently a very common name in Ireland from the 7th to the 9th century, and used sometimes by itself, sometimes in composition, as Bran-beg, Brandubh, &c. Etymologically it signifies a "raven." In A.D. 735 St. Bran of Lann-Eala (Lynally) died, according to the *Four Masters*, but really A.D. 740 (*Ann. Tig.*). At May 18 stands the festival of Bran Beg, of Clenadh, in Ui Faelain, in Magh-Laighen, i.e. of Clane, in Kildare county, and plain of Leinster. This is Branius, or Bran, one of the seven sons of Guimne, eldest sister of St. Columba; his father was Degillus, and his brothers Mernoc, Laeren, and Maeldubh. (See Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 478, n.^o 479, n. 10, 488, n. 13; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 240-7.) [A. P. F.]

BRANDAN, said to have been bishop of Man, but the early lists are doubtful (Stubbs, *Registrum Sacrum*, 154). [C. W. B.]

BRANDUBH. (1) Bishop—June 3. *Mart. Donegal* says, "This may be Brandubh, the bishop, son of Maenach, who is of the race of Mac Con, son of Maenadh, king of Erin, of the race of Lugaladh, son of Ith." Colgan (*Acta SS.* 596, n. 7) calls him bishop, and places him among the seven brothers who were saints, of St. Fagnenus or Fachtna, bishop of Ros-Alethir (now Ros-Carbery, in the county of Cork [FACHTNA I.], in the country of the Deali, and province of Munster; while in *Tr. Thaum.* (383, n. 17), he gives his complete genealogy, up to Mac Con, king of Hibernia (A.D. 196-225).

(2) Of Loch-muircemhair, i.e. Loch Ramor, in Cavan—Feb. 6. *Mart. Doneg.* says, "There is a Brandubh, bishop, of the race of Eochaidh, son of Muircemhair, who is of the race of Heremon." Among the saints belonging to the family of Maecarthennus and offspring of Eochaidh, Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 741, col. 2) cites, "Brandubius Episc.; videtur esse qui colitur Lochmunreamhair in Ultonia, 6 Febr."

(3) Bishop—June 13. In Colgan's 'Life of St. Fintan' (*Acta SS.* 352, c. 20), there is mention made of a certain bishop, named Brandubh, "vir sapiens, mitis, humilis," from the district of Kinsella, the most famous part of Leinster, who came to Abbot Fintan of Clonenagh, in his monastery of Achadh-Finglas, or Ardglasa "in plebe Hun-drona" (Idrona, county Carlow, over against Leighlin) to be a monk under him, and end his days in his monastery (Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. pp. 228, 230). Having had others under him, he wished now to be in subjection, and accordingly promised implicit obedience on this one condition, that if St. Fintan should die before him, he would soon come back to meet his soul. In three weeks or months after death St. Fintan returned with six companions "in vestibus albis cum magna luce," and called St. Brandubh away according to promise. St. Fintan died A.D. 634. (See Colgan's *Acta SS.* 352, c. 20 and 354, nn. 224; and also p. 355, c. 3, where "Sanctus Brandubius Episcopus, adiecto episcopatu," is enumerated among St. Fintan's disciples.) [A. P. F.]

BRANWALATOR, ST., whose name occurs in a Breton liturgy of the 10th century, in conjunction with St. Sampson (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 82); and Middleton abbey, in Dorsetshire, which claimed to have been founded by Athelstan, was dedicated to these two saints in conjunction with some others. (Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, Nos. 375 and 1119. Kemble marks the charters as spurious, but they are sufficient to prove that these two were the patron saints.) St. Branwalator's day is given as Jan. 19 in the calendars of Winchester and Malmesbury (in Hampson's *Medii Aevi Kalendarium*, 422, 435, shewn to belong to these two places by numerous entries).

[C. W. B.]

BRAULIO, succeeded his brother John in 627 as bishop of Saragossa, of which he had been previously archdeacon. He was deservedly famous as one of the most learned men of his age, to whom Spain was largely indebted for the revival of the study of the Scriptures, and the awakening of a taste for classical literature, with which his letters shew great familiarity, containing frequent quotations from Horace, Virgil, Terence, Juvenal, &c., as well as for the reformation of ecclesiastical discipline. His contemporary and friend, Isidore of Seville, extols him for having raised Spain from the decay into which it had sunk; in re-establishing the monuments of the ancients, and preserving it from rusticity and barbarism. It was owing to his persevering importunity that Isidore commenced his great work, *de Etymologiis*, the incomplete MS. of which at Isidore's death was placed in Braulio's hands to arrange, and was published by him in its present form. Braulio took part in the 4th, 5th, and 6th councils of Toledo, and drew up the canons of the last, A.D. 638, and in the name of the bishops and clergy there assembled wrote to pope Honorius I. a letter refuting the calumnies brought against them, the exquisite style of which excited general admiration at Rome; "quam Roma urbium mater et domina satis mirata est" (Isid. Pacens.). His voluminous correspondence includes letters between him and the kings Chindesvinth, and Recesvinth, and the bishops and presbyters of Spain and Gallia Narbonensis. There are also extant a life of St. Aemilianus (d. 564), one of the earliest promoters of the Benedictine rule in Spain, dedicated to Frumianus, consisting chiefly of the miracles attributed to him; an iambic hymn in honour of the same saint; and *Acta de Martyribus Caesaraugust.* These are printed in Migne, *Patrol.* lxxx. 639-720. (Cave, i. 579; Ildefons. *de Vir.* iii. 12; Mabill. *Saec. Bened.* i. 205.)

[E. V.]

BREACA, ST. The connexion of the Celtic tribes with each other was very close in the early Christian times, as is clear from the lives of their saints; and Cornwall stood in a near relation with the three opposite Celtic coasts, by mere geographical position. From the Land's End to a point about half-way up the north coast of Cornwall, the saints after whom the churches are named were of Irish origin. Eastward of this, Welsh influence is predominant, while on the south-west coast the connexion is with the kindred race in Brittany. One of the companies of Irish ascetics is stated to have

landed in the Hayle Estuary, on the north coast (*Acta Sanctorum*, Oct. 27; vol. xii. p. 293), the names given being Breaca, Ia, Uni, Sininus, Elwinus, Marnanus, Germochus, Crewenna, Helena, Etha (or Thecla), Gwithianus, Wynnerus, and most of these names are still found in the neighbouring parishes. The Irish annals, however, make hardly any mention of the missionaries who permanently left Ireland. The Celtic churches were mostly named after their founders, not dedicated to them, or to the saints whom we now find in the Roman calendar. The exceptions are characteristic, viz. St. Michael the archangel, St. Martin of Tours, and St. Germanus—the latter of course owing to the mission of the church of Gaul, during the Pelagian controversy. In Devonshire, which became English at an early period, the case is different, thus the churches dedicated to the Virgin are as common there as they are rare in Cornwall. Lives of Breaca, Ia, Elwinus, and Wynnerus, existed in Leland's time (*Itin.* 3, pp. 4, 15, 16, 21), which connected some of their companions with St. Patrick. It is possible that we may date the arrival of Breaca in the latter part of the 5th century, while the Welsh saints who settled in Cornwall must be dated in the latter part of the 6th. The pagan prince of the country, who killed some of the voyagers, is called Tewder in the Lives, and this is the name also of the persecutor in the curious miracle-play written in the Cornish language, on the Life of St. Meriadoc (Beunan's *Meriasek*, ed. Whitley Stokes, 1872). Paganism lasted long in Cornwall, and in the tumuli which contain burnt bodies (the custom of burning can hardly have long survived the introduction of Christianity) coins of very late Roman emperors are found (cf. Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 73). Breaca is said to have been born on the confines of Ulster and Leinster, *i.e.* in East Meath. Can the name be connected with that of the district in which St. Brigid's oratory was situated—viz.: "Breacae campus," *i.e.* Magh Breagh, between the Lifey and the Boyne (*Four Masters*, anno 226, p. 111; O'Donovan, *Book of Rights*, p. 11; Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 406). The Cornish parishes of St. Ives (Ia), Crowan, Germoe, Gwithian, Gwinnear (Wynnerus), are all near the parish of Breage; and St. Uni is the patron saint of Lelant, the next parish to St. Ives, and has chapels in several other places; St. Breaca's day is June 4. Breage and Germoe are united parishes, and a curious old Cornish proverb couples the names together in the distich,

"Germoe mather, Germoe a kling;
Breaga laveths, Breage a midwife."

[C. W. B.]

BRECAN (BRACAN, BROCAN, BERCHAN). Of those bearing this name it is difficult to define what properly belongs to each, especially as one, like the saint of Echdrum and son of Saran, is indifferently called Brecan and Brecan.

(1) Bishop of Ard-Braccan—Dec. 6. He was of the race of Eoghain, son of Niall (*Mart. Doneg.*), and bishop of Meath, but the name of his place is derived from Brecan of Ara and Killbraccan.

(2) Of Cill-mor-Dithruibh—Aug. 9. He is one of the nineteen saints of Kilmore, near the

Shannon, in the territory of Tir-Briuin, co. Roscommon. (*Four Masters*, by O'Donov. i. 327, n.°; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 214.)

(3) Of Cluain-catha and Ard-bracan—July 16. In *Mart. Doneg.* he is Breacan, of Cluain-catha (battle-field), in Inis-Eoghain (Inishowen, county Donegal), bishop of Ard Breacan, and abbat of Magh-bile (Movilla, county Down). He was of the race of Eoghan, son of Niall. Another dedication may be April 29 (*Mart. Doneg.* and *Tall.*; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 650, c. 8).

(4) Of Ros-tuirc—Sept. 17. *Mart. Doneg.* calls him Bracan, and that of *Tall.* Broccan, of Rostuirc, in Magh Raighne, in Osraighe, or of Cluain-iomorchuir. His name is still found in Kill-braghan, a townland in the parish of Kill-aloce, co. Kilkenny (*Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* v. 212, new series). In Colgan's *Life of St. Abban* (March 16) an account is given of a meeting between the two saints Abban and Breacan, the latter being abbat of the two monasteries in the region of Ossory, Rostuirc and Cluain-imurchuir. St. Abban had come for the recovery of some of his monastic property; and after the purpose was effected by means of a miracle, their friendship was cemented by a perpetual bond; but we must doubt the legend, which says this bond included St. Brendan of Clonfert (May 16), St. Moling (June 17), St. Flannan (Dec. 18), and St. Munna (Oct. 21). (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 618, c. 34; p. 624, nn. 40-4.)

(5) Bishop—May 1. This was Breacan of Ara, and of Cillbreacain, in Thomond (North Munster), of the race of Corbmacc Cas, son of Oilill Olum. He was son of Eochaidh Baldearg, son of Carthiune or Carthen Finn, both princes of Thomond, and the latter being baptized by St. Patrick. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* p. 158, c. 45; *Acta SS.* 17, n.°.) In the island of Inishmore, in Galway Bay, and diocese of Tuam, formerly called "Ara-na-naomh," i.e. "Ara of the saints," there is, says Colgan (though he entirely errs in his geographical account of the Arran Isles, and gives it as if this church stood in Inisheer, or the Eastern Island), a beautiful church, once a parish church, called "Templum Breacani," Breacan's church (*Acta SS.* p. 715, c. 7, n. 13). This Temple-braccan was S. Breacan's principal establishment, but he also founded and gave his name to Ardbraccan, the diocesan seat of the bishop of Meath, near Navan, co. Meath. (Petrie, *Round Towers*, 139; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 268 n.°; *Journ. Hist. and Arch. Ass. Ir.* 3 ser. i. 78-9.) [A. P. F.]

BRECC FELE, of Bealach-Fele—Jan. 15. *Mart. Doneg.* adds that he is of the family of Fiacha Suidhe, son of Feidhlímídh Reachtmhar. His father was Silan, descended from the family of St. Ita and house of the Desii (county Waterford), and Bealach Fele is now identified with Ballyfoyle in Kilkenny. (*Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* iii. 376, v. 191; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 220; Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 73, c. 2.) [A. P. F.]

BRECNAT, V.—July 3. She was also Brignat, received the veil from St. Patrick, and is named among the disciples or attendants of St. Monenna or Modwenna, St. Brigida's mistress. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 270, c. 1; 623, c. 13; *Vit. S. Monenn.* c. 14, 16.) [A. P. F.]

BREGUSUID (Beorhtswith, Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 632), the mother of St. Hilda and wife of Hereric; she had a vision of her daughter's greatness in her infancy (Bed. *H. E.* iv. 23). [See HILDA.] [S.]

BREGWIN, BREGOWINUS, the twelfth archbishop of Canterbury, succeeded archbishop Cuthbert, who died in 758, and was consecrated on St. Michael's Day, 759 (*Chr. S. Flor. Wig. M. H. B.* 545). His appointment is dated 761, in the Chronicle of Mailros, but the weight of evidence is in favour of the earlier date. His pontificate lasted, according to Osbern, for seven years (*Ang. Sac.* ii. 76), according to Eadmer for only three (*Ib.* 187). Although the majority of the historians follow Eadmer, the evidence of Osbern is confirmed by the charters, and his death may be fixed to the year 765, the day being Aug. 24 (Flor. Wig.) or Sept. 1 (Osbern), or Aug. 26 (*Obit. Cant. Ang. Sac.* i. 52). He was buried in the chapel of St. John the Baptist, at the east end of the cathedral church. His life was written by Osbern and Eadmer, neither of whom, however, gives any historical particulars about him, simply the dates of his pontificate and a few miracles (*Ang. Sacra.* ii. 75-77, 184-190). The historians of St. Augustine's (Elmhurst, 328) say that he repeated the artifice of his predecessor, directing the clergy to conceal his death until he was buried, lest the monks of St. Augustine's should claim his body. The most important relic of him is a letter addressed by him to Lullus, archbishop of Mentz, about 762, in which he offers him presents, and informs him of the date of the death of the abbess Bugge (*S. Bonif.* ep. 130). From the same letter we learn that Bregwin had visited Rome, and had met Lullus there, probably about 751. A synod held by Bregwin is mentioned in an act of the council of Clovesho, in 798, the subject being the detention of one of the estates of the see, which had been granted by Ethelbald of Mercia (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 399). Ralph de Diceto (*Ang. Sac.* i. 87) says that Bregwin received the pall from pope Paul I., but this was probably a mere matter of calculation. The charters which bear his name are from the cartularies of St. Augustine's, dated 761 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 129, 131), 762 (*Ib.* 132, 133, 137), and Rochester, dated 762 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 134), 764 (*Ib.* 135), and 765 (*Ib.* 137, 139). See also *Acta Sanctorum*, Bolland. August, v. 827-835. [S.]

BRENDAN (BRANDAN, BRENAINN) is the name, according to Colgan, of fourteen Irish saints: the *Mart. Doneg.* attaches ten to different days. But two of these are so conspicuous as to cast all others into the shade. With the exception of Brendan, abbat of Fobhar (now Fore, county Westmeath), on July 27th, there is scarcely anything known beyond the place and day of dedication of the other minor saints. The name is recognised now as belonging generally to St. Brendan of Birr and St. Brendan of Clonfert, who are counted among those who compose the second order of Irish saints: they are also two of the twelve apostles of Ireland.

(1) ST. BRENDAN of Birr—Nov. 29. He was son of Neman and Mansenna, of the race of Corb Olum, son of Fergus, grandson of Rudh-

raíge, the founder of the Clanna Rudraíge, and is said to have had a similarity in habits and life to St. Bartholomew the apostle. (*Mart. Doneg.*; Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 210; *Four Masters* by O'Donov. i. 190, n. ") But Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 38) prefers calling him son of Luaigne, and criticizes Ussher who calls him sometimes the one, sometimes the other. The monastery over which he presided, and from which he received his designation, was called Birr or Bior, "a stream," and is now represented by Parsonstown, at the south-west extremity of King's county, in Leinster. Among the scholars attracted to the school of St. Finnian of Clonard, were the two Brendans—Brendan son of Finnlogh, and Brendan of Birr "qui Propheta in scholis illis et etiam Sanctorum Hiberniae habebatur." He was sometimes called *Senior Brendanus*, to distinguish him from St. Brendan of Clonfert. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 113, c. 7, 395, c. 19.) It is said that, as a prophet, he foretold the birth of St. Colum-Cille some time before it took place. He was an intimate friend and companion of St. Columba, and seems to have aided him at the Synod of Teltown, near Kells, in Meath, and protested against the attempt to excommunicate him. (Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, iii. c. 3, and notes; also his Appendix to Pref. *Ib.* pp. lxxiii-iv.) When St. Columba, in consequence of the proceedings against him on account of the battle of Cooldreveny, wished to leave his home in Ireland, and cross the sea into exile, he sent a messenger to "*Seniorem Brendanum*," abbat of Birr ("a man endowed with the spirit of wisdom and counsel in devising and carrying out whatever would be useful and pleasing to God"), that he might point out where he should decide to remain in exile. (*Vit. Brend. Birr*, in Colgan's *Tr. Thaum.* p. 462, c. 44.) The ascension of St. Brendan in a chariot into the sky is given by the *Four Masters*, in A.D. 553, and in the *Annals of Clonmacnoise* in 562. He died on the eve of Nov. 29, in the 80th year of his age, A.D. 571, say Ussher and the *Four Masters*, but it is more likely to have been in A.D. 573. (*Four Masters* by O'Donovan, i. 206-7; Reeves, *Adamn.* 210; Ussher, *de Ecol. Brit. Prim.* Dubl. 1639, pp. 882-3, 955, 1064; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 38, 39, 149 sq.; Ware *Ir. Writ.* 4.) St. Columba got instant notice of his death in Ireland, by seeing a company of angels ascending into heaven with his soul (*Adamn.* iii. c. 11). His Acts are preserved in the *Cod. Salmant.*, from which Colgan published the portion relating to St. Columba (*Tr. Thaum.* 462, c. 44); and in O'Donell's *Life* (*Quint. Vit. S. Columb.* iii. c. 41, in *Tr. Thaum.* 438), there is mention of how "*encomiasticis versibus S. Brendanus et S. Dalanus ejus synchroni et amici cecinerunt*;" but these were probably only lines in praise of his virtues. His body is said to have lain in one grave with those of SS. Fursey, Conall, and Berchan, in the cemetery of the church called Tempull an Cheathruir Aíuinn, i.e. "The church of the four beauties," in Inishmore or the Great Island of Arran, in Galway Bay (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 715, c. 7, n. ¹²), but this at best could only have been relics.

(2) Brendan of Clonfert, A. C.—May 16, A.D. 577. The founder of the church of Cluain-fearta (the Lawn, Meadow, or Bog-island of

the Grave, now Clonfert, in the barony of Longford, co. Longford) was son of Finnlogh, of the race of Ciar, descendant of Rudraíge, and is often known by the designation *Mocualti*, derived from his great-grandfather Alta. His brother was Domaingen, bishop of Tuaim-Muscraíge (April 29), and his sister Brigh or Briga, abbess of Enach-duin or Annadown (on the east margin of Lough Corrib, in the barony of Clare, county Galway). He is said to have been like the apostle St. Thomas, in manners and life. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 9, 35, 113, 129; Reeves, *Adamn.* 221, n.) Full accounts of his life and seven years' voyage are given in the *Breviary of Aberdeen*, and in two remarkable lives of St. Brendan in the Brussels MS. *Lives of the Saints*, fol. 69, 189. (See Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 284-6; O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 125, 141; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 129-30; Colgan, *Acta SS.* and *Tr. Thaum.*, in Ind. Hist.; Alb. Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 266, sq.; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 55, 220, 223; Ussher, *de Brit. Ecol. Prim.* Dubl. 1639, c. xvii.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 28 sq.; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.*, viii., 429-30; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* ii. 474.) From these, we gather that he was born about A.D. 482 or 484 in Kerry, West Munster, and at an early age was under the charge of Bishop Ere, who placed him under St. Ita, with whom he became a special favourite, and whom he ever after regarded as a friend and spiritual mother. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 67-71.) By her advice he attached himself to St. Jarlath, and he is also traditionally connected with St. Finnian's school at Clonard. But Lanigan questions this relation between St. Finnian and St. Brendan, as the latter was not younger than his reputed master. He was always closely associated with his namesake of Birr, and, like him, was regarded as one of the second order of Irish saints, and one of the twelve apostles of Ireland: like St. Columba, he was a priest, and had a bishop attached to the monastery for the higher functions of the ministry. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 222.) Like his namesake, too, he must be regarded as a prophet. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 309, c. 3; 310, nn. ¹¹, ¹⁰⁻²¹.) Butler (v. 266) and Ussher (p. 955) say he was in Wales under St. Gildas and in the Abbey of Llancarven in Glamorganshire, building also the monastery of Ailech in Britain, and a church in a territory called Heth. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 190.) But that for which the name of St. Brendan is most famous is the seven years' voyage in search of the Fortunate Islands ("quaerendo terram repromissionis"), which Colgan (*Acta SS.* Ind. Chron.) puts as commencing in A.D. 545, and which speaks, at least, of the bold enterprise and Christian zeal so characteristic of those times. (Grub, *Ecol. Hist. Scot.* i. 55-6; *Uist Journ. Arch.* iv. 104-6. For the probable reason for his long voyage, see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 74, 619, c. 43, 624, n. ⁴⁶, who is ready to do battle with all who count it fabulous.) When he returned from his voyage and his sojourn in Brittany, he founded the monasteries of Clonfert and Annadown, placing his sister Briga over the latter. For the monastery at Clonfert and several others connected with it he drew up a particular rule, which was so highly esteemed as to be observed for many centuries by his successors, and was believed to have been written at the dictation of an angel. The dates of the

erection of the monastery of Clonfert vary in the Annals from A.D. 553 to 564. It is said that he built many monasteries and cells through Ireland, where he had 3000 monks under him. (Ussher, *ut supra*, 910; Archdall, *Monasticon Hibern.* 73; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 192, 310, nn. ¹¹ and ¹³.) He died in his sister's monastery in Eanach-duin, or Annadown, in A.D. 577. Archdall says that after his seven years' peregrinations he returned to Ireland, and became bishop of Kerry, where he ended his days, and lies buried at Cluenarca, otherwise called Luarca (*Mon. Hiber.* 37, 359), but his connection with a bishopric seems a fable (Lanigan, *ib.* ii. 30, 37). Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* p. 50, n. ⁵⁰) has a learned note on the dates of his birth and death, in connection with the prophecies uttered by St. Patrick regarding him; and in *Mart. Doneg.* (p. 130) there is a beautiful story of the heavenly music he heard from the altar, and his distaste ever after for any earthly music. He was contemporary with SS. Finbar, Kiaran, Finnian, and Lenan, and at a late period of his life was one of the four holy founders of monasteries who found St. Columba in the island of Hinba. (*Adamnan*, iii. c. 17. For a bibliographical history of the legends connected with St. Brendan, see Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. 221, n.; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 153, 166; Baring-Gould, *Myths*, 250 n.; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 4, 26.)—But St. Brendan has a connection with Scotland as well as with Ireland. Fordun states that he erected a cell in Bute, which took its name from that Bothy—"idiomate nostro bothe," and lived in Scotland about A.D. 531. He had many dedications all through Scotland, but another St. Brendan of a later date is imagined by Camerarius and Dempster (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 286-7; Skene, *Fordun*, ii. 381).

[A. P. F.]

BRESAL (BREASAL). (1) Son of Seghene, abbat of Iona from A.D. 772 to 801; his dedication is May 18 (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 232, 252). During his presidency two Irish kings were enrolled under him, and Iona became a celebrated place of pilgrimage. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 386, 388; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 500.)

(2) Another is mentioned by Tirechan, and cited by Ussher, as one of the disciples of St. Patrick. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 378, n. ²²; Ussher, *de Brit. Ecol. Prim.* Dublin 1639, p. 950.)

(3) The *Four Mast.* give the obit of Breasal, son of Colgan, abbat of Fearn (Ferns), at A.D. 744, but the true date is A.D. 748. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 223.)

[A. P. F.]

BRICIN, of Tuaim Dreacain—Sept. 5. *Martirology of Donegal* gives him as of the race of Tadhg, son of Cian, son of Oillil Olum. At Tuaim Dreacain (the mount or tumulus of Drecon, and now called Toomregon, near Ballyconnell, on the borders of Cavan and Fermanagh, *Four Masters* by O'Donovan, i. p. 45, n. ¹) he had a famous college, consisting of three distinct schools under three different professors—viz. of Feinechas or Brehon law, of poetry and general Gaedhelic learning, and of the classics. Amongst other pupils at his schools, St. Bricin had the most remarkable man of his age, Cennfaeladh, "the learned" [CENNFAELADH]. (See O'Curry's *Lect. Anc. Ir.* ii. 77, 92-3.)

[A. P. F.]

BRIGH (BRIGA). At Jan. 7 the *Mart.* *Doneg.* and *Tull.* place Brigh of Coirpre. In Evinus, *Trip. Life of St. Patrick* (lib. iii. c. 19) there appears a certain pious matron named Briga, the daughter of Feargna, who did what she could to aid St. Patrick on the banks of the Liffey, and Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* p. 185, n. ²³) thinks this pious matron and Brigh of Coirpre may be the same, and one of the "daughters of Feargna" celebrated on this day. But O'Clery (in *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 9) evidently inclines to the belief that it refers to Briga, the sister of St. Brendan of Clonfert. If daughter of Feargna, she was probably a Palladian Christian, and lived at Glashealy, near Narraghmore (*Journ. Roy. Hist. Arch. Ass. Ir.* 4 ser. ii. 498, 559-60); O'Hanlon (*Ir. Saints*, i. 390 sq.) gives the speculations regarding several of this name. [A. P. F.]

BRIGIDA (BRIDGET, BRIGHT, BRIDE). In the 4th Appendix to his *Lives of St. Brigida*, Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* pp. 611-13) gives a list of fourteen Brigidas who are distinguished from each other, and another list of eleven who are not so distinct. He also gives a learned criticism of the lists of Severinus Ketinus and Aengus the Culdee. As regards many of these, little can be said; and even of those who are better known there is no little difficulty in keeping the lines of distinction clear.

(1) Daughter of Aedh. On Sept. 30 the kalendars give the name "Bright" without dedication, but Colgan identifies her with the daughter of Aedh, son of Eochadius, son of Colla, son of Coelbadius, of the Dal-aradii, and says that Colla or Colladius was he who gave to St. Patrick the site for the church of Domhnach Combuir, or Magh-combuir, in Connor. She is probably the Brigida of Moinmiolain (March 9), in Dalaradia, the district which was governed by the offspring of Coelbadius. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 376, c. 7, 730, c. 10-11; *Tr. Thaum.* 611.)

(2) Daughter of Darius—May 13 and 24. Darius was son of Fergus, son of Ende Niadh, of the royal house of Leinster, and Colgan thinks that this Brigida is she who nursed so carefully her infirm husband and converted him; when after his death she dedicated all her property to God and St. Mochteus, the saint advised her to return to her father's house, build her cell, and there await the resurrection. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 730, c. 10.) Colgan tries to identify her also with Brigida of Huachter-aird (Oughterard, co. Kildare), and Brigida of Senboith or Shanbo, in Wexford (*Tr. Thaum.* 611-12).

(3) Daughter of Leinin, of Cill-inghen-Leinin (*Mart. Don.*)—March 6. Among the saints descended from the family of St. Foillan, Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 104, c. 2) enumerates "Brigida V. filia Lenini," &c., who is venerated on March 6, in the church of Kill-naninghean, in the district of Ui-Briuin. This "church of the Sisters" is dedicated to her and other five daughters of Lenin (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* p. 612, col. 2).

(4) Daughter of Neman and sister of St. Sedna or Sedonius (March 9), abbat of Killaine; sister also of SS. Gorba, Lassara, &c., who are all descended from Erc, son of Eochaidh, from whom the kings of Albanian Scotia are descended, through Loarne (brother of Fergus), son of Erc. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 569, n. ⁴.)

(5) V., abbess of Kildare—Feb. 1, A.D. 523. The designation "Fiery Dart" seems peculiarly appropriate for "the Mary of Ireland," who, although her fame on the Continent is eclipsed by the greater reputation there of her namesake the widow-saint of Sweden, yet stands forth in history with a very marked individuality, though the histories that have come down to us are mainly devoted to a narrative of the signs and wonders which God wrought by her. As to her acts, Colgan has published six Lives in his *Trias Thaumaturga*, and the Bollandists five. Colgan's first Life is the metrical one by St. Brogan Cloen, who wrote her praises about A.D. 525, immediately after her death, or, as Ware and Lanigan say, in the 7th century. The second is by Cogitosus, or Cogitus, of whom Dr. Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, pp. 199 sq.) seems correct in assigning the date as between A.D. 800 and 835. This Life is given by Canisius, *Lectt. Antiq.* tom. v.; by Messingham, *Floril. Sanctorum*; by Surius, *de Prob. SS. Hist.*; and by the Bollandists, *Acta SS.* Feb. tom. i. [See COGITOSUS.] The third is attributed to Ultan, bishop in Ardbraccan, who flourished in the 6th century, and died full of years, A.D. 656. The fourth is by Anmchadh, or Animosus, who died in A.D. 980, or by Annirius, who flourished before the end of the 7th century. The fifth is by Laurence of Durham, A.D. 1160. The sixth is by St. Chilian, or Coelanus, of Inis Kealtra, who flourished after the beginning of the 8th century; but the Bollandists decline to subscribe to Colgan's dates regarding this. The Bollandists, in addition to giving Lives two, five, and six above, publish one from an old MS. in the church of St. Andomar, carefully collated with an ancient codex, from the monastery of Ripen or Am Hoff, dedicated to St. Magnus, in the suburb of Ratisbon, and another Life from Hugo Wardeus, which Colgan edited, and Ussher refers to as "anonymous," "unedited," "old." Hugo lived before 1152. An abecedarian hymn in honour of St. Bridget, from the library at Basle, is given in the preface of the *Arbuthnott Missal*, p. xlii. In Messingham's *Florileg. SS.* are given, (at pp. 200 sq.) Capgrave's "Life of St. Brigida," and (at pp. 206 sq.) additions from various authors, and also the "Translation of SS. Patrick, Columba, and Brigida." (For later Lives of St. Brigida, see Sir T. D. Hardy's *Catalogue*, vol. i. 105-116. See an article on St. Brogan Cloen's hymn, in the *Irish Eccl. Record*, 1868, p. 222. See also Dr. Todd, *St. Patrick*, 11, and *Book of Hymns*, i. 60 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, ii. 2-18; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 3, 26; *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, i. 171-2, n. ²; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 287-91; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 379-81.) For the reason given above, it is more difficult to trace the historical points in St. Brigit's life than to recount the legendary accretions which testify to a basis of fact, could we but find it after so many centuries. In the legends there is no little beauty, and in almost all we find an undercurrent of true human feeling and deep Christian discernment. (See some of them given at length in Bishop Forbes' *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 288 sq., from Boece, *Breviary of Aberdeen*, and Colgan's *Tr. Thaum.* For a full and critical account of her Life, see Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i.

68, 335, and chaps. viii. and ix. *passim*; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, i. 65 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, ii. 1 sq.; Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, ii., 14 sq.) She was of the race of Eochaidh Finnfuathairt, son of Feidhlimidh Reachtmhar (the Lawgiver), and thus connected with St. Columba. (See the table of kindred in Todd, *St. Patr.* p. 252.) Her father was Dubtach, a man of Leinster, and her mother a slave or captive, whom *Mart. Doneg.* calls Broicseach, daughter of Dallbronach; and her mother's brother was St. Ultan, of Ardbraccan, who collected the accounts of her virtues and got Brogan to put them into poetry. She was born at Fochart (Faughard, where her stone-roofed well still remains), near Dundalk, about A.D. 450, and early brought up "bonarum literarum studiis." In order to avoid marriage, she betook herself to Bishop Macchille, at Usny Hill, Westmeath, who gave her the "pallium album et vestem candidam," dedicating her to virginity, about A.D. 467 (Lanigan, *ut supra*, i. 335, 377, 385 sq.), and soon acquired a name for wisdom and piety. In connection with the story of marriage, it is said that she prayed to become deformed, and that immediately one of her eyes swelled and burst. Her chief residence was the monastery of Kildare, "cella quercus," which she founded; but affiliated houses of both men and women ("de utroque sexu") were raised all over the country, she being abbess above all other abbesses, and the bishop with her at Kildare being similarly above all bishops in her other monasteries. (On the monastic and ecclesiastical position of St. Brigida and the bishop she had with her in the monastery for the performance of the higher functions of the ministry, see Todd, *St. Patrick*, 10 sq. and *Book of Hymns*, ii. 299 sq.; see also Cogitosus, Prolog. to the Life in Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* p. 518.) She is connected with Bishop Mel, disciple of St. Patrick. Her charity, piety, and miracles are shortly related in *Mart. Doneg.* on Feb. 1, and by the *Four Masters* at A.D. 525 (i. 171-3). Her lector and preacher was Bishop Nadfraoich; "for she said, after she had received orders from Bishop Mel, that she would not take food without being previously preached unto" (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 331), i.e. without having Scripture or some pious book read to her. In O'Donnell's *Life of St. Columba* (Fifth Life, l. i. c. 9 in *Tr. Thaum.* p. 390) it is related that she foretold the birth of St. Columba, as of a young scion that would be born in the northern parts, and would become a great tree, so that its top would reach over Erin and Albania. (For her connection with St. Ninnidhius of the clean hand, abbot and bishop, and the promise that he would give her the viaticum at death, see Colgan in "Life of St. Nennius," Jan. 18, *Acta SS.* 111-12, cc. 5, 6; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, i. 60, sq.; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 450 sqq.) Thirty years after the death of St. Patrick, whose winding-sheet she prepared, and at the age of about seventy-four, St. Brigida departed to the Lord, but the year of her decease is uncertain. Montalembert (*Monks of the West*, Edinb. ii. 393-5) gives an account of St. Brigida and her monasteries, and places her birth at A.D. 467 and her death at A.D. 525. He says, "there are still eighteen parishes in Ireland which bear the name of Kilbride or the church of Bridget" (*Id.* ii. p. 395, n.). The Irish annals however vary as

to the date of her death, but the most probable, and resting on highest authority, is A.D. 523 (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 13; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 287). Cogitosus (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* pp. 523-4) says that when she died she was buried at Kildare, her body and that of Bishop Conlaedh being placed on either side the decorated altar, and deposited in monuments adorned with gold, silver, gems, and precious stones, crowns of gold and silver also hanging above. (For a full and most interesting account of ecclesiastical art in this and the following centuries, with special reference to the tombs of St. Brigida and Bishop Conlaedh at Kildare, see Petrie's *Round Towers*, 197 sq.). But Ussher (*De Eccl. Brit. Prim.* Dublin, 1639, pp. 888 sq.) and others say that her body was afterwards translated to Down and deposited in one grave with St. Patrick and St. Columba. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* pp. 617-9. See this, however, controverted as an invention of the 12th century, in O'Donovan's note in *Four Masters*, i. 171; Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq. of Down and Connor*, 224 sq.; but Dr. Todd, *S. Patr.* 489 sq., seems to prefer the story of the tomb at Downpatrick.) In the Scotch account, she was buried, or her relics were kept, at Abernethy (see Leslie and Boece, quoted in Ussher, *ut supra*, p. 888); but it is more probably another St. Brigida (see BRIGIDA (6) below). St. Brigida was a very frequent object of invocation; and churches dedicated to St. Bridget, St. Brighit, and St. Bride, in all parts of the British Isles, attest the belief in the efficacy of her intercession. In Ireland they are almost numberless, and many forgotten. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* App. iv., 624-5; Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq. Down and Connor*, 31, 34, 35, 64, 86, 232.) In Scotland also the cultus of this saint was very extensive, and, as might be expected, her dedications are chiefly found in those parts which were nearest to Ireland and under Irish influence. (For a short list see Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 290-1.)

(6), V.—March 14. It is probable there was a Scotch saint of this name, whose relics were kept at Abernethy (Ussher, *Works*, ed. Elrington, vi. 256, 257, 451; Gerdon, *Monasticism*, ii. 275-9). A Brigida is said, in the Irish Life of St. Cuthbert, to have been brought from Ireland, and educated by St. Columba the first bishop of Dunkeld, along with St. Cuthbert at Dunkeld. (*Libellus de Nat. S. Cuthb.* c. xxi.; Reeves, *St. Adamnan*, 297; Ussher, *De Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Dublin, 1639, pp. 703-4, who also cites the dedication of Abernethy to God and to St. Brigida by King Nectan.) The Brigida of Abernethy is associated with the Nine Maidens. (See MAZOTA. Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, p. 291.) [A. P. F.]

BRIOCUS, ST. As is not uncommon with the early Celtic saints, who led a very wandering life (Gildas says of them "transnavigare maria terrasque spatiosas transmare non tam piget quam delectat"), he is claimed by several of the Celtic tribes. An old Life of St. Brioc is cited by Usher, 184 (see Leland, *Itin.* 3, p. 15), but his "Acts" are late and interpolated, and certainly rewritten in 1621. (*Acta Sanctorum*, May 1; vol. i. 91-4, and cf. vii. 539; Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 103; Lobineau, *Vies des Saints de la Bretagne*, 11; Montalembert, *Monks of the*

West, Edinb. ii. 273, 368, 373.) The "Acts" say that he was born in Corriticia (Cardigan), and educated from the age of ten by Germanus, bishop of Paris. His parents were idolaters (in Le Grand they are called Cerpus and Eldruda), until St. Brioc converted both them and his tribe. He at last settled in Brittany, where he died at the age of ninety. His monastery at St. Brieuc was made the centre of a bishopric, about 844, but his body was soon after translated to the monastery of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, near Angers, the monks flying before the Danes, as in so many other cases of the translations of relics. His bell was still existing in 1210—the importance attached to the bells of the Celtic saints is well known. St. Germanus of Paris died in 576, and this date would suit that of the plague, which is said to have ravaged Corriticia, and which may have been the yellow death, the plague of the 6th century. In this century too, there was a close connexion between South Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany, owing to the very considerable migrations which took place from Britain into Armorica, which account for the relation between the old languages of Cornwall and Brittany, and for the Celtic legends (such as that of Arthur) being transferred thither, and as it were localised. Those who place St. Brioc in the previous century, think that the Germanus meant in the original life was probably the more famous Germanus of Auxerre, well known for his mission to the British church. The count Rigual (Riwallus) mentioned in the "Acts" lived somewhere about the year 500. It is doubtful too whether idolatry lasted on to such an extent at so late a period. The parish of St. Breock, in Cornwall, is on the river Camel, just west of Wadebridge, and the parish fair is on May 1, the day of the saint's translation (see the Calendar in Hadden and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 31, and cf. ii. 73, 86); but his feast day at St. Poi de Léon was April 28 or 29. He is known in Scotland as Brayoch, Broc, Brock, Bryak, and had dedications at Montrose, Rothesay, and Dundrod in Kirkcudbrightshire, but does not appear in the Scotch kalendars (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 291; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. 223).

[A. P. F. & C. W. B.]

BRISON, a eunuch of the Empress Eudoxia, an orthodox Christian, and a faithful friend of Chrysostom. He took the lead in the processions set on foot to overpower the litanies of the Arians, and in an assault made on them by their rivals received a serious wound in the head from a stone (Soc. vi. 8; Soz. viii. 8). When, on Chrysostom's first deposition, Eudoxia's fears had been aroused by the earthquake, Brison was one of the messengers sent to discover the archbishop's place of retreat. He found him and brought him back (Soc. vi. 16; Soz. viii. 18). On his arrival at Cucusus Chrysostom wrote to Brison giving an account of his journey and its miseries. He begged him not to endeavour to obtain for him a change of place of exile. He would rather stay at Cucusus, wretched as it was, than undertake another journey. (Chrysost. *Ep.* cxc., ccxxiv.) [E. V.]

BROC. [BRIOCUS.]

BROGAIDH, of Imleach-Brocadha—July 9. He is said to have been the son of Gollit, Colleach, or Gallus, a Briton or Welshman, and

of Tigrida, sister of St. Patrick; he and his brothers came with St. Patrick into Ireland, and laboured with him to bring great stores of wheat into the heavenly garner. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 224 sq. for a full and learned chapter on the kindred of St. Patrick; see also *Ib.* 76, 177, 228, 259.) He was bishop or abbat of Imleacheach, in the barony of Castello, county Mayo, which from him got the name of Imleach-Brocadha. (See Todd, *St. Patrick*, 150 sq., 257 sq.)

[A. P. F.]

BROGAN (BROCAN). (1) **BROGAN** of Maethail-Brogain—July 8. He is said to have been one of the sons of Gollit the Welshman, and of Tigrida sister of St. Patrick, who accompanied their uncle into Ireland [BROGAIDH]. He was bishop of Breghmagh or Maghbrehgh, in Meath, among the Ui Tortain tribe, near Ardracran, though Evinus (*VII. Vit. S. Patr.*) also calls him "presbyter." (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* p. 110, n. ⁵¹; 136, c. 52, 224 sq.) He founded the Abbey of Mothell, co. Waterford (Ware, *Ir. Ant.* 100). In the Kalendars he is called "Brogan the scribe," and in the *Four Masters*, A.D. 448, we have in St. Patrick's household "Brogan the scribe of his school." In the Introduction of the *Mart. Doneg.*, edited by Drs. Todd and Reeves, there is mentioned, among "the more famous Books," "The Books of Brogan Scribhni" (p. xxxvii.), and in the Book of Lecan "Priest Brogan" is one of St. Patrick's "two waiters." (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 139-40.)

(2) **BROGAN CLOEN.** He was the disciple of St. Ultan of Ardracran, uncle of St. Brigida; he is said to have put into a rhythmical form in Irish the accounts of St. Brigida's virtues and miracles which St. Ultan had gathered and put into his hand. This Irish hymn Colgan has translated into Latin, and given in his *Trias Thaumaturga* as the "First Life of St. Brigida;" according to Colgan, reasoning from its own preface, it was composed about A.D. 525. (*Tr. Thaum.* pref. to St. Brig., and pp. 515 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, ii. 6.) But Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 379) follows Ware in reckoning him among the writers of the 7th century. Colgan (*Ib.* 520, n. ¹) seems to identify him with Breacan of Rosruiric on account of residence and day of dedication.

[A. P. F.]

BRON, bishop of Caisel-irrae, in Ui-Fiachrach-Muaidhe—June 8, A.D. 511. Dr. Kelly (*Cal. Ir. SS.* 4) identifies his see as Kilasbuigh-brone, near Sligo, in Ireland. In Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* p. 134, c. 35), he is "Episc. Bronus filius ignis, qui est in Caisel-irra, servus Dei, socius Sti. Patricii," but he can give no account of his receiving from Evinus the designation "filius ignis," except that his father's name may have been Aidh ("fire"). The *Four Masters* give his death at A.D. 511, and to this O'Donovan (i. 166-7, n. ⁸) adds a note on Cuil-irra, and traces, from the Annotation of Tirechan and the *Book of Armagh*, the wanderings of St. Patrick, till, "crossing the Muaidh (Moy) at Bertriga (Bartragh), he raised a cross there, and proceeded thence to the mound of Riabart, near which he built a church for his disciple, bishop Bronus, the son of Icnus. This is called the church of Cassel-irra in the *Trip. Life of St. Patrick* (part ii. c. 97), and now Cill earburbhoirne—*anglice*, Killaspugbrone—from this bishop" (Petrie, *Round*

Towers, 179; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 242, sq. 340, 410, 435.)

[A. P. F.]

BRONACH (BROMADA) V.—April 2. She was abbess of Glenn-siechis, otherwise called Glentegys, Clonfeys, and now Kilbroney since the 14th century (Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq.* 115 sq. 309, 315, 318). She was also called St. Broman, and her *baculus* or crozier seems to have been a relique which was preserved with great veneration and emolument in the parish church of Kilbroney, which derived its name from her.

[A. P. F.]

BROEDA, a Mercian ealdorman, also called Hildegils, whose death in 799 is recorded by Simeon of Durham (*M. H. B.* 671). He attests the charters of Offa from 764 to 795 (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* i. 137-205), and, after the death of Offa, those of Ecgrifith and Kenulf down to 798 (Kemble, *C. D.* i. 212). He is probably the person who is mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as a benefactor of Medeshamsted in 777, although the passage is an interpolation (*M. H. B.* 335), and the monastery of which he was the patron was Woking in Surrey (Kemble, *l. c.* p. 205). He was present at the Legatine Synod of 787 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461).

[S.]

BROTHERNUS, ST., the founder of Llanfrothen in Merionethshire in the 6th century (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 302). Rees says his festival day was Oct. 15, but the *Acta Sanctorum* gives him under Oct. 18 (viii. 358), in conjunction with the abbess Gwendolen (Gwyddelan) whose name is preserved at Llanwyddelan, in Montgomeryshire.

[C. W. B.]

BRUERDUS, ST., a name preserved in the Cornish parish of St. Breward, south of Advent (a corruption of Adwerna), and west of Althernun; the saint had also a chapel in the parish of St. Breock.

[C. W. B.]

BRUGHACH was bishop of Rath-maigh-eaenigh, a church situated in Tir-enna, in Tyrconnell, probably the church of Rath, near Manor Cunningham, county Donegal. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 384-5; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 377, n. ⁶; *Tr. Thaum.* 148, c. 136, 183, nn. ²²⁷⁻⁹.) But Dr. Reeves (*S. Adamnan*, 192, n.) says it is what is now called Raymochy in the barony of Raphoe. He is said (*Mart. Doneg.*) to have been of the race of Colla-da-Chrioch: he perhaps was son of Sedna and disciple of St. Degaidh; and his dedication is given on Nov. 1. He was consecrated by St. Patrick for Rath-Mugeaonaich, and afterwards himself consecrated St. Cairpre (Nov. 11). (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 394; *Acta SS.* 600, c. 7; Reeves, *Eccl. Antiq.* 245, 247.) But Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 77, 79) points out that Brugach must have been bishop there after St. Bolcan, and the latter could scarcely have been a bishop till after St. Patrick's death.

[A. P. F.]

BRUINSECH CAEL (the slender), daughter of Crimthan, and virgin of Magh-trea (Moytra, co. Longford)—May 29. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 459, c. 10, 789, c. 1) suggests that this may be the Bruinecha, a favourite disciple of St. Kieran's mother, Liadania (a widow-saint revered on Aug. 14 at the church of Kill Liadhuin). But instead of being daughter of Crimthan, some account her as one of the three sisters of St. Cronan, or Mochua of Balla (March 30), and

Z 2

thus belonging to a different race [MOCHUA], while others identify her with St. Burienna who went to Cornwall [BURIENNA]. [A. P. F.]

BRYCHAN, king of Brecknock in the 5th century, who is said to have been the father of twenty-four sons and twenty-five (or six) daughters, who are called "the third holy family of Britain." Giraldu Cambrensis (*Itin. Cambriae*, i. 2) only mentions the daughters, quoting *Historiae Britannicae*, which with him usually means Geoffrey of Monmouth. The fact seems to be that Brecknock was at one time a great centre of missionary enterprise, and numerous inscribed gravestones are still found there (Hadden and Stubbs, i. 169), and an incised cross at Llan-spydddy is still called Brychan's stone. The connecting various members of a tribe under the form of a genealogy is not uncommon, and the relationship of disciples to their spiritual teacher is easily regarded as that of children to their father. Anyhow the lists are valuable as shewing the connexion of the churches in South Wales and the opposite coast of Cornwall. Rees, (*Welsh Saints*, 138 seq.) gives them as follows: (1) sons—Cynog, Clydwyn, Dingad, Arthen, Cydfeyr, Rhain, Dyfnan, Gerwyn (or Berwyn), Cadog, Mathaiarn, Pasgen, Neffai, Pabiali, Llecheu, Cynbryd, Cynfran, Hychan, Dyfrig, Cynin, Dogfan, Rhawin, Rhun, Clydog, Caian. (2) daughters—Gwladus, Arianwen, Tanglwst, Mechell, Nefyn, Gwawr, Gwrgon, Eleri, Lleian, Nefydd, Rhiengar, Goleuddydd, Gwenddydd, Tydie, Elined ("Almedha," in Giraldu, who says that she suffered martyrdom on a hill called Pengingers, near Brecknock), Ceindrych, Gwen, Cenedlon, Cymorth (wife of Brynach), Clydai, Dwynwen, Ceinwen (whom Cressy identifies with St. Keyne), Tydfyl, Enfail, Hawystl, Tybie. The practice of making such lists also prevailed in Cornwall, where "Brychan's children" only mean the devotees who came from the opposite coast of Wales. Leland gives them from a life of St. Nectan, thus: Nectanus, Joannes, Endelienta, Menfre, Dilic, Tedda, Mabon, Weneu, Wensent, Merewenna, Wenna, Juliana, Yse, Morwenna, Wymp, Wenheder, Cleder, Keri, Jona, Kananc, Kerhender, Adwen, Holic, Tamalanc. William of Worcester gives this list, with a few variations, from the calendar of St. Michael's Mount, and most of the names are still recognisable in the names of Cornish parishes. [C. W. B.]

BUADMAELUS is given as one of the disciples of St. Patrick. When St. Patrick was passing through Connaught, it is said that Buadmal died and was buried in the place, where a church was built and took the name of Kill-Buadhmael, which was a Patrician church. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 134, c. 33, 176, n. ⁶⁸.) Among the disciples of St. Benignus are included Buedanus and Buadmelus (*Id.* 204, c. 28). [A. P. F.]

BUAIDHBHEO is given by *Mart. Doneg.* on Nov. 17, and as the same as Aenghus of Cill-mor, of Airthir Fine, of the race of Irial, son of Connall Carnach. In his *Life of Olcan*, or Bolcan (Feb. 20, see **BOLCAN**), Colgan says that Colladius, who gave St. Patrick a site for his church, had five of his seed noted for sanctity, e.g. St. Buabeo, son of Eochaidh (*Acta SS.* 378, n. ¹⁴). In Dr. Reeves's *Ecol. Antiq. Down and Connor* (p. 381 n.) mention is made of

Buaidh Beo, "son of Lughaih, son of Leathcu, son of Araidhe, a quo Dal Araidhe, at Loch Cuan" [A. P. F.]

BUAN, ST., the founder of Bodfuan, in Carnarvonshire, in the 6th century. His festival was held Aug. 4 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 280). [C. W. B.]

BUATAN, of Eithais-cruimm—Jan. 24. Thus he is designated in the *Mart. Doneg.*, but that of *Tallaght* has "Batani Methais Truim," which Kelly (*Cal. Ir. SS.* 44) identifies as Mostrim. Colgan calls him "Baitanus de Eathui Cruim, 25 Januarii" (*Tr. Thaum.* 377, n. ⁶⁸). [A. P. F.]

BUDDAS or TEREBINTHUS [MANES].

BUDDHA, BUDDHISM. The history of the rise and development of Buddhism is in itself one of the most interesting subjects of inquiry which modern researches have opened to us; but it is chiefly connected with the present work from the few allusions to it which occur in some of the fathers, and its supposed influence on some of the Gnostic heresies and Manicheism. Megasthenes is the earliest Greek writer who seems to mention the Buddhists; he is quoted in Strabo (p. 713) and Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i. 15), but the two quotations differ from each other. That in Strabo speaks of the two classes of Indian philosophers as named Brahmins and Garmanes (Γαρμανές or Σαρμανές), and calls the most distinguished of the latter the Hylobioi; that in Clemens calls them respectively Sarmanai and Allobioi. It is doubtful however whether Megasthenes was really referring to Buddhists in his description (as the bark garments would rather apply to Brahmanical ascetics); and Clemens certainly could hardly have understood him to do so; for he goes on to add, apparently from some other source, "and there are Indians who obey the precepts of Boutta, and they honour him as a god for his exceeding dignity" (εἰσὶ δὲ τῶν Ἰνδῶν οἱ τοῖς Βούττα πειθόμενοι παραγέλμασιν τὸν δὲ δι' ὑπερβολὴν σεμνότητος εἰς θεὸν τετιμῆκασιν). In another place (*Strom.* iii. 7), he mentions, apparently on the authority of Alexander Polyhistor, a class of Indians called Semnoi, who lived naked, and kept themselves strictly chaste, and worshipped a pyramid under which they supposed the bones of some god to lie; they also observed the heavenly bodies, and through them foretold future events; there were likewise women of this sect, Semnai, who also devoted themselves to a virgin life. Here again it is doubtful (see Priaux, *Journal of the Royal As. Soc.* 1862, p. 279), whether this is an exact quotation from Polyhistor, as the term Semnoi is not found in any known fragment of his, and Cyril (*cont. Julian.* iv. 133; cf. Clemens, *Strom.* i. 15) quotes him as mentioning the Bactrian priests called Samanaioi (Σαρμαναῖοι). Origen (*contra Celsum*, Spencer's ed. p. 19) divides the Indian philosophers into Brahmins and Samanaioi. Both these words, however, Semnoi and Samanaioi, appear to represent the Pali word *Samana*, as Sarmanes, the original Sanskrit word *Śramaṇa*; this properly means a Brahmanical ascetic, but is also a favourite Buddhist term, and in its Pali form exclusively means a Buddhist priest.

Jerome had heard the tradition that the Indian

Gymnosophist Buddha was born from a virgin's side ("e latere suo virgo generavit," *Adv. Jo-
vinianum*, i. 42). But the fullest account of
Buddhism is to be found in a quotation from
Bardesanes' *Indica*, preserved in Porphyry *de
Abstinentiâ*, iv. 17. He divides the Indian Theo-
logi into Brahmins and Samanaioi, and describes
the latter at some length. He says that, unlike
the Brahmins, they were not an hereditary caste,
and admitted any one to their communion; but
the novice must shave his body, assume a pecu-
liar dress, and give up his property as well as
abandon his family. They lived outside the
cities in houses and temples of royal foundation;
they prayed and took their meals at the sound
of a bell, and were not allowed to marry or hold
property. All this strictly agrees with Bud-
dhism, and each particular may be illustrated
from Mr. Hardy's account of the Buddhist monas-
teries in Ceylon at the present day. But the
information from all these fragmentary notices
in Western authors is at best meagre and unsatis-
factory; we must turn to Buddhist sources for
fuller and more definite knowledge.

Buddhism, though expelled from India, the
birthplace of its founder, at the present time
prevails in Nepal, Tibet, Burmah, Siam, Ceylon,
Tartary, China, and Japan; and its followers un-
doubtedly comprise a larger portion of the human
race than those of any other religion—recent cal-
culations raise them to 450 millions. Within the
last forty years stores of materials have been
brought to Europe, and many of these have been
diligently examined by various scholars, and we are
thus enabled to trace with ever-growing fullness
and certainty the history of this marvellous phe-
nomenon of the human mind. Mr. B. H. Hodgson,
the political resident in Nepal, was the first to pro-
cure copies of some of the Sanskrit canonical books
of Buddhism, with their Tibetan translations; and
about the same time Csoma de Körös published in
the *Researches of the Bengal Asiatic Society* his
analyses of some of the Tibetan works. Ceylon
has supplied a still more important contribution
in its Pali literature; and China has opened an
immense store of Buddhist materials, especially
in the accounts of Chinese Buddhist travellers in
India. Much of the wide field thus opened to
us remains as yet unexamined, but still Buddha
and Buddhism are no longer mere names and
abstractions. For the first a definite personality
begins to detach itself from the mist of legend
and miracle; and for the second we begin to be
able to trace the causes of its rise, and to explain
the course of development through which its
doctrines have run.

It is important to bear in mind, however, that,
with all this immense mass of literary materials,
Buddhism cannot be strictly called an historical
religion. Christianity and Muhammadanism still
remain, of all the great religions of the world,
the only two which are based on contemporary
memorials. It is possible to treat of the first
century of Christianity as an historical era, be-
cause we can appeal to the writings of those
"who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and
ministers of the word;" just as Dr. Sprenger
has shewn in his life of Muhammad, how clearly
and certainly we can watch the rise of Islâm
amidst the confusion and moral anarchy of the
7th century. But the annals of Buddhism have
no such power to transport us into the heart of

the 6th century before Christ, and to give us
eyes to see the rise of Buddhism as a protest
against caste and Brahmanism. The earliest re-
cords of Buddhism actually are that to which
Strauss would reduce the gospels—the mere
mythic aggregations which a lawless popular im-
agination has crystallised round a few dimly
remembered facts. Every step of our progress for
the first two or three centuries is through fable;
we find, in short, every sign which is held to dis-
tinguish a legendary from an historical period.
We seem to possess a vast amount of materials,
which only requires to be analysed to yield a
residue of historical certainty; but (to use Dr.
Arnold's words on early Roman history) "if we
press on any part this show of knowledge, it yields
before us and comes to nothing." We have no
criterion except our own subjective impressions,
whereby to distinguish fiction from truth; and
we are in continual danger of mistake, if we try
to transform the one into the other. The most
unsatisfactory of all processes is to suppose that
we have only to eliminate the miracles, and that
the narrative so reduced may be received as
authentic. We may thus indeed reduce the
poetry to prose, but this is not transmuting the
fiction into truth; it has been well said that
"le vrai n'est pas toujours le vraisemblable,"
but in these researches it is still more true
that "le vraisemblable n'est pas toujours le
vrai."

One of the great authorities for the life of
Buddha is the Sanskrit book called the *Lalitâ Vis-
tara*, which has been published in the *Bibliotheca
Indica* by the Bengal Asiatic Society; M. Fou-
caux had previously published in 1848 the Ti-
betan version of the same work, called *Rgya
tch'er rol pa*, with a French translation. This
work professes to be related by Ānanda, Śākya
Muni's cousin, and he introduces his narrative
by the formula, "this discourse was one day
heard by me;" but the entire form and con-
tents shew that this is only the fiction of a later
disciple, in whose eyes the era of Buddha and
his immediate followers had long receded into a
distant land of wonder and mythology.* Every
event is related twice: first we have a prose
account, written in a singularly bald Sanskrit
style, which dwells on every detail with the
most wearying minuteness, and continually di-
gresses into long strings of epithets and idle

* The real date of the composition of the *Lalitâ Vistara*
is uncertain. M. Foucaux says that the Tibetan trans-
lation, which closely corresponds to our present Sanskrit
text, is not older than the 6th or 7th century of our era;
but four successive Chinese translations were made of a
Sanskrit work which seems to have been the *Lalitâ Vis-
tara* (see M. Julien's note, *apud* Foucaux, *Rgya tch'er
rol pa*, Intro. p. xvii.). The first was made apparently
between A.D. 70 and 76; the second A.D. 309; the third
about A.D. 652; for the fourth no date is given. As only
the third and fourth have the same division as the San-
skrit text into twenty-seven chapters, it would appear that
the two earlier represent another text, but for an accu-
rate judgment on these points we need a careful compari-
son, which has not yet been instituted. The *Lalitâ Vis-
tara* is not found in Pali, but its legends are all well
known in Ceylon. Mr. Hardy has given the Ceylonese
legends (*Manual*, ch. 7) from the *Pujâwâlîya* (composed
in the 13th century); and the Burmese version from the
Pali is given in Bishop Bigandet's *Life of Gaudama*.
They agree in the main very closely with the *Lalitâ
Vistara*, but carry on the history to Buddha's death.

exaggerations when Buddha's name is mentioned; this is followed by a poetical version (gāthā) which generally goes over the same ground as the prose, but is written in a very peculiar dialect, bristling with curiously ungrammatical forms.^b These songs in this rude patois seem to us to be the original versions of the various legends, as they were recited by the unlettered multitude; and they have been reduced to prose by some Buddhist monk who wrote Sanskrit just as a mediaeval monk of France or Germany wrote Latin. Other details of Buddha's life, all more or less marvellous, can be added from the other works in the Sanskrit collection of Nepal and the Pali of Ceylon, and a large proportion of the legends are found alike in every Buddhist literature; but all are the production of a subsequent period. We thus see that the very foundations of early Buddhist history are unstable; we find ourselves face to face with sacred ballads, not contemporary chronicles; and we might as well attempt to build up a certain history of regal Rome or of Greece before Pistratus as to claim for the realm of authentic history the period of the first rise of Buddhism in India.

The dates of the birth and death of Śākya Muni, or Buddha, have been generally fixed by European scholars as B.C. 622 and 543;^c but Professor Max Müller (*Ancient Sanskrit Lit.* pp. 298, 299) has shewn good reason for preferring B.C. 556 and 477, though even these dates are only conjectural; Professor Kern has recently tried to fix the date of the Nirvāpa as B.C. 370 or 388. Buddha's proper name was Sarvārthasiddha or Siddhārtha ("he by whom all ends are accomplished," *Lal. V. p. 109*), but his more usual title is Śākya Muni, "the holy sage of the Śākyas." He is also called Gautama, "the descendant of Gotama," or more properly Śramaṇa Gautama, "the Gautamid ascetic;" but the origin of this name is obscure. The Buddhists derive it from an old ancestor of the solar race, whose son Ikshvāku is said to have reigned near Tatta on the Indus (but cf. *Ind. Studien*, v. 425), from whence long subsequently the Śākya branch of the family emigrated to Kapilavastu. On the other hand, Gotama is one of the old Vedic saints of Hindu tradition; and as we find some of his descendants in later Sanskrit legends living at the courts of the eastern part of India (Kuru-panchāla, Videha, &c.), some of those who traced their descent from him may have been family priests of the Śākyas; and these latter may have assumed the family name of their spiritual directors (Burnouf, *Introduction à l'Hist. du Bouddhisme Indien*, p. 155).

^b This double narration distinguishes the so-called *Vaṭṭapala sūtras*, or "developed discourses," from the simple sūtras; the latter are the earlier (see Burnouf, *Introd.* pp. 64, 124). This peculiarity is not found in the Pali books.

^c The Buddhists of Ceylon give these dates, but even these seem to have been falsified. The other Buddhist nations differ widely as to the dates of the two events. Thus the Tibetan books (Foucaux, *Rgya Tek'er rol pa*, p. xi.) give fourteen different dates of Buddha's death, varying between B.C. 2422 and B.C. 576; and the Chinese dates similarly vary between B.C. 1130, 949, and 767 (*Ibid.*).

His father Suddhodana was the king of a little district called Kapilavastu, and belonged to the Kshatriya family of the Śākyas, who were a branch of the great family of Ikshvāku. Ikshvāku is also the ancestor of the Solar dynasty of Ayodhyā (Oudh), the family in which the demigod Rāma was born, whose exploits are the subject of the Sanskrit epic, the Rāmāyana. It is curious that amidst the copious geographical notices which abound in Hindu Sanskrit literature, the name Kapilavastu never occurs; and Professor Wilson has even conjectured that it may have been merely an allegorical name as expressing the relation between Buddhism and the Sāṅkhya philosophy of Kapila.^d The universal tradition of all Buddhist nations is a strong argument that such a place must once have existed; yet it is singular that Brahmanical prejudice should have suppressed all notice of it. The Chinese Buddhist traveller Fahian (A.D. 399-414) describes Kapilavastu as in his time "a wilderness untenanted by man;" and Hiouen T'sang (A.D. 630-644) speaks of the royal city as in ruins; the palace was built of bricks, and its ruins were still lofty and solid, but deserted for ages. Still their reports only prove that the site was traditionally identified at that time; and as a thousand years had passed since Buddha's death, this popular belief may have had no better foundation than that which identifies Arthur with Glastonbury or Atræus with the treasury at Mycenæ. Kapilavastu lay in the eastern part of the ancient kingdom of Kosala, and was probably to the north of the present Gorakhpur. It is said to have been besieged and destroyed, shortly after Buddha's death, by Virūdhaka, the king of Kosala.

The *Lalitā Vistara* is supposed to have been repeated by Buddha in a bamboo grove in the garden of Jetavana, at Śrāvastī, to the Bodhisattwas and Śrāvakas who attended him; one of these was Ananda, who professes to be the relator of the work in its present form. The recital commences with the second chapter, the scene of which is laid in the Tushita heaven, where Buddha, then a Bodhisattwa or potential Buddha, is represented as sitting in his palace, surrounded by countless millions of divine beings, who tell him that "the time is come." He then announces to them that he will be born in a mortal mother's womb in twelve years. Then follows a curious discussion as to the fated time, continent, region, and family, in which his last human birth is to take place. He can only be born in the full maturity of the world after one of its ever-recurring creations—in a central continent like India—in a central region of it, and in a family of the Brahman or Kshatriya caste, according as either may happen at the time to be pre-eminent. As at this particular time the latter is said to be the most honoured,^e Buddha

^d The Buddhists say that the exiled princes from Tatta (or Benares?) settled near the hermitage of the Rishi Kapila, hence the name of their city, Kapila-vastu, "the dwelling of Kapila." *Vastu* properly means "substance," but may be here used for *vāstu*, *āstru*.

^e This seems to be connected with a very obscure point in Indian literary history. In the Rig Veda the caste system of later times is unknown; traces of the three twice-born classes are indeed found (thus the Brahmins seem referred to in the word *brahman*, "priest," and some-

will be born in a Kshatriya family. Next are discussed the different royal families of India, and one by one each is rejected, until finally Buddha shews that the Śākya royal family of Kapilavastu possesses the requisite qualifications. Buddha then leaves the Bodhisattva Maitreya as his vicegerent in the Tushita heaven, during his absence on earth, and puts his own diadem on his head.

The scene of the legend now changes to earth.

Māyādevī,^a the queen of King Śuddhodana, asks the king's leave to fast and practise austerities in a palace by herself; her abode is to be decked with every mark of honour, and to resound with music and song. While she is sleeping there, Buddha descends from heaven, in the form of a white elephant, attended by myriads of heavenly beings, and enters her womb. She perceives his arrival in a dream, and announces it to the king. He summons the Brahmans "skilled in the Rig Veda and the Śāstras," and they declare that the king who will be born, is destined either to be a universal emperor of ideal justice and glory, or, if he become a devotee, to be a Buddha who shall give blessings to all the worlds. (Similar pretended prophecies of the signs of a Buddha in the Vedas are mentioned in the Ceylonese legends, see Hardy, *Manual*, p. 371.)

When the time for Buddha's birth approached, the queen went with a royal retinue to the garden of Lumbini, and there under a *figus religiosa* is Buddha born, coming forth miraculously from her right side. The gods, Indra and Brahmā, received the infant in their arms; his body is marked with thirty-two pre-eminent and eighty secondary marks; as a protuberance on the top of the skull, curled hair, a circle of hair between the eyebrows, &c., many of which peculiarities are still to be seen in all the images of

times we have the actual word *brāhmaṇa*, and similarly we may find the initial hints of the later Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas), but, with the exception of one verse in the last book, it is entirely silent as to the fourth or śūdra caste. In the other Vedas we find the caste system fully developed. But in the upaniṣads, i. e. those treatises of religious philosophy which form a part of the later Vedic literature and subsequently gave rise to the Vedānta system, we find the great teachers of this highest knowledge to be Kshatriyas and not Brahmans, and Brahmans are continually represented as going to the great Kshatriya kings (especially Janaka of Videha) to become their pupils. In the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad, v. 3, the great sage Gautama Aruni goes to king Pravāhana and begs to be instructed by him. The king complies, after first saying: "This knowledge before thee never came to the Brahmans; therefore hitherto in all worlds the right of teaching it has belonged exclusively to the Kshatriya caste." Similarly the gāyatrī, or most sacred verse of the Rig Veda, occurs in a hymn by Viśvāmitra, who in later tradition is described as a Kshatriya who by penances extorted his admission into the Brahmanical caste.

^a Her very name seems to indicate an allegory, as *Māyā* is the well-known Sanskrit word for "illusion," which is continually personified as Nature, to express the illusive character of all created things.

^b The *Lalitā Vistara* nowhere states explicitly that Buddha's mother was a virgin; it only states (Sansk. text, p. 27, l. 13) that she had never brought forth children, and (p. 31, l. 11) that she had, with her husband's consent, made a vow of ascetic chastity for 32 months (cf. Hardy's *Manual*, p. 141). Csoma de Kőrös (As. Res. xx. 299) states that the belief of her virginity comes from Mongolia; but the tradition was known to Jerome, see *sup.*

Buddha. Śākya Muni is no sooner born than he takes seven steps towards each of the four quarters of the horizon, and also towards the nadir and zenith, each time declaring his own unrivalled superiority. [Buddha here interrupts his discourse in the original to prophesy that many of his future followers will disbelieve these miracles of his birth, and he forewarns them of the hell prepared for their punishment.]

Seven days after his birth, the queen dies; the infant is named Sarvārthasiddha, and is entrusted to the care of his maternal aunt Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī. Soon, afterwards, an old sage named Asita,^b residing with his nephew on the side of Himālaya, having seen by his divine intuition what had come to pass, repaired to Kapilavastu to visit the infant. On being admitted to see him, he takes the child in his arms, and prophesies the future glory of his career. He then weeps to think that he himself is old, and cannot hope to live to hear the Buddha's doctrines from his own lips.

About this time the child is taken to the temples of the gods; directly he sets his foot within their precincts, all the images rise from their places and fall at his feet. [Cf. the falling down of the idols of Egypt in the *Evangelium Infantiae*, § 10.]

After some years he is taken with immense pomp to the writing school; on his entry the teacher Viśvāmitra, unable to bear the splendour of his appearance, falls to the ground before him. A deity raises him up and tells him who his pupil is. Buddha then takes a writing-tablet of sandalwood, and asks the teacher in which kind of writing he wishes to instruct him, at the same time enumerating sixty-four different kinds. Viśvāmitra, astonished, confesses that he does not even know the names of these kinds of writing; and Buddha then gives a lesson to the whole school, by which every letter of the Sanskrit alphabet becomes associated with some truth of Buddhist philosophy. [Cf. the legend in the *Evangelium Infantiae*, § 48.]

When he becomes a little older, he goes one day with some of his companions to wander in the fields; he turns aside and seats himself under a tree, and plunges into profound meditation, and there he is visited by the five heavenly sages. Meanwhile the king, uneasy at his long absence, sends his servants to look for him; one of the ministers finds him seated under the tree; the shadow of all the other trees had turned with the sun, but that under which he sat still kept its shadow over him.

When the prince is grown up, the king proposes that he should marry, as he hopes that in this way he may prevent the threatened danger of his son becoming an ascetic and abandoning all family ties. Śākya Muni describes the virtues which the woman must possess who is to be his wife, and the family priest is commissioned to seek in the city for a lady who fulfils the required conditions. "Whatever maiden has these excellences," says the king, "be she the daughter of a Kshatriya, a Brāhmaṇa, a Vaiśya or a Śūdra, bring her to us." The Brahman finds one Gopā, the daughter of a Kshatriya of the royal race, named Dandapāni, who exactly

^a Cf. Kern, *Virāhamihira*, Pref. p. 41.

answers the description; but her father demurs. "The young prince," he says, "has lived all his life luxuriously in a palace, and it is the custom of our family, that our maidens can only be given in marriage to one skilled in arts; now the prince knows nothing of the use of the sword, bow, or quiver." A public tournament is proclaimed for Gopā's hand, and the young prince first shows his superiority in writing and arithmetic; next in leaping, swimming, running, wrestling, archery, and then in a long list of other physical and intellectual accomplishments;¹ and Gopā is finally given to the victor as his queen. She takes the first place in a harem of 84,000 wives.

Śākya Muni remained for some time apparently happy in his palace, but the heavenly beings saw that the time was drawing near; and the 13th chapter, with a truer poetry than we usually find in Buddhist literature, describes how they now exerted their power to awaken him to the consciousness of his lofty destiny. As he sat in his chamber, listening to the musicians, a heaven-sent undertone pierced his soul amidst the jocund strains, reminding him that the time was come, and that all creation was awaiting its deliverer. The king Śuddhodana, now alarmed by a dream, builds three palaces for spring, summer, and winter, to divert his son from forsaking the world, as he suspected that he was thinking of doing. But nothing could stop the march of destiny. One morning the prince proposed to visit the great pleasure garden, and goes out by the eastern gate. The king had ordered his guards to keep away from the road everything which might offend the prince's eyes; but by accident he sees an old man in the road before him—his first sight of old age.² He at once stops and asks the charioteer the meaning of the spectacle. He asks whether it is a peculiar condition of one particular family, or common to all men; and on hearing his answer, the prince turns back at once to the palace. Similarly, another day he goes out by the southern gate and meets a man in a fever, and another time near the western gate a man lying dead on a bier; his first sight of disease and death. The next time, as he goes out by the northern gate, he meets an ascetic, calm and passionless, with his rags and begging-pot; and at the sight all his repressed emotions burst forth, and he resolves to become himself the same. The king, on hearing of this last encounter, has his son carefully guarded, and he redoubles his care to divert his mind by music and song; but one night the prince rises from his bed, when all are asleep, and goes to his faithful attendant Chhandaka, and reveals to him his purpose as well as his real nature. Chhandaka, weeping, yields to his entreaty, and saddles the prince's horse; and the two pass

through the silent streets, and go out from the city. They had travelled thirty miles when day dawns, and the prince then sends Chhandaka back with the horse and all his ornaments; and having cut his hair, and changed garments with a hunter, pursues his way alone. Every scene of this memorable legend was holy ground to the Buddhist; and the Chinese travellers in India in the 5th and 7th centuries visited every spot in succession, and found each a place of constant pilgrimage.

Śākya Muni first goes to Vaiśālī, and begs a celebrated Brahman there, named Arāḍa Kālāma, to initiate him as a religious student. The teacher at once discovers that he has nothing to teach his new scholar, and he begs him to join in instructing his 300 disciples. But Śākya Muni soon reflects that the Brahman's doctrine cannot bestow complete liberation, and he leaves Vaiśālī, and proceeds to the mountain Pāṇḍava, near Rājagriha, in South Behar (Magadha), and there he remained some time, under the protection of the king Bimbisāra. After a time he becomes a pupil of a great Brahman teacher in Rājagriha, named Rudraka, but the same result ensues as at Vaiśālī. The teacher soon acknowledges his pupil's superiority, and Śākya Muni again discovers that not by such teaching is complete liberation to be obtained. Five of Rudraka's disciples follow Śākya Muni, when he leaves Rājagriha, and go with him to Uruvilvā, near the river Nairanjana, where for six years he practises the most tremendous asceticism; he surpasses in fact the different penances by which Hindu legends distinguish their sages. His body becomes emaciated to the last degree; and then Māra, the demon of desire, who had been long standing behind him, in vain watching his opportunity, appears to him and remonstrates against his destroying himself by austerities, as life is the indispensable condition of performing religious acts; and bids him present offerings to the gods. But Śākya Muni resolves to persevere, as he shall thus vanquish Māra and his allies, desires, passions, hypocrisy, praise, &c.; and the demon, abashed, vanishes. Now, however, Śākya Muni determines to adopt a totally different course, as he reflects that in his present emaciated state, even if he attained perfect intelligence, he would be too weak to communicate it to others, and so the grand end of becoming a Buddha would be unsecured; and he therefore begins to take proper food. His five disciples, disgusted at what they regard as a relaxation of his vow, leave him and go to Benares; while he remains in Uruvilvā, and ten village maidens bring him rice and other food. He clothes himself with a cloth from a cemetery, which he makes into a devotee's dress. He then goes to Buddha Gayā, and seats himself under the sacred *figus religiosa*, called the Bodhi tree,¹ resolved that he will never rise from his seat until he obtains the perfect intelligence of a Buddha. He is here interrupted by Māra, who exerts his whole power to hinder the sage from attaining his object. He at first attacks him

¹ Among the philosophical studies are mentioned the Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, and Nyāya (sc. hetuvidyā), but neither the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā nor Vedānta.

² This celebrated Buddhist legend is reproduced in the romance of *Barlaam and Josaphat*; for this and other traces of Buddhist influence in that book, see a paper by Felix Liebrecht in Ebert's *Jahrbuch für Romanische und Englische Literatur*, ii. 314-334, Max Müller's *Chips*, iv. 182. For a similar Buddhist influence on the apocryphal *Acta Thomae*, see *Rhein. Museum* (neue Folge), xix. 162 sq.

¹ "The celebrated Bodhi tree still exists, but it is very much decayed."—Gen. Cunningham, *Anc. Geog. of India*, i. p. 459.

with armies of monsters, but their utmost efforts can do nothing against his calm patience, and no weapon can touch or harm him. He next tempts the sage with hosts of heavenly nymphs, but all their blandishments fail, and they end by singing his praise. Māra makes a final effort with all his armies to shake Śākya Muni's fortitude, but fails; and he finally flies in confusion. [Cf. Josophat's temptation in *Barlaam and Josophat*.] The sage, thus left to his triumph, plunged into the depths of meditation, and is represented as revolving in his memory at once every past transmigration of every being in the universe; and he finally unravels the problem of existence, beginning from birth and misery, and step by step rising by twelve stages to ignorance as the ultimate cause of all things. This last being annihilated, all the subsequent causes and effects are annihilated; and thus at the last watch of the night Śākya Muni accomplished his object, and in his thirty-sixth year attained the perfect intelligence of a Buddha, and thus himself became a Tathāgata.^m Māra now again appears to tempt Buddha by counselling him at once to enjoy his perfect liberation and enter *nirvāṇa*; but he declares that he will not enjoy it until he has established the "law" and the "assembly" in the world, and so provided for the happiness of mankind; and again the demon flies ashamed, crying "my empire is over." But though the external temptation fails, Buddha feels the full force of the same temptation from within; he reflects in his solitude how few will understand his words, and what toil and insults will attend him if he preaches his law; and he resolves to retain his knowledge to himself. Three times the gods, with Brahmā at their head, implore him in vain to change his purpose; but at last the sight of the miseries of the world overcomes him, and he resolves "to turn the wheel of the law." He then considers whom he shall first instruct. By his supernatural knowledge he sees that both his old masters Rudraka and Arāḍa Kālāma are just dead: he then bethinks him of the five disciples who had left him at Uruvilvā, but who were now at Benares in the deer park of Rishipattana. His disciples see him approaching, and at first agree together that they will pay him no respect; but his majestic air forces them to rise from their seats, and they fall at his feet, confess their error, and become once more his devoted followers. The gods and heavenly beings then crowd round to hear

Buddha's first discourse, in which he propounds "the four sublime truths," so celebrated in Buddhist literature: "pain—its origin—its prevention—the way." The southern Buddhists say that "though he spoke in the language of Magadha, each one of his hearers thought that he spoke in his own language; and all the different species of animals, great and small, listened to him under the same supposition." (Hardy, *Manual*, p. 187; cf. *Lalitā Vist.*, Foucaux, p. 399.)

The *Lalitā Vistara* ends with this discourse at Benares, and we have from that time no ancient biography of Buddha; but we have an endless series of isolated details of his subsequent history, woven into the various Buddhist works, but all more or less overlaid with miracles and mythology. He lived for about forty years afterwards, and seems to have chiefly spent his time at Śrāvastī in Kosala, and Rājagriha in South Behar. The kings of both these places, Prasenajit and Bimbisāra,ⁿ protected him. Here the Chinese travellers found countless monuments, especially at Rājagriha, to commemorate various events in his life; and the Sūtras and Avadānas continually link their legends to some spot in this hal-
lowed neighbourhood. At Śrāvastī was the Jetavana garden, given to Buddha by the merchant Anātha Piṇḍada, where the scene of the recital of the *Lalitā Vistara* is laid; and not far from the city Hiouen Tshang saw the tower where Buddha's aunt Mahā Prajāpatī was buried. He also saw the spot, a few miles to the south, where Buddha first met his father again; and there is a legend of his visit to Kapilavastu, when the Śākya tribe adopted his religion, and his three principal wives became ascetics. His greatest enemy was his cousin (or, as he is sometimes called, his brother-in-law) Devadatta; and there are many legends which describe his controversies with the Brahmins, and the anger which they shewed against the daring innovator. Later legends add stories of his supposed visits to the Deccan, Ceylon, and even beyond the Indus; but all accounts agree that he died, or entered into *nirvāṇa*, at Kuśinagara, under a *Shorea robusta*, at the age of eighty. General Cunningham identifies this place with the ruins near Kasia, thirty-five miles to the east of Gorakhpur, where one of the mounds is still called the "fort of the dead prince" (*Anc. Geogr. of India*, i. p. 431). His body was burned with all the ceremonies prescribed for an emperor (*chakravartin*), and the ashes were divided into eight portions for eight different kingdoms, and each erected a *chaitya* over their portion^o (*Dulva*, as given in *As. Researches*, xx. pp. 309-317).

ⁿ Bimbisāra was murdered by his son and successor Ajātasatru, who at first opposed Buddha, but afterwards embraced his doctrines and was one of the eight sharers of the sage's ashes.

^o It is curious that one of the few known incidents of the history of the Greek kings of Cabul is that recorded of Menander, that he died in camp and the cities contended for his ashes and at last divided his remains equally among them, and raised monuments to his memory (Plut. *Reip. gerendae praecepta*, § 28). It has been thought that this may be a confusion with the account of Buddha, but it seems very improbable. Menander appears to have had some special connection with the Buddhists, as there is a popular book in Ceylon, the *Milinda panho*, or dialogue between the Buddhist Nāga-

^m This is the peculiar title of a Buddha—its significance is not quite certain, since it is differently analysed by Buddhist writers as *tathā-gata* or *tathā-āgata*. According to the former it would mean, "he who has gone as his forerunners went," according to the latter, "he who has come as his forerunners came." A similar term is *Sugata*, "he who has auspiciously departed or walks happily." The term *Buddha* means "awakened," "wise," from the root *budh*, "to know," whence also *bodhi*, "supreme knowledge."

Śākya Muni, after he became Buddha, is also called *Bhagavat*, "adorable," a term continually applied to gods and saints in Brahmanical literature; and also *Jina*, "the conqueror," a term which afterwards produced the name *Jaina* as the title of the later sect which alone at the present time represents Buddhism in India. Hindu legend generally represents Buddha as the ninth incarnation (*avatāra*) of Vishnu, who descended in this form to delude the *daityas*. The name Buddha has probably no connection with Budha, the regent of the planet Mercury.

His two most distinguished and favourite disciples were Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, both of whom died before him. He is said to have had eighty other distinguished followers, but many of them evidently belong to a later date.

Śākyā Muni (like Socrates) had spent his life in proclaiming his doctrine orally, and he left nothing written behind him; the canonical books which contain his doctrines are avowedly the work of others. Three general councils play an important part in Buddhist legend; but it is not easy to reconcile the different traditions. All accounts agree that shortly after his death the first council was held at Rājagṛha, while Ajātaśatru was still reigning. Five hundred of the most distinguished disciples met there under the presidency of Kāśyapa, and there the three divisions of Buddhist doctrine are said to have been compiled, from the recollected discourses of the deceased master. That of the *Vinaya*, or discipline, was repeated by Upāli, a Śūdra; that of the *Sūtras*, or discourses of Buddha, by Buddha's cousin, Ānanda; and that of the *Abhidharma*, or metaphysics, by the president. Each rehearsed what he remembered, to the assembly, and the whole assembly afterwards repeated with a loud voice what they had heard.^p Nothing is said as to anything having been committed to writing; and it is quite certain that, if such a collection was then made, it could have been only of the heads of the discourses. The very title, *sūtras*, which is a well-known technical term, and applied in Sanskrit only to a series of concise aphorisms, seems to shew that the original memoranda so called could not have been the voluminous and tautological works which at present bear that name. These three divisions are collectively called the *tripiṭaka*, or "triple basket." [For the *tripiṭaka* of the North, see Čsoma de Kőrös, *Asiat. Res.* xx., Burnouf, *Introd.*; for that of the South, see Turnour, *Mahāv.* pref. p. lxxv., and Feer, *Journ. Asiat.* 1871.]

The second general council, according to the southern tradition, was held at Vaiśālī under the presidency of Sarvakāmin, where 700 monks met to consider some irregular deviations from traditional customs which had arisen in a great monastery in that city. The *vinaya* was the main object of their deliberations, and no doubt it was re-arranged and extended. This led to the first Buddhist schism, that of the Mahāsanghikas. The southern Buddhists (of Ceylon) place this council 100 years after Buddha's death in the reign of Kālāsoka, the sixth successor of Ajātaśatru, but the very existence of this prince is in the highest degree problematical. The northern Buddhists (of Nepal) fix it 110 years after that event in the reign of Dharmāsoka, or in other words their second council is what the southern Buddhists reckon as the third. According to the southern authorities, the third council was held 235 years after Buddha's death, in Pāṭaliputra,

in the seventeenth year of the reign of Dharmāsoka; according to the northern it was held in Cashmir, more than 400 years after Buddha's death, in the reign of Kanishka, apparently the Kanerki of the Indo-scythian coins. Dharmāsoka is, alike in Buddhist and Hindu tradition, the grandson of the Chandragupta, who, born of low origin, overthrew the nine Nandas who previously held the throne; but the traditions differ as to the names of the kings between these Nandas and Ajātaśatru. Here we have to fall back on the great point of contact between Greek and Indian history in Chandragupta, who has long been identified as the Sandracottus (or Sandracoptos) of classical writers. The identification is almost certain; and in the utter confusion of all Hindu chronology it may well be called a "sheet-anchor," for "every thing in Indian chronology depends on it" (Prof. Müller's *Anc. San. Lit.* p. 274; cf. pp. 274-298). Sandracottus was the king of Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra), whose court Megasthenes several times visited, and with whom Seleucus Nicator (B.C. 312?) made a treaty. This synchronism enables us to grope our way in the maze of legend, and we may suppose Chandragupta to have begun to reign about B.C. 315. All accounts agree that he reigned twenty-four years, so that his son Bindusāra would begin his reign B.C. 291.

Bindusāra is said to have reigned twenty-five or twenty-eight years; this will give B.C. 266 or 263 for the date of his son Aśoka's accession, but his inauguration is said to have taken place four years afterwards. If we take the latter date B.C. 263 (the Ceylonese), that of his inauguration will be B.C. 259, and the council would be held in 242; and 242 + 235 gives us 477 B.C. the supposed date of Buddha's death (Müller's *Anc. San. Lit.* p. 298), but of course this is only conjectural. Professor Kern has recently put forward a theory that there were two divergent traditions in Ceylon as to the date of the Nirvāṇa, one fixing it 100, the other 118 years before Aśoka's accession; both were adopted by the Singhalese writers, and hence their two councils. He thus makes Aśoka begin to reign in 270, and places the Nirvāṇa in 370 or 388.

Aśoka (Dharmāsoka) was at first a zealous upholder of the Brahmins, but he was converted to Buddhism, and became in fact the Constantine of the new religion. He extended his empire over a large part of India, and is said to have erected 84,000 topes or monuments over the relics of Buddha, in different provinces.^a He is supposed on the authority of the southern Buddhists to be the Piyaḍasi, whose edicts, written in a kind of Pali, are found engraved on pillars at Delhi and Allahabad, and on rocks at Kapur di Gird in Afghanistan, Girnar in Guzerat, Dhanu in Orissa, and Bhabra on the road from Jaipur to Delhi. In some of these inscriptions we find mentioned as friendly princes the names of the Greek princes Antiochus (*Antiyoko yona rājā*), Ptolemy (*Turanāyo*), Antigonus (*Antikona*), Magas (*Mako* or *Magā*), and Alexander (*Aliskasunari*). If Antiochus II. be meant (B.C. 261-246), the others may be Antigonus Gonatus (B.C. 276-243), Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 284-246), Magas or Cyrene (B.C. 308-258), and Alexander II. of

sena and the Yonaka king Milinda of Sāgala (Hardy, *Manual*, 512-516), i. e. apparently the Greek (Yavana) Menander who reigned in Sāgyala B.C. 140, and whose name is written on his coins Menada, Minanda (Weber, *Ind. Stud.* iii. 121).

^p Compare the Jewish legend of the repetition of the Mishna by Joshua to the elders.

^a The Chinese traveller Hiouen Tsang finds them everywhere.

Epirus (B.C. 272-254); or they may be merely well-known Greek names added to fill up the list.

The inscriptions themselves breathe the merciful spirit of early Buddhism with none of the later mysticism; the king's subjects are exhorted to practise virtue, to abstain from killing cattle, to shew toleration to other creeds, to dig wells, to build caravanserais and hospitals for men and animals, and to hold public assemblies every five years for general confession. Burnouf has shewn (*Lotus de la bonne loi*, p. 727) that in the inscription at Bhabra is an edict addressed to "the assembly of Magadha" (*Magadha sangham*), where the king points out the necessity of holding fast the law of Buddha, especially the vinaya, the gāthās of the Muni, the sūtras of the Muni, the speculations of the son of Tissa (Śāriputra), and the instruction of Rāhula (Buddha's son). It seems certain that this must refer to the council held at Pāṭaliputra, the capital of Magadha or South Behar, in the seventeenth year of Aśoka's reign. It certainly seems to establish the historical truth of one of these celebrated councils, though, which it is, is not so clear.* It is most likely to have been the second, which the Ceylonese writers place under an unknown Kālāsoka, but which the northern Buddhists place under the great Dharmāsoka. This in turn lends credibility to the account of the northern writers, when they place the third council under Kanishka, in Cashmir.

The third council under Dharmāsoka was, according to Ceylonese books, presided over by Tisso Moggaliputto; 1000 monks were present at it; and the canon was subjected to a third revision, but nothing seems to have been committed to writing. None of our present Buddhist texts therefore can be earlier than this council, and probably even the oldest are more recent, at any rate in their present form. In the same year, after the conclusion of the council (according to Ceylonese tradition), while other missionaries were sent to Cashmir, Cabul, and other countries in the north, and to the Deccan, Mahinda, the son of Aśoka, went as a missionary to Ceylon, and spread the faith of Buddha there; but the Mahāwanso (p. 207) expressly states that the *Tripitaka*, which he introduced, was not committed to writing until the reign of Wattagāmini, B.C. 100-88;† and there is reason for suspecting some later additions by Buddhaghosha in the 5th century of our era. (See Weber, *Indische Stud.* iii. 178-181. Köppen, *Religion des Buddha*, i. 200.) We may still believe, in spite of tradition, that some of the sacred books may have been written down from the first; but these legends of successive recensions, and their oral transmission, must not be forgotten in the critical examination of the texts which we at present possess.

The very language in which they were at first compiled is disputed. The tradition of the nor-

thern Buddhists (Nepal, Tibet, and China) declares it to have been Sanskrit; that of the southern (Ceylon, Burmah, and Siam) maintains that it was Pali. Burnouf (*Lotus*, p. 862) is inclined to think that there may have been two recensions current from the first, the one in the vernacular language (Māgadhī) current among the common people of Behar and Oudh; the other in Sanskrit for the learned. The one eventually may have developed into the Pali *piṭakattayam* of Ceylon; the other into the Sanskrit *tripitaka* current in Nepal and Tibet. Both collections treat of the same subjects to some extent, and apparently some of these treatises are nearly the same; but unfortunately Burnouf's intended comparison of the two was interrupted by his death, and no one has as yet taken up his unfinished task. There can, however, be no question that the Pali texts represent the older form of Buddhism; but we must not forget that it is the Northern and later form which has influenced the human race so widely through its diffusion in China. The southern Buddhists know nothing of the council in Cashmir; this belongs only to the northern; and hence we may perhaps explain the difference between their respective forms of Buddhism: the one was reduced to writing about B.C. 90, the other, about the commencement of our era, assumed at Kanishka's council a form similar to that which we now find in the older Sanskrit writings of Nepal. At the last council (in Cashmir) we first hear of the rise of the school of Nāgārjuna, called "the greater vehicle" (*nāhāyāna*), which plunges into the depths of transcendental philosophy.

[For the history of northern Buddhism we have Tāranātha's history, translated from the Tibetan by Schiefner, *Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*, 1869; but, though a very interesting work, it is quite a modern compilation, having been finished in A.D. 1608. With this should be read Wassilief's work on Buddhism, originally written in Russian, but translated into German by Benfey, and into French by La Combe. For the southern Buddhists we have the valuable Mahāwanso (partly translated by Turnour, 1837), which was compiled by Mahānāma about A.D. 480, chiefly from an older chronicle, the Dipawanso, which goes down to A.D. 302, and was probably written soon after that date.]

We now proceed to give some account of the tenets of the system founded by Śākyā Muni. He himself, as we have seen, left no writings; and Buddhism, as we find it in its literature, has undergone a series of developments in the different countries where it is professed, which have widely altered its character from the simple creed first promulgated by its founder. His teaching seems to have had three great objects—morality, asceticism, and Nirvāṇa; but on this foundation his followers have erected a system, which rivals the Brahmanical in extent and, to some degree, in extravagance.

Thus Buddhism has its own cosmogony, partly borrowed from the Brahmanical, but which has been in turn copied and exaggerated by the Purāṇas; this cosmogony, with a few small variations, is common to all Buddhist nations. The number of worlds is infinite. Each world is formed of a number of concentric circles of seas, separated by girdles of rocks, round a Mount

* Another proof of the spread of Buddhism at this time is the occurrence of scenes taken from the legends of Buddha's previous births, on the rail of the tope at Bhārahāt, discovered by Col. Cunningham.

† The Ceylon tradition states that at the same time the Singhalese commentary was composed, called the *Atthakathā*; this is however lost, and we have only the Pali translation by Buddhaghosha, which seems to be much more legendary than the *Tripitaka*.

Meru as the centre; outside of the last girdle, in our world, is our sea with the four continents corresponding to the four sides of Meru, viz., Pūrvavideha to the east; Jambudvīpa (or India and its adjoining regions) to the south; Godhanya, or Aparagodāna, to the west; and Uttarakuru to the north. The whole is enclosed by a huge iron wall, called Chakravāla, and under it are the principal hells. Each world has its own chakravāla, its own sun, moon, stars, hells, and heavens. Above Mount Meru, in each system, rise first the six heavens of the gods, which with the earth constitute the world of desire (*Kāmadhātu*); above these rises the world of form (*Rūpadhātu*), divided into four successive stages of Dhyāna, or contemplation; and lastly, the world without form (*Arūpadhātu*). There are six classes of beings: gods, men, asuras (or demons), beasts, pretas (or ravenous monsters), and the damned; these are the six *gatis* or "paths" of souls. Only the first two are the good paths; the others cannot in their present condition enter on the road to Nirvāṇa, though they may have the hope of it in some future birth.*

The Hindu pantheon is transferred almost unaltered into the Buddhist system, but the gods are of course immeasurably inferior to its own peculiar spiritual powers. Indra is the king of the second heaven (or lowest but one); the third is that of the yāmas, the fourth is that of the Tushitas, where the Bodhisattvas reside, while awaiting their final birth on earth; the fifth and sixth are similarly appropriated to peculiar classes of celestial beings. Māra, the god of desire (whom we have seen as Buddha's tempter under the Bodhi tree), is located in the sixth, the highest stage of the world of desire, and has more or less influence over all the beings beneath him.

The lowest region of the world of form (*rūpadhātu*), corresponding to the first degree of contemplation, is ruled by Brahmā; the second belongs to the beings of light; the third, to the beings of purity; each of these regions consists of three stages; the fourth or highest consists of seven or nine stages, inhabited by various classes of beings, like those of the second and third regions, peculiar to Buddhist mythology. Here dwell certain *arhats*, or beings next below Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Above these is the world without form (*arūpadhātu*), comprising four stages; this is the sphere of the Buddhas, or, according to the Southern scheme, of the formless Brahmas.

The Buddhist chronology consists of an endless series of aeons (*Kalpas*) on aeons, with perpetually recurring periods of wider or more limited destruction and renovation. The destruction is

* The legends sometimes represent even the lower animals as influenced by Buddha's preaching; thus in one he preaches to fishes, in another a frog hears him preaching at Champā, and is subsequently born in the Tushita heaven (Hardy, *Manual*, p. 378). Cf. the similar stories in the lives of St. Francis and St. Philip Neri of the Oratory.

† The whole range of regions below him is called in Northern Buddhism the *sahālokadhātu*, or world of suffering; hence Brahmā is called *sahāmpati*, "lord of suffering beings." The *sahālokadhātu* is generally held to be the region of *samsāra*, or birth and death; above there is still gradation, but only upward progress.

effected by fire, water, or wind. The details vary widely in different books, but the general outline is the same. We have here in fact a mere copy of Brahmanical yugas and days of Brahma; but Buddhism shews its posteriority by fresh additions and multiplications. The series has no beginning, and, until all souls are emancipated, it will have no end.

Buddhism, unlike the Sāṅkhya philosophy admits no *prakṛiti* or *ūla* into its system, as the basis of the universe, which remains unchanged even during an æon of destruction. Everything depends on the accumulated merit and demerit of individual souls; this merit or demerit regulates and causes everything, from the minutest incident of individual experience up to the revolutions of worlds.

Souls wander through the six orders of beings, but it is only in exceptional cases that they enter plants or inorganic bodies (Köppen, *Religion des Buddha*, i. 293). Each successive birth is determined by the actions of the soul in its former births, as every action inevitably ripens sooner or later, and brings a sensible fruit in some subsequent birth. This mechanical influence of former actions is the Buddhist *fate*, and, combined with the inherent attachment to existence in every individual soul, is the cause of all mundane phenomena. The latter is the gravitation to new life; the former supplies the direction. Some of the Buddhist schools (particularly those of Ceylon and Burmah) do not allow any identity between the souls of two successive existences; the soul dies at the end of each life, and transfers its responsibilities at death to a new entity, just as it had inherited its own from a previous one; but this is not the doctrine of Nepal or China, nor was it probably the original creed of Buddhism. Still, as we shall see, when we come to Buddhist metaphysics, it easily flows from the tenet of the five *skandhas*.

The cardinal tenet of Buddhism is the four sublime truths, "pain (*duḥkha*),—its cause (*samudaya*),—its prevention (*nirodha*),—the way (*mārga*)."^{*} Pain is the eternal fact presented to consciousness throughout the entire universe of *samsāra*; it springs from desire which leads to action, and consequent merit and demerit; it can be prevented, but the only means is the law, as promulgated by Buddha. These four truths recur everywhere in Buddhist literature, and they no doubt formed one of the main features of Śākyā Muni's teaching. They are arranged in two pairs, and the members of each pair are mutually related as effect and cause. They are repeated in a well-known stanza, which was first found on the pedestal of a Buddhist statue dug up at Bakhra, and then afterwards on a stone block discovered at Sārṇāth, near Benares; they are also found in the Nepalese and Pali canonical books, and no doubt are a very ancient memorial. "Whatever laws (or qualities, *dharma*) arise from a cause, the cause thereof hath the Tathāgata declared; and what is the check to the same, that too hath the great ascetic explained"[†] (cf. Burnouf, *Lotus*, App. p. 522).

* The same division is found in Hindu philosophy; thus the Commentaries on the Sāṅkhya and Yoga both speak of the four heads of their school's doctrine, viz. mundane existence and its cause, or the conjunction of the soul and matter; and liberation, and its cause, or the

To proclaim the law, which is thus the sole means of escaping from the region of ever-renewed birth and death, is the office of a Buddha. Any individual soul, even the meanest worm under our feet, might eventually rise to that high station; but it is only a few who can pass through the long preliminary trials, and surmount the almost endless obstacles. The distinguishing characteristic of a Buddha is that he not only seeks *nirvāṇa*, but desires also to lead others into it. His aim is benevolent, not selfish.

There have been countless Buddhas in the past eternity: each has gradually attained this rank by steadfastly carrying out absolute self-negation and virtue through an enormous number of successive births, never losing sight of the high goal from the moment when it was first definitely set before him. At length he becomes a Bodhisattwa, i.e., a potential Buddha, one who has only one more birth remaining before he becomes a full Buddha, and meanwhile he remains in heaven until his period comes round. Every Buddha must finally be born as a man, since it is only in a human birth that any soul can attain that rank (Hardy's *Manual*, p. 363). It is curious to mark how the wildest freaks of imagination are inevitably limited by surrounding circumstances; and, just as Plato's republic is only a reproduction of Greek actualities, Buddhism could not escape from the conditions of Indian society, as this existed at the time of its rise. Thus every Buddha must be born as a male Brahman or Kshatriya: they are all born in Central India; they must all gain supreme intelligence under the *bodhi* tree at Gayā, and begin to preach in the deer-park at Benares; and their doctrine of course must be eternally the same. The names of a thousand successive Buddhas are preserved, but it is only the last four or seven who have any real celebrity.

The present Buddha, Śākya Muni, has established a law which is to last 5000 years; then when all traces of it have disappeared, the new Buddha, Maitreya, whom he left as the regent Bodhisattwa in Tushita, will appear on earth and restore the forgotten doctrine. It is easy to see that these anterior Buddhas are purely imaginary: they are simply an attempt of enthusiastic disciples to create a spurious antiquity for the great revolution inaugurated by Śākya Muni.

The hierarchy of beings in the Buddhist community is as follows:—

1. Buddhas, i.e., the perfect Buddhas (*samyak-sambuddha*);
2. Bodhisattwas;
3. Pratyeka-buddhas;
4. Āryas, or the spiritual saints;
5. Prithagjanas, or ordinary mortals.

The Buddhas are those who have successively obtained absolute knowledge and infinite power, and, after communicating the law to others, have entered *nirvāṇa*. If they have only attained it for themselves, they are Pratyeka-buddhas, "individual Buddhas;" these beings have attained to supernatural knowledge, and are freed from personality; but they have yielded to the temp-

tation which Śākya Muni resisted at Gayā, and they have sought it only for themselves. The Bodhisattwas await the time of their becoming Buddhas in the Tushita heaven; the *Lalitā Vistara* in its opening chapter introduces us to 32,000 of these beings, who are described as listening to Buddha's words.

The Āryas are those who have entered on the road to *nirvāṇa*. They are divided into four classes (the four "paths"), and each of these is subdivided into those who are still in progress toward the end of their respective stage, and those who have attained it. Thus the lowest, the *śrota-āpānnas*, are they who have "entered the stream," that surely leads to *nirvāṇa*; they have learned the delusion of consciousness, and have full faith in Buddha and his precepts, and they can never be born again except as gods or men. After seven such future births they will become *arhats*. The next class is that of the *sakrid-āgāmins*, those who have only one more birth as men and one more as gods, before they become *arhats*. The third is that of the *anāgāmins*, "those who return no more;" these will be born in the heaven of Brahmā, and there become *arhats*. The fourth is that of the *arhats*, who are perfectly pure and sinless. They are described as possessing the four forms of perfect understanding (*pratisamvid*) (Burnouf, *Lotus*, Append. 14, 17), and the five supernatural intuitions (*abhijñā*); by these last they behold all beings, hear all their words, know all their thoughts and all their past existences, and can assume any form and appear anywhere. The perfect Arhat awaits calmly his appointed time, and then enters into *nirvāṇa* (Hardy's *Eastern Monachism*, p. 287). The three other paths all eventually end in Arhatship; but only the Arhat, whether in earth or heaven, passes into *nirvāṇa*, without any intermediate stage.

Below all these are the *prithagjanas*, or ordinary disciples, who content themselves with ordinary duties, and do not aspire to the transcendental perfections of the Āryas. It is important to notice that these different distinctions have no necessary connection with that between devotees and laic; a devotee (*bhikṣu*) may be only a *prithagjana*, and a laic (*upāsaka*) may be already far advanced in the scale of the Āryas.

(We may here mention a peculiar tenet of the northern Buddhist schools, that of the three *yānas* or "*vehicula*." It is said that Buddha, in compassion for mortal infirmity, has adapted his doctrine to the capacities of various intelligences, and consequently has revealed three different "means of transport," by which the Āryas may escape from transmigration, and attain a lower or higher degree of *bodhi* or transcendental knowledge. These are the lesser, middle, and greater Yāna. The lesser comprises morality and external observances (*vinaya*), while the others deal with Buddhist metaphysics. The first belongs to ordinary disciples (*śrāvakas*), who will thus become *arhats*; the second to the *pratyeka-buddhas*; the third to the Bodhisattwas. This idea, however, appears to be of later growth, and does not belong to the original Buddhist theory. In the *Lotus de la bonne loi*, edited by Burnouf, we find it maintained, that there is in reality only one yāna (the greater); the hypothesis of the others being only conceded as an accommodation to the dulness of Buddha's hearers.)

perfect knowledge of the twenty-five principles (see *Sāṅkhyā-pravachana-bhāṣya*, p. 8, and Vyāsa's Comm. on the *Yoga*, II. 15). We also find a very similar exposition of the theory of life in the Nyāya aphorisms, I. 2.

The five above-mentioned gradations, however, mostly belong to the unseen world; the visible Buddhist communion has necessarily other divisions.

The Buddhist "church" (if we may use the term) is called *Sangha*; and the *tri-ratna*, or "three precious things,"—Buddha, the law (*dharma*), and the assembly (*sangha*)—are continually mentioned in Buddhist formulae and books. It is impossible to believe that during the founder's life the Buddhist system was developed into the hierarchy which we find in the literature; but it would naturally grow up as the religion spread. The *upāsakas*, or lay-brethren, do not belong to the *sangha*; this is composed of *bhikshus* (religious mendicants), who are also called *śramāṇas* (ascetics); and the elders among them are called *sthavīras* (in Pali *theros*). Each member has to pass through a novitiate before he is regularly consecrated, when he takes vows of chastity and poverty. These vows however do not seem to have been at any period irrevocable, and they certainly are not so in Buddhist countries at the present day.

Buddha from the first discouraged in his disciples all those painful modes of asceticism which we find so prevalent in Brahmanism; but he laid great stress on a mendicant and celibate life. Throughout the legends we find him attended by male and female mendicants, dwelling sometimes alone, but more frequently as little separate communities in *vihāras*, or monasteries. They are represented as subsisting on alms, and the male members went out every day with their begging vessels to collect the gifts of the laity, just as they may be seen doing in Buddhist countries to the present day. Originally the Buddhist ascetics were only enjoined to live in a community and in a settled habitation during the four months of the rains, but gradually the monastic system developed itself in its permanent form. No *bhikshu* can possess more than three garments, and those who aspire to a higher degree of holiness wear only one, and that of filthy rags. The *vihāra*, or community, may own property, and, from the accounts of the Chinese pilgrims in India, we see that at that time many of the establishments were very wealthy; but each individual took a vow of poverty.

In contradistinction to the *bhikshus* and *bhikshunis*, we find in the Buddhist books continual reference to the *upāsakas* and *upāsikās* (literally, male and female servants, or worshippers) *i.e.*, the pious lay men and women who continued in their household life, and supplied by their alms the wants of the mendicants.⁷ Thus there is a dialogue in one of the legends (Burnouf's *Introd.* p. 281), "What is one to do in the state of a mendicant?" "He must observe all his life the rules of strict chastity." "This is impossible; is there no other way?" "There is another, my friend; to be an *upāsaka*." "And what

must one do in this state?" "He must abstain all his life from all inclination to murder, theft, unchastity, lying, and the use of intoxicating drinks." The duties of the laity are in fact said to be included in the three formulae of "taking refuge" (*śaraṇa*) and the "five prohibitions." The former are, "I take refuge in Buddha, in his doctrine, and in his community;" the latter are to avoid the five sins just enumerated. These five prohibitions bear a singular resemblance to the last five of the ten commandments of the Old Testament, and may have come to the Buddhists from Jewish sources through Persia; and the obligation on the laity reminds one of the Talmudic *ger toshav*, "one who without being circumcised kept the seven precepts of Noah." Besides these five prohibitions, there is also a decalogue which forbids the sins of the body, the speech, and the mind.⁸ Those of the body are murder, theft, and unchastity; those of the tongue, lying, slander, abuse, and idle words; those of the mind, covetousness, malice, and scepticism. By practising the opposite virtues, a laic, though as long as he remains such, he can never become an *arhat*, may obtain such merit as to be born hereafter in a position where he may obtain *nirvāṇa*.

The morality of Buddhism is its brightest side. Hardy says (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 169), "a collection might be made from the precepts of the Dhammapadam,* that in the purity of its ethics could scarcely be equalled from any other heathen author." Bishop Bigandet says, "most of the moral truths prescribed by the Gospel are to be met with in the Buddhist scriptures; the essential, vital, and capital discrepancy lies in the difference of the ends the two creeds lead to, but not in the variance of the means they prescribe for the attainment of them." Universal charity, *maitrī*, towards all sentient beings is everywhere inculcated in Buddhist ethics; and the idea of self-sacrifice is undoubtedly put prominently forward, however feeble the motives supplied to carry the idea into practice. Brahmanism had been essentially selfish in its morality, till Buddhism widened its horizon; and those words of Buddha reported by Kumāṛila, the fierce opponent of Buddhism in the 6th or 7th century of our era, did not fall barren even on the Brahmins, "Let all the sins that have been committed in this world during the Kali age fall on me, and let the world be delivered."^b The highest ideal of the different

* It has been said that this ethical division is of Buddhist origin and thence passed, through the Persians and Manichaeans, to the Christian church. The division is found, however, in Plato's Protagoras, p. 348; but the Christian use of the phrase comes from the Sept. translation of Deut. xxx. 14. It is constantly adopted by Philo (as, *e.g.* Tauch. ed. ii. 23, iii. 217, 321, v. 296), and from him it probably passed into the Liturgy of St. Mark, which was used at Alexandria (Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.*, Coll. i. 132) and Origen (*adv. Cels.* Spencer's ed. pp. 200, 241, 273).

^a Edited, with a Latin trans. by Fausbøll, 1855, and translated into German by Weber (*Zeitsch. d. Morg. Gesellschaft*, vol. xiv.), and into English by Max Müller, 1870.

^b Quoted in Professor Max Müller's *Anc. Sans. Lit.* p. 80. It is one of the many Buddhist traces in the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, where we find (lvi. 153) the disobedient son, who is condemned to wear on his head a revolving crown of red-hot iron,—saying, "May other sinners be released

⁷ In ordinary life Śākya Muni recognised the caste system of the Brahmanical society, but he opened to all alike the right of studying his religion, and caste ceased in those who embraced a religious life. The same cessation of caste is seen in the modern Hindu religious orders; and in the temple of Jagannath at Puri (which seems to have been originally established on an old Buddhist foundation) caste ceases for the time, when the worshippers enter the sacred precincts.

virtues is called the six *pāramitās* or "transcendental virtues." These are the perfection of liberality, moral conduct, patience, energy, contemplation, and wisdom; these high qualities are beyond the reach of ordinary men, and he who can attain to them becomes an arhat or a Bodhisattva.

This moral purity of Buddhism has greatly influenced its literature. Buddhist books have generally little literary merit; but the purity and benevolence which so often pervade them, supply the want of poetry, and strongly excite the interest of the reader. Thus the legend of Pūrpa (Burnouf, *Introd.* pp. 235, &c.), and still more that of the harlot Vāsavadattā (*ibid.* pp. 146, &c.), have a moral beauty and pathos which shine out all the more brightly from the absence of all polish in the style. Where this moral element is wanting, Buddhist books (especially the northern) are almost unreadable, as, for instance, the greater part of *Le Lotus de la bonne Loi*. Some of the Pali poetical works, however, as the Dhammapada and parts of the Sutta-nipāta possess considerable literary power.

As Buddhism does not recognise the idea of God, it has properly no worship or sacrifices; and originally there can have been no religious service or ceremonies, though the Northern Sūtras, by a natural anachronism, often represent Buddha's images and likenesses as worshipped even in his lifetime (Burnouf, *Introd.* p. 340); but as the religion spread among the common people, a cultus inevitably arose. Its objects of worship were the images and relics of Buddha himself, and the other holy personages of the legends. The ceremonies consisted of offerings of flowers and perfumes with music, and the recital of hymns and prayers. First Buddha himself was the sole object of worship; then the four preceding Buddhas of the present kalpa; but gradually Bodhisattvas and other saints were included, until the Buddhist pantheon rivalled the Brahmanical. All the statues of Buddha represent him with the same physical characteristics; but he is variously sculptured as sitting, standing, or lying down; in the first he is absorbed in contemplation, in the second he is the teacher, while the third reveals him as entered into Nirvāna. In the pictures and bas-reliefs he and his principal disciples are represented with a glory round the head, and this idea has probably passed from Buddhism into Christian art (see Hardy, *East. Monach.* p. 416). The relics are either the

ashes or other corporal remains (*Śarīra*, which is a Sanskrit word meaning "body," and is only used in this technical sense by Buddhist writers), as e.g. the eight hairs supposed to be buried under the Shwedagon at Rangoon, and the tooth still preserved in Ceylon; articles used by Buddha in his lifetime, as his alms bowl, which Fahian saw in Peshāwar, but which Hiouen T'sang mentions as being in his time in Persia (cf. Sir H. Rawlinson, *Journal of the Royal As. Soc.* vol. xi. p. 127; Ferrier, *Afghanistan*, Engl. transl. p. 318); or objects associated with certain incidents in his history, as the Bodhi tree (a branch of which is said to have been brought to Ceylon by Mahinda,

and slips are planted in nearly every vihāra there to the present day), and his footsteps on rocks, as that on Adam's peak. It has been

mentioned before that Śākya Muni's ashes were enclosed in eight monuments (*chaityas*) after his death, and Aśoka is said to have erected 84,000 topes (*stūpas*) in different parts of India (for the difference between a *chaitya* and a *stūpa*, see Burnouf, *Introd.* p. 349); so that no doubt this reverence for relics grew up very early in the history of Buddhism. For a detailed account of the topes we must refer the reader to Ritter's *Stupas* (1818), Wilson's *Ariana Antiqua* (1841), Prinsep's *Essays* (Thomas's edit. 1858), General Cunningham's *Bhilsa Topes* (1854), and Fergusson's *Tree and Serpent Worship* (1868). The older topes are in the form of a dome resting on a cylindrical or square basement; they are surrounded by a peculiar balustrade, and surmounted by a simulated relic box (the *tee*) enclosing a support for one or more umbrellas; but this construction has been variously modified in Ceylon, Burmah, Tibet, Nepal, and China. In the topes of Afghanistan have been found coins of the first Caesars, and some of the Byzantine emperors of the 5th century, A.D.

The worship of the Bodhi tree is connected with an obscure but deeply interesting question, discussed at length by Mr. Fergusson, in his *Tree and Serpent Worship*. He maintains from the sculptures of the topes at Sānchi and Amravati, that Buddhism was originally a revival of the superstitions of the aboriginal races, purified by Brahmanical morality; and hence the frequent appearance of tree worship and snake mythology in the sculptures and in Buddhist legends. This of course is untenable; but there is every reason to suppose that these aboriginal superstitions may have helped to degrade the creed as it spread among the masses of the people.

The Buddhist service must originally have consisted of mere confessions of faith and ascriptions of praise; but formulae of prayers have gradually come into use, although the idea of a being who answers prayer is utterly foreign to the system. The prayers are supposed to produce their effect by a kind of magical efficacy, a notion which we also find in the atheistical school of the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā philosophy among the Hindus. The Buddhists use a rosary of 108 beads; and the praying machines of Tibet and Mongolia are a singular but not illogical consequence of their fundamental notion of prayer. (For the curious resemblances between the ceremonies and services of the Buddhists, especially the lamas, and those of the Roman Catholic church, see Hue and Gabet's *Travels* ii. 110 and Hardy's *Eastern Monachism*, *passim*.)

The religious communities assemble for prayer three times a day, i.e. morning, noon, and evening. They publicly confess their sins on the days of the new and full moon; and the laity also attend for confession, and to listen to the reading of some sacred text. Besides these two days, there are several other fast days in the month; thus the Ceylonese and Nepalese Buddhists fast on the eighth day of each lunar fortnight; but we do not always find this lunar reckoning observed elsewhere.

The third division of the *tripitaka* is the *abhidharma* or metaphysics. Our knowledge of this

from their sins,—may this crown circle round my head till all sin is destroyed." Cf. also *Bhāgavata Purāna*, ix. ch. 21.

part of Buddhism is at present very imperfect;* but one of its main features appears to be the theory of the twelve steps of successive causation (or the *pratītya-samutpāda*), by which Buddha is said to have attained to perfect knowledge under the *bodhi* tree at Gayā. These twelve steps are as follows. The great evils of embodied existence are age and death; these spring from our being born; this springs from existence; this from the inherent attachment to existence (*upādāna*); this from desire; this from sensation (*vedanā*); this from contact between the senses and their objects; this from the six organs of sense; these from the organism (*nāma-rūpa*, literally "name and form," but here used for the individual consisting of mind and body); this from incipient consciousness in the womb (*viñāna*); this from the latent impressions (*sanskārāḥ*) of former actions involving merit or demerit (hence the southern Buddhists sometimes put *karma* "moral action" instead of *sanskārāḥ*), and these from the universal cause, ignorance (*avidyā*). Some of these terms are variously explained (see Burnouf, *Introd.* pp. 491-506; Hardy, *Manual*, pp. 391-396; Childers's note in Colebrooke's *Essays*, 2nd ed. i. 453-455); but the general outline seems sufficiently clear. The series extends over at least two births or existences of the sentient being: ignorance and merit or demerit belong to the first, the next eight steps to the life in the womb, the last two to the second existence; but the order of the middle steps is not always the same. A somewhat similar analysis forms the opening of the Nyāya Sūtras, the well-known text-book of the Hindu logical system. There we read, "Pain, birth, activity, faults, false notions; since, on the successive annihilation of these in turn, there is the annihilation of the one next before it, there is, on the annihilation of the last, final beatitude." In other words, we start, as in Buddha's series, with the present sad fact of consciousness, pain; this arose from our having been born; birth arose from the mistaken "activity" which led to actions in a previous existence, involving merit or demerit, which necessitated this present birth as a recompense. This mistaken activity was caused by the so-called "faults" of desire, dislike, or stupidity; and these were in turn caused by false notions inherent in the soul. The Nyāya philosophy, by inculcating true notions of things, cuts the root of the evil, and with this all the subsequent germination necessarily ceases. The general idea of this series is a fundamental position in Hindu thought; and Buddha no doubt, here as elsewhere, only adopted and amplified the current opinions of his time. The exact relation, however, of Buddhism to the various systems of Hindu philosophy is very obscure, as indeed is the relation of those systems to each other. The absence of all dates in Sanskrit literature renders a literary history impossible, and internal evidence is necessarily a very vague and uncertain basis for a chronological arrangement. But there are some indications that Buddhism and the Nyāya had some connexion. Not to mention the

fact that the founder of the Nyāya is said to have been Gotama or Gautama (which is probably only an accidental coincidence), it is certain that one of its early teachers must have been a Buddhist, as the third work in the successive series of logical authorities, the *vārtika* of Uddyotakara, was expressly written to refute the erroneous interpretations of Dinnāga and others and the name Dinnāga, the logician, is only known elsewhere from Buddhist literature (see Weber, *Zeitsch. der D. M. G.* xxii. 727). The Sāṅkhya, however, is the system most akin to Buddhism, and it is hardly possible to avoid the conviction that Buddha's teaching was based on this as its starting-point.

Another important feature of Buddhist metaphysics is the psychological division of the five *skandhas*, or, in Pali, *khandhas*. These appear to be the five forms of mundane consciousness. They are—1. *rūpa*, "form," or the organized body; 2. *vedanā*, "sensation," i.e. pleasurable, painful, or indifferent; 3. *saññā*, "perception," or "idea," i.e. the knowledge or belief arising from names, words, or signs; 4. *sanskāra*, apparently "feeling" or "imagination;" 5. *viñāna*, "knowledge," or "consciousness," i.e. the consciousness of the uninterrupted flow of successive momentary sensations and ideas. All these terms, except *saññā*, have appeared in the twelve steps of causation, but their application is different. There they were employed to account for a man's embryo existence, and to connect it with his previous births; here they describe his nature when born, as an intellectual and moral organism.

Apart from these five *skandhas* (according to the stricter schools, even among the northern Buddhists, and to a still wider extent among the southern), there is no such thing as soul; it is only their aggregation (cf. the interesting passage in the *Śiṣupāla-badha*, ii. 28). "The five *khandas* embrace all the essential properties of every sentient being; some beings possess them less completely than others, and the inhabitants of the four *Arūpabrahmalokas* do not possess the first *khandha* (*rūpa*) at all. When a man dies the *khandhas* of which he is constituted perish, but by the force of his *kamma* (*karma*), a new set of *khandhas* instantly starts into existence, and a new being appears in another world, who, though possessing different *khandhas* and a different form, is in reality identical with the man just passed away, because his *kamma* is the same. *Kamma* then is the link that preserves the identity of a being through all the countless changes which it undergoes in its progress through *Samsāra*" (Childers, *Pali Dict.* art. *khandho*). But this extreme view is not held by all the northern schools, and it certainly is not the view held by ordinary Buddhists. The Brahmanical commentators consider *viñāna* to represent the soul, the other *skandhas* being its attributes. According to Julien (*Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales*, i. 385, note) the Chinese call the *skandhas* "the five shadows," "ces cinq choses peuvent couvrir et cacher la nature vraie de l'homme, et l'empêcher de se montrer dans toute sa pureté."

All existence is said to consist of a continued succession of momentary states, each arising from the preceding as an effect from its cause. The material and moral worlds are only different instances of this endless concatenation according

* There are said to be four great philosophical schools among the northern Buddhists, the *Vaiśāhikas*, the *Sautrāntikas*, the *Yogācāras*, and the *Mādhyamikas*, and each is divided into several different sects. Buddhist books speak of eighteen sects in all.

to innate necessity. Thus in the material world we see the germ spring from the seed, the branch from the germ, the stem or culm from the branch, the leafy gem from the culm, the bud from the leafy gem, the blossom from the bud, the fruit from the blossom, and the seed again from the fruit, and so on in eternal succession. The twelve steps of Buddha's analysis, mentioned above, are, to a certain extent, an application of the same law to the mental and moral world. Existence in all its infinite forms everywhere exemplifies the same law of endless succession; inherent necessity, without any superintending providence, governs every development.

The end of the Buddhist system, as we have said, is *nirvāṇa*; but what is *nirvāṇa*? This is one of the most difficult problems in Buddhism; but unless it be answered, our idea of the system must be vague and imperfect, for *nirvāṇa* is the keynote which runs through every part. Now *nirvāṇa* is a technical term, and, though used in early Sanskrit as a passive past participle "blown out" (from *nir* + *vā*), its use as a neuter noun appears to have been introduced by the Buddhists, and to have been subsequently borrowed from them by the later Sanskrit writers (see Goldstücker's *Pāṇini*, p. 226). "The Brahmanic Hindus hope that their soul will ultimately become united with the universal spirit; which, in the language of the upanishads, is the neuter Brahman, and, in that of the sects, the supreme deity who takes the place of this philosophical and impersonal god. And however indefinite this god Brahman may be, it is nevertheless, to the mind of the Brahmanic Hindu, an *entity*. The final salvation of a Buddhist is entire non-entity. The various expressions for eternal bliss in the Brahmanic creed, like *apavarga*, *moksha*, *mukti*, *nirāśraya*, all mean either 'liberation from this earthly career,' or 'the absolute good;' they therefore imply a condition of hope. The absolute end of a Buddhist is without hope, it is *nirvāṇa*, or extinction" (*ibid.*). The philosophical writings of the Buddhists represent a complete nihilism. In an important passage from the great text-book, the *Prajñā pāramitā* (quoted by Burnouf, i. 474), the five skandhas are said to be only an illusion—conscious existence is itself only as a magical show. Now in *nirvāṇa* the five skandhas are abolished, and what remains? In the Vedānta system, indeed, a somewhat similar phraseology occurs, since, in final emancipation, every *upādhi*, or "disguise" caused by ignorance, falls off, and the pure undisguised Brahman remains. This one absolute being had been concealed under the various forms of individuality as the rope is hid under the appearance of the snake for which it was mistaken; all individual existence (from the highest God Brahmā down to a plant) is but a similar delusive veil, and has no more reality than the snake thus created by our imagination. Yet beneath all these illusions there still remains the absolute Brahman, and *mukti* is thus the return to reality, when the various delusive veils are destroyed. But in Buddhism there seems to be nothing beneath the illusion—individual existence is not like the imagined snake which conceals the real rope, but it is merely a magic show, which, when it passes, "leaves not a rack behind."

But here we must carefully distinguish between the ordinary practical Buddhism and Buddhism as a strictly developed system. As a system, Buddhism can hardly admit of any goal short of absolute annihilation. Its aim is to enable its faithful disciple to enter one of the "four paths," and any one of these inevitably conducts, after a briefer or longer interval, to *nirvāṇa*. But it can hardly be disputed that the great mass of Buddhist believers in every age have given to *nirvāṇa* a vague meaning of future happiness; human nature has been too strong to be shackled by a theory—

"'Tis life whereof our nerves are scant,
Oh life, not death, for which we pant;
More life and fuller, that we want." ^a

Nor is it at all certain that the founder of the system held the transcendental nihilism in which subsequent philosophers of his sect have lost themselves. His aim seems to have been ethical rather than metaphysical; and even among those philosophical sects, which allow a soul as distinct from the five skandhas, *nirvāṇa* can hardly mean absolute annihilation. Hence in the ordinary Buddhist books we find frequent mention made of three kinds of *nirvāṇa*, which have been by some supposed to correspond to the three previously mentioned *yānas* or *vehicula*, i. e. *nirvāṇa*, *parinirvāṇa*, and, lastly, *mahāparinirvāṇa*. But just as we saw that in *le Lotus de la bonne Loi*, it was expressly declared that in reality there was only one *yāna*, so the same book as expressly affirms that there is only one, and that the absolute, *nirvāṇa*. Similarly among the southern Buddhists we find the word *nibbāna* applied to two different things, —that annihilation which is the goal of Buddhism, and the state of blissful sanctification or arhatship which is destined to end in annihilation. [For further details respecting *nirvāṇa*, cf. Burnouf, i. 516, 589 ff.; Köppen, i. 304-309; St. Hilaire, *le Bouddha* (3rd ed.), i. -xxvii., 132-140; Max Müller, *Chips*, i. 279-290, *Lecture on Buddhist Nihilism*, 1869; Childers, *Pāli Dict. art. nibbāna*.]

In the foregoing pages we have endeavoured to give a general sketch of Buddhism as it existed in its flourishing state in India and Ceylon, as far as this can be gathered from the older writings in the Sanskrit of the northern Buddhists and the Pāli of the southern; but of course with the lapse of time the religion gradually underwent many changes, especially as it extended to other countries with an inferior or different civilization. Its subsequent history in India itself is obscure, and Tāranātha's "history" will need a rigorous sifting by European criticism, to separate the fragments of truth from its mass of legend. We find from the accounts of the Chinese travellers in India, Fa Hian (A.D. 399-414) and Hiouen Tshang (629-645), that in their time it was still flourishing throughout that continent. The latter, especially, represents Brahmanism and Buddhism as existing side by side; and, though he often has to lament the wide spread of heresy, it is still evident from his pages that in most of the kingdoms into which India was divided, Buddhism had a strong hold on the population, and in many it was even the predominant faith. Shortly after that time it must have begun to

^a Cf. Vijnāna Bhikshu's Comm. on Sāṅkhyā Sūtras, i. 47.

decline. Hindu legend assigns the commencement of its overthrow to a persecution brought about by Kumāṛila, the celebrated commentator on the Pūrva mīmāṃsā philosophy, who is supposed to have flourished in the 7th century; but, as the persecution is also placed in the time of Śāṅkara Ācharya, who probably flourished towards the end of the 8th century, we may assume that Buddhism was not suddenly uprooted by any universal revolution. Gradually, however, it did cease to exist; and in the 16th century the Mogul emperor Akbar is said to have sought in vain for a single Buddhist in his dominions. Later Sanskrit writers generally confuse the Buddhists with the Jains. This latter sect profess many of the tenets of Buddhism, but they have also many peculiarities of their own, and they seem to have only risen into importance as the older faith declined. Professor Wilson thinks (*Essays on the Religion of the Hindus*, i. 334) that they arose in the 6th or 7th century,* reached their highest prosperity in the 10th or 11th, and declined after the 12th. They never spread much in the north of India, and are at present found chiefly in Guzerat, Rajputana, and Canara.

But though Buddhism thus faded away in India, it was destined to spread far and wide outside that continent. Its conquests, however, were not, like those of Islām, made by the sword, but by the moral influence of missionary preaching. The records of every Buddhist country tell the same story of Buddhist disciples bringing the doctrine to their ancestors; and the early enthusiasm of these Buddhist missionaries cannot be better expressed than in the following remark by the author of the Mahāwanso, when he tells the story of Aśoka's messengers coming to Ceylon. "These disciples, following the example of the all-compassionating Buddha's postponement of his own entry into Nirvāṇa, laid aside the exalted state of happiness attained by them, and for the benefit of mankind undertook these missions to various countries. Who is there who would demur when the salvation of the world is at stake?"

Buddhism seems to have found an early home in Cashmir. Wassilief calls that country its "second native land;" from thence it spread into Cabul, Bactria, and Tibet.

In Nepal we meet with a theistic Buddhism, however contrary to the original creed as founded by Śākya Muni, though even there it is an innovation of comparatively modern date. An Ādi or "primordial" Buddha is acknowledged, from whom have emanated five Dhyanī or "contemplative" Buddhas, who in turn have produced certain Bodhisattwas, who are the creators of the successive worlds. Our present creation is the work of the Bodhisattwa Avalokiteśwara or Padmapāni, who is the active representative of the fourth Dhyanī Buddha Amitābha, and to whom is addressed the well-known Tibetan formula "Om mani padme hūm" (Köppen, ii. 59-61). Besides these superhuman Buddhas, there are also certain Mānushi or "human" Buddhas,

who have risen from men to that eminence; these are, as it were, the reflections in the lower world (*Kāma-dhātu*) of the Dhyanī Buddhas, who rule in the world of Form (*rūpa-dhātu*) (Köppen, ii. 26). In Nepal, Tibet, Mongolia, and China, the Bodhisattwas Avalokiteśwara and Mañjuśrī have become prominent objects of worship (Burnouf, i. 112-117); the former is said to have vowed that he will not enter nirvāṇa until he has declared 'the law' to all beings in every world, and his 'descent into hell' to preach there is a famous Northern legend; and the sacred books of Nepal and Tibet include an extensive body of mediæval works called Tantras, which enjoy the highest repute at the present day. In these we find a strange mixture of Buddhist notions with the obscene tenets of the Śaiva sect of the Brahmanical religion, together with puerile superstitions and magical ceremonies (*ibid.* 522-554).

In Tibet Buddhism has in modern times undergone a singular development. In the 14th century a young priest named Tsong kha pa inaugurated a new system in the place of the old hereditary priesthood, the Ssakia hierarchy. From his time Tibet has been ruled by a "double Papacy," the Dalai Lama at Lhasa, and the Panchen Rin poche in Further Tibet, the latter being abstracted from all worldly affairs, and the former being the chief spiritual as well as secular authority. Each is supposed to be the incarnation of one of Tsong kha pa's two disciples, who succeeded him at his death; and as each office becomes vacant, a child is sought out to fill it, into whom the soul of the deceased is supposed to have migrated. Tibet is now governed by China, and the Dalai Lama acts as a regent, assisted by a native council and two Chinese commissioners; and thus the system has become a well-organised engine of statecraft in the hands of the Chinese officials (Köppen, ii.). Mongolia is dependent on Tibet, and the superior of the Mongolian monasteries is very commonly a boy from Tibet, into whom the deceased superior is believed to have passed, just as in the case of the Dalai Lama. Mongolia swarms with Lama-serais, and the emperors of China encourage Lamaism as a means of repressing the warlike spirit of the Tartar population.

In China Buddhism is one of the three coordinate religions, being recognised by the state with those of Confucius and Laon-tsoo, though Confucianism is the proper state creed and the religion of the learned class. Buddhism was introduced into China from India in the 1st century of our era, and its temples are found everywhere, and it has largely influenced the religious belief even of those who profess the other creeds. The popular Buddhism, however, has considerably degenerated from the original form as we find it in the old Sanskrit or Pali books; beside the homage paid, as in Nepal, to Mañjuśrī, two deities, Amitābha, the lord of the western heaven, and Kwan yin, the goddess of mercy (who represents Avalokiteśwara), have risen to equal pre-eminence with Buddha himself. Nirvāṇa is still recognised as the final goal in the metaphysical books of the Chinese Buddhist schoolmen; but it is far beyond the horizon of the ordinary worshipper; his prayer and hope only extend to a new birth on earth in some more prosperous

* This, however, must be too late a date if, as seems most probable, the Nirgranthas, so often mentioned in Hiouen Tshang, were Jains (see A. C. Burnell, *Indian Antiquary*, i. 310).

condition, or, at best, in the western heaven of Amitābha.

From China Buddhism has spread into Corea, Japan, and Cochín China, as from Ceylon it spread into Burmah and Siam.

But wide as Buddhism has thus extended in the East, it has not been without its influence also on the West. It is true that no Buddhist communion has ever been established in Europe or Western Asia, but Buddhist ideas have filtered westwards through Gnosticism and Manichæism. These systems were an attempt to unite Christianity and Oriental philosophy, and many of the ideas of Manichæism were but fragments of Buddhism. But rightly to estimate this Buddhist influence on the world, we must remember that Buddhism sprang up in India; nearly all its tenets were based on the immemorial belief of the Hindu mind. It was the moral teaching of Buddha and his proclamation that the highest religious truth was open to all castes alike, which formed the special features of his system; all else he only borrowed or modified from the Brahmins whom he opposed. There were, in truth, only three creative national intellects in the ancient world, the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Hindu; and Buddhism is that product of the Hindu mind, which, for good or for evil, has most widely influenced mankind.

[In addition to the special works already mentioned in the course of this article, we would single out the following from the wide literature on the subject. For the general subject, C. F. Köppen's *Die Religion des Buddha und ihre Entstehung*, 1857, a most able review of Buddhism, only marred by the needlessly hostile tone adopted towards Christianity; a second vol. appeared in 1859, *Die Lamaische Hierarchie und Kirche*; St. Hilaire, *Le Bouddha et sa Religion*, 1866. For the northern Buddhism, Burnouf's *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*, 1844; and *Le Lotus de la bonne Loi*, 1852 (a transl. of one of the canonical books of Nepal, with copious notes and appendices); Foucaux's transl. of the Lalita Vistara, *Rgya tok'er-rol-pa ou développement des jeux*, 1848; Wassilief, *Der Buddhismus*, 1860, translated by Benfey (there is also a poor French transl. by La Combe, 1863); and Julien, *Voyages des pèlerins Bouddhistes*, 1853-8. For Mongolian Buddhism, the numerous publications of Schmidt in the transactions of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg. For Chinese Buddhism it will suffice to refer to Beal's *Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese*, 1871, and the works mentioned therein.

For the southern Buddhism, Turnour's *Mahāvanso*, 1837; R. S. Hardy's *Eastern Monachism*, 1850, and *Manual of Buddhism*, 1853; the latter work, though chiefly composed from Singhalese authorities, is an invaluable compilation; Bishop Bigandet's *Life of Gaudama*, 1866; Max Müller's transl. of the *Dhammapada*, printed in Rogers's transl. of *Buddhaghosha's Parables*, 1870; Childers' *Pali Dictionary*; and various articles by D. J. Gogerly in the *Ceylon Friend* and the *Journal of the Ceylon branch of the R. A. S.*

[E. B. C.]

BUDOCUS, ST., an abbot and confessor of the 6th century, said to have succeeded Maglorius, in the see of Dol, in Brittany (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, 2, 88). The parish of St. Bua-

dock is just west of Falmouth (which was once included in it), and the church of his disciple St. Winwolaus (Gunwallo) is south of this, in the Lizard district. His feast day was Dec. 8 (see Leland, *Itin.* 3, p. 25). The Close Rolls, i. 498, 529, mention a church of St. Budock, in Oxford.

[C. W. B.]

BUGGA, BUGGA. (1) A nun, daughter of the abbess Dunna, to whom Oshere, under king of Hwiccia, gave lands on the river Tillath to found a monastery; she appears to have married and had a daughter, Hrotwari, who succeeded to the monastery by her grandmother's gift (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* i. 98), under her mother's guardianship. When Hrotwari came of age Bugga refused to surrender the monastery, and was only dislodged by decree of a council in 736 or 737 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 337). The story is of importance as illustrating the state of monastic discipline, and the hereditary transmission of monastic property, so severely commented on by Benedict Biscop and Bede.

(2) Bugga, also called Eadburga or Heaburga, the third abbess of Minster, in Thanet. She appears, from the letters of Boniface, to have been the daughter of an abbess Eangyth (*ep.* 30); and from a poem preserved among Alcuin's works we learn that her father was a king of Wessex, "Eutwin," whom Mabillon identifies with Escwin, who died in 876. It is, however, more probably, Kentwine, who died in 685 (*Act. SS. O. S. B.* saec. iii. 424-426). She is recorded to have rebuilt the monastery of St. Mildred (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, p. 219), and the poem above referred to seems to have been composed on the occasion (*Alc. Opp.* ed. Froben, ii. 549). She is, however, best known from the letters of Boniface. Between 719 and 722, her mother writes to Boniface stating that a pilgrimage which she had many years before proposed to make to Rome had been prevented by the infancy of her daughter, and asking his prayers and advice about the journey (*ep.* 30). A little later Bugga herself writes to him, sending him fifty solidi and an altar-cloth, congratulating him on his success and asking him to write to her (*ep.* 3). The next letter is probably much later in date, Boniface condoles with her on the troubles which had befallen her in her old age, and seems, in a mystical way, to refer to her buildings at Minster (*ep.* 31). In another he addresses her as abbess, congratulates her on having found a resting-place at Rome (*ep.* 32). She appears to have gone to Rome after she undertook the abbacy, and there to have met Boniface, who through her sent a message to king Ethelbert of Kent, promising him his prayers. Ethelbert reminds him of his promise some years after, but unfortunately the date of the letter cannot well be fixed (*ep.* 84). Finally, archbishop Bregwin, writing to Lullus, between 759 and 765, mentions that Bugga died on the 27th of December, and begged him before her death to convey the news to Lullus. Elmham (ed. Hardwick, p. 220) dates her death in 751, but this is certainly too early. These particulars, from three several sources, are well put together by Mabillon, who did not however perceive that the identity of Bugga and Eadburga is proved, rather than disproved, by the concurrence of the West Saxon and Kentish authorities. That she was a

West-Saxon lady is confirmed by her close friendship with Boniface, and that she was a Kentish abbess is illustrated by the evidence of king Ethelbert. The two together throw great light on the poem. Some of the other letters of Boniface, addressed to nuns unnamed, may possibly be referred to her [S.]

BUIITE. [BOETHIUS.]

BULGARANUS, a Spanish count of Gothic descent, governor of *Gallia Narbonensis*, under Gundemar king of the Visi-Goths, c. 610. Letters of his addressed to Gundemar, and the chief bishops of the district, of some value for the history of his age, are printed in *Migne Patrol.* lxxx. 107-112, from Mariana *Istor. de Esp.*, vol. iii. append., who copied them from MSS. in the libraries of the churches of Oviedo and Alcala (Complutum). They chiefly refer to the danger impending from the designs of Brunehild, who had instigated the king of the Avars against Theutibert, and urge the appointment of days of humiliation, with fastings and litanies, to avert the calamity. (Cf. Cl. Anton. *Biblioth. Hispan. Vet.* tom. i. lib. 5, c. 5; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 574.) [E. V.]

BUNDUS (Βουνδος), a Manichean sectary (Jo. Malalas, *Chron.* xii. p. 410), who added some doctrines of his own, and taught them in Rome during the reign of Diocletian, and afterwards in Persia. He held that God had made war with the evil principle and conquered it; and that men ought to worship the conqueror. Malalas adds that his doctrine was called in the Persian language τὸ τῶν Δαρισθενῶν, δ' ἐμνηνεῖται τὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. [E. B. C.]

BURIENA, ST., one of the Irish ascetics (said to have been the daughter of a king), who settled in the wild Land's End district, in Cornwall, during the 6th century (Leland, *Itin.* iii. pp. 7, 8, 18; *Acta Sanctorum* May 29; vol. vii. p. 37, cf. Alford, *Annals*, 460, num. vi. on the Irish saints in Cornwall). The two churches which have been always connected with St. Burian, are those of St. Senanus and St. Levanus, also from Ireland. Athelstan defeated the Cornish king Howel, 926-8, in which last year he held a Gemot at Exeter, and made Conan bishop of Cornwall. He completed the conquest of Cornwall and the Scilly Islands, in 936. In gratitude for his victory, he is said to have founded a collegiate church in honour of St. Burian, as well as a monastery at Bodmin, in honour of S. Peacock, also an Irish Saint. The clergy who served the collegiate church (called Eglosberrie in Domesday—the prefix Eglos is much rarer in Cornwall than the Cymric prefix Lan, which again seldom occurs in Scotland) seem to have been seven in number. The charter of Athelstan, however, which the canons produced, was denounced by bishop Grandison, in Edward III.'s time, as a forgery, and it is only valuable as shewing the extent of the lands and their old boundaries (Kemble, *Codes Diplomaticus*, No. 1143, Oliver's *Monasticon Diocesis Exoniensis*). St. Burian's day is May 29, or June 19 ("Register of St. Buriena," quoted in Wilson's *Martyrologium*, ed. 2, 1640), or June 4 (Alban Butler) or May 1. The parish feast is on the nearest Sunday to old May Day. In fact parish feasts were often transferred in later times to the Sunday nearest to some special day. The Mar-

tyrologium of the Church of Exeter placed it on May 1, and adds "Sanctae Berionae Virginis meritis filius regis Gerontii a paralysis morbo curatus est" (Oliver's *Monast.*). The first two Cornish kings of that name are placed in 530 and 596 respectively, the third was living in 705, when Aldhelm wrote him a celebrated letter. [C. W. B.]

C

CABADES, Cabat, Coades, Cobad, are sundry representations of a name borne by a Persian king, spelt on his coins כَوَاد (Covád), and supposed by Longperier (*Médaillles des Sassanides*, p. 68) to be derived from the ancient name of the sun-god. Cabades I. was succeeded by his son, Chosroes I., A.D. 531; for part of the history of his war with Rome, A.D. 502, see CELEB; for his life see CHOSROES. Cabades II. or Siroes murdered his father, Chosroes II., A.D. 628, and died of plague not long after. [E. B. B.]

CABBALAH (קבלה) or KABBALAH and CABBALISTS or KABBALISTS. By the first term is meant that famous system of religious philosophy or theosophy; and by the second term, the disciples and promoters of this esoteric doctrine, known in the Christian church ever since the middle ages. Though this mysterious doctrine is of peculiarly Jewish origin, and those who developed it, and explained Holy Writ in accordance with its principles, were chiefly Jews, yet as such distinguished scholars as Raymond Lully (1234 or 1235-1315), John Reuchlin (1455-1522), John Pico di Mirandola (1463-1494), the leaders of Christian opinion abroad, and our own celebrated countrymen Robert Fludd (1574-1637), and Henry More (1614-1687), not only found in the Cabbalah an explanation of the secret tie which binds all created things together and unites them with the Creator, but introduced this doctrine into the Christian church, a succinct account of the marvellous system is absolutely necessary in a Dictionary of Christian Literature.

I. NAME AND ITS SIGNIFICATION.—The name Cabbalah (קבלה from קבל to receive), which primarily signifies reception, and secondarily, a doctrine received by oral tradition, has been given to this theosophy, because its advocates maintain that it is of pre-Adamite existence, and that ever since the creation of the first man it has been received uninterruptedly from the mouths of the patriarchs and prophets. God himself taught it first to a select company of angels, who after the fall most graciously communicated it to the disobedient child of earth, to furnish the protoplasts with the means of returning to their pristine state of happiness and communion with the Deity. From Adam it passed over to Noah, Abraham, and gradually to Moses; who covertly laid down the principles of it in the first four books of the Pentateuch, withholding them however from Deuteronomy. Moses also initiated the Seventy Elders into its secrets, and they again transmitted them, in an unbroken line of tradition, to David, Solomon, and so on till Simon ben Yochai, the last depositary

of this tradition. Having been condemned to death by Titus, Rabbi Simon managed to escape from prison, and concealed himself with his son in a cavern for twelve years. In this subterranean abode, where he was visited by his disciples, he discoursed on this sublime doctrine. It is from these discourses the Cabbalists maintain that his son Rabbi Eliezer, and his secretary Rabbi Abba, as well as his disciples, compiled the celebrated work called *Sohar* (זוהר) i. e. *Splendour*, which is the grand storehouse of Cabbalism; and it is from this circumstance that the believers in this theosophy named it Cabbalah. But though Cabbalah is its classical and acknowledged appellation, it is also called *Secret Wisdom* (חכמה נסתרה), because, as its disciples maintain, the doctrines of the Cabbalah are indicated in the Scriptures by signs which are hidden from and are unintelligible to those who are not initiated into its mysteries. It is also called *Grace* (חסד). This name is obtained from the initial letters of *חכמה נסתרה*, *Secret Wisdom*.


II. THE CARDINAL DOCTRINES OF THE CABBALAH.—The fundamental doctrines of the Cabbalah embrace (1) the Nature of the Supreme Being; (2) the Emanations or Sephiroth; (3) the Cosmogony; (4) the Creation of Angels and Man; (5) the Psychology; (6) the Destiny of Man and the Universe; and (7) the Import of the Revealed Law. How these subjects are treated will be seen from the following analysis.

1. *The Supreme Being or the En Soph*.—God is boundless in his nature; there is nothing without him; he is the space of the universe containing the *τὸ πᾶν*, but the universe is not his space. Hence he is called *En Soph* (אין סוף = *ἄπειρος*), *Endless, Boundless*. This idea of the divine nature, which obtained among the Jews at a very early period, gave rise to the designation of God by *Makôm* or *Hammakôm* (מקום), *the Place*, which explains the otherwise inexplicable Septuagintal rendering of *המקום* = *ὁ τόπος* the *Place*, which explains the otherwise inexplicable Septuagintal rendering of *ישראל* *את אלהי ישראל*, and they saw the God of Israel (Ex. xxiv. 10), by *καὶ εὗρον θεὸν τόπον*, and they saw the *Place*. As he cannot be comprehended by the intellect, or described in words in this boundlessness, the *En Soph* is in a certain sense *Ayin* (אין) = non-existent (*Sohar*, iii. 283 b). Nor can He be the direct creator of the universe, because the act of creation involves intention, desire, thought, words, and work, properties which imply limit, and belong to a finite being; and because the imperfect and circumscribed nature of the creation precludes the idea that the world was created or even designed by him who can have no will nor produce anything which is not like himself boundless and perfect. As the design, however, displayed in the mechanism of the world plainly indicates an intelligent designer, the *En Soph* must be regarded as the creator in an indirect manner.

2. *The Emanations or Ten Sephiroth*.—To become the creator in an indirect manner, the *En Soph*, or the *Aged of the Aged* (עתיקא דעתיקין) or the *Holy Aged* (עתיקא קדישא) as God is alternately called, sent forth from the fulness of his infinite light one spiritual substance or intelligence. This first *Sephira*, which existed in the *En Soph* from all eternity, has no less than seven names. They are as follows:—i. The Crown (כתר), because it occupies the highest position. ii. The Aged (עתיקא), because it is

the oldest, or the first emanation. iii. *The Primordial or Simple Point* (נקודה פשוטה) *נקודה ראשונה*, because, as the *Sohar* (i. 15 a) tells us, when the Concealed of the Concealed wished to reveal himself, he first made a single point. The Infinite was entirely unknown, and diffused no light, before this luminous point violently broke through into vision. iv. *The White Head* (חווה) (רישא חווה). v. *The Long Face*, the *Macroprosopon* (ארך אנפין) because the whole of the ten *Sephiroth* represent the *Primordial or Heavenly Man* (אדם עילאה) of which this *Sephira* is the head. vi. The inscrutable Height (רום מעלה) because it is the highest of all the *Sephiroth*, proceeding immediately from the *En Soph*. "No one," the *Sohar* (ii. 100 b) tells us, "can see the King." And vii. this *Sephira* is expressed in the Bible by the Divine name *Ehieh* or "I am" (אהיה), Ex. iii. 4, because it is absolute being, representing the infinite as distinguished from the finite; and in the angelic order it is indicated by the celestial beasts of Ezekiel, called *Chayoth* (חיות). The first *Sephira* contained the other nine *Sephiroth*, which it produced in the following order. From its bosom proceeded *Wisdom* (חכמה), the second, and *Intelligence* (בינה), the third *Sephira*. The first of this twin, which is a masculine or active potency, is represented by *Jah* (יה, Is. xxvi. 4) among the Divine names, and by *Ophanim* (אפנים, *Wheels*) among the angelic hosts; whilst the second, which is a feminine or passive potency, is called by the Divine name *Jehovah* (יהוה), and by the angelic name *Arëlim* (אראלים). These two potencies, united by the first potency form the first triad of the *Sephiric* decade, and constitute the Divine head of the Archetypal Man, as will be seen in the subjoined figure. The junction of *Wisdom* and *Intelligence*, its second and third *Sephiroth*, respectively denominated *Father* (אבא) and *Mother* (אמא), yielded the masculine potency *Mercy, Love, or Greatness* (נדולה), the fourth *Sephira*, and the feminine potency *Justice or Strength* (נבורה פחד דין), the fifth *Sephira*. Of these two, which constitute the Divine arms in the Archetypal Man, the first is represented by *El* (אל) among the Divine names, and by *Chashmâlim* (חשמלים, Ezek. i. 4) among the angelic hosts, whilst the second is called by the Divine name *Eloah* (אלה), and by the angelic name *Seraphim* (שרפים, Is. vi. 7). From them emanated *Beauty or Mildness* (תפארת), the sixth *Sephira*, which is the chest in the Archetypal Man, and is called by the Divine name *Elohim* (אלהים), and by the angelic name *Shinânim* (Ps. lxxviii. 18). By the union of *Love* and *Justice*, effected through the medium of *Beauty or Mercy*, the second trinity of the *Sephiroth* is obtained. *Beauty*, the sixth *Sephira*, and the uniting principle of the fourth and fifth *Sephiroth*, beamed forth the masculine potency *Firmness* (נצח), and this again produced *Splendour* (הוד), which are the seventh and eighth *Sephiroth*, and form the Divine legs of the Archetypal Man. *Firmness*, the seventh *Sephira*, which is the right leg, is called by the Divine name *Jehovah Sabaoth* (יהוה צבאות), and by the angelic name *Tarshi-*

shim (תְּשִׁיִּים, Dan. x. 6), whilst Splendour, the eighth Sephira, which is the left leg, has the Divine name Elohim Sabaoth (אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת), and the angelic name Benei Elohim (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, Gen. vi. 4). From the latter emanated Foundation or Basis (יְסוּד), the ninth Sephira, which is the genital organ in the Archetypal Man, and is represented by the Divine name El Chai (אֵל חַי, the God of Life), and by the angelic name Ishim (אִשִּׁים, Ps. civ. 7), and which is the uniting principle between Firmness and Splendour, the two opposites thus yielding the third triad in the Sephiric decade. The ninth Sephira sent forth Kingdom (מְלֻכּוֹת), also called Shechinah (שְׁכִינָה), the tenth, which encircles all the others, and is represented by the Divine name Adonai (אֲדֹנָי), and by the angelic name Cherubim (כְּרוּבִים).

FIGURE OF THE ARCHETYPAL MAN.^f

Now, in looking at the grouping of the Sephiroth, it will be seen that the three triads respectively represent intellectual, moral, and energetic or stable qualities. Hence the first is called "the Intellectual World," the second "the Moral" or "Sensuous World," and the third

^f The Hebrew words in this figure correspond with those in the table on the next page (p. 359).

"the Material World." Looking at the Sephiroth longitudinally, it will be seen that the three Sephiroth on the right of the Archetypal Man are masculine, and represent the principle of vigour; the three on the left are feminine, and represent the principle of mercy; whilst the four uniting Sephiroth, which occupy the centre, represent the principle of mildness. From this aspect, therefore, the right is called "the Pillar of Judgment," the left "the Pillar of Mercy," and the central is denominated "the Middle Pillar." From the important position which these uniting Sephiroth of "the Middle Pillar" occupy, they are synecdochically used to represent the worlds which the respective opposite pairs yield by means of their uniting power. Thus the Crown, which unites Wisdom and Intelligence, and which, together with these two opposites, yields the first triad, called the Intellectual World, is, by itself, denominated the Intellectual World. Again, Beauty, the sixth Sephira, which unites Love and Justice, yielding the second triad, or the Sensuous World, is, by itself, used to denote the Sensuous World, and in this capacity is called the Sacred King, or simply the King: whilst Kingdom, the tenth Sephira, which unites the whole, is used to represent the Material World, and as such is denominated the Queen or the Matron (מַטְרוֹנִיּוּתָא). Hence within the trinity of triads a higher triad of units is obtained, consisting of the Crown, Beauty, and Kingdom, and representing the potencies of all the Sephiroth.

It is of the greatest importance to observe that the Cabbalah enforces the following points with regard to the Sephiroth. i. That they were not created, but emanated (נִצְטָל) from the En Soph, since creation implies a diminution of strength on the part of the Creator, which is not the case in emanation. ii. That they form among themselves, and with the En Soph, a strict unity, and simply represent different aspects of one and the same being; just as the different rays which proceed from the light, and which appear different things to the eye, form only different manifestations of one and the same light. iii. That since they simply differ from each other as the different colours of the same light, all the ten emanations alike partake of the perfections of the En Soph: and iv. That as emanations from the Infinite, the Sephiroth are infinite and perfect like the En Soph, and yet constitute the first finite things. They are infinite and perfect when the En Soph imparts his fulness to them, and finite and imperfect when that fulness is withdrawn from them. In this respect, therefore, the Ten Sephiroth correspond to the double nature of Christ—his finite and imperfect human nature, and his infinite and perfect divine nature.

3. *The Cosmogony, or the Creation.*—It was only by means of the Sephiroth that creation became possible. Worlds indeed came into existence before the En Soph assumed this human form, but they were abortive, since they could not continue, because the conditions of transmitting life and procreation, which appeared with the sexual opposites of the Sephiroth, were as yet absent. Or as the Sohar, the Bible of the Cabbalah, states it, "there were old worlds which perished as soon as they came into existence—they were formless, and were called sparks; just

as the smith, when hammering iron, lets the sparks fly in all directions. These sparks are the primordial worlds, which could not continue, because the Sacred Aged [= God] had not as yet assumed his form [of opposite sexes, of the King and Queen], and the master was not as yet at his work" (*Sohar*, iii. 292 b). "The Holy One, blessed be he, created and destroyed several worlds before the present one was made; and when this last work was nigh completion, all things therein, all the creatures of the universe, in whatever age they were to exist, before ever they entered into the world, were present before God in their true form. . . . The lower world

is made after the pattern of the upper world; everything which exists in the upper world is to be found, as it were, in a copy upon earth. Nevertheless the whole is one" (*Sohar*, ii. 20 a; iii. 61 b). This world, however, is not a creation *ex nihilo*, but is simply an immanent offspring, and the image of the King and Queen; it is a farther expansion or evolution of the Sephiroth, which are the emanations of the En Soph: and it reveals and makes visible the Boundless and the Concealed of the Concealed. And though it exhibits the Deity in less splendour than its Sephiric parents, because it is farther removed from the primordial source of light than the

NAMES OF THE TEN SEPHIROTH.	The Ten Corresponding Names of the Deity.	The Ten Corresponding Names of Angels.	The Ten Corresponding Members of the Human Body.
I. { 1. כתר, CROWN. 2. עתיקא, THE AGED. 3. נקודה ראשונה, PRIMORDIAL OF SMOOTH POINT. 4. רישא חוורה, WHITE HEAD. 5. ארך אנפין, MACROPROSOPON. 6. אדם עילאה, HEAVENLY MAN. 7. רום מעלה, INSCRUTABLE HEIGHT. }	אהיה, I AM (Ex. iii. 4).	חיות, ζωον.	HEAD.
II. חכמה, σοφία, WISDOM.	יה, JAH (Is. xxvi. 4).	אופנים, οὐρανισ.	BRAIN.
III. בינה, νοῦς, INTELLIGENCE.	יהוה, JEHOVAH.	אראלים, ΑΡΕΛΙΜ (Is. xxxiii. 7).	HEART.
IV. { 1. חסד, χαρις, LOVE. 2. גדולה, GREATNESS. }	אל, THE MIGHTY ONE.	חשמלים, CHASHMALIM (Ezek. i. 4).	RIGHT ARM.
V. { 1. דין, JUDGMENT. 2. פחד, JUSTICE. 3. גבורה, STRENGTH. }	אלה, THE MIGHTY ONE.	שרפים, SERAPHIM (Is. vi. 7).	LEFT ARM.
VI. תפארת, BEAUTY.	אלהים, THE ALMIGHTY.	שנאנים, SHINANIM (Ps. lxxviii. 18).	CHEST.
VII. נצח, FIRMNESS.	יהוה צבאות, JEHOVAH SABAOOTH.	תרשישים, TARSHISHIM (Dan. x. 6).	RIGHT LEG.
VIII. הוד, SPLENDOR.	אלהים צאות, THE ALMIGHTY SABAOOTH.	בני אלהים, SONS OF THE ALMIGHTY (Gen. vi. 4).	LEFT LEG.
IX. יסוד, FOUNDATION.	אלחי, MIGHTY LOVING ONE.	אשים, ISHIM (Ps. civ. 4).	GENITAL ORGAN.
X. { 1. מלכות, βασιλεία, sc. τῶν οὐρανῶν, KINGDOM. 2. שכינה, SHECHINAH. }	ארני, THE LORD.	כרובים, CHERUBIM.	UNION OF THE WHOLE BODY

Sephiroth, still as it is God manifested, all the multifarious forms in the world point out the unity which they represent. Nothing therefore in the universe can be destroyed; everything must return to the source whence it emanated. The universe is composed of four different worlds, each of which has a separate Sephiric system, consisting of a decade of emanations. i. The World of Emanations (עולם האצילות), alternately called "the Image" and "the Heavenly Man," which by virtue of its being a direct emanation from God, and most intimately allied with the Deity, is perfect and immutable. ii. The World

of Creation (עולם הבריאה), also called "the Throne" (כורסא), which is the immediate emanation of the former, and whose ten Sephiroth, being further removed from the En Soph, are of a more limited and circumscribed potency, though the substances they comprise are of the purest nature and without any admixture of matter. iii. The World of Formation (עולם היצירה), which proceeded from the former world, and whose ten Sephiroth, though of a still less refined substance, because still further removed from the primordial source, are yet without matter. It is also called the World

of Angels, because those intelligent and incorporeal beings reside therein, who are wrapped in a luminous garment, and who assume a sensuous form when they appear to men: and iv. The World of Action (עולם העשיה), also called the World of Matter (עולם הקליפות), which emanated from the preceding world, the ten Sephiroth of which are made up of the grosser elements of all the former three worlds, and which has sunk down in consequence of its materiality and heaviness. Its substances consist of matter limited by space, and perceptible to the senses in a multiplicity of forms. It is subject to constant changes, generation, and corruption, and is the abode of the Evil Spirit. These four worlds, which have thus successively emanated from the En Soph, and from each other, sustain the relationship to the Deity of first, second, third, and fourth generations.

4. *The Creation of Angels and Men.*—"God," says the *Sohar*, "animated every part of the firmament with a separate spirit, and forthwith all the heavenly hosts were before him" (iii. 68 a). These angelic beings consist of two classes, good and bad, have their respective princes, and occupy the three habitable worlds in the following order. The angel Metatron inhabits the second world, called the World of Creation. He alone constitutes the world of pure spirits, and is the garment of Shaddai (שדאי), i.e. the visible manifestation of the Deity. His name is numerically equivalent to that of the Lord (*Sohar*, iii. 231 a). He governs the visible world, preserves the unity, harmony, and the revolutions of all the spheres, planets, and heavenly bodies, and is the Captain of the myriads of the angelic hosts who people the third world, or the World of Formation. The angelic hosts who occupy this world are divided into ten ranks, answering to the ten Sephiroth; and each of the multitudinous angels is set over a different part of the universe. One has the control of one sphere, another of another; one has the charge of the sun, another of the moon, another of the earth, another of the sea, another of the fire, another of the wind, another of the light, another of the seasons, and so on. These angels derive their names from the heavenly bodies, or the elements which they respectively guard (*Sohar*, i. 42 b). The demons, which constitute the second class of angels, inhabit the fourth world, or the World of Action. And though they are the grossest and most deficient of all forms, and are the shells (קליפות) of being, still they form ten degrees, answering to the ten Sephiroth. In their ranks darkness and impurity increase with the descent of each degree. The first two degrees are nothing more than the absence of all visible form and organisation, the third degree is the abode of darkness, whilst the remaining seven degrees, or "infernal halls" (שבע היכלות = Hells), are occupied by the demons, which are the incarnation of all human vices. These seven hells are subdivided into endless compartments, so as to afford a separate chamber of torture for every species of sin. The demons here are occupied in torturing those poor deluded beings who suffered themselves to be led astray by them in this world. The prince of this region of darkness is Samael (סמאל = angel of poison or

death). He is the evil spirit, the serpent who seduced Eve. He has a wife called the Harlot, or the Woman of Whoredom, who, together with him, are treated as one person, and are called "the Beast" (*Sohar*, ii. 255-259 with i. 35 b).

As to man, he was not created by the En Soph, or God, but "the heavenly Adam (i.e. the ten Sephiroth), who emanated from the highest primordial obscurity (i.e. the En Soph), created the earthly Adam" (*Sohar*, ii. 70 b). Man is both the import and the highest degree of creation, for which reason he was formed on the sixth day. As soon as man was created, everything was complete, including the upper and nether worlds, for everything is comprised in man. He unites in himself all forms" (*Sohar*, iii. 48 a). Originally man was created with faculties and features far transcending those of the angels; and even his body was not of that gross matter which constitutes our present bodies. He was wrapped in that luminous ethereal substance in which the celestial spirits are clad, and which is neither subject to want nor to sensual desires. It was only after the fall that the protoplasts obtained the garments of skin, which mean our present body, in order to adapt them to the changes which the fall introduced. Still even in their present form the righteous are above the angels. Every man is still the microcosm, and each member of his body corresponds to a constituent part of the visible universe. "The mystery of the earthly man is after the mystery of the Heavenly Man. Just as we see in the firmament above, covering all things, different signs, which are formed of the stars and planets, and which contain secret things and profound mysteries, studied by those who are wise and expert in these signs; so there is in the skin, which is the cover of the body of the son of man, and which is like the sky that covers all things, signs and features which are the stars and planets of the skin, indicating secret things and profound mysteries, whereby the wise are attracted, who understand to read the mysteries in the human face" (*Sohar*, ii. 76 a). Even now man is the presence of God upon earth; and the very human form depicts the Tetragrammaton, the ineffable Jehovah (יהוה). The head is the shape of the letter Yod (י), the arms and the shoulders are like the letter He (ה), the breast is in the form of the letter Vau (ו), whilst the two legs with the back resemble the form of the second He (ה). Comp. *Sohar*, ii. 72 a. All human countenances are divisible into the four primordial types of faces, which appeared at the mysterious chariot throne in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel, viz., the face of man, of the lion, of the ox, and of the eagle.

5. *The Psychology.*—The doctrine about the nature of the human soul is one of the most important features of the Cabbalah. All souls are pre-existent in the World of Emanations, and without exception are destined to inhabit human bodies, and pursue their course upon earth for a fixed number of years. "When the Holy One, blessed be he, wished to create the world, the universe was before him in idea. He then formed all the souls which are destined for the whole human race. All were minutely before him in the same form which they were to assume in the human body. He looked at every one of them,

and there were some among them which would corrupt their way upon the earth" (*Sohar*, i. 96 b). Being an emanation of the ten Sephiroth, and in the likeness of this Archetypal Man, the soul has ten potencies, which are divided into a trinity of triads. (i.) The Spirit (*נשמה*), which is the highest degree of being, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by the Crown, representing the highest triad in the Sephiroth, called the Intellectual World. (ii.) The Soul (*רוח*), the seat of moral qualities, which both corresponds to and is operated upon by Beauty, representing the second triad in the Sephiroth, called the Moral World: and (iii.) The Cruder Spirit (*נפש*), which, immediately connected with the body, is the direct cause of its lower functions and the animal life, and which both corresponds to and is operated upon by Foundation, representing the third triad in the Sephiroth, called the Material World. "Each soul, prior to its entering into this world, consists of male and female, united into one being. When it descends on this earth the two parts separate and animate two different bodies. At the time of marriage the Holy One, blessed be he, who knows all souls and spirits, unites them again as they were before, and they again constitute one body and one soul, forming, as it were, the right and the left of one individual. . . . The union, however, is influenced by the deeds of the man, and by the ways in which he walks. If the man is pure, and his conduct is pleasing in the sight of God, he is united with that female part of his soul which was his component part prior to his birth" (*Sohar*, i. 91 b).

6. *The Destiny of Man and the Universe.*—It is an absolute condition of the soul, which underlies its very nature, to return to the Infinite Source from which it emanated, after developing on earth the perfections, the germs whereof are implanted in it. If the soul, after assuming a human body and its first sojourn on earth, fails to acquire that experience for which it descends from heaven and becomes contaminated by sin, it must reinhabit a body again and again till it is able to ascend in a purified state. This transmigration, however, is restricted to three times. If two souls, on their third residence in human bodies, are still too weak to acquire the necessary experience, they are united and sent into one body, in order that by their combined efforts they may be able to learn that which they were too feeble to effect separately. The world, too, being an expansion of the Deity's own substance, must ultimately share that blessedness which it enjoyed in its first evolution, and which is indicated in the letter *B* (*ברכה*), i.e. blessing, wherewith the history of the creation begins. Even Satan himself, the archangel of wickedness, "the Venomous Beast," "Samael," will be restored to his angelic nature, inasmuch as he too, like all other beings, proceeded from the same Infinite Source of all things. He will then drop the first part of his name (*סם*), which signifies *venom*, and retain the second *El* (*אל*), which is the appellation of all the angels. This universal restoration will take place at the advent of Messiah. And though the soul of Messiah, like all other souls, has its pre-existence in the world of the Sephiroth, it cannot be born, and hence the Saviour cannot make his appearance till all

human souls have passed through their period of probation on earth, since it is to be the last born at the end of days. Then the great Jubilee year will commence when the whole pleroma of souls (*אוצר הנשמות*), cleansed and purified, shall return to the bosom of the Infinite Source. Then hell shall disappear. There shall be no more punishment, nor temptation, nor sin. Life will be an everlasting feast; a Sabbath without end. Then all souls will be united with the Highest Soul, and supplement each other in the Holy of Holies of the Seven Halls (*Sohar*, i. 45, 168 a; ii. 97 a).

III. THE CABBALISTIC VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.—The view which the Cabbalah takes of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the mode of interpretation to which it resorts in order to obtain these doctrines, are best exhibited in the words of the *Sohar*, which, as has already been remarked, is the Cabbalistic Bible. "Woe be to the son of man who says that the Torah (= Pentateuch) contains common sayings and ordinary narratives. If this were the case we might in the present day compose a code of doctrines from profane writings which would excite greater respect. If the Law contains ordinary matter, then there are nobler sentiments in profane codes. Let us go and make a selection from them and we shall be able to compile a far superior code. No. Every word of the Law has a sublime sense and a heavenly mystery. . . . As the spiritual angels had to put on earthly garments when they descended to this earth, and as they could neither have remained nor be understood on the earth without putting on such a garment, so it is with the Law. When it descended on earth the Law had to put on an earthly garment, to be understood by us, and the narratives are its garment. . . . Those who have understanding do not look at the garment but at the body beneath (i.e. the moral), whilst the wisest, the servants of the Heavenly King, those who dwell on Mount Sinai, look at nothing but the soul," i.e. the secret doctrine (*Sohar*, iii. 152 a). To obtain from the obvious and simple words of the Bible the mysteries of the Cabbalah, definite hermeneutical rules are employed, the most important of which are as follows:—(1) Every letter of a word is reduced to its numerical value, and the word is explained by another of the same quantity. This rule is called *Gematria*. (2) Every letter of a word is taken as the initial or abbreviation of a word. This is called *Notaricon*. (3) The initial and final letters of several words are respectively formed into separate words. (4) Two words occurring in the same verse are joined together and made into one word. (5) The words of those verses which are regarded as containing a peculiar recondite meaning are ranged in squares in such a manner as to be read either vertically or boustrophedonally, beginning at the right or left hand. (6) The words of several verses are placed over each other, and the letters which stand under each other are formed into new words. (7) The letters of words are changed by way of anagram and new words are obtained. The commutation is effected according to fixed rules. Thus the alphabet is bent exactly in the middle, and one half is put over the other, and by changing alternately the first letter, or the

first two letters of the beginning of the second line, twenty-two commutations are produced. These anagrammatical alphabets obtain their respective names from the first two specimen pairs of letters which indicate the interchange. For instance, the first alphabet thus obtained is called *Abuth* (אלבּוּת) from the first words, the second *Abgath* (אבגּוּת), and so on. Of course, with such exegetical canons, any system of theosophy, or anything else, may be obtained from the Bible.

That the Cabbalah favours, to a certain extent, the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement, is not only admitted by many Jewish literati who are adverse to the theosophy of the Cabbalah, but by some of its followers. We subjoin the most striking passages in the *Sohar* bearing on this subject. Discussing the import of the liturgical declaration about the Divine unity (Deut. vi. 43), where Jehovah occurs first, then Elohehu, and then again Jehovah, it says: "The voice though one consists of three elements, fire (i.e. warmth), air (i.e. breath), and water (i.e. humidity), yet all these are one in the mystery of the voice and can only be one. Thus also Jehovah, Elohehu, and Jehovah, constitute one—three forms which are one" (*Sohar*, ii. 43 b). "Come and see the mystery of the word (i.e. Jehovah). There are three degrees, and each degree exists by itself (i.e. in the Deity); although the three constitute one, they are closely united into one, and are inseparable from each other" (*Sohar*, iii. 65 a). Indeed one Codex of the *Sohar* had the following remark on the words, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts" (Is. iv. 3): (וְהוּא בֵּן קְדוּשָׁה זֶה רֹחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ), *the first holy denotes the Holy Father, the second the Holy Son, and the third the Holy Ghost*. Equally distinct is the teaching of the Atonement. "The Messiah invokes all the sufferings, pain, and afflictions of Israel to come upon him. Now if he did not remove them thus and take them upon himself, no man could endure the sufferings of Israel, due as punishment for their transgressing the law: as it is written (Is. liii. 4), 'surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows'" (*Sohar*, ii. 12). That these and similar statements favour the doctrines of the New Testament is moreover attested by the fact that a large number of Cabbalists, who occupied the highest position in the synagogue, both as pious Jews and literary men, have from time to time embraced the Christian faith. We need only specify Paul Ricci, physician to the emperor Maximilian I.; Julius Conrad Otto, author of the *Unveiled Secrets* (נִלְאָה רוּחָא); John Stephen Rittangel, grandson of the celebrated Don Isaac Abravanel; and Jacob Frank, the great apostle of the Cabbalah in the 18th century, whose example in professing Christianity was followed by several thousands of his disciples. The testimony of these distinguished Cabbalists, which they give in their elaborate works, as to the affinity of some of the doctrines of this theosophy with those of Christianity, is fully corroborated by some of the most orthodox Jews.

7. *The Canonical Codes of the Cabbalah*.—The two works which the Cabbalists claim as the authoritative exposition of their doctrine, and which they indeed regarded as inspired records, are (1) the Book of Creation (סֵפֶר יְצִירָה) and (2) the *Sohar* (וְזוֹהַר). THE BOOK OF CREATION

pretends to be a monologue of the patriarch Abraham, and assumes that the contemplations it contains are those which led the father of the Hebrew race to abandon the worship of the stars and to embrace the faith of the true God. The whole treatise consists of six *Perakim* (פְּרָקִים) or chapters, subdivided into thirty-three very brief *Mishnas* (מִשְׁנָוֹת) or sections. As the Hebrew alphabet has twenty-two letters, and as these letters are not only used phonetically but are employed as numerals, which are represented by the fundamental number *ten*, the patriarch Abraham thus obtains thirty-two mediums or ways of secret wisdom by which God created the universe, and shews from the gradual and systematic development of the creation, and from the harmony which prevails in all its multitudinous component parts, that one God produced it all, and that He is over all. The patriarch Abraham deduces this from the analogy which subsists between the visible things and the letters which are the signs of thought, or the means whereby wisdom is expressed and perpetuated among men. The doctrines thus propounded are delivered in the style of aphorisms or theorems, and are laid down very dogmatically as becomes the authority of the great patriarch Abraham.

The renowned *Sohar*, however, is, *par excellence*, the Bible of the Cabbalists. It is a commentary on the Pentateuch, according to its division into the fifty-two hebdomadal lessons. Originally its name seems to have been "Midrash" or "Let there be Light" (מִדְרַשׁ יְהִי אוֹר), deriving its title from the words in Gen. i. 4, with the exposition of which it begins. As its opening theme is light, it afterwards obtained the laconic name *Sohar* (זוֹהַר), i.e. Light, Splendour, an expression of frequent occurrence in the first page. It is also called "Midrash of R. Simon b. Yochai," because this Rabbi is its reputed compiler. Interspersed throughout the *Sohar*, either as parts of the text with distinct titles, or in separate columns, are the following eleven dissertations. (1) *Tosephta* and *Mathanithan* (תּוֹסֵפְתָּא, מַתְנִיתָין), or Additions and Supplements which briefly discuss the topics of the Cabbalah, calling the attention of the initiated to some doctrine or explanation. (2) *Hechaloth* (הַיְכָלוֹת) or the Mansions and Abodes, describing the structure of Paradise and Hell. (3) *Sithr Thorah* (סִתְרֵי תּוֹרָה), or the Mysteries of the Pentateuch, describing the evolution of the Sephiroth, primordial light, &c. (4) *Midrash Ha-Nēlam* (מִדְרַשׁ הַנֶּעְלָם), or the Hidden Midrash, which deduces from the narratives in the Pentateuch the esoteric doctrine by allegorical rules of interpretation. (5) *Raya Mehemana* (רַעְיָא מֵהֶמְמָנָא), or the Faithful Shepherd, recording the discussions between Moses the faithful shepherd, the prophet Elijah, and R. Simon b. Yochai. (6) *Razē Derazin* (רָזִי דְרִיזִין), or the Secret of Secrets, discoursing on physiognomy and psychology. (7) *Saba Demishpatim* (סָבָא דְמִשְׁפָּטִים), or the Aged, i.e. the prophet Elijah, who discourses to R. Simon b. Yochai on metempsychosis, based on the pericope called *Mishpatim*, i.e. Exod. xxi. 1–xxiv. 18. (8) *Siphra Detzniutha* (סִפְרָא דְצִנְיֻתָּא), or the Book of Secrets, discoursing on the cosmogony and demonology. (9) *Idra Raba* (אִדְרָא רַבָּא), or the Great Assembly, giving the discourses of

R. Simon b. Yochai to his numerous assembly of disciples, on the form of the Deity and on pneumatology. (10) Yanuka (יָנוּקָה), or Discourses by the young men of superhuman origin on the mysteries of ablutions: and (11) Idra Suta (יְדֵרָה שׁוּטָה), or the Small Assembly, giving the discourses of R. Simon b. Yochai on the Sephiroth to the small congregation of six surviving disciples.

8. *Date and Origin.*—To determine the rise and age of this esoteric doctrine, great care must be taken to distinguish between the essential features which constitute it a separate system within the precincts of Judaism, and those collateral ideas which were afloat among the Jews from time immemorial, and which the Cabbalists made contributory to the exposition of their theosophy. That everything is in the Deity, that worlds were created and destroyed prior to the present creation, that Metatron is at the head of the angelic hosts, that the serpent which seduced Eve is identical with Satan, that man is androgynous, that the righteous are greater than the angels, that all human souls are pre-existent, that the soul is subject to transmigration, that the Bible under the garment of the letter conceals deep mysteries, that these recondite thoughts are to be evolved by peculiar exegetical rules involving the transposition and commutation of the letters, that all this and many other topics propounded in the Sohar are to be found in the earliest extra-canonical Jewish writings, are facts well-known to those who are conversant with Rabbinical literature. These, however, are simply so much old material used up in the erection of the building, but do not constitute the edifice itself. The cardinal doctrines of the Cabbalah, which constitute its distinguishing features, are the speculations about the En Soph, the Sephiroth, the Archetypal Man, and the evolution of the creation. Now the Book of Creation, which the Cabbalists claim as their oldest document, being as they assert the production of the patriarch Abraham, has nothing whatever in common with these vital dogmas. Even its treatment of the ten digits, as part of the thirty-two ways of wisdom whereby God created the universe, which has undoubtedly suggested to the authors of the Cabbalah the idea of the ten Sephiroth, is quite different from the mode in which the Cabbalistic Sephiroth are depicted. When it is added that the language and whole complexion of this pseudograph, as well as the train of ideas therein enunciated, shew unmistakably that it is a production of the 9th century of the Christian era, we at once see that the doctrines of the Cabbalah could not have originated prior to this period. It is true that the Sohar, which is the sacred canon of the Cabbalists, pretends to be a revelation from God communicated through R. Simon b. Yochai, who flourished about A.D. 70–110, and that such distinguished Christian scholars as Lightfoot, Gill, Bartolocci, Pfeifer, Knorr von Rosenroth, Molitor, &c., have ascribed this date to it. The fact, however, that the Sohar praises most fulsomely R. Simon b. Yochai, its supposed author, exalting him above Moses, mystically explains the Hebrew vowel-points, which did not obtain till A.D. 570, borrowed two verses from the celebrated hymn called the Royal Diadem by Ibn Gebirol, who was born about A.D. 1021, mentions the cru-

saders, the taking of Jerusalem by the Crusaders and the retaking it by the Saracens, speaks of the comet which appeared at Rome, July 15, 1264, under the pontificate of Urban IV., and by a slip assigns a reason why its contents were not revealed before A.M. 5060–66 = A.D. 1300–1306, shews beyond doubt that its author lived in the 13th century of the Christian era. This is fully confirmed by the fact that the doctrine of the En Soph, the Sephiroth, and the metempsychosian retribution, was not known before the 13th century, and that the very existence of the Sohar, according to the confession of staunch Cabbalists themselves, was not known before this period. For these and many other reasons the most distinguished critics now admit that Moses da Leon († 1305), who first published and sold the Sohar as the production of R. Simon b. Yochai, was himself its author, as was indeed confessed by his own wife and daughter.

9. *Literature.*—Azariel, *Commentary on the Doctrine of the Sephiroth*, Warsaw, 1798, and Berlin, 1850: *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, by the same author, Altona, 1763: the *Sohar*, frequently published, and Baron von Rosenroth's translation of portions of this celebrated work in his *Kabbala Denudata*, Sulzbach, 1677–78: Franck, *La Kabbale*, ed. Jellinek, Leipzig, 1844: Stern, *Analysis of the Sohar in the Ben Chananja*, vols. i.–v.: Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. vii. 442–459: Löw, *Ben Chananja*, vi. 325 ff.: Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah, its Doctrines, Development, and Literature*, London, 1865.

[C. D. G.]

CADAN. [CATAN.]

CADAR (CADOC), third archbishop of London in British times, in the list compiled by Jocelin of Furness in the 12th century. He also occurs at Caerleon. (Godwin, *Praesul.* 170; Usher, *Brit. Ecc. Ant. Wks.* v. 88; Le Neve, *Fasti*, ii. 273, ed. Hardy; Stubbs, *Regist. Sac.* 152.)

[C. H.]

CADDA (1) (CEADDA, CHAD), grandfather of Caedwalla, king of the West Saxons (*A. S. C.* an. 685). The reading Ceadda in two MSS. (ed. Thorpe) is adopted by Ingram, who in his translation writes it Chad.

[C. H.]

(2) a bishop whose name is attached to a spurious charter of A.D. 706 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 58); possibly Hedda or Headda, bishop of Lichfield. [HEADDA.]

[S.]

CADELL, king of Powys. [CATELL.]

CADELL, Welsh saint of the 7th century, patron of Llangadell, a church formerly in Glamorganshire. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 295; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 498.)

[C. H.]

CADEOLDUS (EDALDUS), St., bishop of Vienne. Originally a monk, he became abbat of Grison and finally bishop of Vienne. He died in 696. The mode of spelling his name is doubtful (*Acta SS. Boll.* Jan. i. 975).

[H. W. Y.]

He occurs in the *Martyrologium* of Usuard, with an *alias* Eoldus (see also the *Obs.* and *Auct.*). Commemorated Jan. 14.

[C. H.]

CADFAN (1), a Celtic saint of the 6th century, of good birth in Armorica, who crossed over into Wales at the head of a large company, most of them of princely rank and his own relatives, exiled, it is conjectured, in consequence

of the Frankish invasion, which had reached their peninsula. He is chiefly known as the first abbat of a monastery founded by him in conjunction with Einion Frenhin, in the Isle of Bardsey, off the promontory of Carnarvonshire (Rees, *Essay on Welsh Saints*, 213 sq.; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 499). An ancient Welsh inscription, almost the only one of the kind remaining, upon a rude pillar at Tywyn, in Merionethshire, where was one of the many churches of his foundation, is considered as probably referring to him; it is given by Haddan and Stubbs (i. 165) among the sepulchral Christian monuments of Celtic Britain. [C. H.]

CADFAN (2) (CADUANUS, CATUAN), king of Venedotia, Guenedotia, or Gwynnyd, who is said in the *Annales Eccles. Menevensis* (Wharton, *Angl. Sacr.* II. xxxi.) to have reigned between the years A.D. 575 and 610, although a later date (616-630) has been given. By this authority, and by the *Brut y Tywysogion*, he is made the father of Cadwallon and grandfather of Cadwallader, whereas usually these two names are considered but varieties of one, Cadwalla. A Latin inscription on a tombstone at Llangadwaladr, or Eglwys Ael, in Anglesey, supposed to have been erected by Cadwallader to king Cadfan, is given by Haddan and Stubbs (i. 165) among the sepulchral Christian antiquities referred to in the preceding article. (See also Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 301.) [C. H.]

CADFARCH, Welsh saint about the middle of the 6th century, founder of the churches of Penegs in Montgomeryshire and Abererch in Carnarvonshire. Commemorated on Oct. 24. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 270; *Acta SS.* Oct. x. 763, 764.) [C. H.]

CADFRAWD, early Welsh saint. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 92, 100.) [C. H.]

CADGYFARCH, early Welsh saint. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 102.) [C. H.]

CADIOCENUS (THADIOCENUS, THADIACUS), a supposed archbishop of York who retired into Wales A.D. 586. (Stubbs, *Regist.* 153.) [C. H.]

CADO (CATAW), Welsh saint of the 6th century. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 232.) [C. H.]

CADOC (CADOCUS, DOCUS, CATHMAEL, CATWGW DDOETH, or CATWGW THE WISE), abbat of Llancarvan, was the son of Gundleus or Gwynllyw Filwr, by Gladusa or Gladys, daughter or grand-daughter of Braghan or Brechan, from whom Brecknock took its name. In the Welsh annals he occupies a period immediately succeeding that assigned to King Arthur. His life has made a deep impression upon the Celtic race, and his name, which was long popular in Wales, still remains so in Brittany. He was educated by an Irish anchorite, Meuthi, and, refusing to succeed his father in his principality, he went to Gwent or Caerwent, in Monmouthshire, where he studied under the Irish St. Tathai. He was cousin to St. David of Menevia, and nephew to St. Canoc of Gallen (Feb. 11): and with his friends St. David and St. Gildas he gave a mass to the second order of Irish saints. From Gwent he removed to Glamorgan, and founded the monastery of Llancarvan, near Cowbridge, of which he became first abbat. This house became a famous centre of sacred and secular learning, where the Holy

Scriptures chiefly, but also the great authors of antiquity, were studied and transcribed. There he is said to have had St. Gildas the Wise teaching in his school, and St. Cainnech of Achadbo one of his pupils. He was the friend of Dubricius, and the means of the conversion of St. Illutus. It is impossible to fix the dates of his life, but he was probably born about the beginning of the 6th century. In order to fulfil the conditions of being master of St. Cainnech, contemporary of St. David and St. Gildas, and helper of these two in giving a mass to the second order of Irish saints, who are usually said to have extended from about the year 542 to 599, this saint must have flourished in the early part of that period. Colgan and Lanigan assign 570 as the date of his death, by martyrdom according to the former and others, or in his own monastery at Llancarvan as says the latter. He was commemorated on Jan. 14. A list of the churches he is considered to have founded may be seen in Rees; and a large collection of his maxims and moral sayings, both in prose and verse, is preserved in vol. iii. of the *Myvyrian Archaeology*.

The Fables of Catwgg the Wise are printed in a volume entitled *Iolo Manuscripts*, edited by Edw. Williams in 1848 for the Welsh MSS. Society. It is observed by Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, i. 158 n.), that Cadoc's college at Llancarvan, with two others at Caerworgern and Docwinni [see ILLTYD and DOCWINUS], were the three great monastic establishments of the diocese of Llandaff. His *Life* in the *Acta SS.* of the Bollandists occurs Jan. ii. 602. The manuscript *Lives* are described by Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* I. 146-151.

Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 152, 185, n.²⁸) seeks to identify the Mochatocus left by St. Fiach at Inisfail as the Cadocus of Wales, but the dates do not harmonise; neither can ours be the Docus of the *Annals of Ulster*, who died A.D. 473. He has also been confused with St. Sophias of Beneventum. His Scotch dedication was at Cambuslang, co. Lanark. (See Colgan, *Acta SS.* 158-161, where he gives two lives; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 489 sq.; Ussher, *De Brit. Ecol. Prim.* ch. xiii.; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 292 sq.; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, i. 344; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 415 sq.; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 170-71; Rees, *Essay on Welsh Saints*, 177; W. J. Rees, *Cambro-British Saints*, 22-96, and App.; Capgrave, *Nova Legenda Angliae*, lii.; Montalembert, *Les Moines d'Occident*, iii. 55 sq., Paris, 1868; *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 61.)

[J. G. & C. H.]

CADOG, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of Llangadog Fawr church in Carmarthenshire, and others; not to be confounded with Cadoc, abbat of Llancarvan. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 142.) [C. H.]

CADROD, reputed Welsh saint of the 6th century. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 270.) [C. H.]

CADUANUS (*Ann. Eccles. Menev.* in Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* II. xxxi.; Diceto, *de Reg. Brit.*, Gale, xv. Scriptt. 559), duke or king of Venedotia, or king of the Britons. [CADFAN (2).] [C. H.]

CADUCIUS, a rich gentleman in Gaul, whose bailiffs at Capua turned an old presbyter named

Basil out of the little house that was his property and home. Paulinus therefore sent a letter by Amandus and Delphinus to plead the old man's cause with Caducius, and they were successful. Tillemont (xiv. 79) dates the occurrence A.D. 397. Paulinus, *Epp.* 12, 14 (21, 18). [E. B. B.]

CADWALA (Alcuin, *de Pontiff. Ebor.* v. 262, Gale, xv. Scriptt. 707); CADWALADER, -DRUS, -LLADRUS (*Brut y Tywysog.* trr. Williams, M. H. B., ad init.; *Annal. Eccles. Menev.*, Wharton, A. S. II. xxxi.; Diceto, *de Reg. Brit.*, Gale, xv. Scriptt. 559; Fordun, *Scotichr.*, Gale, ibid. 646, 647; ed. Skene, i. 126-128; ii. 119); CADWALLA (Bede, *H. E.* ed. Giles, ii. 20; iii. 1; A. S. C. trr. Thorpe, Ingram, M.H.B. ad an. 633); CADWALLO, -ON (Wend. *F. H.* ed. Coxe, ad an. 633; *Brut y Tywysog.* trr. ad init.; *Annal. Eccles. Menev.* l. c.; Diceto, Fordun, ll. cc.), king or duke of Guenedota, Guenedotia, Venedotia, the Venedoci, or Gwynnyd, or king of the Britons. [CAEDWALLA (1).] Of the authorities above cited, the following do not identify Cadwallo with Cadwalader, but, for the most part, make them father and son, and Cadwallo the son of Caduanus [CADFAN (2)], namely, *Ann. Ecc. Menev.*, *Brut y Tywysog.*, Diceto, Fordun. [C. H.]

CADWALLA (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12, ed. Giles), king of Wessex. [CAEDWALLA (2).] [C. H.]

CADWR, 5th metropolitan of Caerleon as given in the *Iolo Manuscripts*. (Stubbs, *Reg. Sac.* 154.) [C. H.]

CAECILIA, ST., (1) a Roman lady, one of the four principal Virgins and Martyrs of the Western church, commemorated in the Latin and also in the Greek church on the 22nd November. Of her life and history, however, hardly any authentic account has come down to us.

The veneration paid to this saint can be traced back to a very early period. The martyrdom of St. Caecilia and of her three companions is referred to in nearly all the most ancient Latin breviaries and missals. It is mentioned in the Sacramentary of Pope Gregory; in the breviary and missal of the church of Milan ascribed to St. Ambrose; in the Mozarabic or Spanish liturgy, with proper prayers and prefaces; and a grand office for her feast will be found in the Gallican missal, which is believed to have been in use in Gaul from the 6th century down to the time of Charlemagne. Under the date of the 22nd November, her name appears in the Martyrology attributed to Jerome, in that of Bede, and in all the others. In these collections her martyrdom is placed at Rome.

Yet it is very difficult, says Tillemont, to find the true place of St. Caecilia in the chronology of the saints. The earliest writer who makes mention of her is Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, at the end of the 6th century. According to his account she died in Sicily between the years A.D. 176-180, under the Emperor M. Aurelius or Commodus. The life of St. Caecilia that we owe to Symeon Metaphrastes, a Hagiographer of the 10th century, makes her contemporary with Urban, and places her martyrdom at Rome under Alexander Severus about the year A.D. 230. The Greek menologies relate that she suffered there

in the time of Diocletian (284-305). On the other hand, the Roman calendar drawn up at Rome under Pope Liberius, about the middle of the 4th century (A.D. 352-366), contains no mention of her name. This, indeed, is not a complete list of martyrs, but a ferial, or list of the chief feasts (Rossi, i. 116). Her body must, however, have been removed thither from the place of her first sepulture not long after this period; for in the time of Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498) there was a church of St. Caecilia at Rome, in which he held a council.

The account of her life and martyrdom by Symeon Metaphrastes, to be found in Surius, is of no authority. The narrative is full of marvels and improbabilities, and the internal evidence alone is quite sufficient to prove its legendary character. This was long ago pointed out, among others by Tillemont. Some modern critics have, however, of late endeavoured to uphold the credibility of the work, and to refer its compilation in the form which has reached us to the commencement of the 5th century (cf. Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacrés*, vol. ii. Paris, 1859).

There can be little doubt that these Acts of St. Caecilia were composed to be read in the church of the saint on the day of her feast. According to the legend, "she was born at Rome of a noble family. After she had heard the sweet voice of Christ and had believed in Him, she resolved, from love to her dear Lord, to devote herself evermore to Him by a vow of perpetual virginity. Her parents wished her to marry Valerian, a young Roman, who at that time was not a Christian. Caecilia so far complied with their wishes as to go through the marriage ceremonies; but when alone with her young husband, she told him of the vow that she had made, and Valerian allowed her to keep it. Yielding to her entreaties, he sought out the retreat of Urban, and received baptism at his hands. On returning to his spouse, wearing the white robe of a neophyte, he found her praying in her chamber, and an angel of God at her side. In answer to Valerian's prayer, the angel promised that his brother, Tiburtius, should become a Christian, and he foretold that both brothers should receive the crown of martyrdom.

"In the year A.D. 230, the Emperor Alexander Severus was absent from Rome, waging war against the Persians. Turcius Almachius, praefect of the city, took advantage of the emperor's absence to give free vent to his hatred of the Christians, and daily put many to death. Valerian and Tiburtius were soon brought before his tribunal. After having been scourged, the two brothers were commanded to offer incense to the gods. On their refusal they were condemned to be beheaded, and given in charge to Maximus. So moved was he by the exhortations of these two martyrs, that in the night he and all his family, together with the lictors, believed and were baptized. On the morrow his prisoners were beheaded at the place called Pagus Triopius on the Via Appia at the fourth mile from Rome. When the news reached the Praefect that Maximus also had become a Christian, he ordered him to be scourged to death with a scourge of leaden balls. Soon afterwards he sent his officers to Caecilia and bade her sacrifice to the gods. On

her refusing to do so, he commanded her to be shut up in her bath, and that the furnace should be heated with wood seven times hotter than it was wont to be heated. But a heavenly dew falling upon the spouse of Christ refreshed and cooled her body, and preserved her from harm. A day and a night the Praefect waited for news of her death. Then he sent one of his soldiers to behead her; but though the sword smote her neck thrice, the executioner could not cut off her head, and he departed, leaving her on the floor of her bath bathed in blood. For three days longer she lived, never ceasing to exhort the people whom she loved to continue steadfast in the Lord, and watching over the distribution of her last alms. Having given her house to the church, she gave up her precious and beautiful spirit into the hands of the living God. Urban and his deacons buried her in the cemetery of Calixtus on the Via Appia near the third milestone. Her house he consecrated to God as a church for ever."

It is alleged that her body was found at Rome by Pope Paschal I., in the year A.D. 821, in the cemetery of Praetextatus, adjoining that of Calixtus on the Via Appia, and that it was removed by him to the church of St. Caecilia, he was then rebuilding, which stands, as is said, on the site of her house, at the extremity of the Trastevere. Here, it is said, her body was again discovered at the end of the 16th century in the time of Clement VIII. Baronius has given a long account of the circumstances connected with this pretended discovery, of which he was a witness (s. an. 821).

The legend of this saint has furnished the subject of several remarkable pictures. The oldest representation of her is a rude picture or drawing on the wall of the catacomb, called the cemetery of San Lorenzo, of the date probably of the 6th or 7th century. (See D'Agincourt, plate xi.) In this she appears with the martyr's crown on her head. In the 13th century Cimabue painted an altar-piece, representing different episodes in the life of the saint for the church dedicated to her at Florence. Here she again appears with the martyr's crown. In fact, before the 15th century, St. Caecilia is seldom seen depicted with her musical instruments. She has generally the martyr's palm and the crown of red or white roses. At what time she first came to be regarded as the patron saint of musicians is unknown. In the ancient documents that have come down to us, there is nothing to shew that she ever made use of instruments of music. The most celebrated of the modern representations of St. Caecilia as patroness of this art is the picture executed by Raphael in the earlier years of his residence at Rome (A.D. 1513), now in the gallery of Bologna. After this date, representations of her in this character are very common.

In 1584, in the time of Pope Pius V., an academy of music was founded at Rome, and placed under the tutelage of St. Caecilia. From that time forward she came to be more and more regarded as queen of harmony, and Dryden's well-known ode has rendered her familiar to Englishmen in this character.

For a more detailed account of St. Caecilia, reference may be made to the following works:—*De Vitis Sanctorum*, ed. Surius, Venice, 1581,

tom. vi. page 161, s. d. Nov. 22; *Acta Sanctorum*, by the Bollandists, s. d. April 14, p. 204; *Baronii Annales* s. an. A.D. 821; Tillemont, vol. iii. pp. 259–689; *S. Caeciliae Acta a Laderchio*, Rome, 1722, 2 vols. 4to. incorporating the work of Bosio, with large additions; *Sacred and Legendary Art*, by Mrs. Jameson, 3rd edition, London, 1857, pp. 583–600; Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés*, vol. ii. Paris, 1859; *S. Cécile*, par Dom Guéranger, Paris, 1874. [T. D. C. M.]

Tillemont supposes her to have suffered in Sicily (ii. 348, iii. 260, 690). De Rossi (*Roma Sott.* ii. xxxii.–xl.iii. 113–161) believes the author of the Acts to have lived in the 4th or 5th century, and gives reasons for supposing Caecilia to have sprung from a Christian branch of the senatorial family of the Caecilii Maximi Fausti, and that the true date of her martyrdom is that found by Ado in old MSS., namely, under M. Aurelius or Commodus. [E. B. B.]

Caecilia is four times mentioned in Bede. She stands in his prose *Martyrology* and in his metrical one. In the hymn in praise of Etheldritha and virginity she receives a line, in society with Agnes, who is honoured with another—

"Laeta ridet gladios ferro robustior Agnes,
Caecilia infestos laeta ridet gladios,"

(*H. E.* iv. 20). Again Bede writes, "in the church of the holy martyr Caecilia, and on her natale," the English Wilbrord was ordained by Pope Sergius, A.D. 696, archbishop for the Frisians (v. 11). The tradition which connected her name with music is easily accounted for. Pope Paschal, for the future protection of the relic which he had found, built on to Caecilia's church a monastery, to which he gave a handsome endowment to provide that the religious should guard the bodies of the saint and her companions, and chant the praises of God around her tomb day and night. (Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, ad diem Nov. 22.) Such a service of song could not but kindle a legend-loving imagination, and the story grew that often, while the Saviour's praises arose in vocal music, Caecilia's own instrumental accompaniment was heard. In England, at the latter part of the 17th century, her day was found a convenient one for holding an annual festival that was set on foot for the encouragement of music. This celebration brought the lyric poet also into requisition, and odes for St. Caecilia's day were annually offered to the public. It need not be added how the genius of Dryden and Pope sent all the other essays into oblivion. [C. H.]

CAECILIA. (2) Martyr at Carthage with DATIVUS, in A.D. 304. [E. B. B.]

(3) The exact date of this saint, who is also called Clara, is not known, but she is supposed to have lived in the 7th century, and to have been abbess of Remiremont in Lotharingia for a period of thirty years. She is commemorated Aug. 12. (*Acta SS. Boll.* Aug. ii. 732.) [H. W. Y.]

CAECILIANUS (1). Jerome says that Cyprian was converted "suadente presbytero Caecilio, a quo et cognomentum sortitus est," and this statement probably influenced most editors to substitute *Caecilius* for *Caecilianus* in the texts of the *Life of Cyprian* by his own deacon

Pontius. All the manuscripts which Hartel has used have *Caecilianus*, as Manutius also reads, and Ruinart (*Acta Mart. Sinc.*), though he has *Caecilus*, admits that the two (vetustissimi Hartel. Praef.) codices Fossatensis and Floriacensis had *Caecilianus*. There can be no doubt then that *Caecilianus* is correct, and Jerome's story falls to the ground as does also the suggestion (otherwise valueless though most adopted) of Don Maran, that he was the Caecilus Natalis of Minucius Felix. Baronius boldly conjectured that he was the tutor of Diadumenus, and again quotes Pontius to the effect that Cyprian in giving up the world commended his wife and children to Caecilus; whereas what Pontius says is that Caecilian dying commended his family to the piety of Cyprian. He was *aetate* as well as *honore presbyter*, and Cyprian [CYPRIANUS], as a deacon, probably lived with him, reverencing him greatly "as the father of his new life." All that Pontius farther tells is that he was *justus et laudabilis memoriae*. He appears afterwards as *venerabilis sacerdos* (Bolland. *Acta Sanct.* Jun. t. i. p. 264, § 3, Henschen), and was inserted as *Sanctus Caecilus* in the Roman Martyrology (June 3) by Gregory XIII. (Morcelli, *Afr. Christiana*, vol. ii. p. 76; and see Papebroch in *Acta Sanct.* l. c.) [E. W. B.]

CAECILIANUS (2). First archdeacon, then (A.D. 311) bishop, of Carthage. His name is of importance in connexion with the Donatist controversy. [DONATISM.] When archdeacon, Caecilian resolutely supported his bishop, Mensurius, in his opposition to the fanatical craving for martyrdom. The Christianity of Northern Africa exhibited an extravagance on this subject which reached its height after the Diocletian persecution. Men courted death at the hands of the Pagans, that after death they might be honoured as martyrs and confessors; some, without doubt, in a spirit which commands our respect, however much we may consider the enthusiasm mistaken; but others in a spirit which fostered the supposition that the martyr's cross would wash away for eternity the misery, the follies, the sins, and the crimes of a whole life. It was hopeless to attempt discrimination between these classes, and in either case the only sound policy seemed to be to suppress such extravagance; if possible, kindly, but where kindness failed, by stern and rigorous measures.

On the death of Mensurius, Caecilian was nominated as his successor. The part he had taken against the would-be martyrs was then remembered, and brought up against him. The religious world of Carthage was thrown into a ferment, and divided itself broadly into two sections, the moderate and the rigoristic parties, or the supporters and the opponents of the principles of Caecilian. At the head of the latter was a devout and wealthy lady named Lucilla, who had been severely rebuked by the archdeacon on account of her superstitious veneration for martyrs' relics. The rebuke was also a rebuke to the principles and practice of the rigoristic party; it was accepted as such, and when the vacancy in the see occurred, this party prepared to fill it with one of their own followers. Caecilian's party hastened matters to a conclusion; the election took place, and the archdeacon was

consecrated by Felix, bishop of Aptunga: whether in the presence of any Numidian bishops or not seems uncertain.

Secundus, primate of Numidia and bishop of Tigisis, was presently invited to Carthage by the rigoristic party. He came, attended by seventy bishops, and cited Caecilian before them. Charges personal and ecclesiastical were made against the newly-consecrated bishop. Felix of Aptunga was denounced as a "traditor" (i.e. one who had delivered up the sacred writings in his possession), and consequently any ordination performed by him was to be rejected, according to the principles of the North-African church, as invalid. Caecilian himself was charged with unnecessary and heartless severity to those who had visited the confessors in prison; he was denounced as a "tyrannus" and a "carnifex." Caecilian declined to appear before an assembly so prejudiced; but he professed his willingness to satisfy them on all personal matters, and offered, if right was on their side, to lay down his episcopal office, and submit to re-ordination at their hands. Secundus and the Numidian bishops answered by excommunicating him and his party, and ordaining as bishop the reader Majorinus, a member of Lucilla's household. "As weeds are mown down," said one of Caecilian's opponents, "and cast away, so traditors and those who are schismatically ordained by traditors cannot remain in the church of God, except they acknowledge their error, and become reconciled with the church by the tears of repentance."

The church of North Africa now became a prey to schism. The party of Caecilian broke off relations from the party of Majorinus, and the Christian world was scandalised by fulminations, excommunications, invectives, charges, and countercharges. Both parties confidently anticipated the support of the state; but Constantine, who was now emperor of this part of the Roman world, took the side of the Caecilianists. In his largesse to the Christians of the province, and in his edicts favourable to the church therein established, he expressly stipulated that the party of Majorinus should be excluded: their views were in his opinion the "madness" of men of "unsound mind." This imputation was intolerable; the rigoristic party at once appealed to the justice of the emperor, and courted full inquiry. They asked only, as a special favour, that the inquiry might be conducted in Gaul—at a distance, that is, from the spot where passions and convictions were so strong and one-sided.

A council met A.D. 313 at Rome, in the Lateran. It was presided over by Melchiades (Miltiades), bishop of Rome, who had as his assessors the bishops of Cologne, Arles, and seventeen others. Caecilian appeared with ten bishops; Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae, in Numidia, headed the party of Majorinus. The personal charges against Caecilian were examined and dismissed, and his party proclaimed the representatives of the orthodox Catholic church; Donatus himself was declared to have violated the laws of the church, and his followers were to be allowed to retain their dignity and office only on condition of re-union with Caecilian's party. The bitterness of this decision was modified by Caecilian's friendly proposal

of compromise; but his advances were rejected, and the cry of injustice raised. It was wrong, the rigorists pleaded, that the opinion of twenty should overrule that of seventy; and they demanded first that imperial commissioners should investigate matters at Carthage itself, and that then a council should be summoned to examine their report, and base their decision upon its information. Constantine met their wish. Jurists went to Carthage, collected documents, tabulated the statements of witnesses, and laid their report before the bishops assembled (A.D. 314) at Arles. This council, presided over by Marinus, bishop of the see, and composed of about 200 persons, was the most important ecclesiastical assembly the Christian world had yet seen; and its decisions have been of permanent value to the church. As regarded Caecilian personally, the validity of his ordination was confirmed, the charge raised against his consecrator, Felix, being proved baseless; and as regarded the general questions debated—such as traditorship, its proof or disproof; ordination by traditors, when valid or not; baptism and re-baptism—canons of extreme importance were passed (see ‘Arles, Synod of,’ *DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES*).

The temper displayed by the victors was not calculated to soothe the conquered; and an appeal was at once made from the council to the emperor himself. Constantine was irritated; but, after some delay, ordered the discussion of the question before himself personally. This occurred at Milan (A.D. 316). The emperor confirmed the previous decisions of Rome and Arles, and followed up his judgment by laws and edicts confiscating the goods of the party of Majorinus, depriving them of their churches, and threatening to punish their rebellion with death.

From this time the schism in the North-African church lost whatever purely personal questions, as between Caecilian and Majorinus, had been imported into it, and became a stern religious contest on questions of discipline (see *DONATISM*). Whether or not Majorinus was alive at the time of the council of Arles seems doubtful: some writers put his death in A.D. 313, others in A.D. 315; but he was succeeded by Donatus—called “the great,” to distinguish him from Donatus of Casae Nigrae—who gave his name to the party; and with him compromise was impossible. Caecilian lived to about A.D. 345, probably occupied in practising towards his opponents and their fanatical offshoots, the Circumcellions, Agonistici, etc., the toleration which the letters of his imperial master inculcated, and which his own Christian feeling dictated. (For authorities, etc., see *DONATISTS*.) [J. M. F.]

CAECILIANUS (3), ALFIUS. Duumvir of Aptunga at the time of the alleged *traditio*, and cited to give evidence in the cause. Constantine, ap. Aug. *Ep.* 88 (68), vol. ii. 304.

[E. B. B.]

(4) Martyr with others at Caesaraugusta, under Datianus the praeses of Spain. His natalis was April 16 (Usuard. *Mart.*) [*MARTYRS OF SARA-GOSSA.*] [C. H.]

(5) Martyr at Carthage with DATIVUS in 304.

CAECILIANUS (6) Prefect of the praetorians A.D. 359 (*Cod. Theod.* vi. tit. 23, law 47), not to be confounded with the following:—

(7) Vicarius under Honorius A.D. 404, in the 4th law in the code of Justinian on assessors. Prefect of the Praetorians at Rome A.D. 409 (*Cod. Theod.* i. ii. 8, ix. 2, 5, etc.). Zosimus (v. 44) tells us that he was one of the legates sent by the senate to Honorius at Ravenna to deplore the miserable state of things in Rome, where Alaric did not fulfil his engagements, in A.D. 409. The embassy was fruitless, but Caecilianus was appointed to succeed Theodorus in the chief office of the prefects. Niebuhr thinks this means in the praetorian prefecture.

Symmachus writes to Ambrose (*Sym. Ep.* iii. 36) begging him not to admit to his episcopal court or favour a suit of one Pirata against this Caecilianus, who was then *praefectus annonae*. He writes to Caecilianus himself (*ix. Ep.* 49 or 50), and addresses him as a friend and as a judge whose decision was final.

Augustine writes to him, *Ep.* 86 (60), begging him to extend to Hippo the measures that he was enforcing against the Donatists in other parts of Africa. Godofredus says that it is by mistake that Augustine here calls him “praeses.” Tillemont thinks that the letter was written in A.D. 405, and that he was then vicarius of Africa (xiii. 428). Perhaps his office as *praefectus annonae* gave him power in the great corn-bearing province. There was indeed a “*Praefectus annonae* Carthagini,” v. Godofred. ad *Cod. Theod.* xi. 1, 13 (vol. iv. p. 22), Walter, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, p. 374. But this office seems to have been subordinate to the vicarius.

We find Caecilianus in A.D. 414 commissioned with Flavianus, the ex-prefect of the city, the son of his old friend Symmachus, to go to Africa and inquire into the complaints of the provincials there, and also into the corn-tax for the support of the soldiers quartered in Africa.

But he had been at Carthage in A.D. 413, as appears from the other epistle which Augustine wrote to him, as Tillemont supposes (xiii. 1005), when he reached Africa on this mission. Aug. *Ep.* 151 (259). Tillemont thinks that this letter refers to the death of Marcellinus, who had been put to death on the charge of being involved in the revolt of Heraclianus, but really, as the Catholics believed, because he had made himself obnoxious to the Donatists. Augustine mentions no names, but the execution of Marcellinus and his brother, by order of Marinus, the count who was sent to suppress the revolt, seems to be meant. (Tillem. xiii. 612 ff.) Now the revolt of Heraclianus took place in A.D. 413, in the spring, and Marinus was in Africa to execute justice on his accomplices in the autumn of that year. Orosius tells us that Marcellinus was put to death by Marinus. Caecilianus had once received a somewhat sharp answer from Marcellinus, and a very grave injury from his brother. The persecutor on the other hand was an old friend of his, and he was with him when the order was given for their arrest, and frequently closeted with him during the course of the trial. It was a reign of terror, and false witnesses were to be had in plenty, and one false witness was enough to condemn a

man. It was hinted that something might be effected by episcopal intercession, and a bishop was despatched to court (*ad comitatum*) on the understanding that nothing further should be done till he returned. Meanwhile Caecilianus came to Augustine and told him he hoped that he should obtain the release of the men as a parting favour, as he was to leave Carthage next day, and that he had told Marinus, "All your private interviews with me will be a burden, not an honour, to me otherwise, as no one will doubt that their death has been arranged between us." He stretched out his hand to the altar and swore that such had been his words. And the day after his departure, which was St. Cyprian's eve, Sept. 13, the men were executed.

The next communication that passed between Caecilianus and Augustine was, that Caecilianus brought letters from Pope Innocent, which he forwarded to Augustine without enclosing with them a line of his own. So the saint did not venture to trouble the statesman with a letter till he had real occasion to recommend a friend to him. Caecilianus did all he was asked, and wrote complaining of Augustine's silence, and fearing that in the letter he had last written he had hinted at grave suspicions. Augustine writes back to return thanks for the favour, to explain his previous silence, to testify his own unshaken belief in his friend, to point out to him how suspicious his conduct must have appeared to the world, and to beg him, for love and not for hatred, to break off from all association with the judicial murderer, if he has continued to associate with him. He also tells him that a man of his age and probity should not be content to remain a catechumen, "as though the faithful could not, the more faithful they were, so much the more faithfully administer the commonwealth." What reason can he have for his laborious life unless it be philanthropy? He professes his own intention of giving all the leisure Hippo leaves him to the service of posterity. [E. B. B.]

CAECILIUS. [CAPELLA.]

(2) CAECILIUS NATALIS, the pagan in the dialogue of Octavius, by Minucius FELIX, is supposed by Tillemont to be no imaginary personage, but a real convert (*H. E.* iii. 164-6). Tillemont discusses his identity with CAELIANUS, and with the married presbyter who converted Cyprian (*Till.* iv. 46, 47, 50; *Hier. V. Illus.* c. 67; *Pontius*, p. 3; *AA. SS.* June, i. 270).

(3) Presbyter; friend of Cyprian. See CAECILIANUS (1).

(4) One of the seven bishops said to have been ordained by the apostles at Rome and sent into Spain; namely, Torquatus of Cadiz, Ctesiphon of a see near Almeria, Secundus of Avila in Castille, Indaletius of Arbuceia (Arci), Caecilius of Elvira, Hesychius of Cazorla (Carcesi), Euphrasius of Andujar (Illiturgi). The seven are celebrated together in a Choriambic hymn, full of false quantities, in the Mozarabic Liturgy on May 15 (*AA. SS.* May, iii. 441).

It is observable that Caecilius, whether (3) or (4), is commemorated in the Calendar of Carthage May 14. In the Spanish Gothic Calendar (Migne, lxxxv. 1051) we have only mention of "TORCHRIST. BIOGR.

quatus and his companions, confessors," on the 1st of May. Each, however, has now his separate festival, Caecilius on February 1, Ctesiphon April 1 (see *AA. SS.* Feb. i. 4-12).

We hear nothing of any of them till the 9th century: then legends began to spring up thick and fast. They were all supposed to have accompanied James from Jerusalem, and after his return and martyrdom to have carried back his relics into Spain. James carries with him some of all the seven orders, except deacons and subdeacons. Caecilius is a reader. Numerous writings are ascribed to him.

CAECILIUS (5) The martyrdom of a Caecilius on the further side of the Tiber is assigned to Nov. 17 in the *Mart. Hieron.*

[E. B. B.]

(6) Bishop of Biltha (Bilta, Vilta), in proconsular province of Africa, a member of the Committee of Virginibus subintroductis (*Ep.* 4), A.D. 249; sat in each of the synods, de Pace maturius danda (*Ep.* 57), de Basilide et Martiali (*Ep.* 67), de Baptismo Haereticorum I. (*Ep.* 70), and as senior bishop spoke first with aged violence in the synod de Baptismo III. (*Sentt. Epp.* 1). He is not impossibly (Routh, *Rel. S.* vol. iii. p. 190) also the same bishop who is addressed by Cyprian on the subject of the mixed chalice (*Ep.* 63).

[E. W. B.]

CAEDMON (CEDMON), an English poet and singer living in the seventh century. Everything known about his personal history is recorded by Bede. (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 24.) Caedmon seems to have been a lay brother of the monastery of Streaneshalch or Whitby, whilst Hilda was abbess. He had reached a somewhat advanced age, ignorant altogether of song; to such an extent, indeed, that, when on festive occasions it was usual to sing in turn in the common hall, the sight of the harp coming round, which was to give the singer his note, was enough to send Caedmon from the room. One evening he had retired for this cause to the stables, of which he had the charge that night, and in his sleep a man seemed to stand by him and bade him sing something. Caedmon replied that he could not do so. "Nay, but thou hast something to sing to me," was the answer. "What must I sing?" said Caedmon. "Sing of the creation." The new poet burst into unexpected song on the theme, and when he awoke the words were in his memory, and he was able to exercise his new power of versification. In the morning he told everything to the bailiff, his master. He was taken to the abbess, narrating his dream and reciting his verses. All thought that he had received a gift from God. They explained to him next some portion of the Bible, and desired him to put it into metre. In the morning the lines were ready. Hilda, after this, made Caedmon enter the monastery as a monk, and took care that he was made acquainted with the Scriptures. Everything that he heard he versified with sweetness and power, whilst his life was a pattern of devotion and obedience. Sir Francis Palgrave points out the curious fact (*Archaeologia*, xxiv. 341) that a similar story is told of a peasant poet in France, and considers that Bede's legend is only an attempted localisation of a floating tradition not peculiar to England. Judging, however, from the dates, it seems pro-

bable that the French story was derived from Bede.

Bede describes Caedmon's decease in his happiest manner. Fourteen days before he died, Caedmon was seriously unwell, but was able to speak and walk. He was not far from the chamber or house into which, according to monastic usage, the sick and dying were carried. On the evening before his death he bade his attendant to make up a bed for him there. The request was wonderingly obeyed. They entered the place, and after some pleasant converse with the inmates, as midnight drew on, Caedmon asked if they had the Eucharist within. When in astonishment they doubted his need of it, he repeated his question and wish. The Eucharist was brought and received, the sick man obtaining from his audience the forgiveness which he gave to them himself. He then asked them how long it would be before Nocturns began, and learning that the time was near, he expressed his joy, and his resolve to wait for that service. He crossed himself, and falling asleep passed away shortly afterwards in his slumber.

Caedmon is supposed to have died about A.D. 680, and was buried at Whitby. William of Malmesbury records the discovery of the poet's remains in his own day (*Gesta Pontiff.* p. 254, ed. Hamilton). They were considered to have the power of working miracles.

We are indebted to Bede for a general description of Caedmon's poems. He put into verse, among many other things, the books of Genesis and Exodus. In the New Testament he sang the chief incidents in our Lord's life, the descent of the Holy Spirit, the teaching of the Apostles. On the terrors of the coming judgment, the pains of hell, and the blessedness of heaven, he wrote numerous poems, and many on the goodness and visitations of Providence. Bede gives us a translated fragment of the poem that the new-made poet sang to the mysterious visitant who first awoke his inspiration. King Alfred, in his version of Bede, gives the words in the vernacular, and as these are found in the margin of a MS. of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which is believed to be contemporaneous with the author (MS. Bibl. Publ. Cant. Kk. 5. 16. See Hardy's *Cat.* i. pt. i. 433-4), it is probable that the king is quoting Caedmon's own words. If this be so, these few lines are of great value as a test of identity. In the 17th century Archbishop Usher presented to Francis Junius a MS. of old English poetry, which answers in some respects to the description which Bede gives of Caedmon's verse. This MS. (Bodl. Junius, xi.) came to the Bodleian Library in 1678 with the rest of Junius's Anglo-Saxon MSS. (Macray, *Annals of Bodl. Libr.* 102). The work, which seems to have been written at the close of the 11th century (*Archaeologia*, xxiv. 329), is divided into two books, the first of which contains a metrical version of portions of the Old Testament, especially of the Genesis and the history of Daniel. The second is fragmentary, and relates to New Testament subjects, especially to our Lord's descent into hell.

Junius ascribed the MS. to Caedmon, and printed it at Amsterdam, in 1655, under his name. He was induced to do so by its general similarity in subject and style to what Bede says and gives of Caedmon's work. This is really

all that can be said in favour of Junius's view. George Hickes considered the MS., from internal evidence, to be the composition of some imitator of Caedmon in the 11th century (for he was the father of a school of poetry), and asserted that it was written in the Dano-Saxon dialect (*Thesaurus*, pp. 133-4; Bishop Nicholson's *Correspondence*, i. 119-21). Wanley follows Hickes (apud Hickes, 77). The view of these two scholars as to the dialect of the poem cannot be maintained, but it is quite possible that they are right in their general estimate of the age and authorship of the poem. The test-verses, it must be observed, are not to be found in it, although there are some which resemble them greatly. Speaking on the question of authorship, Professor Conybeare observes, "the question must be considered as undecided and, unless some perfect copy should be discovered (an event not to be hoped for), incapable perhaps of decision" (*Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 185). Sir F. Palgrave considered Caedmon himself to be as mythical as the story of his conversion (*Archaeologia*, xxiv. 342). Notwithstanding its doubtful authenticity, the work ascribed to Caedmon is a noble poem, and a worthy commencement of English literature.

The first printed edition of the poems ascribed to Caedmon is that of Junius. "Caedmonis monachi paraphrasis poetica Genesios ac praecipuarum Sacrae Paginae Historiarum, abhinc annos mxx. Anglo-Saxonice conscripta, et nunc primum edita a Francisco Junio, F. F. 4to, Amstelodami, 1655." This was reprinted in 8vo, in 1832, with many corrections, but with other mistakes and deviations from the MS., by Mr. Benjamin Thorpe for the Society of Antiquaries of London. 'Caedmon's Metrical Paraphrase of parts of the Holy Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon, with an English translation,' etc. An earlier and better translation by Edward Lye, the lexicographer, exists in MS. in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries of London. There is an account of the Bodleian MS. with woodcuts of its numerous illustrations, in the *Archaeologia*, xxiv. 329 et seqq. Professor Conybeare gives an abstract of the work with specimens (*Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 8vo, 1826, pp. 183-7). See also Wright's *Biogr. Brit. Literaria*, i. 193-200; Dr. Guest's *History of English Rhythms*, ii. 23-50, where there is the best account of Caedmon's rhythms; Morley's *First Sketches of English Literature*, 16-21; and a small volume of popular lectures on Caedmon, by Robert Watson of Newcastle-on-Tyne, published in 1875. [J. R.]

Caedmon occupies a marked place in Anglo-Saxon poetry, not to speak of the part he must have filled in the struggling cause of Christianity. He was distinct from the established minstrel on the one hand and from the novel Anglo-Latin versifier on the other. In Caedmon a man had arisen to start new and nobler topics for the minstrel, with a genius that could perpetuate the attempt through a school of successors, and so the pagan self-glorifying lyrics current in his day found their rival in his cheerful didactic verse. Like the minstrels hitherto, Caedmon's verse ran in the vernacular. The Anglo-Latins had not yet risen, for the great patrons of classical culture, Theodore and Adrian, had not yet produced their Aldhelm and Alcuin; while these, when they did appear,

composed for the schools, and not for the people. That an acceptable minstrel should have been produced in a monastery rather than have been trained in the festive hall, was something for a monastery to chronicle. That biblical lore should now, through the channel of native minstrelsy, be able to spread among serfs, shepherds, and traders, was a great thing in aid of Christianity; and the more so when we remember that the new religion had been introduced by the upper ranks, and had still to win the lower. That this should have occurred so very soon after the first disturbance of the reign of paganism, was certainly remarkable; and the advent of Caedmon must have been hailed by the Christian teachers much as if a native Milton were in our days to arise in some Hindoo or Chinese mission to propagate the truth among his countrymen whom the preacher could not reach. It is no wonder that a legend like that in Bede, attributing a preternatural visitation, should have become fixed in Christian tradition.*

Caedmon was commemorated on Feb. 11, at which day the Bollandists have given his *Vita*, apparently taken wholly from Bede. (*Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 552.) [C. H.]

CAEDUAL (Bede, *H. E.* v. 7, edd. Smith, M. H. B., Stevenson, Moberly); CAEDUALD (*Ibid.* v. 24); CAEDUALLA (*Ibid.* iv. 12, 15; v. 7, 8), king of the West Saxons. [CAEDWALLA (2).] [C. H.]

CAEDWALLA (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 20, edd. Smith, M. H. B., Stevenson, Moberly), king of the Britons. [CAEDWALLA (1).] [C. H.]

CAEDWALLA (1), a British king, who with Penda, king of Mercia, rebelled against Edwin, king of Northumbria, and slew him in a great battle at Haethfelth (Hatfield chase?) on the 12th of October, 633. In consequence of this defeat archbishop Paulinus retired into Kent, taking with him Ethelburga, Edwin's widow. Caedwalla was a professor of Christianity, and his triumph resulted, not in the extinction of religion, but in the temporary re-establishment of his own British church. Soon after this he surprised and killed Osric and Eanfrid, two of Edwin's kinsmen, and then reigned for about a year over Bernicia and Deira, a terror and a bane to his subjects. In 634 the intruding monarch and his troops were utterly vanquished by Oswald, Edwin's nephew, at Hefenfelth. This place may be identified with an elevated plateau of ground, a few miles to the north of Hexham, in the corner of which there is a little chapel dedicated to St. Oswald (*Memorials of Hexham*, ed. Surtees Soc., i. Pref. xi.-xiii.). Caedwalla during the fight was slain at Denisesburna, a rivulet on the southern bank of the Tyne, which bore that name in the 13th century. (*Ibid.* Appendix, i. ii.) Bede, to whom we are indebted for what we know of Caedwalla, gives a graphic account of the scene and incidents of his last battle (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 20; iii. 1). Nennius calls Caedwalla "Catgublaun,"

and the scene of his last fight Catscaul (M. H. B. 76). [J. R.]

Caedwalla or Cadwallader claims attention in ancient British history. In him terminated the last series of 'kings of Britain,' who with diminishing lustre were reckoned to have held supreme sway over the native race from the most ancient times, and to have handed on the sceptre of Arthur. He thus forms the goal of some historians and the starting-point of others, as the titles themselves often shew (see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 350, 352, 360). Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* concludes with Cadwallader's imaginary abdication; for later Welsh writers fondly suppose that it was he who died at Rome, and there reconciled the British church to the great body of Western Christendom, and thus they avoid chronicling his defeat. - The work of Diceto, carefully numbering the kings of the British succession, makes him the 88th (the number however being suppressed, no doubt through the genealogical difficulty) and the last. The *Brut y Tywysogion*, or Chronicle of the Princes of Wales, opening with Cadwallader's death at Rome, remarks, "thenceforth the Britons lost the crown of the kingdom and the Saxons gained it." Of Ivor, who came next, it is carefully noticed that he "reigned not as a king, but as a chief or prince."

Though holding the supreme authority, Caedwalla is represented with a special and more limited territorial title. He was king of Gwenedota, Guenedotia, or Venedotia, more commonly written Gwynedd, though from Bede and other English writers we can get nothing less vague than "king of the Britons." He thus seems to have corresponded among his own people to the Bretwalda of the heptarchy. Materials are more copious than precise, as Lappenberg (Lapp. i. 122) remarks, for forming definite geographical boundaries. The Gwynedd of Spruner's atlas and of Mr. E. A. Freeman's map (*Old Engl. Hist.* 1869, p. 38) place it in the north of Wales, reaching from the Dee to Holyhead. Lappenberg describes it (*Anglo-Sax. Hist.* i. 120, 121) as occupying the greater part of north Wales, having the royal residence at Aberffraw, now a village, on the south-west face of Anglesey, where the Fraw flows into the sea. South of this and east of Snowdon was Powys, the princes of which resided at Mathraul in north Montgomeryshire, in the upper part of the vale of Meifod, near the junction of the two streams that form the river Ewyrnwy. Powys extended somewhat eastward of Gwynedd, and territory on the right bank of the lower Dee was reckoned to it [DINOTHS]. Others give a much more extensive boundary to the kingdom of Caedwalla. In the *Journal of the Archaeological Association* (vol. xi. p. 54), Mr. G. V. Irving remarks, "Gwenedota is admitted on all hands to have occupied Westmoreland and north Lancashire, to which I would add Cumberland." Camden also calls Caedwalla "king of Cumberland as it seems" (Camd. *Britan.* ed. Gough, iii. 234). The discrepancy is not irreconcilable. If those northern districts were not in Gwynedd, they were, as we may safely assume, in the dominions of the king of Gwynedd, or at all events of Caedwalla. Gwynedd was in constant warfare with Northumbria as well as with Mercia (Lapp. i. 122). If the rule of Caedwalla was not con-

* The part of *Paradise Lost* which most closely corresponds to Caedmon's poem was not included in Milton's original conception, and does not seem to have been added till after his friend Junius had shewn him his version of Caedmon. (Masson, *Milton's Poems*, i. 46, iii. 117; Morley, *English Writers*, 302-318.) [E. B. B.]

fined to the north-west of Wales, it is easier to account for him so far from home as Hatfield Chace eastward of Doncaster, and very easy to account for a battle at Denises-burna by Hexham. He does not on this occasion appear as an invader, but it is Oswald who marches against Caedwalla, and the march is evidently not a lengthened one before the foe is met. Camden understands this battle to have been fought on the site of Heofenfelth, which he identifies with Haledon, though here he does not seem to keep Bede in sight so much as a poetical Life of Oswald, several lines of which he quotes. But Camden's editors (as Gibson's *Camden*, ii. 207, and Gough's *Camden*, iii. 249) criticise the passage, saying that Oswald's cross was erected on Heofenfelth while the battle was fought at another place in the neighbourhood, Denises-burna, perhaps Dilston. According to this view we may imagine that Oswald in the course of his march, finding himself on some commanding ground, took the name for an omen (for *heofen* is both *high* and *heaven*), and erected his cross for a pledge of victory. Two other geographical names in connexion with Caedwalla may here be noticed. The *Annales Cambriae* make him in A.D. 629 besieged "in insula Glannauc," which is identified with Priestholm near Anglesey (M. H. B. 832), and there he is in Gwynedd proper, not far from the royal residence. His last campaign is called by the same authority (ad an. 635) "*bellum Cantseaul*," which in Nennius is Catigual, for which the editors of the *Monumenta* suggest "*pugna infra murum*" (M. H. B. 76), in allusion to the Roman Wall running through that district.

The ferocity of Caedwalla is described by Bede (*H. E.* ii. 20) in his most trenchant style; his alliance with the Mercian pagan is dwelt upon, and his own barbarity worse than any pagan's. What made it so terrible to Bede, himself an Angle and a Northumbrian, was that disaster to the infant Northumbrian Christianity which ensued from the battle of Haethfelth. Seven years had passed since the arrival of Paulinus in the north; Edwin and the national chiefs had been but six years in submission to Christ, when this sudden collapse overtook the most important and promising mission that had issued from Kent. Then followed the re-establishment of Christianity on the Hiberno-Scottish model, and the long controversy with the Roman communion. We may read a world of meaning in that expression of an historian trained under the most thorough Roman sympathies, as he opened his account of the calamity inflicted by Caedwalla with "*Quo tempore maxima est facta strages in Ecclesia vel Gente Nordanhymbrorum*." But are we obliged from this to picture Caedwalla as simply instigated by a rival church interest? The ecclesiastical aspect of the event no doubt touched the heart of the monk of Jarrow. But the Gens Nordanhymbrorum under Edwin's reign might well tempt a man like Caedwalla to arms and to a pagan alliance. The great Bretwalda, in the mightiest of all the invading nations that were fast driving the old race towards the western sea, had reduced under his dominion all the kings, as well of the Angles as of the Welsh (Wend. *F. H.* ed. Coxe, i. 116); so that "*genti Anglorum simul et Brittonum gloriosissimè preeset*" (Bede. *H. E.* ii. 20). His

arms were feared, his power was supplicated not only by the nations of Britain, the Angles, the Scots, the Picts, but the islands of Orcaades and *Anglesey* also (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 69); at which last name we get sight of our British king, and find the Cambrian annalist's entry (ad an. 629) accounted for, "*obsessio regis Catguolaun in insula Glannauc*." The king, who represented the ancient glories of his race, and was fondly looked up to by the brave occupants of all the mountains of Britain, saw that a contest for final supremacy must come now or never. Hence the revolt, as Bede expressly calls it ('*rebellavit*,' ii. 20) against Edwin. It was a blow for independence in the north, as the earlier Arthurian struggles had been in the south; and we are not surprised at the impressive language that found its way into future annals when, after his brief triumph, Caedwalla was finally overthrown by Oswald and it was chronicled how the Britons lost the crown of the kingdom and the Saxons gained it.

The varieties of this king's name are as follows:—CADWALADER, CADWALLA, CADWALLO, CAEDUALLA, CAEDWAL, CASWALLON, CATGUBLAUN, CATGUOLLAAN, CATGUOLAUM, CATGUOLLAUN, CATHLON, CEADUALLA, CEADWALA, CEADWALE, CAEDWALLA, CEASWALA, CEDWALLA, CEDWALLA, CHON. [C. H.]

CAEDWALLA (2), king of the West Saxons 685-688. He was the son of Kinebert, a great-grandson of Ceaulin, born about 659, and rose to power during the ten years of division which followed the death of Coinwalch. During part of this time he was in exile, and employed himself in ravaging Sussex at the head of his followers. Ethelwalch, the king, fell a victim to him, but he was subsequently expelled by the ealdormen Berthun and Andhun. His action in Sussex brought him in contact with Wilfrid, who, according to Eddius, acted for some time as his chief adviser. This must have been about 685, in which year, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Caedwalla began to strive for the kingdom; Wilfrid may not have been disinclined to help him against Centwine and his queen, who had shewn him so little hospitality; or there may have been a string of Northumbrian intrigue running through the anarchy of Wessex at the time. On Centwine's resignation or death, in 685, Caedwalla obtained possession of the whole of Wessex, and signalized his reign by cruel invasions of the Isle of Wight, Sussex, and Kent, where, in 687, his brother Mul was burned. In remorse for his savage conduct he resigned his kingdom in 688, went to Rome, and was there baptized by pope Sergius, under the name of Peter. He died shortly after, on the 20th of April, 689, and was buried in St. Peter's. Bede gives his epitaph (*H. E.* v. 7). Spurious charters of Caedwalla to Malmesbury are printed in Kemble (*C. D.* Nos. 24, 29). The glories of his reign are described in the poem '*Ad Templum Bugge*' (*Alc. opp.* ii. 519). On his relations with the Britons, and the confusion between Caedwalla and Cadwallader, see Lappenberg, *Hist. Engl. ed.* Thorpe, i. 258, 259, 261. [S.]

Caedwalla's baptism and death furnish some illustrations of ancient Christian customs. Bede says that it was "*die sancto sabbati paschalis*," or holy Saturday before Easter, that he was bap-

tized. In A.D. 689 this Saturday was April 10. On the Easter season for baptizing, see *Dict. of Christ. Antiqq.*, art. 'Baptism,' p. 165. For the Saturday, Stevenson (ad *Bed. H. E.* v. 7, § 372) refers to two treatises by J. J. Homborg, *de Paschate Vett. Christ.* § 9, Helmst. 1683, and *de Quadragesima Vett. Christ.* § 67, Helmst. 1677. Caedwalla died, as Bede states, "in albis adhuc positus;" according to *A. S. C.* (ad an. 688) in the course of seven nights after his baptism, in his crism-cloths; and to Henry of Huntingdon, "infra septem dies in albis" (*M. H. B.* 723). These garments (for the nature of which see *Dict. of Christ. Antiqq.* as before, p. 163) were worn until the first Sunday after Easter (cf. *Ducange*, s.v. *Dominica*). We gather therefore that the West Saxon king died not later than April 17. Bede's text says April 20, but the inscription which he quotes shews that he was buried, "depositus," on that day. The inscription makes Caedwalla to have lived "annos plus minus triginta," and accordingly Bede describes him as "juvenis strenuissimus" when he first betook himself to Sussex. Lappenberg (*Hist. Eng.* i. 286, tr. Thorpe) gives him a wife Centhryth, but without any reference; Florence's genealogy (*M. H. B.* 633, 641) is silent as to her; there is no mention of children. He was succeeded on the throne by a distant cousin, Ina. The long metrical inscription, without the prose addition of Bede, has been preserved from the original stone in old St. Peter's at Rome, and a copy of it exists in the valuable work of John Gruter, first published in 1601 (*Inscrip. Antiq. Amstel.* 1707, p. MCLXXIV. ii.) as well as in Raffael Fabretti (*Inscrip. Antiq.* 1702, Rome, p. 735, No. 463, where see note).

Caedwalla was the first of the Anglo-Saxon kings who quitted the throne for the "limina Apostolorum," and his example was subsequently followed by three others, Coenred of Mercia, Offa of the East Saxons, and Ina of the West Saxons. His motives, if Bede knew them, illustrate the religion of the age; they were that he might obtain an everlasting kingdom; that he might enjoy the distinguished honour of being baptized in the Church of the Apostles; and his desire was that shortly after that rite he might be released from the flesh and pass at once to eternal joys (*H. E.* v. 7; cf. iv. 12). From the last expression, it might be conjectured that he found his health failing. Possibly his intercourse with Wilfrid, whose partiality for Rome is well known, may have encouraged the idea. The intimacy, as related by Eddius (cap. 41), was very close. From the wilds of "Ciltina et Ondred," to which the prince first resorted, he sought the bishop out in his peninsula of Selesau, entreated his friendship, and begging he would be a father to him "in doctrina et auxilio," vowed to be his obedient son, and then the two exiles entered into a compact, taking God to witness. Malmesbury goes so far as to relate that on gaining Wessex, Caedwalla set that able bishop over the whole kingdom "ut magistrum et dominum," and took no step without his consent (*G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 233). Hedda, the West Saxon bishop of that reign, also had intercourse with Rome. A continental writer of the 8th century, Paulus Winfridus or Paulus Diaconus, gives us a glimpse of the English king (whom he calls Theodaldus and Cedoaldus) on his journey out, telling us how he visited the court of Cunibert, king of

the Lombards, by whom he was "mirificè receptus," which is all we learn (*Paul. Diacon. de Gestis Longobard.* vi. 15, *Patrol.* xc. 632).

The varieties of his name are—CAEDUAL, CAEDUALD, CAEDUALLA, CAEDUUALA, CAEDUUALLA, CAEDUALLANUS, CAEDUUEALHA, CAEDUUALA, CAEDUUALLA, CEADWAL, CEADWALA, CEADWALE, CEADWALHA, CEADWALLA, CEDOALDUS, CEDUALLA, CEDUALLANUS, CEDUUALA, CEDWALDA, CEDWALE, CEDWALL, CEDWALLA, KEDWALLA, THEODALDUS, PETRUS. [C. H.]

CAEILFHINN. [CAELLAINN.]

CAEL, in Irish, passes into many forms and combinations in proper names, and has carefully to be distinguished from *Cill*, which in form resembles it, but in signification is different. While the latter is equivalent to *Cella*, and appears in Cillinus and Columcille, &c., the former, meaning *lean* or *slender*, is found in Caelan, Coelan, Coelian, &c. (See Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 379 n.⁷⁶, 596, col. 2.) The Latin form of Cael is Coelius.

(1) At Oct. 26 the *Mart. Doneg.* cites Cael, virgin, as one of the four daughters of Mac Iaar, of the Dal Messincorb; "and they were of Cill-na-níngin" (i.e. the church of the daughters) "by the side of Tamlacht to the south," that is, somewhere in Londonderry, or at Killininn, near Tallaght, co. Dublin. But the *Mart. Tallaght* places their abode at Cill-maignend, i.e. Kilmainham, near Dublin. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 391 n.⁸; *Jour. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4, ser. iii. 287 n.)

(2) Colgan mentions a Caila, whom he also calls Coelius, whose festival is Nov. 10, on which day *Mart. Doneg.* gives "Cael Craibhdeach," and the Table to the *Martyrology* "Caol, the Devout (Coelius);" and another Coelius is connected with Athrumia (Trim), Feb. 17. But little more can be said of these (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 318 n.¹, 391 n.⁵).

(3) Cruimther Cael of Kilmore—May 25. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 709, c. 26) connects him with St. Endeus, but gives no account of his relation to Kilmore, to which he is attached in the *Kalendars*. [J. G.]

CAELAN. On this diminutive of Cael see Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 379, n.⁷⁶, 596, col. 2). There are several saints of this name, in the Celtic *Kalendars*, such as Caelan of Cill-co, June 30; Caelan of Doire or Doire-chaoilain, June 19; Caelan of Echinis, Sept. 25; and Caelan of Tigh-na-Manach, Oct. 29. But the most notable is Caelan of Inis-Cealtra, July 29; who under the names Caelan, Coelan, or Chilian, is usually considered the writer of the *Life of St. Brígida* which stands as the sixth memoir of that saint in Colgan's *Trias Thaumaturga*. But little seems known of him. He was a monk of Inis-Cealtra (now Inishcaltra, an island in the north-west of Lough Derg, near the village of Scariff, in the county of Clare), and probably flourished after the beginning of the 8th century. (See Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 596-7 n.¹, giving an account of the manuscript and what is known of the writer; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 187; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 13; Lanigan, *Eccles. Hist. Ir.* i. 381. [BRÍGIDA (5) of Kildare.] Caelan is another name for Mochai.) [J. G.]

CAELESTIACUS, senator of Carthage, driven from Africa by the Vandals in A.D. 439, on whose behalf Theodoret wrote to Apellio, to Aerius the Sophist, to Domnus, bishop of Antioch, to bishop Theoctistus, to count Stasinus, to count Patricius, and to Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre, who is asked to interest others in his case. He was the more helplessly dependent on charity, as he had carried his wife, children, and servants away with him. He rejoiced in his misfortune as the saving of his soul (*Theod. Epp.* 29-35). The name is from Caelestis, or Urania, the goddess of Carthage. [*COELICOLAE.*] (Ceillier, x. 65-67.)

[E. B. B.]

CAELESTINUS, Pope I. [*COELESTINUS.*]

CAELESTIS, ST., confessor and bishop. He was bishop of Metz in Lotharinga at the beginning of the 4th century, and is supposed to have died about the year 320. His acts are doubtful. He is commemorated Oct. 14. (*Acta SS. Boll.* Oct. vi. 480.)

[H. W. Y.]

CAELESTIUS (1), one of the chief presbyters of Carthage—Botrus was the other—who summoned the neighbouring bishops and those of Numidia to elect a bishop, and being disappointed at the election of CAECILIAN made a party against him. (*Optat. Don.* i. 18, pp. 17, 18, Migne, *Patrol.* xi. 918.)

[E. B. B.]

(2), the Pelagian. [*COELESTIUS.*]

CAELIANUS, not Caecilius nor Caecilianus, is the MS. form of the name of the preceptor of Diadymenus, son of Macrinus, and there is no reason for identifying him with any Christian Caecilius, or for supposing him a Christian at all (*Tillem.* iv. 601).

[E. B. B.]

CAELICOLAE. [*COELICOLAE.*]

CAELIN or **CELIN** (1), brother of bishops Cceda and Ceadda, a priest in the household of Aethelwold, king of Deira. He is mentioned by Bede as introducing his brother Cceda to the notice and favour of his master, circa A.D. 653 (*H. E.* iii. 23).

(2) Provost of Ripon. In A.D. 709 Wilfrid allowed him to seek a more retired life, and Tathberht seems to have been chosen provost in his place (*Eddius, Vita S. Wilfridi*, cap. lxi.). The name occurs in the *Liber Vitae* of the church of Durham (p. 24, ed. Surtees Soc.).

[J. R.]

CAELLAINN (*CAELIFHINN*).—Feb. 3. She was daughter of Cael, son of Fionnachadh, of the race of Ciar, descended from Rudhraidhe, monarch of Ireland. Her church is now called Tearmon Caelaine and Tearmonn Mor, in the parish of Kilkeevin, near Castlereagh, co. Roscommon. She was the special patron of her kinsmen the Ciarraidhe in Connaught, and the legend places her in the reign of Aedh, son of Eochaidh Tirmcharna, king of Connaught, who was slain A.D. 574 (*Colgan, Acta SS.* 13 n. 1; *Book of Rights*, by O'Donov. 100 n. 1.)

[J. G.]

CAEMGHEN, or **St. KEVIN**, of Glendalough, June 3. [*COEMGEN.*]

[J. G.]

CAEMH (*CAOIMHE*).—At April 4, *Mart. Doneg.* has "Caemh, virgin, of Cill-Caoimhe," and *Mart. Tullaght* "Coine, Cilli-Coine." Again at Nov. 2, *Mart. Doneg.* gives "Caoimhe, the Allanan, of Cill-chaoimhe," which Dr. Reeves

(*Mart. Doneg.* 294 n.) interprets, "of Alba, the modern Scotland." [J. G.]

CAEMHAN. Under the form Caemhan, Caiman, Coeman, Cayman, Coemhoc, Mochoemoc, this name is of frequent occurrence among the saints of Ireland, and the work of identification becomes extremely difficult (*Colgan, Tr. Th.* 177 n. 86).

(1) Of Ard-caemhain—June 12. He was son of Coemloga and Caemell, and appears to have been uterine brother of St. Coemgen or Kevin [*COEMGEN*]. He was thus descended from Corb Olum, from whom "Oilioll Olum, king of Munster and ancestor of the most powerful families of Munster, was the fourth in descent" (*Four Masters*, by O'Donov. i. 95 n. p). The *Mart. Doneg.* calls him Caomhan (or) Sanct-Lethan, of Ard-Caomhain (now Ardavan, on the peninsula N.E. of Wexford), by the side of Loch Garman, in Leinster. *Colgan (Acta SS.* 584, c. 1, 586 n. 4) cites St. Caeman, Abbas Airdnensis, among the children of Coeltigerna, who was in fact Caeman's sister, and wife of Colman or Colmadius. Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 221, 223) fixes his date, as brother of St. Coemgen, to the period of the second class of Irish saints, that is, to the second half of the 6th century (*Jour. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* iv. 57 sq.).

(2) Of Enach-Truim—Nov. 3. He is said to have been of the race of Labraidh Lorc, monarch of Ireland, but *Colgan (Tr. Thaum.* p. 177 n. 88) is probably mistaken in calling him brother of St. Coemgen of Glendalough, when he and others identify him with Caemhan, son of Coemloga and Caemell, of Ardavan. Along with St. Fintan and St. Mochumin of Tir-da-glas, St. Caemhan was under the direction of St. Colum, son of Crimthann of Tir-da-glas (Dec. 13), and with the rest constantly followed him. He founded the monastery of Enach-truim, now Annatrim in Queen's County, and flourished in A.D. 550. There he spent the remainder of his days in great sanctity, and died on the 3rd of November, but the year is unknown. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 71, 222-5; Ussher, de *Brit. Ecol. Prim.* 441, 962, and *Index Chron.* A.D. 550; *Colgan, Acta SS.* 192, col. 1, 312, c. 5, 350, c. 3; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 136 n. 7; O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 125.)

(3) Feb. 14. This saint appears under the names of Caomhan, Coman, Comman, Conan, Conran, Convan, and in the Table of the *Mart. Doneg.* is also Pulcherius. In *Acta SS.* 335, *Colgan* gives a memoir "De S. Convano, seu verius Conano vel Comano;" and according to this account, he belonged to a noble stock in Scotland, but spurning all earthly delights withdrew to the Orkneys, where he built a monastery, and after living in great sanctity as a bishop and confessor, died there about the year 640. At Kirkwall and throughout the islands his memory was long revered, and many altars were raised to his honour. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 311; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, ii. 185.)

(4) Brec—Sept. 14. St. Caemhan Brec or Breac (the spotted), of Roseach (now Russagh, near the village of Street, in the barony of Moygoish, in the north of Westmeath), is carefully to be distinguished from St. Mac Nissi (Sept. 3), who is known by the same name, and founded Connor. Ussher places the birth of

Caemhan Brec in Hibernia in A.D. 529, and his death in A.D. 615, which is a century after that of Mac Nissi (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 238; *Usher, de Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Dublin. 1639. p. 962; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 131-2, cc. 14, 15). [J. G.]

CAEMHLACH (CAMULACUS), of Rathain—Nov. 3. He was one of the bishops, of the first class, ordained by St. Patrick, and his house was at Rahen, in the barony of Ballycowan, King's County. He is called the Commiensian, and the 'Hymn of Camelac' is in the Antiphony of Bangor (*Ussher, de Brit. Eccl. Prim.* c. xvii.; *Tirechan, Vit. S. Patr.* in the *Book of Armagh*, ff. 9-11; *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* i. 174). [J. G.]

CAEMHOG—July 22. This is one of those saints whose sex has been made uncertain, from the female termination being given to the name, or from other circumstances. (For an explanation of the change of sex, see Reeves, *Culdees*, 34, n. And for this same person or at least an exactly parallel case, see KEVOCA, who is a saint of the male sex, and is called Caemhog and Mochaemoc, pronounced Keevog and Mokeevoc.) Caemhog, known also as Coemaca, was son of Coemloga and Caemell, daughter of Ceannfionnán or Cenandan, and thus brother of St. Coemgen of Glendalough. Both Colgan and Lanigan have regarded this person as a female, and are in confusion as to the identity, the one making her the same as Caoltighern, regarded as the daughter of Coemloga and wife of Colman or Colmadius, and the other taking her to be Coemaca, erroneously supposed to be a sister of Caviltighern and St. Coemgen. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 584, c. 1, 586 n. 48; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 46, 223.) [J. G.]

CAENCHOMHRAC.—July 23. *Mart. Don.* (by Todd and Reeves, 199) gives him as bishop, first at Cluain-mic-Nois, and next at Inis Endaimh, in Loch Ribh (Inchenagh or Inishenagh, in Lough Ree, near Lanesborough, co. Roscommon). He left Cluain on account of the popular veneration given him as a prophet, and sought for solitude in Lough Ree. [J. G.]

CAERLAN (CAIRLAN), bishop of Armagh—March 24. A short memoir of this saint is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 744), which seems to contain all that is known of him. He was born in, and by descent belonged to, the district of the Hy-Niellan or O'Niellan, in the present county of Armagh; according to the author of the *Life of St. Dageus*, or *Daigh* (Aug. 18), he was over a monastery in the same place, about the year 546, and was finally raised to the episcopate. He succeeded Feidlimidh Finn there in 578, and died in 588 (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 183; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 212, n. 213; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 193, 744; Ware's *Bishops*, ed. Harris, 38, 39). [J. G.]

CAERNAN—Jan. 31. *Mart. Doneg.* gives Caornan in the text, but in the table Caornan of Cill-Chaornain (now Kilcornan, a townland in the parish of Stradbally, bar. Dunkellen, co. Galway). Among the disciples and relatives of St. Columba is enumerated "Cairnaan, filius Branduib, filii Meilgi," as coming with St. Columba on his first voyage to Britain, but there is no proof to shew whether the Cairnaan thus named is the Caernan of Jan. 31, or he of Cluain-each, April 28. (See Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 488, col. 1; Reeves, *Adam-*

nan, 246; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 294; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 599.) [J. G.]

CAESAR, bishop of Dyrrhachium, is given by Dorotheus as one of the 70, and is said to be mentioned by Paul, on the strength of the verse "Greet them that be of Caesar's household." This is corrected in the Latin version. The Menology (Dec. 9) makes him bishop of Corona. (Tillem. i. 574.) [E. B. B.]

CAESAREUS, deacon, mentioned in Bede's *Martyrology* (ad Nov. 24) as suffering in the persecution of Maximian with Largus and Smaragdus. Smith here points out that this person must be intended for Cyriacus, commemorated with the same two companions on March 16 and Aug. 8 (Bede. ed. Smith, 448). [C. H.]

CAESARIA (1), or **CAESARIUS** (MSS. vary), had consulted St. Basil to know whether it were lawful and expedient to partake of the eucharist daily by oneself. St. Basil approves of daily communion, though himself communicating only four times a week, and he permits the reservation and solitary participation of the consecrated elements. (Basil, *Ep.* 93; Ceillier, iv. 447.) [E. B. B.]

(2) **CAESARIA** and her daughter Lucilla were among the nine or ten Manicheans who were all that were known to FELIX, the convert from that sect, in North Africa in the 5th century. (Augustini *Opera*, ed. Migne, t. viii. 518; Baronius, *Annales*, t. v. App.) [E. B. B.]

(3) **ST.**, of Arles. Born at Châlons and educated at Marseilles, this saint became abess of Arles when her brother St. Caesarius was bishop of that see. He drew up the rules of her convent and procured their ratification by pope Hormisdas. After governing 200 nuns for 30 years, she died about the year 530. Her monastery was demolished during the invasion of Arles by Theodoric in 507, but Caesarius rebuilt it (*Acta SS. Boll.* Jan. 12, i. 729). [H. W. Y.]

(4) A later abess of the same nunnery, writes to St. Rhadegunda defining a Christian's three duties, prayer, bible reading, and thanksgiving, and sending her, as requested, a copy of a letter of Caesarius, about A.D. 560. (Ceillier, xi. 317.) Her letter is given by Martene (*Anecdota*, t. i. 3, Paris, 1717). [E. B. B.]

CAESARIUS (1) A deacon from Africa, martyred with the presbyter Julianus, at Terracina, in Campania, where he was seized while preaching against idolatry. He was thrown into the sea in a sack, but his body was recovered and buried near Terracina. His story in Bede includes the fall of a temple at his prayer, a celestial light encompassing him, the conversion and joint martyrdom of Leontius his persecutor. Bede and Usuard place him in the reign of Claudius; but another account makes him to have buried Domitilla and her companions in the reign of Trajan. (Bede. *Mart.* p. 439 in Smith's Bede, where note quoting Baronius; Usuard, *Mart.*; *Vet. Rom. Mart.*) [C. H.]

(2) **ST.**, of Nazianzus, physician, son of Gregory, bishop of Nazianzus, brother of St. Gregory of the same place, and youngest of the family, date of birth uncertain, probably about A.D. 330. His death occurred in A.D. 368 or 369.

Name.—The name is simply a derivative from Caesar, originally adopted in compliment to the reigning family.

Authorities.—The funeral oration by his brother, St. Gregory Nazianzen (the 7th, in some edit. the 10th); two letters addressed by Gregory to Caesarius and one to the *Praeses* Sophronius (numbered 17, 18, 19 or, more commonly, 50, 51, 52) and a few lines in the *Carmen de Vita Sua* of the same. Photius, *Bibliotheca Cod.* 210 (p. 168 ed. Bekker, Berolini, 1824).

Life.—According to the testimony of his brother, Caesarius owed much to the careful training received from his parents. The schools of Palestine, though excellent as regards instruction in rhetoric, did not stand high in respect of the physical sciences. Accordingly, at a time when Gregory, who aimed at being a preacher, was content to remain in Palestine, Caesarius betook himself to Alexandria, "the workshop of every sort of education." There he behaved as a model student, being very careful in the matter of companionship, and earnest in pursuit of knowledge, more especially of geometry and astronomy. This last-named science he studied, says his panegyrist, in such wise as to gain the good without the evil; a remark readily intelligible to those who are aware how deeply a fatalistic astrology was at that period associated with the study of astronomy. (It may be sufficient to refer on this head to the *Confessions* of St. Augustine and his writings against the Manichaean, Faustus.) But the forte of Caesarius was his medical skill, in which he outshone all his fellow-students.

After refusing a post of honour and emolument at Byzantium, he came home for a time, but to the regret of his friends returned to the court and was much noticed and honoured by Julian. There is here a slight, but not perhaps irreconcilable, discrepancy between the funeral oration delivered by Gregory and the letter (17 or 51) which he addressed to his brother while alive. The oration seems to depict Caesarius as from the first spurning all offers of Julian, but the letter severely rebukes Caesarius for becoming a member of the imperial household, and taking charge of the treasury. Such a step is called a scandal in a bishop's son, and a great grief to his mother. Caesarius, however, finally avowed himself a Christian, and broke with Julian. His conduct, together with that of Gregory, caused Julian to exclaim, "Oh happy father; oh unhappy sons."

Under subsequent emperors, more especially under Valens, Caesarius more than regained his former honours, and became quaestor of Bithynia. A remarkable escape from a terrible earthquake at Nicæa, apparently about A.D. 367 or 368, to which many distinguished men fell victims, induced Caesarius, at his brother's suggestion, to arrange for retirement from worldly cares. He received baptism (which in the well-known case of the emperor Constantine and many other eminent men of that date had been deferred until late in life), and soon after fell sick and died. He was unmarried and left no children. His property was sadly pillaged, despite the unavailing protests of his brother (letter to Sophronius and Poem by Gregory). [J. G. C.]

[Basil wrote to him his *Ep.* 26 (362), congratulating him on his escape, and relates how at

death he said, "I wish all my goods to go to the poor," and his servants obeyed the injunction, so that his brother got none. *Ep.* 32 (84). Gregory also writes to him his *Ep.* 14 (105), on behalf of Eulalius, and 23 (106) on behalf of Amphilochius. This with *Ep.* 20 (16) are the only letters extant that passed between the brothers. The numbering of the letters is very diverse. Migne gives them thus. The following particulars of the life of this Caesarius are given by Gothofredus in his edition of the Code of Theodosius, vol. vi. p. 354 (Lyons, 1665). He was count of private affairs under Valentinian A.D. 364 (*Cod. Theod.* x. 1, 8), and prefect of Constantinople in A.D. 365 (Amm. Marcell. xxvi. 7; Zos. iv. 6), and thrown into prison by Procopius that same year.] [E. B. B.]

The *Πύσεις* or *Quæstiones* (sive *Dialogi*) de *Rebus Divinis*, attributed to this physician may be safely ascribed to some Caesarius. But the name was not an uncommon one, and the following considerations seem to show that the author was not Caesarius of Nazianzus. (a) Photius, who, while admitting the orthodoxy of the work, is not very complimentary to its style, treats the supposed authorship as merely a current unexamined tradition (*εἶναι δὲ φασὶ Γρηγορίου, οὗ τὸ θεολόγος ἐπώνυμον, τὸν συγγραφέα ἀδελοφών*). (b) The book refers to Maximus, who lived subsequently. (c) Neither St. Gregory nor St. Jerome mention its existence. (d) It is highly improbable that a mere Catechumen, like Caesarius, would put forth a book bearing on abstruse questions of controversial theology. The *Quæstiones* have, however, been printed in some edd. of the works of St. Gregory Nazianzen, and by Fronto Ducaeus in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* published at Paris in 1644 (tom. xi. p. 545). [J. G. C.]

CAESARIUS, (3) ST., sometimes called of Châlons (*Cabillonensis* seu *Cabellinensis*) from his birthplace Châlons-sur-Saône; but more usually known as Caesarius of Arles (*Arelatensis*) from his see, which he occupied for forty years. He was certainly the first ecclesiastic in the Gaul of his own age, and probably not inferior in importance to any Gallican bishop included within the limits of this work, if we except the names of Irenæus, of Martin and of Hilary of Poitiers. The date of his birth is not quite certain; but it lies between A.D. 468 and 470; the date of his death is the 27th August, A.D. 542. Usuard places his natalis at Aug. 27. (Usuard, *Mart.*)

Name.—See the preceding article. It may be added, that the fame of the great Roman conqueror of Gaul would have a tendency to make the name specially frequent in that part of the Roman Empire. Its feminine form, Caesaria, seems to have been very common amongst women.

Authorities.—1. The biography, written by his admiring disciple, St. Cyprian, bishop of Toulon (*Tolonensis*) with the aid of other ecclesiastics (edited by D'Achery and Mabillon in the *Acta Sanctorum Ord. S. Benedicti*, Venet. 1733, tom. i. p. 636, et seqq., and reproduced by Surin in the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum* under date of August 27th). 2. His will, first published by Baronius (*Annal.* tom. vi. ad ann. 508) from archives preserved at Arles; also given by Surius *loc. cit.*; a document of some

interest for the student of Roman law. 3. Acts of the council of Agde (*Agathense*) A.D. 506; of the 4th council of Arles (*Arelatense*) A.D. 527; of that of Carpentras (*Carpentoratense*) also in A.D. 527; and of the 2nd council of Orange (*Arausicanum*) A.D. 529; and the 2nd of Vaison (*Vasense*) also A.D. 529; over all of which, Caesarius presided (Labbe, *Concilia*, tom. ii. pp. 995–1098, ed. Parisiis 1714). 4. The *Regula ad Monachos* and *Regula ad Virgines*, drawn up by him for a monastery and a convent of his own foundation (edited by Holstenius in his *Codex Regularum*, and by P. de Cointe in his *Annales Ecclesiastici Francorum*). Trithemius, fixing the date of Caesarius much too late, fell into the error of supposing him to be a Benedictine. 5. His sermons. Of these forty were published at Basle in 1558; forty-six in a *Bibliotheca Patrum*, edited at Leyden in 1677; fourteen more in another *Bibl. Patr.* of Gallandi, Venice 1776 (cf. Oudin in *Comment. de Script. Eccles.* vol. i. p. 1339) and 102, formerly ascribed to St. Augustine, are by the Benedictine editors assigned to Caesarius (Appendix to tom. v. of the works of St. Augustine). Others have been separately published by Baluz; but Neander justly remarks, that “a complete collection of these sermons, conveying so much important information respecting the character of Caesarius and his times, still remains a desideratum” (*Church Hist.* vol. v. p. 4, note).

Life.—Caesarius was born at Châlons about A.D. 468 of pious parents. His sister Caesaria afterwards presided over the convent, which he founded, and to her he addressed his *Regula ad Virgines*. From his earliest years he shewed a charitable disposition and a predilection for a monastic life. At the age of thirteen he betook himself to the famous monastery of Lerins (*Lerinum*), where he rapidly became master of all which the learning and discipline of the place could impart, and was made the wine-dispenser (*Cellarius*) of the institution. Having injured his health by austerities, he was sent to Arles (*Arelate*) to recruit. There the bishop Eonius, who had also been a native of the district of Châlons, made his acquaintance; and, having obtained the consent of Porcarius, abbat of Lerins, ordained Caesarius deacon and then presbyter. Here, as at Lerins, he displayed the keenest sense of duty, combined with a calmness and humility, reflected, says his biographer, in the very expression of his countenance (*ita ut vultus ejus qualitas nescio quid semper videretur remittere caeleste*). For three years he presided over a monastery in Arles; but of this building no vestige is now left.

At the death of Eonius, and in accordance with the suggestions made by that prelate before his decease, the clergy, citizens and persons in authority proceeded to elect Caesarius, sincerely against his own wish, to the vacant see. He was accordingly consecrated bishop of Arles in A.D. 502, probably about the 33rd year of his life. His fulfilment of his new duties was most apostolic. He was courageous and unworldly, but yet exhibited great power of kindly adaptation to persons and circumstances. It is curious to find that the knowledge of Greek to which Caesar testifies (*B. G.* lib. vi.) still existed in the southern Gaul of the 6th century; and that both at Arles and Marseilles that language was still

employed in some of the church's services. Caesarius took great pains to induce the laity to join in the sacred offices, and encouraged inquiry into points not made clear in his sermons. He also bade them not to be content with what they heard of Holy Scripture in church, but to study it at home, and to treat the word of God with the same reverence as the sacraments. He was specially zealous in the redemption of captives, often selling for this purpose even ornaments belonging to the church.

The political troubles of the age did not leave Caesarius untouched. A notary, named Licinianus, accused him to Alaric as one who desired to subjugate the *civitas* of Arles to the Burgundian rule. Caesarius was for a time exiled to Bordeaux, but was speedily, on the discovery of his innocence, allowed to return. He interceded for the life of his calumniator. At a later period, on the occasion of the siege of Arles by the troops of Theodoric, apparently about A.D. 512, he was again accused of treachery and cast into prison. An interview with the Ostrogothic king at Ravenna in A.D. 513, speedily dispelled these troubles, and the remainder of his episcopate was passed in peace; Childebert, who was allowed to govern from A.D. 538, proving to be anti-Arian and most favourable to the clergy.

The directions of Caesarius for the conduct of monks and nuns have been censured as pedantic and minute. They certainly yielded to the spread of the rising Benedictine rule. But they must be judged by their age and regarded in the light of the whole spirit of monasticism. (Milman, *Lat. Chris.* bk. iv. ch. iii. has some good remarks on the general subject, though he, somewhat unaccountably, omits all mention of Caesarius.)

As the occupant of an important see, the bishop of Arles exercised considerable influence, official as well as personal. Caesarius was liberal in the loan of sermons, and sent suggestions for discourses to priests and even bishops living in Spain, Italy, Gaul and France (*i. e.* the province known as the Isle of France). The great doctrinal question of his age and country was that of Semi-pelagianism. Caesarius, though evidently a disciple of St. Augustine, displayed in this respect considerable independence of thought. His vigorous denial of anything like predestination to evil caused some slight suspicion. He seems to have been accused of a tendency towards anti-Augustinian doctrine, and a slight shade of difference respecting the amount of honour due to his memory may perhaps be traced in writers according as they incline respectively towards the Jesuit or the Jansenist views concerning divine grace.

Of the local councils over which Caesarius presided the most important was that of Orange. Its statements on the subject of grace and free agency have been justly eulogized by modern historians (see *e.g.* Canon Bright's *Church History*, ch. xi. *ad fin.*). The following propositions are laid down towards the conclusion of canon 25: “This also do we believe, in accordance with the Catholic faith, that after grace received through baptism, all the baptized are able and ought, with the aid and co-operation of Christ, to fulfil all duties needful for salvation, provided they are willing to labour faithfully. But that some men have been predestinated to evil by divine power, we not only do not believe, but if

there be those who are willing to believe so evil a thing, we say to them with all abhorrence *anathema*. This also do we profess and believe to our soul's health, that in every good work, it is not *we* who begin, and are afterwards assisted by Divine mercy, but that God Himself, with no preceding merits on our part, first inspires within us faith and love." It is remarkable, that on the express ground that these doctrines are as needful for the laity as for the clergy, certain distinguished laymen (*illustres ac magnifici viri*) were invited to sign the canons of the council. They are accordingly subscribed by eight laymen, and at least twelve bishops, including Caesarius.

As a preacher, Caesarius displays great knowledge of the contents of Holy Scripture, and is eminently practical in his exhortations. Besides reproofs of the ordinary vices of humanity, he had often to contend against lingering pagan superstitions, as auguries, heathen rites on the kalends, &c. His sermons on the Old Testament are not critical, but dwell on those typical aspects, so popular from the days of Augustine to our own time.

Besides certain jealousies and suspicions of individuals, some rivalry appears to have existed in the 6th century between the sees of Arles and of Vienne. This matter was adjusted by pope Leo, and the adjustment was confirmed by Symmachus. Caesarius was in favour at Rome. A book he wrote against the Semipelagians, entitled *De gratiâ et libero arbitrio*, was sanctioned by pope Felix; and the canons passed at Orange were approved by Boniface II. The learned antiquary Thomassin believes him to have been the first Western bishop who received a pall from the pope. But these circumstances have not prevented him from receiving the fullest justice at the hands of foreign Protestants, such as Guizot and Neander. The former, in his *Civilisation en France*, cites part of one of his sermons as that of a representative man; while Neander, who seems to have been specially interested in him, has nothing but eulogy for his "unwearied, active, and pious zeal, ready for every sacrifice in the spirit of love," and his moderation on the controversy concerning Semi-pelagianism. This is indeed the great glory of Caesarius. He more than anticipates the famous picture drawn in a later age by Chaucer of a teacher, earnest, sincere, and humble, but never sparing reproof where it was needed. "He is to be ranked," adds Neander, "with those men, who knew how to assuage by the glowing zeal of Christian charity, and whatever that can do, even the physical distress of those times of desolation."

[J. G. C.]

CAESARIUS. (4) Martyr at Caesarea in Cappadocia under Decius. Commemorated Nov. 3. (Bede, *Mart. Auct.*; Usuard, *Mart.*; *Vet. Rom. Mart.*)

(5) Father of Eudoxus the Arian. He endeavoured to wipe out a life of vice by a martyr's death at Arabissa in Lesser Armenia under Diocletian. The authority for his story seems to be ultimately Phavorinus, copied by Suidas (Tillem. v. 172, 649).

[E. B. B.]

(6) Master of the offices under Theodosius the Great in A.D. 389, *Cod. Theod.* viii. 5, 49, and

said to be a personal friend of that emperor, was sent by him with troops to chastise Antioch. (Theodoret. v. 19.) An oration of Libanius, addressed to him about that business, is extant (Liban. *Or.* 13 (20), and a homily of CHRYSOSTOM (ii. 171).

He was prefect of the praetorians at Constantinople under Arcadius from A.D. 395 to A.D. 401, either at intervals, or sharing the office with Aurelius and Eutychian. In A.D. 397 he was consul with Atticus. He built over his wife's grave a church to St. Thyrsus, at Constantinople (Soz. ix. 2; Tillem. iii. 344), and removed the body of Eunomius to Tyana, to prevent the Eunomians doing it honours (Tillem. vi. 511). See De Broglie, vi. 144; Godofred. *Cod. Theod.* vi. 354. [E. B. B.]

CAESARIUS (7). Among the works attributed to Chrysostom is a treatise entitled, *Ad Caesarium Monachum Epistola contra Apollinaristas*. We only possess it in a Latin translation, though a few fragments of the Greek original are found in Anastasius and John Damascene and elsewhere. This tract, the literary history of which is very curious, is of disputed authenticity. If we accept it as genuine, we learn from it that Caesarius had embraced a religious life from his childhood, and had become a monk; that his piety had secured Chrysostom's affection, and that at one time he had lived with him. Meeting with some Apollinarists, he purchased a book written by Apollinaris which led him eagerly to embrace those views. Full of joy at having passed from darkness to light, he wrote to Chrysostom to tell him of his new-found happiness. The intelligence caused great grief to Chrysostom, who was then in exile at Cucusus, who composed this letter containing a refutation of the Apollinarian heresy, which he sent to Caesarius, in the hope of delivering him from his errors. It contains a celebrated passage illustrating the doctrine of the two distinct natures in the one person of Jesus Christ by reference to the holy Eucharist, in which he speaks of the nature of bread as remaining in that which by the sanctifying grace of God is freed from the appellation of bread and thought worthy to be called the body of the Lord. This passage was adduced in controversy about the year 1548 by Peter Martyr, who deposited a transcript of it in Archbishop Cranmer's library. After Cranmer's death this document was destroyed or lost, and Martyr was accused of having forged it (Perron, *De l'Euchar.* 381-3). His reputation was cleared by the rediscovery by Emeric Bigot, in a Florentine library, of doubtless the very MS. which Martyr, himself a Florentine, had used. Bigot printed the epistle with Palladius's life of Chrysostom in the year 1680. Previous to publication, through the influence of two censors of the Sorbonne, the alarm of Louis XIV. was excited, and he ordered the leaves containing the letter to be cancelled. An account of the ingenious way in which the mutilation was effected is given in Mendham's *Index of Pope Gregory XVI.* xxxii.-iv. But Bigot having made known his discovery to literary friends, the suppression was made matter of expostulation by Allix (preface to Anastasius in *Hexaemeron*), 1682, and the cancelled leaves were printed by Le Moyne, *Varia*

Sacra, 1685, by Wake, 1686, and by Basnage, 1687. The Jesuit Harduin published the epistle in 1689, accepting it as Chrysostom's, and vindicating the consistency of its doctrine with that of his church. It is accepted as genuine by Tillemont and Du Pin. The genuineness was first assailed by Le Quien (1712) in the preface to his edition of John of Damascus, and his arguments were adopted and enlarged by Montfaucon. Maffei found a Greek fragment also at Florence, professing to be from Chrysostom, the first sentence of which is identical with one in this letter, but proceeding to illustrate its doctrine by two similes not found in the Latin. The extract was printed by Basnage in Canisius's *Lectiones Antiquae*, Antwerp, 1725, pp. 283-7. It is natural to conjecture that the second paragraph is taken from a different work, but the MS. gives no indication of a change of author. Perhaps the Latin does not represent the whole of the letter.

Against the genuineness it is urged that Caesarius is not mentioned elsewhere by Chrysostom, though the letter implies that they had been intimate from youth; that the style (if it be fair to judge when so little of the Greek has been preserved) is rugged and abrupt, and the tone more scholastic than is common with Chrysostom; that though quoted as Chrysostom's by several Greek authors, the earliest of these is scarcely earlier than the 7th century, and yet we should expect it to have been used in the Eutychan disputes, and quoted in the Acts of the 4th, 5th and 6th Councils. Le Quien also urged that language is used which is not heard of until employed by Cyril of Alexandria in controversy with Nestorius. Montfaucon, however, has produced precedents for much of this language from Athanasius, and he has clearly proved that the letter was directed not against Eutychanism, but against Apollinarianism; and with much probability he identifies the work assailed with a work of Apollinarius quoted by Eulogius (ap. Photium, *Cod.* 230, p. 849). This being so, we are more inclined to accept the letter as written while the Apollinarian disputes were raging than, as Montfaucon conjectures, forged a century or two afterwards for the purpose of being used in the Eutychan controversy, since one of the arguments against the genuineness is that there is no evidence that it ever was so used.

On the controversy as to the genuineness, see the authorities referred to by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.*, ed. Harles, i. 699; Chrys. iii. 747-760, and xiii. 496, ed. Migne; iii. 736-746, ed. Montfaucon; Tillemont vii. 629, and xi. 340-343; Routh, *Opuscula*, ii. (479-488).

[E. V.]

CAETI (CAOIDE, COEDDI, CAIDEUS, CAIDOCUS, CETI).—Oct. 24. The *Mart. Doneg.* gives two entries of saints under these names at Oct. 24 and 25, and there are five insertions of Caoide's name in different parts of the Brussels MS. (See Dr. Reeves's note in *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 285.) The table of the *Martyrology* (*ibid.* 375) identifies these names as belonging to one person, but it seems more probable that one name under these different Celtic and Latin forms belongs to at least two individuals. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 162 n.²) gives them as distinct.

CAETI (1), Caeti, Caette, or Coeddi, a bishop at Iona, whom Colgan calls Caideus and Caidinus, died according to the *Four Masters* in A.D. 710, but other authorities give 711 and 712, the latter being probably the true date. He is commemorated on Oct. 24 (Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist.* Ir. iii. 153; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 380).

(2) Caoide, Caideus, or Caidocus.—Oct. 25. He was abbat of Domnach Caoide at the Dannaidd foot in Tir-Eoghain, that is, "the church of Caoide," now Donaghedy, in the north of Tyrone, and bordering on Londonderry.

[J. G.]

CAFFO AB CAW, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Llangaffo, a chapel under Llangeinwen in Anglesey (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 227; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 497).

[C. H.]

CAIAN, Welsh saint of the 5th century, patron of Tregaian, a chapel under Llangeufui in Anglesey; commemorated on Sept. 25 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 146).

[C. H.]

CAIANI. [CAINTITES.]

CAIANUS. [GAIANUS, CAIUS (10).]

CAIDOCUS, apostle of the Morini—Jan. 24. Of this saint there is a short memoir by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 161, quoting from Alcuin's *Life of St. Richarius*; Jac. Malbrancus, *de Morinis*, ii. c. 55; Hugo Menard, in App. ad *Mart. Benedict.* p. 136). Of the many disciples of St. Columbanus and companions of his journey, not the lowest place belongs to St. Caidocus, the priest and apostle of the Morini. He and an associate, Fricoreus or Adrian, seem first to have gone to Lower Germany to teach the Gospel, but being driven from that country, they came into the region of Ponthieu in Picardy, in the reign of king Dagobert, who ascended the throne in A.D. 622. There again being badly received and roughly treated by the rustics, they were on the point of giving up their mission, when a young nobleman named Richarius delivered them from their enemies, received them into his house, and had the glad tidings of the Gospel blessed to his own soul. Under the direction of St. Caidocus and St. Fricoreus he retired from the world, distributed part of his wealth among the poor, and with the remainder founded the monastery of Centula, where St. Caidocus spent the rest of his days, and at his death was buried, about A.D. 640, within the precincts of the monastery. But in his account of St. Caidocus, Lanigan (*Ecccl. Hist.* Ir. ii. 442-5) points to the chronological difficulty of his being a companion of St. Columbanus, and yet coming into Picardy in the reign of king Dagobert. St. Caidocus therefore and his companion must either have spent a good many years in Lower Germany, if they left Ireland with St. Columbanus, or they, like so many others, merely followed his example after his death and forsook the land of their birth to evangelize the present France and Germany (O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* iv. 187).

[J. G.]

CAILA. [CAEL (2).]

CAILCON, Irish saint. [COLGA (5).]

CAILLAN.—Nov. 13. He was son of Niatach, son of Dubhan, of the race of Conmac, son of Fergus, son of Ross, son of Rudhraighe: his mother was Deidi or Dediva, daughter of Tren, son of Dubhthach, and his brothers were St.

Diernitius, abbot of Inis Clotra (Jan. 10), etc. He is said to have been brought up with his relation St. Jarlath, under St. Benen of Armagh (Nov. 9), and to have been a disciple of St. Columba, though these two things are evidently inconsistent, and the latter alone seems the more likely, especially as in the *Life of S. Maedhog* or Modocus of Ferns, who was born A.D. 558 at East Breiffny, St. Maedhóg is said to have been his school-pupil. It is clearly an anachronism to represent him as burying Conall Gulban in A.D. 464 as the *Life of S. Cailin* and the *Irish Annals* do. He was one of the chief saints of Ireland, and presided over the church at Fiodnacha in Magh-Rein (Fenagh or Feenagh, co. Leitrim), and his monastery became a famous school of divinity. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 51-2; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 308-9; Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 448; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 56-7; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 146, n.°, 147.) [J. G.]

CAILTAN is mentioned by St. Adamnan (*St. Columb. i. c.* 31) and by O'Donnell (*St. Columb. ii. c.* 44) as a monk who was in charge of a "Cella Diuni," in "stagno Abae fluminis," and was suddenly sent for by St. Columba, who saw his death to be at hand; and next night on his arrival Cailtan became ill and died. There is a doubt as to the site of his cell, but the most probable spot is on the creek or bay in Mull called Loch Buy, or on the freshwater lake Loch Ba. Camerarius gives the commemoration of "St. Cailtanus Abbas" at Feb. 25. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 172; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 60; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 294.) [J. G.]

CAIMAN. [CAEMHAN.]

CAIMIN, of Inis-Cealtra in Loch Deirdheire (Inishcaltra, at present a parish partly in co. Cork, partly in co. Galway, including some small islands in Loch Derg). He was of the race of Cathaoir Mór of Leinster, and was in manners and life like unto Pacomius the monk. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 85.) His festival is March 24. St. Caimin belongs to the third order of Irish saints, and was descended from the princely house of Hy-kinselagh by his father Dima, of the stock of the kings of Leinster: his mother was Cuminia, Cumania, or Mumania, daughter of Dalbronach; and king Guaire Aidhne, son of Colman, king of Connaught (who died A.D. 662, and is so celebrated by the Irish poets for his unbounded hospitality and munificence) was his half-brother by the same mother. (See *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 273, upon the mother of Guaire Aidhne.) Tired of the world, he retired for solitude and devotion to an island in Loch Derg, and lived there in the first half of the 7th century. (For an account of the remains of the church, which was built on the original 7th-century one, see Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 821 sq.) He died A.D. 653, and was buried at Inishcaltra. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 148, n.°, 337, c. 7, 746-7; *Tr. Thom.* 463, n.°; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 11-13; Butler, *Lives of the SS.* iii. 335; Ussher, *De Brit. Ecol. Prim.* Dublin 1639, p. 975; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, 87, 90.) [J. G.]

CAIN, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patroness of Llangain in Carmarthenshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 228; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 497).

[C. H.]

CAINDER. [CAINNER.]

CAINICHUS (Usuard, *Mart.* ad diem Oct. 11), abbat in Scotland. [CAINNECH (3).]

CAINITES. A branch of the OPHITES. The name is variously written; *Kaivól* (Hippol. *Ref.* viii. 20; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 15); *Caini* (Praedest. *Cod.*); *Kaivavoral* (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 17. See CANISTAE), *Kaivól* (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 38; Origen, *contra Celsum*, iii. 13, but his translator Gelenium gives Cainani); *Caiani* (Philast. 2; Augustin. *Haer.* 18, Praedest. 18, *codd.*); *Gaiana* haeresis (Tertullian *de Praescrip.* 33, and *de Bapt.* 1), but Jerome writing with a clear reference to the latter passage of Tertullian has *Caina* (*Ep.* 83, *ad Oceanum*, and *contra Vigilantium*). Elsewhere he seems to have *Cainaei* (*Dial. adv. Lucifer.* 33); but many MSS. here have *Chaldaei*. So also *Cainaei* (Pseudo-Tertullian, 7), *Cainiani* (Praedest. *Codd.*). Irenaeus (i. 31) describes the doctrines of the sect, but gives them no title. Some of these forms suggest a question whether heretics taking their name from some Caius may not possibly have been confounded with those called after Cain, but there is no satisfactory evidence of any heresiarch Caius. Harnack (*Quellenkritik*, 58) finds a heretic Caius in Tertullian (*adv. Valent.* c. 32), and the same view is taken by Lipsius (*die Quellen des A. K.* 68), but this seems to be a misunderstanding of the passage in Tertullian, where the expression "Marcus or Caius" seems to describe nothing more than a person of the male sex. The *Caianus* referred to by Harnack, as mentioned by Melito of Sardis, is a later person, the mention being really by Anastasius Sinaita (*Routh's Reliquiae*, i. 145). [GAIANUS.]

All the Ophites in common regarded the Creator of the world and God of the Jews as a being of limited nature, who in consequence of his imperfection and ignorance, at times at least, worked in opposition to the will of a higher power; but the Cainites looked on the maker of the world as actually an evil being, resistance to whom was a virtue. Consequently they reversed all the moral judgments of the Jewish Scriptures, and honoured as heroes Cain and others whom the writers of the Old Testament had branded as enemies of their God. They held that Cain and Abel were the offspring of different spiritual powers, and that the death of Abel at the hands of Cain proved that the power from which the latter sprang was higher and more powerful than that from which the former was derived. From the same power as Cain were derived also Esau, the people of Sodom, Korah; and according to their version of the story the supposed swallowing up of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, was a rescue proving the impotence of the maker of the world. He had striven to hurt the children of the higher power, but had not been able; for they had been hidden from their persecutor (an angel having blinded the eyes of Moses), and transferred to the company of their parent power. There is a noteworthy difference in this part of the story between the versions of Irenaeus and Epiphanius. Irenaeus does not intimate a rescue of the bodies of Korah and the rest; he says that Sophia, the higher wisdom, took to herself that which was of her own in them, that is to say the heavenly

principle of light which she had bestowed, their bodies being left to the corruption of earth. This distinction disappears in the account of Epiphanius, who says instead that Wisdom took them to herself as being her own. Epiphanius is here apparently copying Hippolytus, but he had independent knowledge of a Cainite work in which the removal of Korah was treated of, and where possibly a bolder account may have been given than that known to Irenaeus.

In any case the Cainites gloried in claiming kindred with the race of Cain, which they maintained had established its superiority over that of the feeble ruler of the world, and they declared it to be the duty of every man to adhere to the stronger power and separate from the weaker. They held that Judas Iscariot had knowledge of these truths not possessed by the other apostles, and that he betrayed our Lord in order to accomplish the dissolution of the power of him who made heaven and earth. But there was a difference between them as to the grounds of this betrayal. Some arrayed themselves in open opposition to Christ, and held him to have been justly consigned to death on account of his attempts to pervert the truth which Judas was zealous to maintain. Such would seem to be the Ophites, to whom Origen (*contra Celsum*, vi. 28) refuses the name of Christian, declaring them to be as great enemies of Jesus as Celsum himself; who did not even allow Jesus to have been a wise or virtuous man, and who admitted no one into their society until he had first cursed his name. But in the view which seems to have found most acceptance among the Cainites, the goodness of Jesus was acknowledged, yet his betrayer was glorified, as having deliberately done a good work needful for our salvation, inasmuch as he knew the benefits to the world which the Crucifixion was to gain. A book purporting to be the Gospel of Judas is mentioned by Irenaeus as in circulation among these heretics. Irenaeus tells also of other writings of theirs in which they exhort to undo the works of Hystera, by which name the maker of the world was intended. Epiphanius mentions another tract of theirs (*Ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου*), which professed to contain the unspeakable words heard by the apostle on his ascension to the third heaven.

The charges of immorality brought against the Cainites become credible when we consider the attitude of opposition which they took to what the bulk of Christians venerated. Disowning the God of the Old Testament, they could teach their disciples to do on set principle the things which he forbade. We are told that adopting the current names of angels or inventing new ones, they assigned one as the patron of each particular form of immorality, invoking him as they committed it, counting it necessary to their perfection to have complete experience of all, and holding it to be "perfect knowledge" not to shrink from deeds which it is not fit to name.

It has been thought that the Cainites are the false teachers denounced in Jude's epistle, where we have mention made of Cain, of Korah, and of Sodom; while the heretics in question are spoken of as turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, as filthy dreamers, who defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. The coin-

cidences are certainly remarkable, and it may easily be allowed that some form of immoral Gnosticism is assailed in the epistle; but the theories which may be specially called Cainite, are clearly later than its date. For in the epistle the fate of Sodom is without misgiving urged as a warning, and Cain and Korah are used as terms of undoubted reproach. On the other hand, it would be an occurrence to which many parallels could be produced if some bold spirit among the Gnostic sectaries had taken the terms of reproach used against his sect by their orthodox opponents, and taught his brethren to accept them, and deny that they had any cause to be ashamed of them.

It is likely that these Cainite doctrines were never more than the frenzy of a few, and that they did not originate very early, nor continue very long. Though not quite extinct in the beginning of the third century, they had by that time ceased to be troublesome in the west, for Hippolytus in his later work on heresies dismisses them as unworthy of notice. Tertullian deals with the opposition to the rite of Baptism made by a female member of the sect, but seems to be under no necessity of controverting the distinctively Cainite notions described in this article. On the other hand, it may with some probability be asserted that the propagation of these notions was later than Justin Martyr.

In the articles EPIPHANIUS and HIPPOLYTUS will be explained how Lipsius has in great measure restored the lost earlier compendium of Hippolytus against heresies by means of the independent use of it made by Epiphanius, Philastrius, and Pseudo-Tertullian. In this way it is ascertained that that compendium contained an article on the Cainites coming in the same place as in the work of Pseudo-Tertullian. Philastrius, induced probably by the names, transfers to the very beginning of his treatise the articles on the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethites, which he treats as pre-Christian heresies, but he leaves *in situ* those paragraphs of the article on the Cainites which relate to Judas Iscariot. Comparing then the recovered article of Hippolytus with that of Irenaeus, the differences and the resemblances are found to be such as seem to indicate that Hippolytus neither copied Irenaeus, nor is absolutely unrelated to him, but that both used a common authority. Lipsius put forward the theory that one authority used by Irenaeus was the lost treatise on heresies of Justin Martyr; that this supplied materials for the account which Irenaeus gives of the heresies from Simon to Marcion (i. 22-27); but that the later chapters of the first book in which the section on the Cainites is included, are an appendix added by Irenaeus from his own resources. In his latest essay Lipsius has withdrawn much of this theory; but this much it seems safe to adopt, viz., that while it is likely enough that Justin's work was one of the sources used by Irenaeus, it did not supply materials for the section on the Ophites. Justin (*Dialog. cum Tryphone*, 35) speaks of heresies as all known by the name of the heretic who introduced them, and this is the way in which the heresies are designated in the section of Irenaeus, which was claimed as derived from Justin; while in the later section no mention is made of the founders of the sects treated of. It would seem then

that the heretical treatise of Justin contained no mention of the Cainites, and there are some slight indications in the extant works of Justin that he was ignorant of them, on which, however, we will not venture to lay too much stress. There are other points in the treatise of Irenaeus which would be affected by the hypothesis that he uses different authorities in the sections 22-27, 29-31. For instance, there are some striking coincidences between the theory of Saturninus, c. 24, and that of the Ophites, c. 30, such as the account of the worm-like motions of the first created man, and the ascription of the books of the prophets to the world-making angels. Now sects put apart by Irenaeus might possibly be referred to the same school, if we understand the descriptions to be of different dates and by different authors. [G. S.]

CAINNECH (CANICUS, CANICE). (1) Jan. 23. Colgan thinks this may be the St. Cannechus, who was baptized by St. Patrick, became "praefectus monachorum S. Patricii et episcopus," and built the church of Kealltag in the same district of Corco-themne (i. e. Corcohenney, co. Tipperary), where he was baptized. But his only reason for the supposition is that no other history is given to the St. Cainnech of this day. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 139, c. 70, 179 n.¹²⁸, 267, col. 1; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 409.)

(2) Jan. 31. In *Mart. Doneg.* is Caineach, son of Ua Chil, priest: Mella was the name of his mother, and also the mother of Tighearnach of Doire-Melle. But as to Cainnech, his father, or his life, we have nothing better than supposition. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 796; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 601.)

(3) Abbat of Achadh-bo,—Oct. 11, A.D. 600. This great saint, who in Ireland is better known as St. Canice, and in Scotland as St. Kenneth, was of the race of Ciar, son of Fergus, son of Ross, son of Rudhraighe. Achadh-bo (now Aghaboe, or Aughavoe, a parish in the baronies of Clondonagh and Clarmellagh, in Queen's County, was his principal church; he was patron also of Kilkenny, which derived its name from him, and of Ossory. On the west coast of Scotland and at St. Andrew's we find many traces of his memory. A life of St. Canicus is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Oct. tom. v. 642-6). The late Marquis of Ormonde printed privately the life of this saint from the *Codex Salmanticensis*, in the Burgundian library at Brussels, marked P. M. s., which formerly belonged to the Irish College at Salamanca, and contains the lives of forty-six saints. Another life is found in what is incorrectly called the *Liber Kilkenniensis*, in Primate Marsh's library in Dublin, marked v. 3, 4. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, xxvi., xxxi.; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 295.) St. Cainnech was born A.D. 517, of the tribe of Corco Dalann, "de genere Corcotolare ab aquilonari parte hujus insulae." Unlike most of the saints of his country, his parents were poor. His father was a bard, Laitech Luerd, Lugayd, or Lugteach, son of Lughaidh, son of Dalann, of a race originally settled in the island of Nulage, probably Inis Doimble, or Little Island, on the Suir, S.E. of Waterford (for his genealogy see Reeves, *Adamnan*, 220). His mother Meld, or Mella, was of the race of Macgnais or Macnaes. The place of his birth,

Kiannaght, is in the county Derry, and is termed "Vallis pellium," or Dungiven: in the barony of Keenaght stood his principal northerly church, called Drumachose, where for many centuries his memory was specially revered, and the superior of which was styled "the Coarb of S. Cainnech in Cianacht;" and he himself is called in the life in the *Book of Kilkenny* (fol. 124) "Canicus sanctus abbas de genere Connach Duine-Gemhyn," i. e. of the tribe of Keenaght about Dungiven. Being baptized by Bishop Luceth or Lryrech, he was brought up in his mother's country at a place not now identified. He went over to St. Cadocus (Cattwg Ddoeth) in Wales, whose love he won by the spirit of obedience, which was so prompt that, when called by his teacher, he left a letter half finished in the transcription. Conquering the envy of his companions by miracle, he afterwards proceeded to Italy, to the "limina apostolorum." Apparently after his return, he studied under Mabi Clairenach at Glasnevin, and under St. Finian at Clonard, where his companions were SS. Ciaran, Comgall, and Columba. He seems to have subsequently gone to Scotland, and been with St. Columba in Iona, and sojourning with him in the western isles, working, it is said, many miracles. He was closely connected with St. Columba, and a lively interest was manifested by them for each other in their distant monasteries, as we see by the story in Adamnan (*St. Columb.* ii. c. 14). He was likewise connected by ties of friendship with other great men of his time, such as the two Brendans, St. Comgall, St. Fintan of Clononagh, and, in his later days, with St. Mochaemog or Pulcherius of Liathmor (March 13). The exact date of the foundation of Aghaboe is not known, but it probably was before 577, on land granted him by his patron Colman, son of Fearadach, lord of Ossory, who succeeded Fearadach A.D. 582. (On the name Aghaboe, "Ager Boum," see Reeves, *Adamnan*, 121 n.; Ussher, *de Brit. Eccl. Prim. Dubl.* 1639, p. 957. For a detailed account of his life and the wonders he wrought, see Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 125, 138 sq.; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 295-7; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, x. 300; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 188, 200 sq.; *Trans. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iv. 300 sq., with special reference to his connection with St. Andrew's; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 121, 220, and *Eccl. Ant.* 374; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 125; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 6, 27, and *Ir. Ant.* 137.) He was fond of solitude, and went from time to time into places of retreat for study and devotion: when teaching he was very remarkable for his eloquence and power. On an island in Loch Ree, he wrote a copy of the Four Gospels, which at the time of the composition of the Life was still extant under the name of Glass-Kinnich, the "chain" or "Catena" of Cainnech, and may have been a commentary. At last, blessed with the holy sacrifice received from the hands of St. Fintan, he departed to the Lord, A.D. 600, in the 84th year of his age. Besides his Irish dedications at Kilkenny, Aghaboe, and Drumachose, and his being honoured as patron of the diocese of Ossory, St. Cainnech or Kenneth is, next to St. Brigida and St. Columba, if we may measure popularity by dedications, the favourite Irish saint in Scotland (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 297; *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* ii. 7, 235, 242; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 230). [J. G.]

CAINNER (CAINDER, CANNERA, CINNERA, CUNNERA, KENNERE), (1) Jan. 28. *Mart. Doneg.* calls her daughter of Cruithneachan, at Cill-Chuilinn, in Cairbre, but *Mart. Tallaght* has "Caínech (Cainer) ingen Cruithnechan mic Laighne i Fail Fobhair." Colgan (*Acta SS.* 174) gives an account of her acts, and calls her S. Cannerá, daughter of Cruthnechan and Cumánia, in Bentráighe (a district near Bantry Bay). She betook herself to solitude and ascetic devotion, and had as a friend St. Senán of Inis-catheay (now Cattery Island in the Shannon). When the time of dissolution drew near, she was removed to his monastery where she died, and was buried on the shore of Scatteray Island, outside the monastic precincts. She flourished about A.D. 530, and in St. Senán's Life is called Kynnera. Being descended from a distinguished family of ancient Carberry, county Cork, she was much revered in that district, especially at Cill-chuilinn, which can hardly be the Kilcullen in county Kildare, but some place as yet unidentified in Bentráighe. (See Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 6; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 461 sq.)

(2) Oct. 29.—St. Kennere, virgin martyr, is given on this day in the Scotch kalendars. She is said to have been one of the companions of St. Ursula, on the Lower Rhine, in the middle of the 5th century, but to have escaped when the rest were martyred. She was afterwards murdered through jealousy, and special honour was given to her relics by St. Willebrod (A.D. 692-741). She had dedications in the south-west of Scotland. (*Brev. Aberdeen*, pars aetiv. f. cxxxiii. a; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, x. 547; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 361; Bolland, *Acta SS.* Oct. tom. xii. 904, "tem-pore incerto.") [J. G.]

CAIREACH DERGAIN.—Feb. 9. She was sister of St. Enna, of Arran, in Galway Bay, and of the race of Colla-da-chrioch and family of the Orgielli in Ulster. Her father was Conall Derg (Rubeus), son of Daimhin, son of Coirpre Domhairgid. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 43, 83.) Her death is entered by the *Four Mast.* at A.D. 577, but though her monastery is placed at Clonburren, in the parish of Moore, bar. Moycarnan, co. Roscommon, there is no little doubt as to her place and time. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 68, c. 17, 72, n. 20; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. 209; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 399, ii. 234-36.) [J. G.]

CAIRELL (CARELLUS)—June 13. On this day *Mart. Doneg.* and *Tallaght* put Cairell bishop of Tir-Rois, and the former adds from the *Life of St. Colman Ela*, that Bp. Carell was along with him when he went to Lann-Ela, that is, in the end of the 6th century (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 169). There were two of this name, and Colgan seems confused in trying to distinguish them. But if we follow our chronological notes this must be Carellus, son of Nesson, of Leinster descent, who is the contemporary of SS. Colman Ela and Senan, and the bishop at Tir-Rois. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 611, recte 529, and *Tr. Thaum.* 135, c. 43.) [J. G.]

CAIRLAN. [CAERLAN.]

CAIRNECH. (1) One of this name (written Cearnach) appears in the *Four Masters* among

the deaths under A.D. 779 (recte 784), as son of Suibhne, and prior of Armagh: in the *Annals of Ulster*, A.D. 783, he is called "Cernach mac Suibne equonimus Ardmachae," i.e. house-steward of Armagh (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 385 and note).

CAIRNECH. (2) B.—March 28. His father was Saran and his mother Pompa or Bebona: the former belonged to the race of Colla-da-Crioch, and the latter was daughter of Loarne, king of the Dalriadic Scots. He was born after the middle of the 5th century: his brothers were St. Berchan of Echdruim (May 7) and St. Ronan (May 27); and his monastery was probably at Cruachan Ligeon on Lough Foyle, near Lifford. He must have died about A.D. 530, and thus could scarcely have been associated with St. Patrick in revising and purifying the Irish laws. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 782 sq.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 89; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 134-5, 173; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 329; *Irish Nennius*, App. No. xxi. pp. ci. sq.; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 52 sq.)

(3) Of Tuilen.—May 16. The more recent hand in the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 132 n.) adds that "he was of the Britons" (and regarding this, see Appendix to Dr. Todd's *Irish Nennius*, pp. ci. cx. 178, and the Life of St. Cairnech in Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 209). He is probably the S. Carnocus Episc. Culdaeus of the 15 June of Camerarius. He flourished about A.D. 450, and is called by the Irish writers Cairneach, and in Latin Carantocus. Timmuth and Capgrave call him the son of the chief "Cereticæ regionis apud Cambrobritannos." Colgan identifies him as "S. Carantocus Episcopus, Carnechus, et mendosè Maccarthein dictus, inter filios Darercae," sister of St. Patrick. He was the son or grandson of Ceredig. His father wished to resign the kingdom to him, but he preferred the religious life. He passed into Ireland impelled by his love for St. Patrick. Going forth to evangelize the country, they agreed to meet every year. He returned to Britain, but eventually died in Ireland. Colgan cannot decide whether this Cairnech or the one preceding is the Carnechus Moel who wrote the Acts of his master St. Ciarán: he says that Cairnech, the Briton, lies at Inisbaithen in Leinster. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 263, 473, 717-18, and *Tr. Thaum.* 127, 231; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 298; Bollandists, Mai. tom. iii. 582-5, "De S. Carentoco seu Cernatho E. A. in Wallia et Hib.") [J. G.]

This Cairnech or Carentocus is said to have come from Cornwall to join St. Patrick, and to have helped him to compile the Brehon Laws (Senchus Mor 1, p. xix., 2, p. v.-viii). He therefore lived in the fifth century. His burial-place is said to be at Dulane, in Meath. The Welsh represent him as the son of Ceretic, the fifth son of Cunedda, and say that he was born in Cardigan. His life in the Cotton MS. Vesp. A. xiv. (No. 114), made use of by John of Tinnmouth, and hence by Capgrave (fol. lxxvi.), is "suspected of much falsehood" (*Acta Sanctorum*, May 16, iii. 585-7; see Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, l. 46, 47). The parish of Crantock is on the Irish Sea in Cornwall, and there was a collegiate church there before the Conquest. The sand which has blown up along this coast has nearly obliterated the remains of the college, but the holy well remains. The parish feast is on

the nearest Sunday to the 16th of May (see Oliver's *Monasticon Diocesis Exoniensis*).

[C. W. B.]

CAIRPRE (CARBREUS, CORPREUS). There were several Irish saints of this name, but most of them are very obscure, such as Cairpre, the bishop of Maghbile (Moville), May 3; Corpreus of Clonmacnoise, with his 12 presbyters, Nov. 1; and Cairpre, bishop of Cill-Chairpre in Tir-Aedha, near Eas Ruaidh, (Tirhugh in Tircconnell, near the Salmon Leap on the river Erne.) (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 312, c. 5, nn. ¹⁴, ¹⁵; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 300; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 426.) In *Acta SS.* 509, Colgan gives a memoir of St. Corpreus Crom of Cluannicnois (March 6), who died A.D. 889. Among the disciples of St. Finnian (Feb. 23) is given St. Carbreus, bishop of Cuil-rathain, son of Decill or Degillus, son of Nadsluagh, of the race of Irial, son of Conall Cearnach: he was venerated on Nov. 11 (Colgan, *Ibid.* 406, c. 3; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 305). He is said to have been a disciple of St. Monenna or Nennius of Clonfert (March 1), and in the Life of that saint there is an account of St. Cairpre's being carried by pirates into Armorica in Gaul, and there engaged with others in grinding corn for the Gallic king; but, after a miracle performed by him, he was released and kindly received at "Rosnatense Monasterium." This, or the fact on which it is based, probably happened before he became bishop. He was consecrated bishop by St. Brugacius, a pupil and bishop of St. Patrick's ordination, flourished at Cuil-rathain, now Cole-raine, "the ferny corner," in A.D. 540, and died about A.D. 560. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 406, c. 3, 438, and *Tr. Thaum.* 148, 183; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 75, 138, 247; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 77-79.)

[J. G.]

CAISSIN. [CASSAN.]

CAIUS (1). The reign of this emperor (A.D. 37-41), better known by the *sobriquet* of Caligula, had perhaps an indirect influence on the growth of the Christian church. It was shortly after his accession that the persecution which had originated in the preaching of Stephen, and which had been so relentless and systematic (Acts viii. 1, ix. 1; Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. i. 13), suddenly stopped, and "then had the churches rest throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria" (Acts ix. 31). With this security there was at once an inner and an outer growth. They walked "in the comfort of the Holy Ghost" and were "multiplied." The history of Caligula's relations to Judaea as shewn in the narrative of Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8) throws light on the causes of this change. It was not only that the leading persecutor had become a preacher of the faith. The whole attention of the rulers and people of Jerusalem was absorbed by another danger. Caligula, in his mad impiety, had given orders to Petronius, the governor of Syria, to compel the Jews to join in the worship which other provinces paid him. The attempt to enforce that worship in the synagogues of Alexandria had already caused tumults and outrages of all kinds there, and had led the Jews of that city to send an embassy to the emperor (Philo *ad Flaccum, de Legatione*). An altar to the emperor had been erected by Capito, a *publicanus* in Judaea, at Jamnia, and

had been thrown down by the Jews. Now the command went forth that a statue of Caligula should at all hazards be placed in the temple, and sacrifices offered to it. The Jews were horror-stricken. They rushed, by tens of thousands, to Ptolemais to entreat Petronius to suspend the execution of the edict. They gathered round him at Tiberias and offered themselves to death. The cultivation of the soil was neglected.* At last he consented to delay till he should receive further orders. Agrippa I., on whom the emperor had conferred the tetrarchate of Philip and the title of king, was fortunately at Rome and high in the emperor's favour. Caligula was invited to a banquet, and promised to grant any boon that Agrippa might choose to ask, and the king was patriotic enough to beg only that the edict which had caused such horror might be rescinded. It was then precisely in this interval that the church enjoyed the temporary tranquillity which was so favourable to its growth. It is noticeable that when the danger had blown over, and Agrippa had returned to Palestine in the character of king, it burst out again with renewed violence (Acts xii. 1).

So far we have been dealing chiefly with the churches of Judaea. But another of Caligula's acts may have had a special influence on the Christian disciples in Galilee. Herodias, stung with jealousy at her brother's success in gaining the title of king through his intimacy with Caligula, stirred up Antipas to apply for a like honour (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 7). The two went together to Italy and found the emperor at Baiae. They were foiled, however, by the representations of Agrippa, who had sent despatches after them accusing Antipas of disloyalty, and the tetrarch and his wife, instead of gaining fresh privileges, lost what they had, were deposed and banished to Lugdunum, and the tetrarchy of Galilee added to Agrippa's kingdom. It is clear that the state of things, in the interval between the departure of Antipas, and the transfer of power to Agrippa, must have been more or less favourable to the Christian disciples there. When Agrippa begins to persecute, the first objects of attack are the Galilean apostles. The probable connection between Acts ix. 31 and Caligula's attempt seems to have been first noticed by Lardner (*Credibility*, i. 1, ch. 2).

[E. H. P.]

CAIUS (2), an ecclesiastical writer at the beginning of the third century, is commonly described as a presbyter of the Roman church; but this, though a natural, is not a necessary inference from what is stated of him by Eusebius; nor does any authority earlier than Photius directly assert either that he was a presbyter, or that he was a member of the church of Rome. Eusebius makes mention of but one work of Caius, to which he refers four times (*H. E.* ii. 25; iii. 28, 31; vi. 20), and from which he gives some short extracts. This was a dialogue which purported to be a report of a disputation held at Rome during the episcopate of Zephyrinus (A.D. 201-219) between Caius and Proclus, a leader of the sect of Montanists, apparently the same as the Proclus who is commended by Tertullian (*adv. Val.* 5),

* May not this, in part, account for the special severity of the famine a few years later? Acts xi. 28.

and as the Proclus who in the list of heresies appended to the treatise *De Præscrip. Haer.*, is said to have been at the head of one of the two parties into which the Montanists were divided. This dialogue is mentioned by the following writers, not one of whom, however, enables us positively to assert that he had derived his knowledge of it from a perusal of the work itself, and not merely from the account given by Eusebius (Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* 59; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* ii. 3; iii. 2, where the present text, doubtless by a transcriber's error, reads Patroclus instead of Proclus, Niceph. Call. *H. E.* iv. 12, 20, Photius, *Bibl.* 48). None of these authors except the last attributes any other work to Caius. Theodoret says that he wrote against Cerinthus, but he is probably referring not to a separate work, but to a part of the dialogue to be noticed presently.

In the short fragments preserved, Proclus defends the prophesings of his sect by appealing to the four daughters of Philip, who with their father were buried at Hierapolis; Caius, on the other hand, offers to shew his antagonist at the Vatican and on the Appian Way, the tombs of the apostles "who founded this church." That Caius should have conducted a disputation at Rome does not of itself prove that he, any more than Proclus, permanently resided there. Yet the expression just cited conveys the impression that he did; and it would seem that Eusebius was of that opinion, for elsewhere (vi. 20) having mentioned that Caius only counted St. Paul's epistles as thirteen, omitting that to the Hebrews, he adds that even in his own time "some of the Romans" did not ascribe that epistle to the apostle. It is just possible that we are still in possession of the list of genuine apostolic writings which Eusebius (*l. c.*) intimates that Caius gave, in order to rebuke the rashness of his opponents in framing new Scriptures. Muratori attributed to Caius the celebrated fragment on the canon published by him, which concludes with a rejection of Montanist documents [see MURATORIAN FRAGMENT]. But it is difficult to believe that if this were the list referred to by Eusebius, he would not have quoted it more fully. Among the heretical writings rejected by Caius was a book of Revelations (Eus. ii. 25) purporting to be written by a great apostle and ascribed by Caius to Cerinthus, in which the author professes to have been shewn by angels that after the resurrection Christ's kingdom should be earthly, that men should inhabit Jerusalem, should be the slaves of lusts and pleasures, and should spend a thousand years in marriage festivities. It has been conjectured that the book intended is the canonical book of the Revelation. The strongest reason for thinking so is that Dionysius of Alexandria (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 25) asserts that some of his predecessors had maintained that the Apocalypse is the work of Cerinthus, and describes their views in language strongly resembling that of Caius. On the other side it is urged that the author of the canonical book does not expressly claim the title of an apostle, nowhere describes millennial happiness as consisting in sensual gratifications, and teaches concerning our Lord's person doctrines irreconcilable with those known to be held by Cerinthus; that Eusebius does not seem to have understood Caius as referring to the

CHRIST. BIOGR.

canonical book; that Theodoret certainly did not, who (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 3) says that Cerinthus invented certain revelations, *pretending to have seen them himself*; and lastly that Caius gives no sign that he is putting forward an opinion opposed to that of the Roman church of his time, which, as we know from Hippolytus, and from the Muratorian fragment, recognised the Apocalypse as St. John's.

A deep obscurity covers the personal history of Caius. Eusebius describes him as a member of the church (*ἐκκλησιαστικός ἀνὴρ*), and as very learned (*λογιώτατος*), but gives no indication that he knew anything more of him than he gathered from the dialogue against Proclus itself. And there do not seem to be any trustworthy materials for filling up the blank. St. Jerome, who might be expected to know something of the traditions of the Roman church, gives no sign of being in possession of independent information, and only loosely repeats what had been said by Eusebius. The Roman church does not include Caius in its martyrology, and does not honour him with the title of Saint. There is but a single notice with any pretensions to antiquity which speaks of Caius in any other way than as the author of the dialogue. The extant MSS. of the martyrdom of Polycarp profess to be ultimately derived from a transcript made at Corinth by one Socrates from a copy taken from the writings of Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, by Caius, who was intimate with Irenæus. Notwithstanding the difference of place, and the commonness of the name, we can scarcely help supposing that the Caius intended was the Roman Caius, the only notable Caius contemporary with Irenæus. It is doubtful whether we can place more confidence in this note than in those which ascribe to Julius Africanus the composition of the history of certain Italian martyrdoms; but there would be no difficulty in supposing that Caius was of Greek extraction (in fact the dialogue against Proclus appears plainly to have been written in Greek), that he had known Irenæus in the East, and, like him, afterwards travelled westward. Some French writers, indeed, claim Caius for their country, and make him to have received his instructions from Irenæus in Gaul.

Photius tells us (*l. c.*), apparently on the authority of a note which he found in the MS. of a work attributed to Caius: "They say that Caius was a presbyter of the Roman church, during the episcopates of Victor and Zephyrinus, and that he was elected bishop of the Gentiles (*ἐθνῶν ἐπίσκοπον*)."

The strangeness of this expression sufficiently explains why, although there is exactly the same authority for calling Caius a bishop as a presbyter, he is habitually known by the lower title. Different explanations of this phrase have been given, and conjectural emendations proposed, Ἀθηνῶν by Fabricius, ἑωθενῶν by Wordsworth; but it is needless to discuss minutely a statement which, when traced back as far as we can, is separated by an interval of 600 years from the death of Caius. Photius, on the authority of the same MS. notes, with some hesitation ascribes to Caius a work on the cause of the universe, and another called the Labyrinth, the authorship of which was unknown to previous writers who had quoted it. In the article on HIPPOLYTUS the authorship of

these works is discussed; as well as the question whether the last is to be identified with the Little Labyrinth mentioned by Theodoret. Photius asserts that a separate work against the heresy of Artemon was also ascribed to Caius, but it is generally agreed that this work is not to be distinguished from the Little Labyrinth, which was directed against that heresy. The "Refutation against all heresies," the greater part of which was recently brought to light and published in 1851, has been attributed by several critics to Caius, whose claims may be supported by many arguments. But every one of the same arguments may be urged with equal force in favour of the claims of Hippolytus, to whom it is now by general agreement ascribed. The difficulty of making a case for Caius which will not be equally strong for Hippolytus arises from the fact, noticed by Professor Lightfoot, that almost everything that has been asserted of Caius is predicable also of Hippolytus. Both flourished at Rome during the same episcopate; both wrote in Greek; both were disciples of Irenaeus; both were men of great learning at a time when the Roman church was devoid of literary eminence; both counted Paul's epistles as thirteen, excluding the epistle to the Hebrews; and the title of bishop of the Gentiles, ascribed to Caius, not inaptly describes the office held by Hippolytus, who is said to have been bishop of Portus, which, as the principal harbour of the Imperial city, was thronged by a motley crowd of strangers; and who more than once in the Refutation speaks of the Gentiles as though they were his special charge (x. 31, 32, 34).

The singular absence of any notice of the personal activity of a writer so distinguished as Caius is explained if we adopt Professor Lightfoot's conjecture (*Journal of Philology*, i. 98) that the disputation against Proclus was in fact conducted by Hippolytus, who in his report of the dialogue styles himself by his praenomen, as Cicero does in his philosophical works. Those into whose hands the book fell, unless in possession of some other information about the author, would naturally describe him merely as Caius. If this conjecture could be strengthened by any independent proof that the praenomen of Hippolytus was actually Caius, there is no formidable difficulty in the way of the identification. The greatest is that in the Syriac catalogue of Hebed-Jesu, who lived about the year 1300 (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. 15), among the works of Hippolytus, is enumerated "Heads (theses) against Caius." A corruption in the text had been suspected from the difficulty of finding either a heretic of the name of Caius (see CAINITES), or any conceivable subject of difference between Hippolytus and our Caius. The idea that we are to identify these "Heads" with the book otherwise known to have been written by Hippolytus "In defence of the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. John" is refuted by the fact that this is enumerated as a distinct work in the same catalogue of Hebed-Jesu; as well as by the impossibility that Caius would have rejected St. John's Gospel, whatever we may think of his reception of the Apocalypse. There has, then, been given no explanation of the title of this work of Hippolytus so satisfactory as to exclude the conjecture that the work intended to be ascribed to him is no other than the well-known dia-

logue, here described, not as usual, the disputation against Proclus, but by the name of the other interlocutor, the disputation against Caius. [G. S.]

CAIUS (3). Pope from Dec. 17 (16?) A.D. 283 (9 or 10 days after the death of his predecessor Eutychianus), to Apr. 22, A.D. 296, i.e. for 12 years 4 months 1 week (*Pontifical*, Bucher, p. 272), but only for 11 years according to Anastasius (c. 24) and to most Latins, and for 15 years according to Eusebius, who speaks of him as a contemporary (*H. E.* vii. 32; *Chron.* 284). He is probably the same as Caius the deacon, imprisoned with pope Stephen, A.D. 257 (Anastas. c. 24). Just as he was raised to the chair, the stern old Roman Carus died mysteriously in a thunderstorm in the East, and his profligate son Carinus succeeded to the empire at Rome. These events would seem to make a persecution, such as is assigned to this period by various martyr acts, not in itself improbable, and though the acts in question are untrustworthy (see Tillemont, iv. 565), we are hardly justified in taking Eusebius for a witness to the contrary, as far as concerns the West. The probability is confirmed by the delay of the funeral of Eutychianus till July 25, 284 (v. Rossi, ii. 378). The persecution is not represented as general, but as aimed at a few obnoxious devotees, and Caius does not appear as leading, accompanying, or inciting them, but only as exercising a fatherly supervision. (See under SEBASTIANUS.) It is probable that the persecution continued for some time under Diocletian. The early Pontifical, as well as Anastasius, makes Caius of Dalmatian origin and cousin to this emperor. The acts of St. Susanna confirm this, but are wholly untrustworthy. That a heathen, Gabinius, her father, should call his brother the pope, Your Holiness, is not so very incredible, but other statements are. It is not likely that Christians prostrated themselves to the pope (Till. iv. 760). Caius is said in the early pontifical to have avoided persecution by hiding in the crypts. During his latter years the church must have enjoyed peace. The church of Rome in his days was still in great part Greek (Rossi, ii. 72), as is inferred from the epitaph of Eutychianus. He is said by Anastasius to have established the 6 orders of usher, reader, exorcist, subdeacon, deacon, and presbyter, as preliminary stages necessary to be passed before attaining the episcopate, and also to have divided Rome into regions, and assigned them to the deacons. He is said to have sent Protus and Januarius on a mission to Sardinia (*Mart. Rom.* Baron. Oct. 25). He died in peace according to the 6th cent. pontifical, and is not called a martyr by any one earlier than Bede and Anastasius. He was succeeded by Marcellinus. A decretal is ascribed to him. From a confusion between the calends of March and of May, in the *Mart. Hieron.* Rabanus assigns his death, and Notker his burial, to Feb. 20 (Rossi, ii. 104). His commemoration on July 1 in the *Mart. Hieron.* is unexplained (*Ib.* p. 105). He was the last of the 12 popes buried in the crypt of Sixtus, in the cemetery of Callistus (*Ib.* p. 105). He is therefore mentioned again, Aug. 9, at which date a copy of the inscription set up by Sixtus III. was placed in the margin of the ancient martyrology (*Ib.* pp. 33-46). It was impossible to identify

his portrait in the series at San Paolo (Bulletini, 1870, p. 124).

CAIUS (4). Only one Gaius is named among the 70 disciples by Dorotheus, and is said to have succeeded Timothy in the see of Ephesus. So also in the Menology, where he is commemorated Nov. 4, along with Patrobas, Hermes, and Linus. This may be the Gaius who is addressed in the third epistle of John, if we suppose Diotrephes to have held the see when the epistle was written. [But see *Bibl. Dict.* JOHN, THIRD EPISTLE OF.]

(5) "Gaius mine host" (Rom. xvi. 23) is said, in Origen's comment on the passage, to have been afterwards bishop of Thessalonica. He may have confused him with Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29). Orig. in Rom. x. 41, vol. iv. p. 289.

(6) Oct. 4, Usuard, *Mart.* and the *Mart. Rom. Parvum* have "Apud Corinthum Crispus et Caius" (1 Cor. i. 14).

(7) Caius, bishop of Pergamos, is named in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, vii. 46.

(8) 21st bishop of Jerusalem (Eus. *H. E.* v. 12), called Gaius in the Chronicon (*sub anno* 160 P.C.); as also by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 66, p. 637).

(9) 23rd do. (*Ib.*), called Gaius in the Chronicon also (*Ib.*). Only one of these is named in Rufinus.

(10) Martyr, of Eumenea, at Apamea, refused to be reckoned with Montanist martyrs (Apollin. ap. Eus. *H. E.* v. 16). Commemorated March 10 (Usuard, *Mart.*; *Mart. Rom.*). Not in the Menology.

(11) Arrested with DIONYSIUS of Alexandria, A.D. 250, and forcibly rescued and confined with him in a desert place of Libya (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 40, vii. 11, pp. 236, 261, quoting from Dion. *Ep.* x. and i.), and commemorated with him by the Greeks, Oct. 4, as a deacon and martyr.

(12) Priest of Didda, excommunicated, with the approval of CYPRIAN, for receiving the lapsed without penance. (Cypr. *Ep.* 28 (34)). He is supposed by Tillemont (iv. 94) to have been one of the 5 schismatics named in *Ep.* 40.

(13) FORTUNATUS, Gaius, and Antus, patron saints of Salerno, commemorated there Aug. 28, are supposed by Ferrari to have been companions of FELIX (Till. v. 668). They are not mentioned in the martyrologies on that day, but Gaius and Fortunatus are frequently joined in the *Mart. Hieron.* See, for instance, Jan. 19, Feb. 2, March 4. (*Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 163.)

(14) One of the MARTYRS OF SARAGOSSA.

(15) Martyr at Nicomedia, Oct. 12, with twelve soldiers. (Usuard, *Mart.*; *Mart. Rom. Parv.*) [DASIUS.]

(16) One of the FORTY MARTYRS OF SEBASTE. The other mentions of the name in the *Mart. Hieron.* are numerous. Why the *Mart. Parvum* should have selected only those on April 19 at Militana, in Armenia, and on Nov. 20 at Messina, and Usuard have added one at Bononia in the East (Bologna?) Jan. 4, and one drowned March 4, it is not said when or where, does not appear.

(17) Persecutor of ST. AFRA.

(18) Deacon of Alexandria, followed Arius, and signed his letter to S. Alexander (Till. vi. 246, 256).

(19) Orthodox bishop of Thmuis in Egypt. Assisted at the Councils of Tyre, Sardica, and

Nice (Till. vi. 639). He had to flee from the Arian persecution, and perhaps appears at the Council of Alexandria in A.D. 362, as bishop of Paretonia in the Libyan Desert (*Ib.* viii. 697).

CAIUS (20) Arian, bishop of Pannonia, was at the Council of Milan in A.D. 355, and at the Council of Rimini in A.D. 359, maintained the 3rd confession of Sirmium and was deposed (Till. vii. 535, vi. 447). His condemnation is referred to by Athanasius in his epistle to Epictetus (i. 720). Afterwards (*Ib.* 459) he was reinstated, and sent on a deputation to Constantius. The Semi-Arians who were deposed at Constantinople, in A.D. 360, wrote and asked the Western churches to hold him excommunicated in A.D. 366, which they accordingly did in A.D. 371 (*Ib.* viii. 400). Before then he had complained to Germinius of ill-treatment from some of his ecclesiastics, and wrote praying that bishop to hold fast to the formulary of Sirmium (Till. vi. 546).

(21) Tribune, guarded Lucifer and Florentius in A.D. 355 (Till. vii. 545).

(22) Heretic, to whom Augustine writes in A.D. 390 his Epistle 19 (84), sending him all his books (Till. xiii. 141).

(23) Supposed Donatist bishop at Carthage. Others read Carus. (Tillem. vi. 713.)

(24) Patriarch of Alexandria. [GAIANUS.] [E. B. B.]

(25) Monk. [DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE.]

CALAIS. [CARILEFUS.]

CALAMANDA, virgin martyr, honoured Feb. 5 at Calaffa in the diocese of Vico in Spain, of whose history nothing is known (Till. v. 550). [E. B. B.]

CALANDIO or **CALENDIO** (Καλανδίων), succeeded Stephen II. as bishop of Antioch, A.D. 481. There is no doubt that he owed his promotion to the episcopate to the emperor Zeno, and Acacius, bishop of Constantinople; but the exact circumstances of his appointment, in common with many of the events of the stormy period in which Peter the Fuller is the chief character, are hard to ascertain with any precision. His predecessor in the see, Stephen II., had been chosen and consecrated bishop at Constantinople, by Acacius, to whom the emperor Zeno had entrusted the appointment, fearing to hazard an election at Antioch, after the shocking murder of Stephen I. in his church by the partisans of Peter the Fuller. This uncanonical proceeding was remonstrated against by pope Simplicius in his letters to Zeno and Acacius; and he only consented to sanction such a breach of ecclesiastical usage on the ground of absolute necessity, and with the assurance of Zeno, backed by an oath, that it should not occur again (Simplicii *Epistolae*, xiv. xv. apud Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1034-5). There is a large body of evidence (not however to be admitted without grave question), that in spite of this solemn promise Calandio's election was of the same uncanonical character; that being at Constantinople, on business connected with the church of Antioch at the time of the vacancy of the see, he was chosen bishop, and ordained by Acacius. The authorities for this version of the facts are Theophanes, p. 110, c., Gelasius, *Gesta de Nomine Acacii*, Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1082, Theodor. Lector. p. 566, and perhaps

Candidus, p. 19, B. (though Tillemont gives a different interpretation of the passage); and it is accepted by Valesius (*De Petro Antioch. Episc.* annexed to his edition of Evagrius, p. 175). The same authorities add that the eastern bishops had in the meantime met, and canonically reappointed the deposed bishop of Antioch, John Codonatus; but that Acacius had sufficient influence to establish the election of his nominee; Codonatus being bribed to retire by the appointment to the archbishopric of Tyre. Calandio thus quietly succeeded to the see and was recognised not only by the eastern bishops, but also by pope Simplicius (Theophan. *u. s.* Victor Tunensis, ad ann. 488, Valesius, *u. s.*).

Clear and straightforward as this narrative is, the letter of pope Simplicius to Acacius, dated July 15, A.D. 482, conveying his sanction of Calandio's election (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1035), renders it very doubtful whether it does not seriously misrepresent the facts, in consequence of a confusion between the election of Calandio and his predecessor Stephen II., who is entirely passed over by Theophanes. After the weighty remonstrances against the violation of the Nicene Canon addressed by Simplicius to Zeno and Acacius, and the solemn assurance given to him that future elections should be regular, it is incredible that if the same breach of canonical rule had taken place in this election, the letter of Simplicius should contain no allusion to it; but should simply remonstrate with Acacius for the delay that had occurred in his being apprised of the appointment, and for having permitted him to learn it first from Calandio's own letters, and those of his synod which had been despatched by the hands of Anastasius, an eastern bishop, as he passed through Constantinople, and that he should at once admit Calandio into full communion as a brother bishop, without the least reference to any irregularity in the form of his election. The whole question may be seen carefully and fairly argued by Tillemont (*Mémoires*, xvi. 760-762, note xiv.), and he appears to demonstrate satisfactorily that the account given by Theophanes, etc. is incorrect, and that though Calandio was probably chosen by Zeno and Acacius, and presented himself at Antioch with letters commendatory which hardly permitted a refusal, he was really elected and ordained at Antioch according to canonical rule by the bishops of his province.

Calandio commenced his episcopate by the customary measure of excommunicating his theological opponents. He refused communion with all who declined to anathematize Peter the Fuller, Timothy the Weasel, and the Encyclic of Basiliscus condemning the decisions of the council of Chalcedon (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 10; Niceph. *H. E.* xv. 28). He is reported to have endeavoured to counteract the Monophysite bias given to the *Trisagion* by Peter the Fuller in the addition of the words *ὁ σταυρωθὲς δι' ἡμᾶς*, by prefixing the clause *Χριστὸν βασιλέα*. (Theodor. Lector. p. 556, B.) Calandio rendered his short episcopate still further illustrious by translating the remains of Eustathius, the banished bishop of Antioch, with the permission of Zeno, from Philippin in Macedonia where he had died, to his own city—a tardy recognition of the falsehood of the charges against Eustathius, which had the happy result of reuniting to the church the

remains of the party that still called itself by his name. (Theodor. Lector. p. 577, Theophanes, p. 114.)

Calandio did not remain long in favour with his imperial and episcopal patrons. He fell into disgrace and was banished by the emperor Zeno, at the instigation of Acacius, to the African Oasis, A.D. 485, where he probably ended his days. The charge brought against him was political: that of having erased from the diploms the name of Zeno, as the author of the *Henoticon*; and of having favoured Illus and Leontius in their rebellion, A.D. 484. But the real cause of his deposition was the theological animosity of Acacius, whom he had offended by writing a letter to Zeno accusing Peter Mongus of adultery, and of having anathematized the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (Evag. *H. E.* ii. 16); and by his refusal to forswear communion with John Talajas, bishop of Alexandria, and Pope Felix III., by whom the *Henoticon* had been severely condemned, and its adherents anathematized. (Liberatus Diaconus, *Breviar.* c. xviii.; Gelasius, *Epist.* xiii. *ad Dardan. Episc.*; Labbe, iv. 1208-9, xv. *ad Episc. Orient.* Ib. 1217.) On his deposition, the victorious Peter the Fuller was recalled to occupy the see of Antioch. [E. V.]

CALAPATAUROTH, an archon placed to guard the mysterious book of Jeû, written by Enoch in paradise [PISTIS SOPHIA, p. 354].

[G. S.]

CALDONIUS, bp. of unknown African see; discreet man, well-read in Scripture (Cyp. *Ep.* 25); much trusted by Cyprian. He was not a well-educated man (see Hartel upon his style, p. xlviii. *præf.*, and the *viii* in *Ep.* 24), using *priorem delictum*; extorrenes for extorres. He first appears *Ep.* 24, in which he begs the opinion of Cyprian and Carthaginian presbyters (possibly not aware of Cyprian's retirement, for to omit *consistentibus* in title is arbitrary) as to whether 'peace' may not be given to lapsi, who, on subsequent confession, suffered confiscation and banishment. Cyprian praises his tone, and sends copies of his letter and the reply to the clergy of both Carthage and Rome. In A.D. 251, he is appointed by Cyprian to visit [Carthage] with two other bishops, HERCULANUS (*Ep.* 41) and VICTOR (*Ep.* 41, 42), to relieve sufferers by persecution, assist them in resuming their trades, to influence the lapsi (*Ep.* 25), and recommend suitable persons for minor ecclesiastical offices. Afterwards (he was not at Carthage when *Ep.* 41 was written, see § 2) he is charged further with the excommunication of Felicissimus the deacon and his adherents (*Ep.* 41), who resented the appointment of the commission; *Ep.* 42 is the excommunicatory letter. In same year he was sent to Rome from the Carthaginian synod with bishop Fortunatus to report on the circumstances of the election of Cornelius and the position of Novatian, *Ep.* 44, 45 (cf. POMPEIUS). They also conveyed to Cornelius the last synodical letter about Felicissimus, and copies of Cyprian's 41st and 43rd epistles on the same subject.

In 252 he appears as second bishop by seniority, Conc. 2, Carth. sub Cyp. (*Ep. Synod.* 57), and in 255 in same rank at Conc. Carth. 5 (*Ep. Synod.* 70), but not in 7th Council at all. [E. W. B.]

CALEMERUS, deacon of Antioch at the Council of Alexandria in A.D. 362 (Tillem. viii. 206, *Ath. Ep. Conc. Alex. de Eccl. Ant.*).

[E. B. B.]

CALENDIO. [CALANDIO, CANDIDIANUS (10)].

CALEPODIUS (1), Roman presbyter, made the cemetery three miles from Rome on the Aurelian way, in which, instead of in his own cemetery, Callistus was buried. These makers of cemeteries seem to have been martyred by popular fury in spite of the favour of Alexander Severus (v. Till. iii. 252; Rossi, *Rom. Sott.* ii. 51). The distinguished conversions he made at Rome jointly with Pope Callistus, whose presbyter he was, his old age, his sufferings, his burial in his own cemetery by the care of Callistus, his appearing in a vision after death to Callistus in his martyrdom, the burial of Callistus in the cemetery of Calepodius, are related in Bede (*Mart.* May 10, Oct. 14) and partially by Usuard. His natale was May 10, as recorded also in *Mart. Rom. Parv.*

[E. B. B.]

(2) Bishop of Naples and legate of the pope at the Council of Sardica (Till. viii. 682). But according to Athanasius two presbyters signed for the Pope, and Calepodius for himself only (i. 767, ed. Paris). Perhaps the same by whom Liberius wrote to Eusebius of Vercelli in A.D. 354 (*Ib.* vii. 534).

(3) Donatist, bishop of Bazar, in Africa, in A.D. 411 (Till. vi. 190).

[E. B. B.]

CALES, bishop in Hermethe. His name was on the list handed over by Meletius to ALEXANDER.

[E. B. B.]

CALES. [CARILEFUS.]

CALETRICUS, ST., confessor and bishop of Chartres. This saint was present at the third council of Paris in 557, and also took part in the second council of Tours in 567. He seems to have died either in the year 571 or 573 (*Acta SS. Boll.* Oct. iv. 278).

[H. W. Y.]

CALIBIUS, Calidius or Claudius Saturninus, or Saturninus and Calibius the younger, surnamed Gratianus, were successively curators of Aptunga in 303 and 314, and concerned in the trial of the claims of Caecilian. (Aug. ii. 304.)

[E. B. B.]

CALIGULA. [CAIUS (1).]

CALINICUS, martyr at Apollonia in the reign of Decius; commemorated on Jan. 28 (Usuard, *Mart.*).

[C. H.]

CALIPPUS, a deacon represented as the bearer of the spurious correspondence between Sabinus and Polybius (*Vita Eviphanii*, ii. 379).

[G. S.]

CALLEN—Nov. 28. in the parish of Rogart, in Sutherland, the church, dedicated apparently to a saint locally known as St. Callen, was repaired between 1602 and 1619. In 1630 a yearly fair, named St. Callen's, was held at Rogart (*Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. 719–721). It may be that this saint is Colga (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 294).

[J. G.]

CALLICRATES (1) Macedonian, bishop of Claudiopoli in Pontus, joined in petitioning Jovian against the Arians. (Socr. iii. 2, 5; Tillem. vi. 5, 29.)

[E. B. B.]

CALLICRATES (2) Sergeant, who wrote down the dispute of Basil against Photinus, A.D. 351. (Tillem. xiii. 353.)

[E. B. B.]

CALLIGONUS, eunuch and chamberlain to Valentinian II., insulted Ambrose, A.D. 385, as that father relates in a letter to his sister (Ambr. *Ep.* xx. (1); iii. p. 859). He conveyed a message, or reported a saying of the emperor's, and added, "While I am alive, dost thou condemn Valentinian? I will remove thy head from off thee." Ambrose answered, "God grant thee to fulfil thy threat; for I shall suffer what bishops suffer, and thou wilt do what eunuchs do. And would that God would avert them from the church, that they might turn all their weapons on me." Calligonus was afterwards put to death on another and peculiarly infamous charge (Augustine, *contra Julianum*, vi. 14, vol. x. 845). Tillemont (x. 175) supposes that these events were in the mind of Ambrose when he wrote the 6th chapter of his book on Joseph. This is very probable, but the further inference that that book was written two years later seems to be wholly erroneous. The event that occurred after two years was the usurpation of Maximus. It is just possible that Ambrose encountered two eunuchs. Cf. also De Broglie, *l'Eglise et l'Empire*, vi. 173.

[E. B. B.]

CALLINICE [CONSTANTINUS SILVANUS, PAUL OF SAMOSATA].

CALLINICUS (1) A Greek sophist and rhetorician, usually assigned to the reign of Gallienus (A.D. 259–268). Among the works ascribed to him by Suidas (p. 1961 B) are ten books on Alexandrian history, referred to by Jerome (*Prooem. Com. in Daniel*). But Clinton (*Fasti Rom.* ann. 266) points out that the sophist is also assigned to a later date, and thinks Suidas may have confounded two Callinici. See *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

[H. W.]

(2) Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 693 or 692 till 705. He had previously been presbyter and treasurer of the church of Blachernae (Niceph. Constant. *Chron.*; Theophanes, *Chron.* p. 302, A.M. 6177). Soon after his appointment the emperor Justinian, wishing to remove a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary in order to erect a fountain and seats on its site, requested the patriarch to compose a form of prayer fitting for the occasion. Callinicus replied that he had many forms of prayer for laying the foundation of a church, but none for pulling one down. When the emperor pressed him more urgently to comply, and threatened to use force in the event of his continued refusal, he simply said, "Glory be to God, who endures always, πάντοτε ἀνεχόμενος, now and for ever." (Theophan. *Chron.* p. 307; A.M. 6186.) It appears that he offended the emperor by his conduct on this occasion, for soon afterwards it came to his ears that orders had been given to Stephen, the governor of Constantinople, for a great massacre of the inhabitants, beginning with the patriarch. (*Ib.* p. 307; A.M. 6187.) This intelligence must have disposed him to receive Leontius as a deliverer. Either willingly or by compulsion he accompanied that usurper to the font on his entry into the city, and publicly welcomed him with the cry, "This is the day which the Lord hath made." (*Ib.* Niceph. Constant. *Bre-*

viarium de rebus post Mauricium gestis, 25.) On the return of Justinian in A.D. 705, Callinicus was deprived of his eyes and banished to Rome. (Theoph. Chron. p. 313; A.M. 6198; Niceph. Constant. *Breviarium*, 28.) [P. O.]

CALLINICUS (3) Martyr of Cilicia, made to run six miles in boots bristling with nails inside, to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he was burnt, and where his church was afterwards famous. (*Menol.* July 29; Till. v. 564.)

(4) Meletian bishop of Pelusium, slandered Athanasius in A.D. 331, accused him at Tyre in 335 of breaking a chalice, and of deposing and ill-treating himself (Callinicus). He was present at the Council of Sardica (Till. viii. 19, 38, 95). He asked permission to persevere in schism after the Council of Nice (*Ib.* vi. 234). [E. B. B.]

(5) Bishop of Perga, in Pamphylia, at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 53.)

(6) Bishop elect of Sangra, sent by Eusebius of Ancyra, who was himself unwilling to ordain him, to Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 434-446), for ordination, but sent back to Eusebius to be ordained, who thereupon did ordain him. (Tillem. xiv. 712; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 815, 818.) He died soon after.

(7) Bishop of Apamea in Bithynia, named the Patriarch of Antioch, as well as those of Rome and Constantinople, as leading him to condemn Dioscorus at the council of Chalcedon. (Tillem. xv. 663; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 445.) [E. B. B.]

CALLIOPIUS, a Pamphylian, brought before Numerius Maximus, and scourged and crucified on Good Friday, April 7, A.D. 304. His mother Theodia is said to have given the officers five pieces of gold to have him crucified head downwards. It is not quite clear whether he was fixed to the cross or expired just at the third hour. His mother is said to have expired upon his dead body. (*Menol.* Basil. and Till. v. 69.) [E. B. B.]

(2) Bishop in Thessaly, whom Pope Boniface (A.D. 422), in writing to Rufus (*Ep.* 13) declares separated from his communion, as far as we can gather, for resisting the authority of the see of St. Peter. (*Epist.* 9, *Decretal.* tom. i.; Migne, *Patr.* xx. 776, p. 1034; Ceillier, viii. 10.) [E. B. B.]

(3) Bishop of Nice, to whom, about A.D. 425, Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, sent 300 pieces of gold, at a time when a multitude of people in Nice were starving, with directions to distribute without regard to the religious opinions of the recipients, but with careful regard to their personal characters, so that not the professional beggars, but the really needy, who were ashamed to beg, might get help. (Socr. vii. 25.) [E. B. B.]

CALLISTA (1) and CHRISTA. [The names are also written Calliste; and Christe, Christina, Christiana, Christena, Christela, Caelestene, *Boll. Acta SS.* Feb. i. 771.] Two sisters who had lapsed, to whom DOROTHEA was intrusted that they might persuade her to imitate them. She found them in despair, and encouraged them to renewed confession. They were tied back to back and thrown into a boiling caldron. (Till. v. 497.) [E. B. B.]

(2) [CALOCAERUS.]

CALLISTHENE, daughter of Adauctus, Christian duke at Ephesus under Maximian, was sent to Mesopotamia by her father to escape the lust of that emperor. The father was therefore accused on the ground of his religion and put to death. On the accession of Licinius, permission was obtained by the wife and daughter from the empress for the translation of his relics to Ephesus, where Callisthene died (*Men. Bas.* Oct. 4). [E. B. B.]

CALLISTHENES, a layman of Cappadocia, to whom Basil wrote on behalf of the slaves of a certain Eustochius who had aided their master in some outrageously offensive conduct towards him, and who, in apprehension of Callisthenes's vengeance, had taken refuge with Basil as their spiritual father. Callisthenes having demanded that the slaves should be given up to him to be punished according to law, Basil wrote to him at considerable length deprecating his anger, and begging him to exhibit his magnanimity and Christian spirit by pardoning their offence, resting satisfied with the terror he had caused, and the correction administered by Basil (Basil, *Epist.* 388). Basil wrote also at the same time to Hesychius, entreating him to use his influence with Callisthenes to obtain the pardon of the culprits (*Ib.* *Epist.* 351). [E. V.]

CALLISTIO, addressed by Rhodo in his book against the Marcionites (Eus. *H. E.* v. 13). Caspere remarks that this Callistio was probably a tolerably well-known person, otherwise Eusebius, instead of saying that the book was addressed to Callistio, he would be likely to have said "to a certain Callistio." [G. S.]

CALLISTRATUS (1) Father of the successor of Basil of Amasea. (Tillem. v. 517.)

(2) An Isaurian bishop, a friend of Chrysostom. Callistratus having written to Chrysostom to excuse himself for not having visited him at Cucus on account of the length of the journey, and the inclemency of the season, Chrysostom replied early in the winter of 404 thanking him for his letters, and expressing a hope that Callistratus might be able to visit him at some future time, and would meanwhile gratify him with frequent letters (Chrysost. *Epist.* 200; Tillemont, xi. 280). [E. V.]

(3) Legendary Martyr, Sept 27 (*Menol. Bas.*).

CALLISTUS (1) (i. q. formosissimus; later spelt Calistus, but Calixtus first in the 11th century, Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, i. 131, note), the successor of pope Zephyrinus in A.D. 218, said to have been a Roman, and the son of Domitius.

Nothing was known of Callistus, except that the *Martyrologium Romanum* contained a tradition of his martyrdom, till the discovery of the *Philosophumena* in 1850. This work, which first appeared under the name of Origen, but has since been agreed to be by Hippolytus, almost certainly the contemporary bishop of Portus, gives an account of the life of Callistus which is scarcely credible respecting one of the bishops of Rome, who before had been honoured as a saint and martyr. Accordingly, much controversy has sprung up round the names of Callistus and Hippolytus. If Hippolytus is to be believed, Callistus was an unprincipled adventurer: if Callistus can be defended, grave

doubt is thrown upon the veracity of Hippolytus. Bunsen and Wordsworth adopt the former view: Döllinger the latter, in an ingenious treatise, of which a translation by Mr. Plummer has just (1876) been published by Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh. No doubt it is a peculiarly hard fate to be known to posterity only from the pages of an unsparing rival: yet the story as told by Hippolytus is lifelike and natural, and, however much we may allow for personal rancour, we cannot but believe it to be substantially true, at least in its main features.

He tells us that Callistus was originally a slave in the household of a rich Christian called Carpophorus. His master intrusted to his charge a bank in the *Piscina Publica*, where Callistus induced his fellow-Christians to deposit their savings upon the security of the name of Carpophorus. The bank broke, and Callistus fled; but Carpophorus tracked him to Portus, and found him on board an outward-bound ship. The slave threw himself overboard in despair, intending suicide; but he was picked up, and delivered to his master, who brought him back and put him to the *pistrinum*, or mill worked by the lowest slaves, for a punishment. After a time, however, he was set at liberty, on the petition of some fellow-Christians, apparently the sufferers from his bankruptcy, who represented that he was hindered by his captivity from collecting money due to him, to which his creditors would now be entitled. But the plea was false: and being released he only sought to compass his former end of suicide, and for this purpose raised a riot in a synagogue of the Jews. By them he was seized and brought before Fuscianus, the *præfectus urbi*, who, in spite of the fact that Carpophorus claimed him as his slave, condemned him, as a disturber of public worship allowed by the Roman laws, to be sent to the mines of Sardinia (*Philosophumena*, ed. Miller, pp. 286, 287).

Of the narrative so far everything is plain except the last scene; but his supposed desire for death is certainly an inadequate motive for his raising the riot in the Jewish synagogue. Döllinger supposes that, while claiming his debts at the hands of members of the Jewish synagogue, his zeal for religion impelled him to bear witness for Christ, and that thus his exile to Sardinia was a species of martyrdom for Christianity (Döllinger, *Hippolytus u. Callistus*, p. 119). The date of his exile is proximately fixed by the fact that Fuscianus served the office of *præfectus urbi* between A.D. 188 and A.D. 193 (Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, i. 138).

Some time after, proceeds Hippolytus, Marcia, the Christian mistress of Commodus, persuaded the emperor to grant an amnesty to the Christians who were undergoing punishment in Sardinia; and Callistus, at his own entreaty, was released, although his name was not on the list (which had been supplied by the then bishop Victor) of those intended to benefit by Marcia's clemency. Callistus reappeared in Rome, much to the annoyance of Victor, for the outrage on the synagogue was recent and notorious. He therefore sent him to Antium, making him a small monthly allowance (*Philosophumena*, p. 288). Milman thinks that this must have been about A.D. 190—the very year of Victor's accession (*Lut. Christ.* i. 55, note).

Here we see plainly that the narrative of Hip-

polytus wants explanation, which is not given; though perhaps the circumstances under which he is recounting the early life of a theological rival sufficiently explain the omission. But that Carpophorus's runaway slave should suddenly have become of such importance that the pope should buy him off with an allowance, and insist upon his residing at a distance, shews that Callistus was already thought to be no ordinary man.

He must have resided at Antium for a long time; for we are told that Zephyrinus, Victor's successor in the bishopric, recalled him, and Zephyrinus did not succeed till A.D. 202, twelve years after the presumed date of Callistus' going to Antium. The new bishop placed him in offices of trust: "gave him the control of the clergy, and set him over the cemetery" (*Phil.* p. 288). This notice makes us believe that Callistus had been ordained during his residence at Antium; and the last-quoted words, that Zephyrinus "set him over the cemetery" (*εἰς τὸ κοιμητήριον κατέστησεν*), have a special interest for us; for one of the largest of the catacombs in Rome goes by the name of the Coemeterium Sti. Calixti. We can hardly doubt that this was the cemetery over which Callistus was set; or that De Rossi is right in his conjecture from these words, that "this was the first common cemetery given to the pope by some noble family for the use of the whole Christian community" (*Roma Sotterranea*, by Northcote and Brownlow, p. 86). That the care of this should have been intrusted to the same man to whom also was given the control of the clergy, proves what a high value was set upon this first public burial-place of the Christians in Rome. As a matter of fact, thirteen out of the eighteen popes next after this time are said to have been buried here; and the names of seven out of the thirteen (Callistus himself being one of the exceptions) have been identified from old inscriptions found in one crypt of this cemetery (*Id.* pp. 130–151).

It was now (A.D. 202) for the first time that Callistus became a power in the Roman church. To Hippolytus, who held a double position in that church [*HIPPOLYTUS*], he became especially obnoxious. As he was the archdeacon, so to speak, who was set over the Roman clergy, he was over Hippolytus, who was the presbyter of one of the Roman *cardines* or churches; but as a presbyter himself, he was inferior in ecclesiastical position to one who was also the bishop of Portus. It is easy to read some such feeling of rivalry beneath Hippolytus's account of the church in Rome at this time. They were probably the two most prominent men in the Roman church under this episcopate, and yet opposed to one another on all questions of doctrine and practice. Hippolytus claims to have detected Callistus's double-dealing from the first: but he tells us that Callistus, aspiring as he did to be bishop of Rome himself, would break openly with neither party. The question which now divided the church was that of the Monarchia, or how to reconcile the sovereignty of the Father with the Godhead of the Son. Callistus, who had obtained a complete ascendancy over the mind of Zephyrinus, according to Hippolytus an ignorant and venal man, took care that he should use language now agreeing with the Sabellians, now with Hippolytus. At the same time he per-

sonally sided with Sabellius, called Hippolytus a Ditheist, and persuaded Sabellius, who might otherwise have gone right, to coalesce with the Monarchians. His motive in all this, says Hippolytus, was that there might be two parties in the church which he could play off against each other, continuing on friendly terms with both (*Phil.* p. 289).

As to the practice of the church under Zephyrinus, we find from contemporary accounts that there was a liberal tendency in its rulers, which can hardly have been less distasteful to Hippolytus than their heretical views. We find from Tertullian that Zephyrinus began, no doubt under Callistus' influence, the relaxation of discipline which he himself afterwards carried further when he became bishop. Till this time it had been the practice to exclude adulterers from the church communion, and not to readmit them even upon repentance. Under Zephyrinus first the practice obtained of allowing such offenders to be re-admitted after public penance (*De Pudicitia*, i. 21; Döllinger, pp. 126-130).

Zephyrinus died in A.D. 218, and Callistus was elected bishop instead. That they preferred him to Hippolytus shews the popularity of his liberal church policy among the Roman clergy: and Hippolytus does not scruple to avow that by this act the Roman church had formally committed itself to heresy. He regards his own as the orthodox church, in opposition to what he henceforth considers as only being the Callistian sect (*Phil.* pp. 289, 292).

Yet the first act apparently of Callistus as bishop was a step towards conciliating his rival. He threw off, perhaps actually excommunicated (*ἀπέσσε*) Sabellius, whom till now he had protected. But he only did this, says Hippolytus, to proclaim a heresy quite as deadly as the other. If he is to be believed, he is right in thus characterising it. The Father and the Son, Callistianism said, were one; together they made the Spirit, which Spirit took flesh in the womb of the Virgin. Callistus, says Hippolytus indignantly, is as Patripassian as Sabellius, for he makes the Father suffer with the Son, if not as the Son (*Id.* pp. 289-330).

But this charge against Callistian doctrine, if the gravest, is not the only one. Hippolytus brings against him several other grave accusations of further relaxing the bonds of church discipline (*Id.* pp. 290, 291). But all his accusations run up into four. 1. He relaxed the terms of readmission into the church: accounting no sin so deadly as to be incapable of readmission, and not exacting penance as a necessary preliminary to it. This, it may be observed, was but to develop the church policy which had already obtained under Zephyrinus. But certainly, if the last part of Hippolytus's accusation is true, Callistus's acts were reversed by later bishops. 2. He relaxed the terms of admission into orders, ordaining even those who had been twice or thrice married; and permitting men already ordained to marry freely. Here too appears the liberal reformer; though we can well understand with what horror such reforms would be treated by the more strictly orthodox, and also how an unscrupulous man like Callistus might be impelled thus to pack the clergy in the hope of gaining more support. 3. He also relaxed the marriage

laws of the church, thereby bringing them into conflict with the laws of the state. How far he went in this direction is not clear, for the exact words of the passage in which Hippolytus makes this charge are hopelessly corrupt. But it is clear that he looks upon it as the gravest he has yet made: for he says that a general immorality was the consequence of this step. How far this was the actual consequence, or only what the more orthodox thought must of necessity follow, may be doubted: and Döllinger pertinently observes that Hippolytus does not even hint a charge of personal immorality against Callistus, though no doubt he would not have refrained from so doing, had such charges been afloat. (Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Callistus*, p. 195.) 4. He allowed second baptisms. Hippolytus does not explain his charge, and it is not easy to see what it means, unless that a repetition of baptism was substituted for the penance which had been necessary at the re-admission of grievous sinners into the church. This is the only accusation which Döllinger meets with a distinct contradiction, on the ground that no such practice was known in the later Roman church (p. 189). Yet it surely is not as inconceivable as it seemed to him that later bishops of Rome might have reversed the acts of their predecessor, if he had really ventured on such a step.

This is all that Hippolytus tells us about Callistus, and this is all that we know about his life. He is said to have died in A.D. 223 (*Eus. H. E.* vi. 20). Tradition tells us that he was scourged in a popular rising, thrown out of a window of his house in Trastevere, and flung into a well. This would account for no epitaph being found to Callistus in the Papal crypt of his own cemetery in the catacombs. We do not know the nature of the tumult which caused his death: but we do not hear of any persecution by the civil power in Rome between the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Maximin. Either, therefore, it was a tumult among the Christians themselves, which is not impossible from the excited state of controversial feeling shewn by Hippolytus; or it was an outbreak of pagan hostility which was not countenanced by the civil power. [G. H. M.]

CALLISTUS (2) A deacon who accused Pope DAMASUS of adultery, and was expelled from the church by the Council of Aquileia. (Tillem. viii. 415.)

(3) Prefect of Egypt, killed by his servants, Sept. A.D. 422; to which event a passage of CYRIL's homily the next Easter (*Hom. Pasch.* 11, c. 8) is supposed by Tillemont to refer. (Tillem. xiv. 282; Theophan. *Chron.* p. 72, ed. Paris, 1655.) [E. B. B.]

(4) Son of a Roman prefect, and the subject of a miracle of healing in the legendary *Life of Epiphanius* (ii. 337). [G. S.]

(5) A servant of Marcellus ('Disputation of Archelaus and Manes,' Routh, *Rel. Sac.* v. 48). [G. S.]

CALLITROPOS, sister of Epiphanius (*Vita Epiphani*, ii. 318). [G. S.]

CALLWEN, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patroness of a church in the parish of Defynog in Brecknockshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 153).

[C. H.]

CALMAIG. [COLMAN (20) of Druim-mór or Dromore.]

CALMINIUS, ST. This person is commonly known by the French as St. Carméry, or St. Calmèle. Both Carméry and Calmèle are said to have founded the monastery of Manzac or Mozac in Auvergne belonging to the church of Clermont, and the monastery of Moustier-St.-Chaffre belonging to that of Velay. The uncertainty about them, however, is illustrated by the fact that Carméry is celebrated on the 19th of August, Calmèle on the 22nd of November; Carméry is said to have died both in the 6th and 7th centuries, Calmèle at the beginning of the eighth.

The anonymous *Vita Calminii*, edited by Thomas Aquinas, states that the saint lived in the time of Justinian. The first Justinian died in 565, the second in 711. But there is no reason for trusting this date. The same document makes him senator and duke of Aquitaine.

Among the letters of St. Sidonius Apollinaris, who died at the end of the 5th century, occurs one addressed to a Calminius of Auvergne, who was in arms for the empire against his native district, which was in the hands of the Visigoths. Sidonius bewails it, begging him to come and see him, now that a truce gives him a chance.

This is one of the later letters of Sidonius, and is placed by Tillemont in 474. If Calminius was now a young man, he may well have reached senatorial rank in the time of Justinian I.

There are not however sufficient materials to determine the identity of the correspondent of Sidonius Apollinaris, with the ambiguous St. Calminius, Calmèle, Carméry, or Carmèle. Both are of Auvergne. (*AA. SS. Bolland. Aug. iii. 759*; Tillemont, *Ecc. Hist. xvi. p. 249*; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist. lib. v. num. 12, Patrolog. Lat. lviii. p. 543*; *Gallia Christiana*, ii. p. 352; Migne, *Encycl. Théol. xl. pp. 547, 522.*) [W. M. S.]

CALOCAERUS and PARTHENIUS, eunuchs, chamberlain and major-domo (*Mart. Hieron. Berne MS.*) to Aemilianus, a Christian of Armenia, who was consul under the emperor Philip, and to his daughter Anatolia Callista. He left them as his executors to have charge of his daughter, and to distribute his wealth to the poor. Decius interfered, and is said, after himself first trying them with offers of friendship if they would sacrifice, and menaces of death if they would not, to have left them to his prefect, Libanius, who had them separately into his closet to tempt and to torture, Calocaerus first, then Parthenius. Their acts, which only exist in a form not earlier than the 6th century, relate that Calocaerus's tortures were cut short, because the prefect perceived him rather to desire than to fear them, and ordered him to be removed and the other brought; that Parthenius told the gospel history, and so shocked the prefect by what he said of Jove, that both were at once condemned to the stake; that the flames would not burn, and therefore the martyrs were dispatched by a blow on the head with a burning log; and that, while the prefect was being informed of it, the bodies were stolen by their fellow-servants, at Anatolia's bidding. The martyrdom was on the 19th of May. The bodies were transferred to a safer crypt during

the persecution of Diocletian, Feb. 11, A.D. 304 (*Rossi, ii. 210*; *Acta SS. May, iv. 300*). [E. B. B.]

CALOCAERIUS (2) Said² to have been deputy and successor of APOLLINARIS at Ravenna, and to have held the see from the time of Vespasian to the time of Adrian. (*Acta SS. Feb. ii. 508.*)

(3) Martyr (under Adrian?) at Albenga, on the coast of Genoa, put by Usuard at Brescia, March 19 or April 18 (v. Till. ii. 249). [E. B. B.]

CALOGERIUS, bishop of Claudiopolis, in Pontus, at the council of A.D. 449, at Ephesus; was represented by a deputy. (*Tillem. xv. 551.*) [E. B. B.]

CALOPODIUS, eunuch and presbyter, Eutychian, deposed by Anatolius A.D. 451 (*Labbe, Conc. iv. 521*; *Tillem. xv. 637*). One Calopodius stole the authentic copy of the acts of the council of Chalcedon from the altar of the great church of Constantinople, of which he was steward, and brought it to the Emperor Anastasius, who tore it up, A.D. 511. (*Tillem. xvi. 690*; *Theoph. Chronog. p. 133, Patrol. cviii. 365, 366*; *Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. lib. xvi. c. 26, Patrol. cxlvii. 167.*) The first must have been a very old man then, if his identity with the second is assumed. But in the affair of A.D. 451, as related in Labbe, he is called presbyter as well as eunuch; while in the theft of A.D. 511 he is spoken of by Theophanes and Nicephorus as eunuch and oconomus only. The disgraced heretic of some mark in his party, which the narrative of A.D. 451 shews that he was, is not quite in place as the steward of the great church in 511, with the slur of obscurity—"a certain Calopodius," which is all Nicephorus calls him. [E. B. B.]

CALOSYRIUS, a suffragan of Cyril of Alexandria, who writes to him about A.D. 444, a letter to be read in all the monasteries of his diocese of Arsinoe, especially in one that stood on a very desolate mountain, called Calamo, against Anthropomorphism, and against confounding idleness with sanctity. The same bishop at Ephesus in A.D. 449 declared that he had always maintained communion with EUTYCHES. (*Cyrl. Ep. 83*; *Conc. iv. 119, 271, 315, 322*; *Tillem. xv. 662.*) [E. B. B.]

CALPHURNIUS. See MACARIUS. (*Cyp. Epp. 21, 22.*) [E. W. B.]

CALPURNIUS (1) Father of Pope PONTIANUS.

(2) [ST. PATRICK.] [E. B. B.]

CALUPPANUS, ST. Born in the year 527, this saint in his early years lived at the monastery of Incla, where he was especially noted for his humility and gentleness. His self-denial in the matter of food was so excessive that he was unable, through weakness, to perform his share of the ordinary work of the monastery. The other monks reproached him on this account, and treated him so unkindly in consequence, that he at last withdrew from them altogether, and took up his abode in a cave in the neighbourhood where he built himself an oratory. Study and prayer occupied his entire time, while his fasts were most severe; even such scanty food as he possessed he gave to the poor who flocked to his cave. While in this retirement, it is said, he was much persecuted by evil spirits; but he vanquished them all by using

the sign of the cross and repeating the Lord's Prayer. St. Avitus visited him at his cave and ordained him deacon and priest. From this period until his death he is said to have performed many miracles of healing, which are duly recorded by his biographers. He died in the year 576, aged about fifty. St. Gregory of Tours, who accompanied St. Avitus, speaks highly of his piety, and gives an account of his visit to the cave in which St. Caluppanus dwelt (*Acta SS. Boll. Mart. i. 262*). [H. W. Y.]

CALVINUS, CALWINUS, a presbyter addressed by Alcuin in two letters, dated respectively, in the edition of Frobenius, circ. A.D. 797 and A.D. 800. From his being mentioned in connexion with "Symeon sacerdos" (under which name Alcuin is thought to have intended, after a manner usual with him, Eanbald archbishop of York) it is conjectured that he was an Englishman. In the first letter (*Ep. 73, Patrol. c. 245, Ep. 58, ed. Frob.*), wherein he is exhorted to a contempt of wealth and worldly honours, it is added—"nil tibi deesse aestimo in cella sancti Stephani honestae conversationis," but Frobenius is ignorant whether this cell is some English monastery, or whether it was that of St. Stephen at Choisy in France, to which Calvinus might have retired. The second letter (*Ep. 116, Patrol. c. 347, Ep. 175, ed. Frob.*) is addressed to him jointly with Cuculus, and they are bidden to exhort "Symeon" to fortitude under his tribulations. He tells them he has laid down the burden of his pastoral duties, and is now tranquilly awaiting his last summons at St. Martin's. He entreats their prayers, and begs them to remind all his friends, especially his "son Symeon," to join in supplication for him. His salutations are sent to Credulus, but as this name occurs nowhere else in Alcuin's writings, it gives us no help in discovering who Calvinus and Cuculus were. [C. H.]

CAMERUS, ordained deacon by Polycarp, succeeded Papirius in the see of Smyrna, according to Metaphrastes. (Till. ii. 372.) [E. B. B.]

CAMILLA (1), ST., of Auxerre, went with St. Germanus to Ravenna, but is said to have died on the return journey in the year 437 (*Acta SS. Boll. Mart. i. 342*). [H. W. Y.]

(2) Widow related to ENNODIUS. She had dedicated her child to the service of the church before giving him a liberal education; for which Ennodius rebukes her, but says that a liberal education must thenceforth be thought of no more. (Enn. *Ep. ix. 29*, in De la Bigne, *Bibliotheca*, t. vi. p. 238.) [E. B. B.]

CAMILLIANUS, ST., confessor and bishop of Troyes. It is supposed to have died in the year 525 or 536, but the precise date is not known. He was present at the first council of Orleans in the year 511. His acts are doubtful (*Acta SS. Boll. Jul. vi. 566*). [H. W. Y.]

CAMILLUS (1) Presbyter of Genoa, who consulted St. Prosper respecting some propositions of Augustine on predestination, after that father's death, and to whom Prosper addressed his book of *Answers to the Genoese*. (Ceillier, x. 300; Prosper, p. 242.)

(2) A.D. 473, father of St. ENNODIUS, bishop of Pavia. (Ceillier, x. 569; Enn. *Ep. iv. 25*)

CAMMARCH, Welsh saint of the 6th century, founder of Llangammarch in Brecknockshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 233). [C. H.]

CAMPANIANUS, correspondent of Sidonius (*Ep. i. 10, p. 24*). He had recommended the prefect of the granaries to Sidonius, who was prefect of the city (see *Dict. Class. Biog.* "Sidonius"). *Patrol. viii. 465*. [E. B. B.]

CAMPITAE, MONTENSES, or RUPITANI, a small congregation of Donatists at Rome, mentioned by Jerome, Optatus, and Augustine. Optatus says that their first bishop was Victor of Numidia, and that among the forty or more churches at Rome he and his flock had no place to assemble. So they surrounded a cave outside the city with wattles, and used it for their conventicle. Jerome says that they met on a mountain. The three names are of course derived from *campus*, *mons*, and *rupes*, in allusion to their place of meeting. (*Historia Donatistarum*, Patr. Lat. xi. 798; Hieronymus, *Dialogus adv. Luciferianos*, Patr. Lat. lxiii. 201; Augustine, *de Haeresibus*, Patr. Lat. xlii. 43; Augustine, *Ep. liii.*, Patr. Lat. xxxiii. 195.) [W. M. S.]

CAMULACUS. [CAEMHLACH.]

CANACARES (Photius, cf. Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr. vii. 318*), or **CANACARIUS**. [CONSTANTINUS SILVANUS.]

CANDIDA (1). (Cyp. *Epp. xxi. xxii.*) See CELERINUS. [E. W. B.]

(2) A Manichean woman, of Thipasa in Northern Africa, in the 5th century. (Augustin. t. viii.) [E. B. C.]

CANDIDIANUS (1) Son of Galerius, adopted by Valeria, daughter of Diocletian, put to death by Licinius. (Lact. *de Mort. Pers.* 50; De Broglie, i. 271.)

(2) Governor of Cappadocia under Julian, though a Pagan, was friendly to Basil (Till. ix. 40), and to Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote to him his Epistle 194 (*Ib. 360*). He may perhaps be the general whose daughter Bassianilla was eminent for piety at the opening of the 5th century (*Ib. xi. 522*), and the friend to whom, in 404, Chrysostom writes his Letter 42 (*Chrys. iii. 633*). [E. B. B.]

(3) An old and intimate friend of Chrysostom, to whom he wrote from Cucusus in 404, acquainting him with his sufferings from the inroads of the Isaurians, by whom the town was blockaded, and from his own ill-health, and requesting him to cheer his solitude with frequent letters, which would be doubly welcome if they brought the news of his being in good health (Chrysost. *Epist. 42*). [E. V.]

(4) A correspondent of Ambrose (*Ep. 91*). [J. Ll. D.]

(5) Bishop, carries a letter to Pope Siricius (Till. x. 157, 362). Perhaps the same as the bearer of a letter from Victorius at Rouen, to Paulinus, and perhaps also to Pope Innocent (*Ib. 674*). He may be the same as the brother and fellow presbyter known to Augustine by the letters of Paulinus, welcomed by him with all his heart, and sent back with the book on the care of the dead, which, at his instance, Augustine wrote. (Aug. *Cur. Mort. 23*; Tillem. xiii. 834.)

(6) A lay correspondent of Nilus in the 5th

century, who is informed by the saint why monks fasten the pallium on the left shoulder while men of the world fasten it on the right. (Nilus, ii. *Ep.* 245; see Ceillier (ed. Paris), viii. 219.)

CANDIDIANUS (7) Deacon, A.D. 431, carries the letter of Alypius of Constantinople to Cyril of Alexandria (Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 786; Ceillier, viii. 291).

(8) Count of the horse guards, A.D. 431, sent by Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. to keep order at the council of Ephesus, and instructed not to intermeddle in theological debates, but to remove and prohibit from the city all lay strangers and foreign monks, for the prevention of bigotry and tumult, and to keep the bishops in Ephesus, like jurors, not permitting them to return home or visit the court or go elsewhere till the dispute was settled, nor yet to attack any other questions before they had done with the main question of the Nestorian dogma, nor to start any pecuniary or criminal accusations at all. When, on June 22, sixteen days after Pentecost, the festival appointed for the meeting of the council, the fathers grew tired of waiting for John of Antioch, and demanded to begin at once, Candidianus demurred, but at last, for the avoidance of tumult, consented to read the imperial mandate, which was received with applause, and to leave them to their deliberations, charging them to do nothing rash. Afterwards, when requested to obey the mandate, they would not listen, but drove out with contumely the bishops that Nestorius had sent to them, and Candidianus himself for venturing to expostulate. This is his own account, confirmed by Nestorius (who bases his refusal to attend the council on the fact that he waited to be duly summoned by Candidianus, and represents the various messages sent by Cyril to summon him as the beginning of a seditious uproar, in which his own friends were denied a place of session or sanctuary, and were all threatened with death), and by Theodoret, *Ep.* 152, t. 4, p. 1314; Mansi, *Conc.* iv. 1271.

The Acts of the council say nothing of such disorderly proceedings. Next day, when the act of deposition of Nestorius was posted up, Candidianus tore it down, sent it to the emperors, forbade the criers to proclaim it, and collected the Nestorian bishops to await the arrival of John of Antioch and form another council in opposition. This they did five days after, June 27, as soon as John arrived at his inn; and Candidianus, after telling the above story, left the Syrians and Nestorians to their deliberations, and they deposed Cyril and Memnon. On June 29, the emperors wrote back, reprobating the hasty proceedings of Cyril, and commanding all the bishops to wait till the council could be duly held in the presence of John of Antioch, of Candidianus, and of another count, whom they promised to send, for fear, perhaps, that Candidianus had been too much the partisan of Nestorius. Such was the accusation brought against him by the council, who wrote on July 1, accusing him of refusing to let the real acts of the council be transmitted, and of sending the acts of the opposition council at once to the emperors, so as to preoccupy their ears (Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 444, 452, 566, 590 ff. 703, 747;

Mansi, iv. 1117, 1130, 1233, 1259, 1378, 1422; Ceillier, viii. 575 (xiii. 723); Fleury, ch. xxv. §§ 34-46, vol. vi.; Neale, *Alexandria*, i. 256-266; Socrates, vii. 34; Gibbon, ch. xlvii. notes 43-46. Compare Isidore, *Ep.* i. 311.) Candidianus is not mentioned in Godfred's *Prosopographia* of the code of Theodosius.

CANDIDIANUS (9) Mentioned by Olympiodorus (Photius, *Bibliothec.* cod. 80) as despatched along with Aspar to put down the usurper John at Ravenna (A.D. 423-425), may be the same as the above. It is just possible that he may be identical with (11). He has been conjectured, without grounds, to be the grandfather of the latter.

(10) Bishop of Antioch in Pisidia at the synod of Constantinople in A.D. 449, which condemned Eutyches, and whose acts were read at Ephesus and Chalcedon (*Conc.* iv. 236, 237). He upheld the same acts at Ephesus the same year, where he claimed to have been bred in the catholic faith from childhood, and to have been archdeacon in the royal city (*ib.* 304). Theodoret, in his epistle to John of Germanica (*Ep.* 147, vol. iv. 1109 [1275], ed. Migne), tells us that on this occasion he was accused of many adulteries and other iniquities, and the president answered, "If you accuse his doctrines, we receive your charges; but we are not here to judge adulteries." See also *Conc.* iv. pp. 262, 309, and p. 108, where his name is written CALENDIO (Tillem. xv. 579).

(11) Friend or kinsman of Sidonius, addressed by him (*Ep.* 8) from Rome (A.D. 456 or 458-461, or 467-472), with jests against his birthplace, Cesena, and his domicile Ravenna, in retaliation for his jests against the wintry regions of Clermont (Ceillier, x. 383). [E. B. B.]

(12) A martyr who suffered by fire with Polinctus and Filotomus, according to Florus, who gives no particulars. Commemorated Jan. 11. (Florus, in *Bed. Mart.*) [C. H.]

CANDIDUS (1), author of a work on the Hexameron, of which mention is made by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 27). He is classed by him among orthodox church writers, and placed under the reign of Severus, A.D. 193-211; but no great stress can be laid on this date, since Eusebius appears to have known only the work, and to have had no information as to the history of the writer. [G. S.]

(2) A Valentinian, who held a disputation with Origen about the year A.D. 228; the result of which was that Origen incurred censure, as having fallen into errors no less grave than those of his antagonist. In particular, it was said that in repelling the Valentinian doctrine that the Son was an emanation, he had made him but a creature, and that while maintaining that, even in the Devil's case, sin resulted from an abuse of free will, and not from any necessity of nature, he had taught that the Devil's nature was capable of repentance and ultimate salvation. This disputation is not extant, and is only known by the references made to it in the controversy between Jerome and Rufinus (see Hieron. *Apologia adv. Rufinum*, ii. 512 Vallarsi; and Rufinus, *de adulteratione librorum Origenis*). Rufinus *l.c.* gives an extract of a letter of Origen, in which he complains that his antagonist in a disputation had published an unfair account of it; and it seems more likely that

the disputation with Candidus is intended than, as De la Rue supposes (Origen, i. 6), the disputation referred to in the letter of Africanus. [G. S.]

CANDIDUS (3) Vespronius Candidus, mentioned by Tertullian (*ad Scap.* 4). He is adduced by him, with other examples of humane governors, such as Cincius Severus, Asper and Pudens, as having resisted the clamours of persecuting mobs. He excused himself from delivering up a certain Christian to death on the plea that it might cause a riot. [C. H.]

(4) An Arian controversialist, c. 354, the friend of the celebrated African rhetorician, Fabius Marius Victorinus, whose conversion to the Christian faith in his old age is narrated so graphically by St. Augustine in his *Confessions* (viii. 3). A controversial treatise of Candidus's, *de Generatione Divini Verbi*, addressed to his old friend Victorinus, called forth a reply, *Confutatorium Candidi Ariani*, to which it is usually prefixed. Candidus's only answer was the sending back a translation of the letter of Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia, written in the early stage of the controversy, and that of Eusebius to Paulinus of Tyre, given by Theodoret (*H. E.* i. 5, 6) and by Epiphanius, which formed the groundwork of Victorinus's four books *adversus Arium*. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 229; Maii *Collect.* iii. part 2, p. 1; Tillemont, x. 404; Migne, *Patrol.* viii. 1013, 1036.) [E. V.]

(5) A bishop of the Anomoëan party, consecrated, together with Arrianus, by Aetius and Eunomius at Constantinople in the year 363, to superintend, the one the churches of Lydia, the other those of Ionia. This ordination was by no means popular with the Eunomians generally, who took offence at it as the act of the leaders of the party alone without consulting the members of the body. The disaffected party was headed by Theodosius, and appealed to Eudoxius, who supported them in their opposition to the newly appointed prelates. Candidus and Arrian used their influence with Jovian, whose kinsmen they were, against Athanasius, but ineffectually (Philostorg. *H. E.* viii. 2, 4, 6, 7). [E. V.]

(6) Donatist bishop of Villa Regia, who returned to the church, and was continued in his office (*Aug. contra Crescon.* ii. 10). Tillemont supposes him to have returned in the time of Macarius, A.D. 348 (vi. 120). He was probably deceased when Augustine wrote, A.D. 402, as Cresconius was then the Catholic bishop of Villa Regia. Augustine does not quote the other (Donatist) Cresconius verbatim, as the italics in Migne would seem to imply. [E. B. B.]

(7) Bishop of Sergiopolis, A.D. 544 (Procop. *Bell. Pers.* ii. 5), had died before A.D. 554. (Tillem. v. 493.) [CHOSROES.] [E. B. B.]

(8) One of the two more distinguished ("nobiliores") of the forty soldiers martyred at Sebaste in Armenia Minor in the time of king Licinius under the praeses Agricolaus. Bede and Usuard both mention him, but give the days respectively March 9 and March 11 (Bede, *Mart.*; Usuard, *Mart.*). [SEBASTE, MARTYRS OF.] [C. H.]

(9) Archimandrite, to whom, in A.D. 449 or 450, Theodoret wrote (*Ep.* 128), telling him to get coadjutors in his old age, to be to him as Aaron and Hur, for it was not a time for his

hands to be slack, when heretics, heathens, and Jews were at peace, and only the church oppressed (Tillem. xv. 300).

CANDIDUS (10) A presbyter sent by Gregory the Great into Gaul (A.D. 595) with letters to queen Brunchilda and king Chilbert, charged with the administration of the little patrimony of St. Peter in Gaul, to collect the revenues of the same, and invest them in raiment for the poor, or in English slave lads of 17 or 18, to serve in the monasteries,* as Gallic gold was not current in Rome; and because the boys would be heathens, he was to be sure to send a presbyter with them, to baptize any of them in case of accident or illness on the way (Greg. *Epp.* 5, 6, 7, lib. vi.). He was commended, along with St. Augustine, to Pelagius of Tours and Serenus of Marseilles (*Ep.* 52, *ibid.*). Virgil, bishop of Arles, is warned not to imitate his predecessor in applying the dues of St. Peter to the purposes of his own diocese (*Ep.* 53, lib. vi.). In June, A.D. 597, he was charged to redeem four Christian captives that a Jew had bought and held in slavery at Narbonne (*Ep.* 24, lib. vii.). He had in A.D. 593 been "defender of the church" in Rome, and charged with paying a blind man, named Albinus, son of Martin, two *tremisses*, about 8s. yearly (*Ep.* 28, lib. iv.). In A.D. 598 or 599 he distrained upon a Jew named Jamnus, took his ship and all his goods, and then—at least so the Jew represented to the pope—refused to restore the bond that he had against him. Gregory writes to Fautinus, who held a similar office at Palermo, to investigate the affair (*Ep.* 56, lib. ix.). In A.D. 601 we find Candidus attempting to excuse bishop Desiderius for the enormity of teaching grammar (*Ep.* 54, lib. xi.). A priest named Aurelius was sent to him, and he was charged, if he found any place in want of a priest or abbat, to put the said person into the living (*Ep.* 70, *ib.*).

(11) Bishop of Civita Vecchia (Greg. Mag. *Ep.* 8, lib. ii.; *Ep.* 28, lib. vi.), is directed in A.D. 592 not to mulct a man of his pay because of sickness, and is allowed in A.D. 596 to ordain some monks of monasteries in his diocese to serve as presbyters under him, as he had complained that he had none. He is enjoined to choose them wisely.

(12) Gregory's successor as abbat of the monastery of St. Andrew, is warned in A.D. 598 not further to molest Maurentius, master of soldiery, brother and heir of a deceased monk in his monastery, as the suit between them had been settled once by the pope in the brother's favour (*Ep.* 11, lib. viii.). In February 601 he was sent by Mariniuanus, bishop of Ravenna, to Gregory for relics, and found the pope ill of gout (*Ep.* 32, lib. xi.).

(13) Episcopus Dulcimensis or Fulginiensis at the third Roman council under Gregory, July 596 (Fronto, *ad Kal. Rom.*). [E. B. B.]

CANDIDUS (14) ISAURUS, an orthodox Christian historian who flourished in the reign

* The mission of Candidus (A.D. 596) coincides in time with the mission of AUGUSTINE. It appears from the sixth section of the second book of John the Deacon's *Life of Gregory*, that the English slave lads were not improbably intended for choristers, for that was how lads were employed in monasteries. Gregory hopes they will "get on and do good" (*proficiant*).

of Anastasius, A.D. 491–513. He was a native of Isauria Tracheia, and was by profession a notary, and one of the most influential men of his time in his own country. Photius informs us (*Codex*, 79) that Candidus wrote a history of his own times in three books, from the accession of Leo the Thracian, in 457, to the death of Zeno the Isaurian, in 491. Photius severely censures his style, which he characterises as harsh and inharmonious, abounding in novel constructions, and in poetic diction unsuited to the gravity of history. He commends him, however, as a zealous maintainer of the faith as set forth at Chalcedon, and an opponent of all innovators. This history is lost, with the exception of the few extracts given by Photius, and a small fragment in Suidas (sub voc. *χειρί(ω)*). These are printed in the *Corpus Hist. Byzant.* ed. Labbe, vol. i. p. 154, seq. (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 239, lib. v. c. 5; ix. 276, lib. v. c. 34; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 466; Migne, *Patrolog.* lxxxv. 1741.) [E. V.]

CANDIDUS (15) THEBAEUS, martyr, commemorated on Sept. 22 (*Bed. Mart.*; Usuard, *Mart.*) [THEBAEAN LEGION.] [C. H.]

CANDIDUS (16) WIZO, otherwise surnamed WITTO, WITSO, WISO, presbyter, a disciple of Alcuin, in whose writings his name appears for the space of about 10 years, ending A.D. 802. His home was the monastery of St. Martin of Tours, the residence of Alcuin, who usually mentions him, and never but in language of fatherly regard, in connexion with errands to and from distinguished persons, one of whom was Arno, bishop of Saltzburg, and another Charlemagne himself. Subjoined are the epistles in which he is named, according to the edition of Frobenius, whose dates also are adopted:—*circ.* A.D. 793, *Ep.* 14; A.D. 796, *Epp.* 39, 38 (thought to be alluded to); A.D. 797, *Epp.* 55, 54; A.D. 799, *Ep.* 76; A.D. 800, *Ep.* 176; A.D. 801, *Epp.* 109, 188, 101, 105; A.D. 802, *Epp.* 118, 193; *anno incerto*, *Ep.* 123. Alcuin dedicates his commentary on *Ecclesiastes* "*dilectissimis in Christo filiis, Oniae sacerdoti, Candido presbytero, Nathanaeli diacono*" (tom. i. 410); here for the first and only time calling Candidus a presbyter. From internal evidence the dedication must have been written in A.D. 802.

The earliest mention of Candidus represents him as bringing his master accounts of king Charles; so that about A.D. 793 he must have been beyond the age and status of a pupil, though he is ever addressed as *filius*. When named in the letters to great persons, he is always their *servulus* or *famulus*; but this is only the language of deference, and he remained until nearly the last in the employment of Alcuin. In A.D. 800 he is the bearer of Alcuin's work *Adversus Felicem* to Charles (tom. i. 788, 921). In A.D. 801, just after the great coronation, he brings good news from Rome and the now imperial court; and in the same year, on the emperor's return home, he has the honour to convey his master's congratulations. This evidently leads to his advancement, for in A.D. 802 he is seen established at court, in company with the two ecclesiastics already named, receiving paternal advice from his old master who hopes he will continue to please God, be faithful to the emperor, and set an example in the

palace. He and Nathanael having lately quitted the parental nest of their education, as Alcuin expresses it, are now on their own wings in the open sky of public life. In the dedication of the commentaries the same phrases recur, which fix the chronology, while it is obvious how the volume, *Ecclesiastes*, suits the situation of the young men.

It seems impossible to trace the name of Candidus through the passages we have enumerated without a conviction of his identity throughout; and we make this remark in consequence of inferences that have been drawn from a passage in *Ep.* 39. Alcuin here writes that he is like one bereft of his children, for that Damoetas is gone to Saxony, Homerus to Italy, and "Candidus Britanniam recessit," an expression which of course excites the attention of English writers, while it has given rise to some speculation, not to say invention. It may be accounted for very naturally on the supposition that Candidus was on one of his numerous missions; and accordingly we find under the date of this year, A.D. 796, several of Alcuin's letters addressed to persons of rank in Britain, including Offa king of Mercia (*vid. Epp.* 42, 43, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170). As a minor confirmation we may add that in another letter of the year (*Ep.* 38) where the bearer is spoken of, instead of Candidus it is "*hunc puerulum*." In A.D. 797 Candidus is back again and employed as before.

We notice therefore what Leland says on the passage, premising that that excellent antiquary had not the advantage of referring to a long series of Alcuin's collected epistles like those in the great printed editions of our times. He explains the solitary expression that mentions Britain by a letter which he adduces as from Alcuin to Higebald bishop of Lindisfarne, although his extract does not enable us to identify the document with any of the epistles now extant. The fragment he gives us expresses the writer's desire that a person (not named) may return to him, and by this person Leland thinks it likely that Candidus is meant. On the assumption that it is he, Candidus is made out to have been originally an alumnus of Lindisfarne under Higebald; to have been sent by him to France to finish his studies under Alcuin; and in due time to have returned home. If he ever went back as desired, Leland cannot say. Bale reproduces this little story; Pits embellishes it with an addition that the destruction of the Lindisfarne library by the Danes in A.D. 793 was what occasioned Candidus to migrate to the continent; Dempster states that he was a Scot; that he studied at Melrose likewise; that he was in Scotland when Alcuin dedicated his commentary to him; and finally that he was the author of *Epistolae ad Alcuinum magistrum*. Thus in the literary history of Great Britain Candidus Presbyter figures as one of the writers of the heptarchy, fitted with an illustrative biographical memoir, and all out of three words of Alcuin and a guess of Leland. (Leland, in Tanner, *Bibl. Brit.* 149; Balaeus, *Brit. Script.* cent. xiii. No. 59; Pitsius, *Illust. Angl. Script.* tom. i. 828, ed. 1619; Dempster, *Script. Scot.* ed. Bannat, Club 1829, lib. iii. No. 273.)

In one place of Alcuin (*Ep.* 55) Candidus occurs as "*Witto*," evidently a vernacular form of his name, which is also written Witso and

Wizo (vid. *Epp.* 101, 118, 123, notes) and by this cognomen he is usually distinguished from Candidus (17), a monk of Fulda; but the two are confounded by Pezius, as remarked by Frobenius (*Alc. Ep.* 101 n.). A very short piece of half a folio page, entitled "Candidus de Imagine Dei" occurs in Frobenius's edition of Alcuin (tom. ii. 596), and the editor thinks (p. 556) the author may have been Candidus Wizo. Among Alcuin's poems there is one on Candidus penned in the affectionate strain invariably seen in the epistles (*Opp.* tom. ii. 457). [C. H.]

CANDIDUS (17) A monk of the abbey of Fulda, surnamed *Braun*, was born at the close of the 8th century, and educated at Fulda, where he embraced a monastic life under the rule of abbat Baugulph, by whom he was sent to France to complete his education under Clemens Scotus, in company with a brother monk named Modestus. On his return to Fulda he was advanced to the priesthood. He endured with patience the maladministration of abbat Ratgar, appointed 802, until his deposition in 817. Candidus was taken into the confidence of Ratgar's successor, St. Eligil, by whose successor, Raban (822), he was placed at the head of the conventual schools. It was by Raban's advice, to occupy the time which, in the want of congenial society, was hanging heavy on his hands, that he undertook his literary works. The principal of these was the *Life of St. Eligil*, in two books, one in prose, the other in hexameter verse, dedicated to his old companion Modestus. They narrate nearly the same facts, describing the consecration of the church of Fulda and the translation of the relics of St. Boniface, at which he was present. He also wrote the life of abbat Baugulph, which is not known to exist. Two other works bear Candidus's name, which are attributed by Pez and others to Candidus the disciple of Alcuin, but probably erroneously. These are (1) *Opusculum de Passione Domini*, expository homilies on the harmony of the Gospel accounts of the Passion; (2) *Responsio ad Monachum*, an answer to the inquiry of a brother monk, whether Jesus Christ could behold God with His bodily eyes. This little treatise is replete with modesty, charity, and sound wisdom, deciding in the negative, but urging the cultivation of purity of heart as the only means of seeing God. Ducange attributes to Candidus *Dicta de imagine Mundi*, a MS. formerly at St. Germain des Prés. (Mabillon, *Act. Sanct. Ord. S. Bened.* v. 226; Pez, *Thesaur. Anecd.* i. 241; Migne, *Patrol.* cvi. 57.) [E. V.]

CANFRIDUS, bishop, first in the list of Glastonbury monks who were advanced to the episcopate. He died A.D. 782 (Malm. *Antiq. Glast.* Gale, xv. Scriptt. 325). If we might allow an error of a year in this date, Canfridus could be identified with Eanfrid, bishop of Elmham, who vacated his see (Stubbs, *Regist.* 8, 168) not later than A.D. 781. This identification would then be analogous to that of Cangitha with Eangith. [CANGITHA.] [C. H.]

CANGITHA (Bonif. *Ep.* 30, ed. Würdtwein; *Ibid.* Migne, *Patrol.* tom. lxxxix. 726), abbess, mother of Eadburga or Bugga. [EANGYTH.] [C. H.]

CANICE, CANICUS. [CAINNECH.]

CANIDES, a hermit in the time of Theodosius the Great, was son of Theodotus. As soon as he was baptized he ran away to a little grotto under a waterfall, where he lived 73 years, tasting no food but a few herbs without salt once a week. He died June 10 (*Menology of Basil*). [E. B. B.]

CANINIUS. Mentioned by St. Jerome as sent by him with his letter (74, ed. Vall.) from Bethlehem to Ruffinus, a presbyter, probably at Rome. [W. H. F.]

CANISTAE (*Κανισταί*), enumerated by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 1) in a list of short-lived heretical sects, the origin of which he ascribes to Simon Magus; the next preceding name in the list being the Eutycheatae. The name Canistae is mentioned by no other writer; but there is every reason to believe that Theodoret derived it from a passage in Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vii. 17), where we find in close connection the names Canianistae (*Κανιανισταί*) and Eutycheitae, the latter being described as a branch of the Simonians. There is little room for doubt that Clement meant to speak of the Calaites, but Theodoret could not have so understood him, for his Canistae are not identified with the Cainites, to whom he devotes a separate section (i. 15), under the name *Καίροι*. [G. S.]

CANNA, Welsh saint of the 6th century, from Armorica, reputed founder of Llanganna or Llangan in Glamorganshire, and of Llangan in Carmarthenshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 222). [C. H.]

CANNATUS, ST., is commemorated on the same day with St. Antoninus, and was like him bishop of Marseilles. He was born at Aix, and became a hermit, having retired to the desert, where he spent his time in study and contemplation. He was afterwards elected bishop of Marseilles, and is supposed to have died there in the 5th century. The exact date is unknown (*Acta SS. Boll.* Oct. vii. 25). [H. W. Y.]

CANNERA. [CAINNER.]

CANOC (CONOC). Abbat and confessor. He is also called Mochoonoc, the syllable Mo being added, as Colgan says of such cases, "honoris et singularis observantiae causa." His life is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 311 sq. at Feb. 11, but according to others his feast is celebrated on Feb. 13, where *Mart. Doneg.* has Conan, and on Nov. 18, where the same Martyrology has Mochoonoc). He was born at Brecknock in Wales, but was the son of Breacan, an Irish prince, who had married Marcella, daughter of Theodoric, prince of Gartmathrin, and settled probably on the property which came to him through her and is now called Brecon and Brecknock. Canoc is given as the eldest of as many as twenty-four children born to Breacan, by the same Marcella or another, Dina or Digna, and all said to be saints. He flourished about A.D. 492, and founded monasteries both in Ireland and Wales, his chief foundation having been Gallen in King's County. But much doubt is entertained regarding the details of the story. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 279, 424 sq.; Colgan, *Tr. Thum.* 153, 167; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* Dublin 1705, p. 84.) [J. G.]

CANTIANILLA, CANTIANUS, and CANTIUS, martyrs at Aquileia, in the beginning of the Diocletian persecution, May 31 (*Acta SS.* May, vii. 420). [E. B. B.]

CANTIGERN. [KENTIGERN.]

CAOIDE. [CAETI.]

CAOL. [CAEL (2).]

CAOMHAN. [CAEMHAN (3).]

CAORNAN. [CAERNAN.]

CAPAX, bishop at the 2nd council of Rome A.D. 344 (Labbe, *Conc.* i. 1545). [E. B. B.]

CAPELLA (1), CAECILIUS, mentioned by Tertullian as one among other instances of governors who in their last moments had painful memories of the persecutions they had instituted. All that is said by Tertullian is:—"Caecilius Capella in illo exitu Byzantino 'Christiani gaudete' exclamavit." (Tert. *ad Scap.* 3). [C. H.]

CAPELLA (2), MARTIANUS, an author of the 5th century. See *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* [E. B. B.]

CAPITANI, martyrs commemorated early in November in the calendar of Carthage.

[E. B. B.]

CAPITULA TRIA. [MONOPHYSITES; JUSTINIAN I.]

CAPITO (1), 25th bishop of Jerusalem. His death is placed by Eusebius, in the *Chronicon*, in the consulship of Maternus and Bradua, A.D. 185. His accession is not dated either in the *Chronicon* or the *History* (v. 12). But Epiphanius places the death of Caius II. the 8th year of Verus, A.D. 168. Julianus II. came between (*Art de Vérifier les Dates*, i. 222).

[E. B. B.]

(2) Donatist bishop, joined in presenting a request against CAECILIAN, in A.D. 313, claiming that the question at issue should be tried in Gaul, which had been free from the temptation that had caused the dispute; was present accordingly at Treves, April 28, A.D. 315 (*Tillem. Mém.* vi. 24, 55, 56).

(3) Bishop in Sicily, present at the council of Nice (Athanas. ed. Paris, 1627, vol. i. p. 291; *Tillem.* vi. 644; De Broglie, ii. 19).

(4) Father of the presbyter Athanasius, named, perhaps, to distinguish his son from the great bishop whose persecutions he shared (*Till.* viii. 105), in the letter of the Council of Sardica. (Athanasius, i. 759, compare p. 791.)

(5) African bishop at the Council of Sardica A.D. 347 (*Conc. Labbe*, ii. 679).

(6, 7) In the *Menology* of Basil, on Dec. 22, we read of a Capito sent as bishop to Cherso, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, on the death of Aetherius. He tried to demolish the temple of their virgin idol, and to build a church in the name of Peter. He prepared furnaces for his work, and they told him, that if he would step into the furnace and come out safe, they would not only all believe him, but even cast their children into the fire. He did so, and they believed. "After many works he departed in peace." On comparing the entry on July 8, we see that Cherso means the Crimea, and that we have here a renewed and successful attempt to evangelise a region, to which, perhaps because it abounded with Jews, Hermo, bishop of Jerusalem, had sent mission-

aries, among them an earlier Capito, in the time of the Diocletian persecution, who were all martyred, even after they had gained the protection of the victorious Constantine. [E. B. B.]

CAPITO (8) A robber who became a hermit, and lived by the labours of his hands in a cave four miles from Antinopolis in Egypt. When Palladius saw him, between A.D. 410 and 420, he had lived there 50 years without ever going to the city or even to the Nile, saying that he durst not yet mix with the throng, as the enemy was busy against him still. (*Hist. Laus.* c. 99, 100; *Tillem.* xi. 520.)

CAPITOLINA, martyr of Cappadocia, confessed that her home was Jerusalem on high, her fathers the teachers of the Christians, among them, bishop Firmilian. She was cast into prison. Her servant Eroeteis heard of it, came to her and kissed her mistress' chains. (From this incident the story of Eroeteis coming safe out of the fire may have arisen.) Capitolina is said to have been beheaded on the 27th, Eroeteis on the 28th, of October. The *menologies* put their martyrdom under Diocletian; but the MS. Acts seen by Tillemont (v. 168, 648) under Licinius. This Licinius must of course be Valerian, and this would agree with the date of Firmilian (A.D. 230-270). The same acts make Zelicinthus governor of Cappadocia at the time. He is on the eve of an expedition, probably that against Persia. [E. B. B.]

CAPITOLINUS, vicar of Thrace under Julian, put St. Aemilian to death (*Tillem.* vii. 354; De Brogl. iv. 183).

(2) Martyr in Nicomedia with bishop Quintilian. March 8 (*Acta SS.* Mar. i. 756).

(3) Martyr in Antioch with Zenobius, Emerita, Italica, Jovian, and Julian. Aug. 24 (*Ibid.* Aug. iv. 767).

(4) Martyr at Rome with Eulalia. Dec. 11 (*Mart. Hieron.* D'Achery). [E. B. B.]

CAPPILLATUS CAPELLUS. A Christian at Rome, A.D. 303. (*Conc. Labbe*, i. 939, 940; cf. 1545.) [E. B. B.]

CAPRASIVS (1) Martyr at Agen, in Aquitaine, in the time of Diocletian, had been beloved by all in the town, where a healing fountain, produced by him in the cave where he lay hid, was shewn. His courage under his tortures made two converts, Primus and Felician, and they were all beheaded together along with St. FAITH, whose torture Caprasius had witnessed from his cave, Oct. 20 (*Tillem.* iv. 543). Ruinart (p. lxxv.) shews that Maximian probably sometimes invaded the province of Constantius. There is no good authority for making Caprasius bishop of the place. [E. B. B.]

(2) ST., presbyter at Lérins (l'Isle de St. Honorat). This saint is sometimes called abbat of the monastery at Lérins, but it is very doubtful whether he ever took charge of that religious house. He received a good education, but had a great desire to become a hermit; so he distributed his goods to the poor and went with St. Honoratus and his brother St. Venantius in quest of a place where they might carry out the rule of life which they had planned for themselves. It was their intention to seek some place where the Latin language was not spoken. Before they started, under the direction of Ca-

prasius, Honoratus and his brother Venantius received the tonsure, and they then first went into Greece and the Peloponnesus. But Venantius unfortunately died through fatigue and sickness, and Honoratus then determined to go into Gaul with Caprasius. The place of their destination was the Isle of Lérins, which is described as a frightful desert, where nothing was to be seen but serpents and other venomous creatures. There Honoratus built a monastery, into which he received many monks, who came from the neighbouring countries to work out their salvation. It was under the discipline of Caprasius and Honoratus, who are said to have made it the home of salute. Hilarius describes their new monastery as being distinguished for chastity, faith, wisdom, justice, truth. They also built in the island a church, of which Honoratus became the minister. Caprasius died circa 430, and is commemorated on the 1st of June. His relics were left at Lérins. Hilarius describes him as "of angelic conversation." Eucherius calls him "a man of venerable gravity, equal to the ancient fathers." Some writers call him a Benedictine, but that is an error, as he lived, according to the most trustworthy accounts, about a hundred years before St. Benedict.

(*Acta Sanctorum*, Jun. i. p. 77; Hilari, *Arelat. de Vita S. Honorati*, cap. li. *Patrol. Lat.* i. p. 1255. Eucherius *Lugd. de Laud. Eremit.* 42, *Patrol. Lat.* i. p. 711; Sidenius *Apoll. Carm.* § 384, *Patrol. Lat.* lviii. p. 731; Cellier, *Histoire des Auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, tom. viii. p. 439.)

CAPRASIVS (3) A martyr, of whom nothing is known except that he is commemorated on the 25th May, in the Lucensian Calendar, as martyred at Castrum Gola. There is another doubtful Caprasius mentioned by some authors as Prior of Carmel. He is supposed to be the same person as St. Caprasius (1). (*AA. SS.* May, vol. vi. p. 4; October, vol. vii. p. 3; October, vol. viii. (ad diem 20), p. 813.) [D. R. J.]

CAPREOLUS, bishop of Carthage, is known to history in connexion with the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. The whole of Africa, at that time, was being ravaged by the Vandals, under Genseric—a state of things which made it impossible to convene the bishops of Africa, in order to send a regular deputation to represent the church of Carthage at the council, as all the roads were impassable for fear of the Vandals. The bishop, however, in his zeal for the catholic doctrine, then called in question by Nestorius, despatched an elaborate letter in its defence, by the hand of his deacon Besula, to be laid before the council. This letter, which is extant, both in Greek and Latin, together with that from Celestine, 'Archbishop of Rome,' and another from St. Cyril, was entered upon the acts of the council, as from "another most revered metropolitan," the bishop of Carthage.

There is also extant another letter by Capreolus on this controversy, written in answer to inquiries which had been addressed to him from Spain, by 'Vitalis and Constantius, sinners,' whom he answers as sons. This letter is entitled *Epistola de unit. Christi. Veri Dei et Hominis Personæ contra recens damnatam hæresin Nestorii*. They had abjured the heresy without, apparently,

having heard of the heresiarch, or of the council that condemned him. Both letters are preserved in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, vol. ix. p. 490, and in Migne, vol. lili. p. 843.

There is also a fragment of the letter which he addressed to Theodosius, who convoked the council. This is quoted by Ferrandus in his letter to Pelagius and Anatolius, c. 6, *Patr.* Migne, lvii. 925.

The *Sermo de Tempore Barbarico*, on the Vandal invasion of Africa, usually attributed to St. Augustine, and the other sermons in which Augustine describes the Vandal ravages, are considered by Tillemont (xvi. 502) to have been written rather by Capreolus (Hardouin, l. 1419–22; Fleury, xxv. 41; Tillemont, xii. 559, xiii. 901, xiv. 376, 399, xvi. 495, 502, 789). [D. B.]

Tillemont supposes him to have succeeded to the see of Carthage shortly before the death of Augustine, as the letter convoking the council seems to have been addressed to him and to Augustine (xii. 559). Another object of his letter to Ephesus was to implore the council not to reopen the question of the Pelagian heresy. When his letter was read, Cyril and all the bishops exclaimed, "That is what we all say; that is what we all wish," and they ordered it to be inserted in the acts of the council (*Vinc. Lerin.* c. 31; Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 529). He is probably the 'priest' in Africa in the time of Aspar, mentioned in the Book of Promises, ascribed to Prosper (l. 4, c. 6).

The Spaniards who write to Capreolus, and address him as God's servant and their lord, speak of his fame as already world-wide. The basis of this fame is the principle he laid down in his epistle to the council, that old questions once settled should not be reopened. He speaks of "retaining that perpetual stability which has made statutes concerning the system of the Catholic faith (quæ de Catholicæ fidei ratione statuerit)." The builder's feet must be on the rock. At the same time he expects new questions constantly to arise, new sayings to be approved as right. The authority by agreement with which they are to be corroborated, is the judgment of the Fathers, both old and new; he does not there name Scripture. He has confidence in the abiding presence of the Spirit. The Spaniards who write to him are able themselves abundantly to refute from Scripture the heresy that troubled them, but are not content with this unless they can be assured by a living authority as to what the right Catholic faith may hold. For this Capreolus (c. 13) almost reproves them; his own authority is worth little or nothing; let them turn to the Scriptures and the Fathers. He seems to be mistaken in supposing that the heresy that troubled them in Spain was really Nestorianism. The doctrine that the Word of God had left the Man Jesus when he hung on the cross (*hominem purum decunt pendisse in cruce comprehensum; alunt, Necesse est Deus ab eo*) reminds one rather of the earlier Gnostics. It was only in this particular that the Spaniards had been at all overborne by these heretics; they answered, "God never departed from the man whom He assumed, unless when He said on the cross, 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani.'" It is in recording this answer of theirs that they cry most humbly for pardon and guidance and prayers on their behalf. It is with this accordingly that Capreolus's answer is almost entirely

taken up. His answer to the Nestorian doctrine (c. 2) is borrowed from the celebrated discourse of PROCLUS, at least in two important particulars; the interpretation of *ἀνδρῶν, ἀνθρώπων*; and the argument that if God and Man were not one in Christ, we should have a quaternity, not a trinity (v. Neale, *Alexandria*, i. 240).

It is instructive to note the importance that he attaches to the descent of the God-man into Hades. Chaps. 5–12 are taken up with answering the new error. He quotes Ps. xvi. 10; John x. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Heb. i. 2, 3; Col. ii. 15; Heb. x. 28–30; John xx. 17. He does not quote John xvi. 32, but he says (c. 13) that it would be endless to adduce all scripture testimonies. His answer to the argument from Ps. xxii. 1 is drawn from the latter half of the verse (as it is in the LXX and Vulgate, which are not improbably right), “Far from my health are the words of my failings,” and based on the mystery of the union of the two natures, “that human condition should know itself” (c. 5).

Baronius and Sirmondus would read Tonantius for Constantius as the name of one of the inquirers (Galland, ix. 493). Capreolus seems to have sent them a report of all the proceedings of the council, which was then at an end (c. 1).

The Vandals under Genseric overspread all Africa except Carthage, Cirta and Hippo, which they did not succeed in taking. The sermons *De Tempore Barbarico* (Augustine, t. vi. 690), *De Cultura Agri Domini*, sive *de quarta feria* (B. 686), and the 298th Sermon in the appendix, (the 111th on the Season in the old edition) are not by Augustine. The first two seem to have been preached in this order in the course of one spring, the first shortly after the feast of Perpetua, March 7, in a town that was yet unconquered, where games were still celebrated (*Temp. Barb.* i. t. vi. p. 700). The last was on the Thursday after Easter, in a town that had just been besieged, and was still suffering from pestilence. When Carthage was taken in 439, the bishop was Quodvultdeus, and Capreolus was already dead. The Arian persecution did not begin till 437, and had begun when the sermon *De Tempore Barbarico* was preached. It is therefore more probably by Quodvultdeus than by Capreolus. The third sermon may have been by Augustine's successor at Hippo, when Genseric had raised the siege of that town in 431. But see Tillemont, xvi. 495–504.

The death of Capreolus is generally supposed to have been about A.D. 435. His burial was commemorated in the calendar of Carthage between July 21 and 30; the note of the day is lost. [E. B. B.]

CAPSUR, Moorish king under Genseric, A.D. 455 (Victor Vitensis, *Pers. Vand.* i. p. 9; *Patrol.* lviii. 195). [E. B. B.]

CAPUANUS, presbyter at the council of Sinuessa A.D. 303 (*Conc. Labbe*, i. 943). [E. B. B.]

CARACALLA, the nickname of M. Aurelius Severus Antoninus Bassianus, son of Lucius Septimius Severus, born April 4, A.D. 188, declared Caesar A.D. 196, three years after his father's accession; succeeded to the empire in conjunction with his brother Geta, Feb. A.D. 211, sole emperor after slaying his brother in his mother's

arms A.D. 212, in Gaul A.D. 213, in Germany and on the Danube A.D. 214, at Antioch and Alexandria A.D. 215, marched against Parthia A.D. 216, killed on the way from Edessa to Carrhae, April 8, A.D. 217. His mother, according to contemporary authorities, was Julia, a Syrian woman, whom Severus had married because of certain prophecies. Spartianus, in the time of Constantine, assures us that Julia was his stepmother, and that his mother was Severus's first wife Marcia. This would make the story of his life somewhat less horrible, but it compels the historian at the cost of some inconsistency to refer his birth to A.D. 174, or earlier. For the garment from which his name is derived see DICT. CHRIST. ANT. Rawlinson prefers the form Caracallus.*

The principal authorities are Tertullian, addressing Scapula, the governor of Africa, in A.D. 211; the sober, contemporary, and apparently impartial, narrative of Herodian (bks. vii. viii.); the abridgment, by the very late compiler Xiphilinus, of the 77th book of the contemporary historian Dion Cassius, with which the compiler seems to have incorporated fragments of other works of a like early date; the narrative written for Constantine by Lampridius Spartianus in the *Historia Augusta*; laws, coins, inscriptions (see Clinton), and especially a record in the Digest, bk. 1, tit. 5, l. 17, from the 22nd book of Ulpian.

Dion charges him with inheriting all the worst features of the races from which he drew his origin; on his father's side, the braggart levity of the Gaul and the truculence of the African; on his mother's, the trickiness of the Syrian. Tertullian (*ad Scap.* c. 4) calls him Antoninus, and informs us that “his father Severus had a regard for Christians; for he even sent for Proculus, a Christian, who was surnamed Torpadion, the manager of affairs to Evodia, who had once cured him by means of oil, and kept him in his palace till his death; and Antoninus, too, knew him well, and was brought up on Christian milk. And, moreover, Severus knew most illustrious men and most illustrious women to be of this sect, and not only did not hurt, but honoured (‘exornavit’ or, more probably, ‘exoneravit,’ exonerated) them by the witness he bore them, and withstood the raging populace.” Tertullian must have been on his guard in the facts he alleged about the inner life of the palace in addressing the governor of a province. It has been inferred that the young prince was not only brought up amid Christian influences but had a Christian wet-nurse.

We can easily conceive how injurious it must have been for the child to find the Christians in the palace screened and the matter hushed up, while yet he was taken to see shows of wild beasts where Christians were thrown to them to devour. Spartianus tells us that he was a most charming child, quick at learning, engaging with his prattle, and of a very tender heart. “If he saw condemned criminals thrown to the beasts, he cried, or looked away, which more than won the

* This form is found in the late Byzantines and in the best MSS. of the *Historia Augusta*, and is therefore adopted by most Germans. The name was never of course officially adopted, but Dion, and the analogy of Caligula, favour the old-fashioned form.

hearts of the people. At seven years of age, when he heard that a boy that was his playmate had been severely beaten for Jewish superstition, it was a long while before he would look at his own father or the boy's father again, or at the people who had him flogged. By his own intercession he restored their ancient rights to the people of Antioch and Byzantium, who had helped Niger against his father. It was for his cruelty that he took an aversion to Plautianus. But all this was only while he was a boy (*sed hæc puer*.) The Jewish superstition here mentioned has been interpreted generally, and with great probability, to mean Christianity. The Plautianus here mentioned was, as we learn from Herodian, a vile tyrant, who was all-powerful with Severus, and whose daughter Caracalla was compelled to marry, much against his will, in the hope that the marriage might reform him from certain low tastes, such as won him the favour of the city populace.

The whole subject of the lives of the Roman emperors in their bearing on the fortunes of the church calls for careful investigation. Late and meagre epitomes, like Pharaoh's lean kine, have, for the most part, swallowed up the original authorities. In such brief abstracts, it is chiefly the gossip of the time that is preserved. And at best, the heathen historians rather delight in startling paradox, than attempt to trace the sad history of the ruin of a human soul. Besides, as far and as long as they can, they persistently ignore the existence of Christianity.

Spartianus tells us that when Caracalla emerged from boyhood, before his accession, he was so changed, so stern, that no one would have known him; whereas his brother Geta, on the other hand, who had been an unpleasing child, was very much improved as he grew up. His narrative, and the abridgment of Dion, afford no clue to the enmity that sprang up between the brothers; and when we find large parties swaying this way and that, we might be inclined to surmise that deeper principles were involved on either hand than mere fraternal jealousy. Caracalla's early life was such as to teach him heart-hardening dissimulation; Tertullian, while the brothers yet ruled jointly, urges at once the uncertainty of human life, and the probability that Caracalla would favour the Christians; and it is the fact that his victory coincided with a general and prolonged cessation of a long and cruel persecution.

But Herodian's plain story is to the effect that the enmity of the brothers began with backing different racers or game cocks in their childhood, and was perpetually fomented by clever flatterers, and drawn into the current of the fierce strife of colours, in which no political or religious opinions were involved, but the personal predilection for one or other of the leading charioteers. When we ask what the difference of tastes was that so widely separated the brothers, we learn that Caracalla was the rough and hardy soldier, while Geta affected rather the muses and the palaestra, Hellenic culture of body and mind.

Dion Cassius, as abridged by Xiphilius, informs us that Caracalla had tried to get rid of Geta during their father's life; that there was some difficulty about the sacrifices that the senate decreed they should perform in common for the concord of the empire; that at the saturnalia

Caracalla made an attempt on his brother's life; that thenceforward they each surrounded themselves with an armed retinue, and that it was only by treachery that Caracalla was enabled to slay his brother, inviting him to an interview in the chambers of the empress dowager, and there laying an ambush against him. That very night he hastened to the camp and told the soldiers, "Now, I can do you good; I am one of you; all my treasures are yours." *His next act was to recall all the criminals banished on any charge to the islands, and to put to death, Xiphilius tells us, 20,000 men and women in the palace and the camp as partisans of Geta.* Dio made a list of the names of the murdered persons, as they were at that time very well-known people. But when a rabble of soldiers had rifled the house of Caracalla's foster-father Cilo, and dragged the old man himself, in shirt and slippers, from the bath where they found him, up to the palace doors, Caracalla was very angry with them (which was all set down as pretence), and came out and threw his own cloak round Cilo, and said, "Who touches him, touches me," and had the soldiers executed. He refused to be deified or likened to the gods (Dio, 77, vol. ii. pp. 403-406, ed. Becker). We cannot tell whether he had any higher motives than a mean malice and uneasy envy in his murder of his brother, and whether the mother, for whose sake he claimed to have done the deed, and whom he would not allow to utter, or even to listen to a complaint, ever found it in her heart to forgive him. The incredible charge of incest was afterwards brought against them! But there is little doubt as to the results of the deed. He did not become a Christian, and, on the other hand, we are told that the ancient gods of the state were the last to whom he had recourse. He patronised Philostratus, who wrote for his mother and for him the life of Apollonius of Tyana. Thus he fostered one of the chief counterfeits of Christianity. He identified in his worship Serapis and Apollo, as Hadrian tells the Alexandrians identified Serapis and Christ. He gathered round him all who professed to look into the secrets of the future, and he paid his worship to the spirits of the dead. But they could not rid his ears of his brother's dying cry, *μήτηρ μήτηρ, τεκούσα τεκούσα, βοήθει, σφάζομαι*. He continued to court the city populace, and enriched Rome with his magnificent baths, which even in ruins are the most superb among monuments of refined luxury. But his fits of savagery must have made it hard for him to continue a favourite of the populace. Henceforth he depended mainly on his army for his support, and on excitement for his ease of mind. Both necessities involved expense. Whatever impetus he gave to the corruption of the capital, he himself contentedly shared the roughest privations of the soldiers. But that alone was not enough to secure their affection. In the first day of his crime he had lavished the wealth that his father had been eighteen years in acquiring. New sources of revenue were needed.

It is the method that Caracalla adopted to raise a revenue that gives him his main claim to a place in the catalogue of men whose lives affected the Christian church. His act, as Gibbon has shewn, marked an era in the decline of the empire. But more than that, it affected very greatly the

position of Christians in all future persecutions. It is this indeed mainly that enables us to pronounce with certainty that the act was his, and belonged to no earlier date. Moreover, whatever slur may be cast upon his motives, the act itself reveals, if not a largeness of conception, an audacity of innovation, which makes it a distinct step, we might almost say, in the growth of the self-consciousness of humanity. "All who are in the Roman world," says Ulpian, "have been made citizens of Rome by an institution of the Emperor Antoninus." "A most grateful and humane deed!" exclaims Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, v. 17, vol. vii. 161), and immediately subjoins the proviso that made the boon so equivocal. At a stroke the Roman world was pauperised. Every citizen resident in the capital was entitled to receive every month, at a cheap rate—the indigent quite gratuitously—a certain amount of corn or bread. This was one of the chief drains upon the revenue, and one of the main causes of extortion in the provinces. But Augustus laid a tax on citizens from which aliens were exempt, a tax which made the franchise in many cases a burden to be declined rather than a boon to be coveted, a duty of five per cent. on all bequests. Nerva and Trajan, however, exempted the passage of moderate inheritances from parent to child, or *vice versâ* (Plin. *Paneg.* 37, 38). Caracalla, by raising the provincials to the franchise, did not free them from the tribute they owed before, but imposed this additional burden, which he doubled in amount, and which involved the odious intrusion of the taxgatherer, in seasons of domestic bereavement. The act seems to synchronise with a *congiarium* or largess to the populace in A.D. 214. Thenceforward Caracalla's laws, wherever promulgated, seem to be dated at Rome. Oppressive as were the effects of the act, it seems yet to have been welcomed. It was but fair, thought Augustine, that rustics who had lands should give food to citizens who had none, so long as it was granted as a boon and not extorted as a right.

But besides its effects as a financial measure, Caracalla's act broke down the barriers of society; annulled, as far as any imperial institution could, the proud old sovereign commonwealth, the queen of nations, whose servants and ministers the emperors had ever professed to be; opened the command of armies to unlettered barbarians; removed the bars to the influx of Greek and Syrian and Egyptian corruption into Rome; reduced the subjects to a level, above which only the emperor, the minion of the army, towered supreme.

What the effect was on the status of Christians will occur to any one who has read the Acts of the Apostles, and seen how again and again Paul's Roman citizenship stood him in good stead. The same appears in the story of the martyrs in Gaul under M. Aurelius: the Roman citizens are reserved till the emperor's will be known. It must not indeed be supposed that a boon so widely diffused could retain the same value. But we hear no more of Christians being crucified, unless they were slaves, or first reduced to slavery. They were no longer as sheep appointed for the slaughter. Unutterably horrible as the tortures devised against them were, they were no longer commonly thrown to the beasts as a show. They suffered by the sword at last,

and all their tortures were such as might by equal right befall any citizen of Rome who transgressed the mandate of the emperor. [DICT. CHRIST. ANT. 'Persecution'; 'Torture.'] Thus martyrdom, instead of the obstinacy of an abject alien superstition, became the bold and cheerful resistance of free citizens to the arbitrary will of one, who, when he began to torture, became a barbarous tyrant.

Of the remaining history of Caracalla we need say but little. In Germany he affected German dress and manners, and surrounded himself with a German bodyguard. But in Macedon he was seized with a passionate admiration of Alexander the Great. He visited Alexandria, where he was warmly welcomed; but by a treacherous massacre he avenged the bitter saying about himself and his mother that had been rife in that city. Treachery, revenge, and hatred of the sight of human enjoyment seemed to have become his nature. Again, with a boldness of conception equal to that displayed in the enfranchisement of his own subjects, he demanded the daughter of the Parthian king in marriage, that the two great empires might be united into one. Artabanus demurred, but at length yielded. Then the marriage festivities were scattered by another cruel and treacherous massacre. Artabanus escaped, but his subjects, amid their singing and their dancing, were butchered like sheep. This event had probably not a little to do with the Persian revolt and the sudden fall of Parthia. Another outrage soon followed, equally wanton. He scattered to the winds the bones of the dead of Persia that were preserved in a great necropolis at Arbela. He then spent the winter at Edessa in chariot-racing. Meanwhile he consulted the magicians of Rome to know who should put him to death, and suffered their answer, with other business letters, to pass into the hands of the very man, Macrinus, whom they had named. For his own safety, Macrinus thought it necessary to put the task they assigned him into execution, and as Caracalla was on his way to a temple of the moon-god he was surprised and murdered. (Rawlinson's *Sixth Monarchy*, c. xxi.; Gibbon, c. vi.; Tillemont, *Hist. Emp.* iii. 88.) [E. B. B.]

CARADOC (*Brut y Tywys.*), **CARATAUC** (*Annal. Camb.*), king of Gwynedd or Guenedota, slain by the Saxons, A.D. 798 (*M. H. B.* pp. 834, 843). [C. H.]

CARAN, bishop and confessor; commemorated Dec. 23. The St. Caran who, according to the *Breviary of Aberdeen*, was a bishop and confessor, honoured at Premecht or Premaay, Aberdeenshire, and at Fetteresso, Kincardineshire, must not be confounded with any of the seventeen Ciarans of the Irish calendar. He was a saint belonging to the east of Scotland, and may have been the Corinnu or Corindus who, according to the *Annals of Tighearnach*, died among the Picts, in A.D. 669, Itharnan or Starnan dying in the same year among the same people. (*Brev. Aberd.* pars hyem. f. xliii.; *View Dioc. Aberd.* 550; Bp. Forbes, *Cal. Scott. Saints*, 297.) [J. G.]

CARANTOCUS, **CARANNOG**. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 209; *Montal. Monks of the West*, iii. 80.) [CAIRNECH (3).] [C. H.]

CARAUNUS, a corruption of Ceraunus, the name of a boy-martyr at Rome, to whom Fulbert

of Chartres writes a hymn, punning on the name and the word "carus." The hexameters appended in the *Patrology* are of course quite a separate poem. Fulbert says that he was born of noble parents at Rome. Usuard, who calls him Charaunus, and commemorates him May 28, says that he was beheaded at Chartres. His legend in the *Breviarium Carnotense* makes him a deacon and evangelist of that place, murdered by an ambush on his way thence to evangelise Paris, in A.D. 98, under Domitian. This is mere romance (*Patrol.* cxli. 349; *Acta SS.* May, vi. 740). [E. B. B.]

CARBEAS. [PAULICIANS.]

CARCADIUS, bishop of Maxula, in the province of Africa, at the synod of Carthage, Feb. 1, A.D. 484, banished to Corsica (*Conc. Labbe*, iv. 1142). [E. B. B.]

CARCAMENOS (Καρκαμενός), one of the twelve "maternal" angels in the system of JUSTINUS (Hippol. *Ref.* v. 26). [G. S.]

CARCHEDONIUS, of Subsana, priest or bishop, rebuked and excused by Augustine, *Epp.* 62 (241), 63 (240). [E. B. B.]

CARDAMAS, slave of Paulinus, given to buffoonery and drinking, and sent to Amandus. There he became reformed, and was made an ecclesiastic. He came to Paulinus one Lent with letters from Amandus and Delphinus, and was content to share the very frugal table of the saint all Lent, but after Easter he objected, and was sent back. He was an old man, and complained that his wife was too weak to do his housework for him. Paulinus begs that he may have a little page given him (Paul. *Epp.* 17, 18, 24, 25; *Tillem.* xiv. 81, 82). [E. B. B.]

CARDEN. The churches of Kilmalie, near Golspie, and of Loth, in Sutherlandshire, were dedicated to one known as St. Carden, and the annual fair was St. Carden's, but the person thus honoured seems to have been of only local note (*Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. 649, 681, 731, 733). There are many Cardenwells throughout Scotland, but whether named from an ancient saint, or from the famous Italian physician and reputed magician, Cardan, in the 16th century, is matter of dispute. [J. G.]

CARELLUS, martyr with Primulus at Caesarea in Cappadocia. May 29 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

CARELLUS. [CAIRELL.]

CARENTIUS or CORENTINUS (1), bishop of Cornouaille, Brittany. Commemorated on May 1. (*Acta Sanctorum*, Maius, vol. i. p. 5.)

(2) ST., bishop and confessor, mentioned in the Auctaria to Usuard, in *Patrol. Lat.* cxxiii. May 18. It is uncertain whether or not he is the same person with St. Corentinus, bishop of Cornouaille in Brittany. He is commemorated on May 18. (*Acta Sanctorum*, May, vol. iv. p. 136.) [D. R. J.]

CARENTOCUS. [CAIRNECH (3).]

CARIATTO. [CHARIATHO.]

CARIBERT. [CHARIBERT.]

CARILEFUS, ST. (Calais or Calès). This saint was born in the territory of Auvergne of noble parents, and entered a monastery at Misy, then under St. Maximinus. He did not remain

here long, but went into retirement with St. Avitus to Le Mans. Afterwards he obtained from king Chilbert some land, on which he built the monastery of St. Calais du Désert near the river Anisle. His acts must be fixed between 517 and 542. His remains were translated in 1171 and 1653 (*Acta SS. Boll.* Jul. i. 85 sq. Baring-Gould, *Lives of Saints*, July, p. 12). [H. W. Y.]

CARINUS, LUCIUS. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 28. LEUCIUS.]

CARINUS. [NUMERIANUS; SEBASTIANUS.]

CARIO, an Egyptian in the 4th century, who left his wife and two children to retire to a hermitage at Sceté. His story, in which his little son Zacharias prominently figures, may be seen in Cotelier. (*Ecol. Gr. Mon.* i. 444, 516; *Tillem. Mem.* x. 76.) [E. B. B.]

CARISSIMUS, bishop of Gisipa in Africa, banished by Hunneric A.D. 484 (*Labbe, Conc.* iv. 1142). [E. B. B.]

CARITAN of Druimlara—Mar. 7. He is placed by the *Martyrologies* on this day, and Colgan (*Acta SS.* 510) gives an account of his life by identifying him with St. Cruthnechan. But, as Dr. Reeves says (*Adamnan*, 191 n.), "the connexion of the two names extends no further than their initials." [See CRUTHNECHAN and CURITAN.] Little seems to be known of this Caritan or Carithan. [J. G.]

CARITAS. Charity with her virgin sisters, Faith and Hope, and their mother Wisdom, seem to have been the names of real martyrs. The names were very natural ones for Christians to give to their children. On the Aurelian Way, in the church of St. Pancras, lay Sophia with her three daughters: Sapientia, with her daughters Fides, Spes, and Caritas, as William of Malmesbury calls them; but the Latin names nowhere else occur in this order, the Greek names when given in full always do. Sophia, Pistis, Elpis, Agape, are said to have been a mother and daughters who suffered in September, and whose relics were transferred to the church of St. Silvester. On the other hand, Sapientia, Spes, Fides, Caritas, are said by Ado to have suffered August 1, and were buried on the Appian Way, in the crypt of St. Caecilia. In that crypt has been found the inscription, PISTE SPEI SORORI DULCISSIMAE FECIT. In the same place, if we rightly understand De Rossi, was found AGAPE QVE VXIT ANNIS VGINTI ET SEX IN PACE—Agape, who lived twenty-six years in peace. There is no statement of relationship in the notices of the tombs on the Appian Way. It appears probable that Ado has confounded the widely celebrated Martyrs who are said to have suffered in September under Adrian, with the occupants of some Christian tombs in a crypt where there were many celebrations early in August. The Menology gives the ages of Faith, Hope, and Love, as 12, 10, and 9. (De Rossi, *Rom. Sott.* i. 180-183, ii. 171 ff., pl. lv. 10; Bede, *Mart.* July 1, Bede, *Mart. Aust.* June 23; Usuard, August 1; *Menol. Basil.* Sept. 16.) [E. B. B.]

CARITOSUS, bishop at the councils of Sinuessa, A.D. 303, and Rome A.D. 324 (*Labbe, Conc.* i. 939, 1545). [E. B. B.]

CARLOVINGIAN BOOKS. [CAROLINI LIBRI.]

CARNAS, the Cappharodite, was a soldier in Libya, early in the 5th century, who stole a horse from SYNESIUS, bishop of Cyrene, and then wanted to buy it of him for a small sum, and refused to give it back, if the bishop would not sell it. (*Syn. Epp.* 6, 14, 42; Tillems. xii. 548.)

[E. B. B.]

CAROLINI LIBRI, or Carolingian books, a treatise in four books drawn up by order of Charlemagne, condemning the image-worship as ordered to be restored by the seventh oecumenical council, the second of Nicaea, held there in June 787. The decrees of this council were forwarded by Tarasius patriarch of Constantinople to pope Hadrian I. There had been two ecclesiastics present at the council on the part of the pope, and its decrees were accepted and the council itself recognised as oecumenical by the Roman church. A Latin translation of the decrees was made (so bad, says Anastasius, that the sense could hardly be made out, Mansi, xii. 981, C.) and forwarded by the pope to Charlemagne. Charles caused them to be read before him and his councillors, found fault with much therein, noted down what he objected to, and sent abbat Angilbert to Rome with his objections for correction. (See preamble to *Syn. Paris*, anno 825, ap. Mansi, xiv. 422, or *Bouquet Recueil*, &c., vi. 338.) To this "Capitulare adversus Synodum" Hadrian replied (Mansi, xiii. 759 ff.). Charles had already, in accordance with Hadrian's request, sent on the decrees to England. There, too, deliberation was held upon them. Alcuin wrote an epistle summing up the Scripture authorities on the subject, which epistle he brought over to Francia to king Charles (*Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, &c. by Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 469, note). In 794, at a synod at Frankfort, the decrees of the Nicene council were rejected, and the council itself pronounced not oecumenical, notwithstanding the presence of two ecclesiastics from the apostolic see (*Ann. Laurissenses*, sub anno). In 825 the synod of Paris again condemned image-worship (Mansi, xiv. 417 ff.). In the latter half of the 9th century Hincmar of Rheims states that a volume of no small size concerning the rejection of this synod of the Greeks had been sent to Rome by Charles, by the hands of certain bishops. This volume Hincmar, when a young man, had himself read in the palace, and he proceeds to quote therefrom a passage which occurs in the Libri Carolini [iv. 28]. (*Hincm. Rem. adv. Hincm. Laud.* cap. 20; Opp. ed. Sirmondi, ii. 45.) Thus we have the following facts: (i.) Charles, shortly after receipt of the Nicene decrees from Rome, made notes of his objections and sent them by Angilbert the abbat in the form of the "Capitulare adversus Synodum" to Hadrian. No document bearing this name survives. (ii.) Alcuin summed up in an epistle (not extant) the Scripture evidences on the question, which he brought over with him to Charles; and shortly afterwards Charles himself commanded the synod of Frankfort, which condemned the Nicene council, to take Alcuin into consultation as a man "learned in the doctrines of the church." (iii.) The reference and quotation of Hincmar. From these three facts we have the following hypotheses: (i.) The "Capitulare adversus Synodum" and the Libri Carolini are identical. Against this it may be urged that the Libri Carolini which we now have could not

be adequately described as a "Capitulare," and the latter, on the testimony of Hadrian himself, was sent to Rome by the hands of abbat Angilbert, the former by those of certain bishops. (ii.) The Libri Carolini are an expansion of the Capitulare drawn up by Charles's order after the synod of Frankfort (so Hefele). (iii.) The Libri Carolini constitute the original document drawn up when Charles first received the Nicene decrees from Hadrian, and the "Capitulare" was a condensation sent by the king to Rome (so Floss). (iv.) The Libri Carolini are written by Alcuin, and either identical with the epistle which he brought over with him from England, or an expansion of it drawn up by him after the Frankfort synod. This view is of course mere conjecture, resting on the similarity of argument of the Libri Carolini to that of the epistle of Alcuin, according to Simeon of Durham (*Councils*, &c., l. c.), and to that of some passages in Alcuin's commentary on St. John's gospel (see Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 654). As regards style, Frobenius, the editor of Alcuin in the last century pronounced against the Libri Carolini. Jaffé and Dümmler, his most recent editors, are inclined to accept them as his work (*Monum. Alcuin.* p. 220, note).

The history of the book itself is also curious, and its genuineness as we have it has been greatly disputed. Down to the beginning of the 16th century no trace is to be found of the work alluded to and quoted from by Hincmar. Bernhard of Luxemburg, in his *Catal. heretic. inscript.*, published in 1522, alludes to a work of Charles's, in four books, against heretics, which he says is preserved in the Vatican library; and Steuchus, the Vatican librarian (died 1550), speaks of a book of Charles's concerning images, written in Lombardic characters, as then in the papal library. He quotes therefrom certain passages which are to be found in the present Libri Carolini (see Floss, pp. 7 and 10). In 1549 appeared the "Opus illustrissimi et excellentissimi seu spectabilis viri Caroli Magni nutu Dei regis Francorum . . . contra synodum quae in partibus Graeciae pro adorandis imaginibus stolidae sive arroganter gesta est. Item . . . Quae nunc primum in lucem restituntur. Anno Salutis MDXLIX." Neither place nor editor's name was given. The *nom de plume*, however, of "Eli philii" was ingeniously and correctly identified with Tilius or Du Tillet, bishop of Meaux. This is the present Libri Carolini containing the quotations both of Hincmar and of Steuchus. The editor says he prints from a codex "in tempe quodam majore et augustissimo ac totius Galliae antiquissimo repertum," and proceeds to adduce Steuchus as evidence of the existence of another exemplar in the Vatican. He then somewhat suspiciously adds that "the caligraphy is ancient, and no man can reasonably attribute the work to the present century." Du Tillet himself was several times suspected of heresy, and had to defend himself in 1566 and 1567 by writing against Calvin. The book was placed on the first index of Trent in 1564, and has remained thereon ever since. In 1570 Du Tillet died. Subsequent editions are all reprints of the original of 1549. The best, according to Floss and others, is that published at Hanover in 1731, with an introduction by Heumann. It is entitled "Augusti Concilii Nicaeni ii. censura,

h. e. Caroli Magni de impio imaginum cultu libri iv." The book was generally condemned as a forgery by Catholic divines, by Baronius, Bellarmine, &c. Subsequently opinion began to lean in favour of its genuineness, e.g. by Sirmondus, Dom Ceillier, Dupin, Pagi, &c. Writers since the time of Heumann have generally adopted this view, e.g. Walch, Schröckh, Bouterwek, Hefele, &c. Until the middle of last century no one seems to have searched for the Vatican MS. Frobenius, the editor of Alcuin, in 1759 wrote to and received answer from cardinal Passioneus, the librarian, that no MS. containing the Libri Carolini was to be found in the Vatican (Floss, p. 17). As regards Du Tillet's MS., Cassander, in a letter to Molinaeus in 1560 (quoted by Floss, p. 11), says that he saw it at Du Tillet's, and affirms it to be the work of Alcuin. Nothing further was known of it until in Pertz's *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, viii. 361, published in 1843, a codex bearing the same title as Du Tillet's work was noted as existing in the library of the Arsenal at Paris, and attributed to the 10th century. Floss, professor of Catholic theology at Bonn, examined it in 1859, and at first believed it to be genuine. Afterwards he says that he determined it to be an elaborate imitation of the style of the 10th century by a copyist of the 16th. The examination of Floss was cursory, and until some more thorough investigation is made it cannot be said that the question of the genuineness of these writings is decided. So Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, p. 297-9, and Leist (*Die Literarische Bewegung des Bilderstreits*, Magdeburg, 1871, pp. 22, 23, and notes), who is the latest writer upon the subject.

As regards the contents of the Libri Carolini, and the theological position which they take up, the author is careful to assert himself a good catholic [iii. 1] and an adherent of the Roman church. As the apostles are above other teachers, so is Peter above the apostles. The opinion of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* vii. 54 *sub fin.* 111, and ix. 9) is the basis taken, viz. "that images may be retained as ornaments or means of instruction, but are not to be worshipped," and to this the Western world had generally adhered. The following summary of the doctrines contained is given by Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 663, 4), who adds two elaborate tables of the comparative passages in the Libri Carolini and the decrees of the Nicene council, and of those in the Libri Carolini and the letter of Hadrian (*ib.* pp. 665-8, 672, 3). 1. The two oriental synods, the iconoclastic of 754 and that of Nicaea restoring image-worship, are both "infames" and "ineptissimae," and both transgress the limits of the truth. Against the former we must hold to the belief that images are no idols, against the latter that they are not to be adored. 2. Adoration and worship are due only to God, to the Creator, and not to the creature. 3. Saints are only to be venerated (*venerandi*), and we must pay them nothing more than the veneration which is their due (*opportuna veneratio*). 4. There are certain instances in which adoration is paid to men, in bending the knee before them, and so forth, but these are merely forms of courtesy and respect. Nevertheless even such adoration as this ought not to be paid to images, for they are without life and the work of men's hands. 5. Churches

do well to possess them as ornaments and as memorials of past events. But the possession is a matter of expediency, not of necessity; wherefore the Nicene council ought not to threaten with anathema those who do not pay honour to images. 6. Images must not on any account be placed upon an equality with the cross of Christ or with the Holy Scriptures, holy vessels, and the bodies and clothes of saints. These latter are all venerated in the West, according to ancient tradition, but images are not and have not been so venerated. The full title of Floss's book is *De suspectâ librorum Carolinorum a Joanne Tilio editorum fide commentatio, quam scripsit H. J. Floss*, Bonnæ, 1860. The treatise by Leist is contained in the Report of the Royal Cathedral School of Magdeburg for the year 1870-1. (*Bericht über das Königl. Dom-gymnasium zu Magdeburg*.) [T. R. B.]

CARON, early Welsh saint, patron of Tregaron in Cardiganshire; commemorated on March 5 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 306). [C. H.]

CAROSA, daughter of the emperor Valens. Marcian, the Novatian, a military man and man of letters and piety, was grammar master to her and her sister Anastasia. Some baths in Constantinople bore their name (Soer. iv. 9; Sozomen. vi. 9; Tillem. vi. 538). [E. B. B.]

CAROSSA, the traditional name of Manes's mother, cursed in the anathemas which converts from Manicheanism had to subscribe before they were admitted to the church, which are given us by Cotelier, 'e Regia librorum supellectile MS. 1818,' in a note to the Recognitions, *Patr. Ap. i.* 537. The name will be found p. 539, ἀναθεματίζω τὸν πατέρα Μάνερος, Παρέκκιον, οὐα ψεύστην καὶ τοῦ ψευδοῦς πατέρα, καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Κάροσσαν (see Beausobre, *Hist. Manich.* i. 67). [E. B. B.]

CAROSUS (1). [CATULINUS.]

(2) One of the Illyrian bishops, addressed by Leo the Great (*Ep.* 13, p. 677) in the consulpship of Aetius and Symmachus.

(3) Eutychiean abbat, whom Leo begs the Emperor Marcian to silence (*Ep.* 136, p. 1281), and who was accordingly turned out of his monastery (*Ep.* 142, p. 1297). [E. B. B.]

CARPHACASEMEOCHEIR (Καρφακασή-μεοχείρ), one of the heavenly powers in the system of the PERATAE. (Hippol. *Ref.* v. 14.) [G. S.]

CARPIANUS, the brother to whom Eusebius addressed his scheme of Canons for a harmony of the Gospels. (Eus. iv. 1275.) [E. B. B.]

CARPILIO, witness of the apostasy of MARCELLINUS A.D. 303 (Labbe, *Conc.* i. 939), and bishop at council of Rome A.D. 324. [E. B. B.]

CARPINIANUS or CARPULIANUS, Roman presbyter, witness against and judge of pope MARCELLINUS at Sinuessa A.D. 303 (*Conc.* i. 939, 941). [E. B. B.]

CARPION, a Valentinian, who was preaching in the time of Nilus (*Ep.* 234, p. 167, Migne). [H.]

CARPISTES. In the system of VALENTINUS one of five alternative appellations applied to the Aeon Horus (Irenaeus, i. 2). The

application of so many different names to the same personage seems to be best explained by the fact that in what is apparently an older form of the Valentinian system (known to us by a fragment preserved by Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxi. 6), there correspond to Horus five different Aeons, Carpistes being the name of one of them. It is intelligible that when the system was simplified by the reduction of the five Aeons to one, this one should be counted entitled to receive any one of the older appellations. Of the difficult name Carpistes, far the simplest explanation is that given by Grabe. *Καρπίς* is the rod with which the praetor emancipated a slave; *καρπισμός* is used by Clem. Al. (*Strom.* v. 8, p. 679) to denote the enfranchisement of a slave by touching him with the *καρπίς*; other references will be found in Liddell and Scott s.v. *Καρπιστής* then denotes an emancipator, and is completely parallel to *λυτρωτής*, one of the other titles of Horus. The other names in the fragment *χαριστήριος, ἄφετος, μεταγωγέος* seem to be of kindred signification. If the supposition be correct that these names are derived from an older system, commentators have entered on a false route who have sought an explanation of the name Carpistes by studying the language used in a somewhat later time concerning Horus. The most accepted explanation is that of Neander. The functions attributed to Horus are stated by Irenaeus (i. 3) to be twofold, that of supporting and that of restraining or limiting, as it is by him that each Aeon is sustained in its own place, and restrained from intruding into that which does not belong to it. To the latter function, the words of the Baptist were applied (Luke iii. 17), "Whose fan is in his hand," &c. Hence Neander concludes (*Genet. Entwick.* p. 111) that we are to take *καρπιστής* as equivalent to *θεριστής* the reaper, in reference to the comparison of the last judgment to a harvest, in which the evil will be completely separated from the good. This explanation, with some small modifications of detail, has been most generally adopted, as for instance by Baur (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 128), by Harvey (in *Iren. l.c.*), by Mansel (*Gnostic Heresies*, p. 180), by Heinrich (*Valent Gnosis*, p. 179). Notwithstanding it seems to us far-fetched and much inferior to the simple explanation given by Grabe. Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 31), though he gives some of the other titles of Horus, does not give the name Carpistes. [G. S.]

CARPOCRATES (*Καρποκράτης*, Irenaeus; *Καρποκράς*, Epiphanius and Philaster; most probably deriving this form from their common source, the shorter treatise against heresies by Hippolytus), a Platonic philosopher who taught at Alexandria in the early part of the 2nd century, and who, incorporating Christian elements into his system, became the founder of a heretical sect mentioned in one of the earliest catalogues of heresies that has come down to us, the list of Hegesippus, preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 22). These heretics are the first of whom Irenaeus makes express mention that they called themselves Gnostics; Hippolytus first speaks of the name as assumed by the Naassenes or Ophites (*Ref.* v. 1). Of all the systems called Gnostic, that of Carpoocrates is the one in which the Hellenic element is the most strongly marked, and which contains the least of what we are forced to as-

cribe to Jewish or Oriental sources. He is described as teaching with prominence the doctrine of a single first principle: the name *μοναδικὴ γνώσις*, given by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 2) to the doctrine of the school which he founded, is made by Neander to furnish the key to the whole Carpoocratic system; but possibly is only intended to contrast with the doctrine of the Valentinian teachers, who thought it necessary to provide the first Being with a consort, in order that emanations from him might be conceivable. Carpoocrates taught that from the one unknown unspeakable God different angels and powers had emanated, and that of these the lowest in the series, far below the unbegotten Father, had been the makers of the world. The privilege of the higher souls was to escape the rule of those who had made the world—nay, to be able by magical arts to exercise dominion over them, and ultimately, on leaving the world, to pass completely free from them to God who is above them. Jesus he held to be a mere man naturally born of human parents, having no prerogatives beyond the reach of others also to attain. His superiority to ordinary men consisted in this, that his soul, being steadfast and pure, remembered those things which it had seen in the revolution (*τῇ περιφορᾷ*) in which it had been carried round with the unbegotten God, and therefore power [or a "power"] had been sent to him from God enabling him to escape the makers of the world. Though brought up in Jewish customs, he had despised them, and therefore had received powers enabling him to destroy the passions which are given to men as a punishment. But in this there was nothing special: others might be the equals or the superiors not only of Peter or Paul, but of our Lord himself. Their souls, too, might remember the truths they had witnessed: if they despised the rulers of the world as much as Jesus did, they would be given the same privileges as he, and higher if they despised them more. Thus the Carpoocrats gave honour, but not exclusive honour, to Christ. They had pictures of him, derived, it was said, from a likeness taken by Pilate's order; they had images of him, which they crowned and treated with other accustomed marks of respect; but in this they only put him on a level with Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and other philosophers to whom they paid like honours.

In the opening statement concerning the making of the world, the doctrine ascribed to Carpoocrates is almost identical with that ascribed to Saturninus; but in the following paragraph the language is distinctly taken from the myth in Plato's *Phaedrus*, in which human knowledge is made to be but a recollection of what the soul had seen when carried round with the gods in their revolution, and permitted to see the eternal forms of things.

The doctrine of the duty of despising the rulers of the world received among the Carpoocrats an interpretation which enabled them to practise immorality without scruple. Things in themselves were indifferent; nothing was in its own nature good or evil, and was only made so by human opinion. The true Gnostic might practise everything—nay, it was his duty to have experience of all. A doctrine concern-

ing the transmigration of souls which was taught by other Gnostic sects (see CAULACAU and CAINITES), and which harmonised well with Platonic teaching, was adopted by the Carpoocratesians in the form that a soul which had had its complete experience passed at once out of the dominion of the rulers of the world, and was received up to society with the God above them; those which had not were sent back to finish in other bodies that which was lacking to them; but all ultimately would be saved. But as was also taught by the Basilidians of Irenaeus and by the Ophites, salvation belonged to the soul alone; there would be no resurrection of the body. In conformity with this theory was interpreted the text from the Sermon on the Mount, "Agree with thine adversary quickly." The "adversary" (to whom, we read in Epiphanius that they gave the name of Abolus, a corruption, doubtless, from the Diabolus of Irenaeus) was one of the world-making angels, whose office it was to conduct the soul to the principal of these angels, "the judge." If he found that there were acts which it had not performed, he delivered it to another angel, "the officer," to shut it up "in prison"—that is to say, in a body, until it had paid the last farthing.

The doctrine that we ought to imitate the freedom with which our Lord despised the rulers of the world raises the question, Did Carpoocrates intend to impute immorality to Him? On this point Carpoocrates was misunderstood either by Hippolytus or by his own disciples. According to the version of Hippolytus, Carpoocrates taught that Jesus surpassed other men in justice and integrity (*σωφροσύνη καὶ ἀρετῇ καὶ ἅπῃ δικαιοσύνην*, Epiphanius), and no doubt our Lord's example might have been cited only in reference to freedom from Jewish ceremonial obligations; yet the version of Irenaeus seems more trustworthy, which does not suggest that the superiority of Jesus consisted in anything but the clearer apprehension of eternal truths which his intellect retained. Carpoocrates claimed to be in possession of the true teaching of Christ spoken secretly by Him to his apostles, and communicated by them in tradition to the worthy and faithful; and the apostolic doctrine that men are to be saved by faith and love was used by him to justify an antinomian view of the complete indifference of works. In another article will be given the arguments by which EPIPHANES, the son of Carpoocrates by a Cephallenian woman, maintained a licentious theory of communism in all things, women included. The Carpoocratesians and the Cainites have often been coupled together as the two most immoral of the Gnostic sects, and in practical effects their doctrines may not have been very different; but the Carpoocratian theory of the indifference of human actions fell short of the inversion of good and evil which is ascribed to the Cainites. Whereas the latter represented the God of the Jews and maker of the world as an evil being who ought to be resisted, the former only spoke of the makers of the world as inferior beings whose restrictions it is true enlightenment to despise; and the arguments of Epiphanius, derived from the equality that reigns in nature, assume that the creation is so far conformed to the will of God that from the laws

which pervade it we may infer what is pleasing to the supreme power. Whether immorality were directly taught by Carpoocrates himself or not, his followers became proverbial for deliberate licentiousness of life. The Christians thought it likely that the stories current among the heathen of scenes of shameless debauchery in the Christian love-feasts had a real foundation in what took place among the Carpoocratesians. Philaster, who, apparently through oversight, enumerates the Carpoocratesians twice, the second time (57) giving them the alternative names of FLORIANI and MILITES, directly asserts this. His predecessors had suggested it as probable (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 2) and compare Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 26). And so Irenaeus counts that Carpoocratian doctrines and practices had been employed by Satan as the means of discrediting the Christian name among the heathen. (See also Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 7.)

In a more trifling matter a heathen belief about the Christians generally seems to have been true of the Carpoocratesians, viz. that they knew each other by secret bodily marks ("notaculo corporis," Minucius Felix, *cc.* 9, 31); for the Carpoocratesians are said to have marked their disciples by cauterising them in the back of the lobe of the right ear. It appears from Hieracleon (Clem. Alex. p. 995, *Eclog. ex Script. Proph.* xxv.) that this was a baptismal ceremony, intended to represent the "baptism with fire," predicted of our Lord by the Baptist. This confirms the evidence as to the use of at least St. Matthew's Gospel by the Carpoocratesians furnished by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. p. 188), and by the use made of the Sermon on the Mount already referred to. Celsus probably refers to this rite (Origen, v. 64) when he says that Christians gave to certain others of them the opprobrious name, ἀκοὴν καυστήρια. Origen however does not understand it so, and supposes that 1 Tim. iv. 2 is referred to. In the same place (c. 62) Celsus speaks of Marcellinus derived from Marcellina, and Harpoocratesians from Salome. It is possible that Carpoocratesians are intended by the former, since Irenaeus tells that Marcellina, a teacher of that sect, came to Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus; but it is difficult to say that in the latter name we are either to read or to understand Carpoocratesians, in the absence of any evidence or likelihood that these sectaries claimed any connexion with Salome.

Mention has already been made of the cultivation of magic by the Carpoocratesians, and their pretension to equal the miraculous powers of our Lord. Hippolytus, in the fourth book of the *Refutation*, has given us several specimens of the kind of wonders exhibited by the magicians of his time, which are not very unlike the feats performed by professional conjurors of the present day. It was easy for Irenaeus to shew (li. 32) how very unlike these transient wonders were to the permanent miracles of healing effected by our Lord, and which, as he claimed, continued to be exhibited in the church.

In the preceding account we have not ventured to lay too much stress on the speculations of Neander already referred to. According to him, the Carpoocratian system sees in the world's history one struggle between the principles of unity and of multiplicity. From one eternal Monad all existence has flowed, and to this it

strives to return. But the finite spirits who rule over several portions of the world counteract this universal striving after unity. From them the different popular religions, and in particular the Jewish, have proceeded. Perfection is attained by those souls who, led on by reminiscences of their former condition, soar above all limitation and diversity to the contemplation of the higher unity. They despise the restrictions imposed by the mundane spirits; they regard externals as of no importance, and faith and love as the only essentials; meaning by faith, mystical brooding of the mind absorbed in the original unity. In this way they escape the dominion of the finite mundane spirits; their souls are freed from imprisonment in matter, and they obtain a state of perfect repose (corresponding to the Buddhist Nirwana) when they have completely ascended above the world of appearance.

With respect to the Carpocratians, the primary authorities are Irenaeus (i. 25, ii. 31-34), Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iii. 2); Tertullian (*De Anima* 23, 35), who appears to have drawn his information from Irenaeus; Philaster (35) and Pseudo-Tertullian (9), who represent the earlier treatise of Hippolytus; Epiphanius (27), who weaves together the accounts of Hippolytus and of Irenaeus; and Hippolytus, who in his later treatise (vii. 20) merely copies Irenaeus, with some omissions, thereby suggesting that he was not acquainted with the work of Irenaeus when he wrote the earlier treatise. He certainly had at that time other sources of information, for he mentions three or four points not to be found in Irenaeus; e. g. he emphasises the Carpocratian doctrine of the unity of the first principle, tells of emanations from that principle of angels and powers, gives a different version of the excellence of Jesus, and says that Carpocrates denied the resurrection of the body. It is not safe to make any assertion as to the sources which Irenaeus employed, though there are two or three coincidences with Justin which make it not incredible that the latter's work on heresies may have furnished some materials. In any case, it is likely that Irenaeus added much of his own, for the pains he has taken with the confutation make it probable that in his time the sect had still some activity at Rome.

It is not safe to attempt to assign with any precision a date to Carpocrates; but there are affinities between his system and those of Saturninus and Basilides, which suggest that we are to place his appearance in the character of the founder of a sect in any sense deserving to be called Christian a little later than Basilides, from whom he may have derived his knowledge of Christianity. Eusebius is probably right in placing him under the reign of Hadrian, who died A.D. 138. It suffices barely to mention the invention of the writer known as Praedestinatus (i. 7) that the Carpocratians were condemned in Cyprus by the apostle Barnabas.

Matter, in his history of Gnosticism, gives an account of certain supposed Carpocratian inscriptions, but they have since been found to be spurious (Gieseler's *Ecc. Hist.* chap. II. § 45, note 16). [G. S.]

CARPONES, presbyter of Alexandria. At first a rival preacher to Arius (Epiph. 69. 2),

afterwards excommunicated along with him A.D. 319 (Alex. ap. Socr. i. 6), and his companion in exile at Nicomedia, where he signed his letter to Alexander (Epiph. 69. 8). At a later date he was deputed by Gregory of Cappadocia to pope Julius, who would not listen to his arguments (Jul. ap. Ath. *Apol.* i. 743). [E. B. E.]

CARPOPHORUS (1). [CALLISTUS I.]

(2) Said to have succeeded Cyprian at Carthage (Ceillier, v. 141; Optat. Hilar. i. 19).

(3) Is the name of a martyr of unknown date celebrated in Umbria and at Capua and at Milan. (Tillem. v. 128, 132, 137.) [E. B. E.]

CARPULIANUS. [CARPINIANUS.]

CARPUS (1), a bishop of the time of the apostles (see *Bible Dictionary*), of whom Nilus (lib. ii. *Ep.* 190) tells Olympius the following story: "In his time two young students forsook the Greek schools, and begged and received Christian baptism, and as soon as their schoolfellows heard it—"there the manuscript leaves us, till we find Carpus calling the young converts "most impious and most unholy. And as he spoke thus, lo a great vision of fear and consternation, Christ came down from heaven, and the flaming dragons flee, and He takes the young man with kindness and much meekness, and brings him up out of the gulf. For truly they afterwards changed, and have shewn themselves great Christians. And He blames Carpus for his melancholy and severity, nay, more, that he cursed them sternly without compassion. Knowing this, therefore, O bishop," continues Nilus, "do not curse." A fuller version of the story is given in the 6th chapter of the 8th epistle, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite. It there appears that there was only one young convert, who apostatised while the glad days of his welcome into the church were yet being celebrated (*ἐν τῶν λαπλῶν ἡμερῶν αὐτῷ τελευτήσαντι*), and that the other of the two young men was his seducer. The bishop does not curse them face to face, but is troubled in his sleep and midnight orisons, and prays for a thunderbolt to strike them dead. Then follows the vision in which heaven and hell are opened, and Carpus is rather pleased in looking down, and his sympathies are with the gnawing dragons. But at last he looks up and sees Jesus descending from His throne on the ridge of heaven and the angels with Him, and rescuing the men and saying, "Strike me now that thy hand is stretched out, for I am ready to suffer yet, for men that are being saved. But see if it be well for thee to choose rather to dwell in the gulf with the serpents than with God and good angels that love mankind." Carpus is here described as bishop of Crete and host of Dionysius. It is probable that the Carpus, at whose house Paul left his cloak (2 Tim. iv. 13) is intended, and that for Crete we should read Baretia or Berytus, a city in Thrace, the diocese assigned to him by the Pseudo-Dorotheus. K and B are often confounded, and no Berytus is known in Crete. It is also here recorded of him that he would never celebrate the Eucharist unless encouraged by a favourable vision. (Tillem. xiv. 195; *Patr. Gr.* t. lxxix. p. 218 (299); t. iii. p. 604 (1099).) [E. B. E.]

CARPUS (2) Martyr at Pergamus (Eus. iv. 16). The Byzantine Calendar distinguishes him from the Carpus of Troas, mentioned 2 Tim. iv. 13 (v. *Dict. of the Bible*), who is there commemorated on May 26, as one of the seventy, and commemorates him Oct. 13, with the following legend. "The holy martyrs Carpus and Papyrus were in the time of king Decius. And St. Carpus was bishop of Thyatira and Papyrus deacon. They then, being taken by the ruler of Asia and questioned, confessed the name of the Lord Christ before all. And being constrained to sacrifice and not persuaded, they were bound on horses and walked before the ruler, being dragged to Sardis, and there they were hung on wooden frames and cut with razors. And Agathodorus, who was slave to the saints, and followed them, was tortured and perfected. And as Carpus was hung up, he smiled; and when the ruler said, 'Why did you laugh, Carpus?' he answered: 'I saw the glory of God, and was glad.' And being taken down from the stocks they were cast into the fire. And Agathonica, sister of Papyrus, being present, entered the furnace rejoicing of her own accord. And both yielded their souls to the Lord." (*Menol. Basil.*)

The above seems to be extracted from the book that Eusebius saw and copied. For his error as to the date, see under **PIONIUS** and **PAPIAS**. He makes the martyrdom take place at Pergamus. Thither, according to a sermon attributed by Allatius to Metaphrastes (Simeon Metaphrastes, ed. Migne, ii. 106), the martyrs were transferred on foot in chains after the death of Agathodorus. This is confirmed by the *Mart. Hieron.* (D'Achery, *Spic. t. iv.*), which has on March 12 simply: "In Asia, Carpi [Petronii] episcopi, Firmi, Pauli, Agatoni," on April 12, "In Asia, Pergamo natalis SS. Carpi Episcopi Pauli [Isaach^b] Agathonis," and on April 13, "Pergamo Asiae, Polycarpi (= Pauli, Carpi = Papyli Carpi) episcopi Pauli diaconi." A month's imprisonment may have intervened. April 13 is the day of commemoration in Metaphrastes and in Ado, who follows Rufinus in writing Papius for Papyrus. Again, if Metaphrastes be right in saying that Valerian had been sent by Decius into Asia, this must have been in A.D. 251 (Tillemont, iii. 711), and the persecution must have been at an end before October. The commemoration in the Greek church is probably the anniversary of the dedication of a church to these saints, said to have been built by Helena near her own palace at Constantinople, and in the form of the Holy Sepulchre (*Ib.* p. 348). A trace of the earlier date appears in the commemoration of the Pergamene Antipas, Apr. 11. Metaphrastes also multiplies the tortures, and omits the smile of Carpus. He makes him an old man, whose white hairs are pitied by Valerian. Papyrus appears as working a miracle of healing, and claiming on the strength of it to be a healer, whence both saints are said, in another form of the legend (Arcudius, *Anthologia*, Oct. 13), to have been physicians by profession.

[E. B. B.]

^a A martyr of Nicomedia, March 13. Firmus is probably also a corruption.

^b Isaac, the Syrian, of Spoleto, April 11.

^c Another Paul and Carpus are made out of Polycarp on Aug. 9.

CARSADAN, the name given to one of the three kings. [*CONFLICT OF ADAM, sub fin.*] [G. S.]

CARTERIA, Martyrs of, in Africa, commemorated Feb. 2 in the Carthaginian calendar. They may therefore be either Victor, Marinus, Honoratus, Hilary, Urban, and Perpetua; or else Fortunatus, Felician, Firmus, Candidus, Castula, and Secundula, both which sets are marked that day in the *Mart. Hieron.* of D'Achery.

[E. B. B.]

CARTERIA, a wealthy lady at Antioch, a friend and correspondent of Chrysostom, to whom her ill health and repeated sicknesses caused great distress. She was also an intimate friend of Chrysostom's noble correspondents Marcianus and Marcellinus. Carteria sent presents of money and medicines to Chrysostom at Cucusus. The money was returned as not being needed, but the medicines were kept and gratefully acknowledged. She was very anxious to have visited Chrysostom in his place of exile, but was prevented by her frequent illnesses, and endeavoured to make up for her inability by inducing Libanius, who was probably a man of rank at Antioch, to travel thither, for which attention Chrysostom expresses much gratitude. At one time a journey to some distant place, at another her own sickness, produced an interruption in the correspondence which caused Chrysostom much regret (Chrysost. *Epist.* 18, 34, 44, 227, 232).

[E. V.]

CARTERIUS (1). [PAMPHILUS.]

(2) Martyr at Sebaste in Lesser Armenia under Licinius and duke Marcellus. If the title be rightly attached to the legend, he was of the company of Atticus, Eudoxius, and Agapius, who had taken counsel with the whole army to abide in the faith of Christ. They were tortured and imprisoned, then brought out and beaten, and Carterius was told, 'You alone have made all the people revolt from submission to the king.' He answered, 'I did not counsel them to make insurrection against the king, but to draw near to the immortal king.' Styriacus, Tobias, and Nicopolitanus came next, and were condemned to be edgelled and finally burnt, with many others, Nov. 2. (*Men. Bas.*) The Men. Sirleti (according to Gorres) makes the whole number 10, which is not many, if the conspiracy had spread throughout the army. There seems to be no reason for doubting this account (see **SEBASTE, MARTYRS OF**), though it is unknown to the old Latin martyrologies.

(3) Signed the epistle of the Council of Alexandria to Antioch in A.D. 362 (Tillem. viii. 212). He only says, "I, Carterius, pray your welfare." Tillemont supposes him to be the bishop whose exile was mourned by the church of Antaratius, as Athanasius tells in his apology for his flight (*Ath.* i. 703).

[E. B. B.]

(4) Father of PHILOSTORGIIUS.

(5) The joint provost with Diodorus, afterwards bishop of Tarsus, of a monastery in or near Antioch, under whom Chrysostom and his companions studied the holy Scriptures and prac-

^a Ed. Urbini, 1727. The edition used by Dr. Gorres speaks of "a great multitude of believers." Instead of simply "many others." (*Licinianische Christenverfolgung*, Jena, 1875.)

tised asceticism (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 3). He may also be the same that is commemorated by Gregory Nazianzen, in his poem *To Hellenius, on the Monks*, as given by God to another, yet so that he might claim him by right of friendship as his own (p. 1005). Again, there is a Carterius on whom, when he was gathered to his spiritual father Bassus, Gregory writes epitaphs, and longs to be with him, and speaks of him as the guide of his own youth (Greg. Naz. *Ept.* cxi. cxv. cxvi. cxviii). He was buried in the land of the *ῥωλοῖ* (cxviii.). Does this stand for *ῥωλοῖ*? and if so, does it mean Palestine or Egypt? The Carterius whom he names in his poem *Ad Hellenius* he commends along with Cledonius, Nicomedes, Asterius and his two brothers, Philadelphus, Rheginus, Leontius, and Heliodorus, to the protection of Hellenius. Of these, Nicomedes is lamented along with Carterius (*Ept.* cxvii. cxii.-cxiv.); Cledonius is a presbyter of Iconium (p. 93), who asks a short rule of faith of Gregory, and (p. 204) subscribes his will; Asterius is possibly the same as the assessor of the prefect of Cappadocia (pp. 124-127, 131). The two mentions of Carterius in Gregory seem then to refer to the same person, who was apparently in Cappadocia. Gregory's poem to Hellenius is referred to A.D. 372 by Ceillier (v. 275). Chrysostom was with Carterius up to A.D. 380 (Alzog, *Patrologie*, p. 304). Tillemont (ix. 370) says that there was an abbey of St. Carterius near Emesa in Phoenicia in the middle of the 6th century. [E. B. B.]

CARTERIUS (6) Governor of Caesarea in Cappadocia, A.D. 404. Chrysostom having halted at Caesarea on his way to his place of exile at Cucusus, was there attacked by a mob of fanatic monks, the tools of the bishop Pharetrius, his concealed enemy, from whose violence Carterius used his utmost efforts to shield him. His endeavours proving ineffectual, he made a vain appeal to Pharetrius to call off the monks and allow Chrysostom to enjoy the rest his enfeebled health required a few days longer. On his arrival at Cucusus Chrysostom sent him a warm letter of thanks for his services, and begged that he might hear from him (Chrysost. *Epist.* 14, 236). [E. V.]

(7) Presbyter of Constantinople, brought Anatolius's letter to Leo the Great, and carried back the answer (Leo, *Ep.* 80, p. 1039), April, A.D. 451. [E. B. B.]

CARTHACH, CARTHAGIUS. There were two saints so named, who, having been in the relation of master and pupil, are usually distinguished as Carthach Senior and Carthach Junior, the latter being also Mochuda.

(1) Commemorated Mar. 5. St. Carthach the elder is entered in the *Mart. Tallaght* as "Carthach mac Aengusa Droma Ferdaim," and in *Mart. Doneg.* as bishop, alumnus of Ciaran of Saighir. Colgan (*Acta SS.* pp. 473-6) gives a memoir from the comparatively little that is known. He was of royal descent in Munster, being son or more probably grandson of Aengus, king of Cashel, who was converted by St. Patrick. He is reported to have been a pupil of St. Ciaran of Saighir (March 5), but as the latter belongs really to the 6th century [see CIARAN (4) of Saighir] it is impossible that he could have been a monk under him, if even born, before Aengus's death in A.D. 489. On account of irregular

desire he was sent by St. Ciaran upon a penitential pilgrimage, when he spent seven years abroad, visiting Gaul and Rome. On his return he was heartily welcomed by St. Ciaran, and proceeded to teach, and founded churches and monasteries, St. Ciaran choosing him, it is said, to be his successor. The scene of his labours was Kerry, where he was bishop; he had a church called Druim-Fertain, in Carberry, another on Inis-Uachtair, in Loch Sileann, now Sheelin, and a third, Gill-Carthach, in Tir-Boghaine (Banagh Barony) in Tirconnel, co. Donegal. In Kerry, on the banks of the Mang, he trained his pupil and namesake St. Carthage the younger, or Mochuda, and his humility was such that he always put his pupil forward in preference to himself, so that to this day he is usually designated "institutor St. Mochudae," to whom also he dedicated himself and his church. The year of neither birth nor death is known, but he flourished about A.D. 540, and probably did not die before A.D. 580. His two chief designations are "alumnus S. Kierani Sagirensis," and "institutor S. Carthacii junioris seu Mochudae" (see Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 98 sq.; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 83). The Bollandists (*Acta SS. Mart.* tom. i. pp. 389-399) have a combined account of St. Kieran and St. Carthach.

CARTHACH (2) Commemorated May 14. St. Carthach the younger, or Mochuda, is one of the most noted saints in the beginning of the 7th century. Two lives are given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* at May 14, tom. iii.), the second life being the most historical. There is also a *Life of St. Carthage* in the so-called *Book of Kilkenny*, in Primate Marsh's Library, Dublin. He was a native of Kerry, and if a brother of St. Cuanna (February 4), his mother was Meda, or Finmeda, daughter of Fingen, son of Fintan, so that St. Carthach is often called son of Fingen, while really maternal grandson. The name of his father is unknown, as St. Cuanna seems only to have been uterine brother, and Midarn or Miodarn was the father of another Cuanna [see CUANNA (1) and (2)]. His first chief foundation, where he formed his community of twelve disciples, whose names are all recorded (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 303; Bolland. *Acta SS. Maii*, tom. iii. 382 b) was the monastery of Rathain, not Rathyne in the barony of Fertullagh, West Meath, as supposed by some, but the present Rahen, a townland in the barony of Ballycowan, in King's County. There for forty years he ruled his community of monks, and scholars flocked to him from all parts of Ireland and Britain, so that he is said to have had 867 under him, all providing for themselves and the poor by the labour of their hands. He had been ordained priest by the elder St. Carthage perhaps about A.D. 580, and at Rahen, which was probably founded A.D. 591, he was consecrated bishop. For his monks he drew up a Rule, which, written in Irish character, Ussher seems to have seen in an ancient MS. along with the Rules of SS. Columbkille, Comgall of Bangor, and Ailbe of Emly. But notwithstanding his sanctity and zeal, he was driven from Rahen by Blathmac, son of Aedh Slane, king of the country. His expulsion from Rahen "in diebus paschae" is usually set down at A.D. 630; the *Four Masters* give

631, and the other Irish annals place it later. After wandering about for some time and working miracles, he was at last presented with land for a monastery, by Melris or Moelochtride, prince of the Deisi and son-in-law of Failbhe Flann; this was the origin of the present church and town of Lismore. But the late Dr. O'Donovan thinks it evident, from entries in the Irish annals, that an ecclesiastical establishment must have existed at Lismore before St. Carthage's expulsion from Rahen, and that he could only have remodelled the monastery and exercised his episcopate within or from it. St. Carthage had only been a short time at Lismore, when he died on May 14, A.D. 637, and was buried in the monastery. (Bollandists, *Acta SS.* Maii, tom. iii. 375-388; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 249 sq.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 350 sq.; Uscher, *de Brit. Ecol. Prim.* Publ. 1639, pp. 910, 943, A.D. 637; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 252, 254; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, Edinb. 1861, iii. 90-1; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 244; Reeves, *Admann*, p. lxxv.; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 197, 238-39; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 167, iv. 46, 133; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 8, 27, and *Ir. Ant.* 142.) [J. G.]

CASDOE, martyr in Persia, daughter of king Sapor, celebrated by the Greeks Sept. 29 according to Tillemont (vii. 663), but the story is not in the Menology of Basil, and Sozomen knows nothing of it. [E. B. B.]

CASIANA, the deaconess to whom Theodoret writes his *Ep.* 17. [E. B. B.]

CASINA, taken before Julian, probably the uncle of the emperor of that name, at Ancyra, with her husband Melasippus. Their son Antony, aged 13, was cast into prison; they were hung up and torn and scorched. Then her breasts were cut off, and her husband's legs below the knees. Their boy was brought in, and when he saw them hanging and their bleeding members on the ground, he kissed the same, and anointed himself with the blood. So they, as they hung, departed to the Lord (*Menol. Basil.*, Nov. 7). Then the boy spat in the apostate's face, and was himself martyred. [E. B. B.]

CASSAN (CASSIN, CASSIDANUS, CASSIDUS). Colgan says Cassan was a common name among the saints of Ireland; he mentions four, who are also given in *Mart. Doneg.* and *Tallaght*, but whom he cannot distinguish with any historical accuracy. These are Cassan the son of Neman, March 1; Cassan of Imdhual, of whom he gives a memoir at March 28; Cassan of Domnach Peduir (or Domnach mor Peduir, *Mart. Tall.*), June 4; and Cassan of Cluain-ratha, June 20. Of the last we have merely the name and feast. At Dec. 3, there is a Cassan, where Dr. Reeves (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 325) cites an authority for identifying him with the martyr Cassian in Mauritania, commemorated in the *Roman Martyrology*.

(1) There is entered in the *Annals of Four Masters*, "A.D. 695, Caisin, scribe of Lusk, died." He was son of Athracht, of the race of Laeghaire, son of Niall, and the monastery where he was scribe or chronicler was Lusk or Lush, now a parish in the barony of E. Balrothery, co.

Dublin. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 781, c. 5; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 89.)

CASSAN (2) Son of Neman—Mar. 1. *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 61) calls him Caisin of the Dal Buain, who is of the race of Eochaidh, son of Muiredh, of the posterity of Heremon. He flourished about A.D. 530, and was a contemporary of St. Finnian of Clonard. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 394, c. 15, 741, c. 3, 780, c. 5.)

(3) Of Imdhual and Domnach-mor in Magh-Echnach—March 28. Of this saint Colgan gives a memoir, though he is not quite sure of his identity, as there are so many Cassans. About the middle of the 5th century, when St. Patrick began to preach in Ireland, St. Cassan lived in Meath. He is said to have gone on pilgrimage to Rome and on his return became "Abbas, episcopus, et scholae publicae rector." St. Patrick afterwards gave him the church of Domnach-mor in Magh-Echnach and also a holy patena; at this ancient church of Donaghmore, in the barony of Lower Navan, his relics were preserved and held in the highest veneration for ages after his death. Colgan says he flourished about A.D. 456, but Ceranus or Ciaran of Suighir, a fellow traveller to Rome, is usually placed in the following century. [CIARAN (4).] (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 779 sq. and *Tr. Thaum.* 86, c. 93, 130, c. 9, 136, c. 52, 266, col. 2; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 336-39, 411; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 89.)

(4) Of Domnach-Peduir (Colgan), or Domnach-mor-Peduir (*Mart. Tall.*)—June 4. This Cassan of Peter's church is probably son of Maenach, and brother of St. Fachtna (Aug. 14) of Ross, of the seed of Lugaidh, surnamed Maecon, king of Ireland [FACHTNA]. He may also be Cassidus or Cassidanus, "institutor" of St. Senan at Iniscatheay. He was born in the region of Kierrraigha Chuirke (probably a part of Kerry), and dwelt in the monastery of Irras, where he gave the monastic robe and tonsure to St. Senan; to St. Cassidus's monastery, the scene of his early training, and the resting-place of his master, St. Senan came, when his own death was at hand, and died on his way home. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 170, c. 5, 516 (given as 606), c. 9, 537, c. 42, 780-81; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 447, ii. 90, 92.) [J. G.]

CASSIANUS (1) The second Gentile bishop of Jerusalem (Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 12).

(2) **JULIUS**, a heretical teacher who lived towards the end of the second century, chiefly known to us by references to his writings made on two occasions by Clemens Alexandrinus. In the first passage (*Strom.* i. 21, copied by Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* x. 12) Clement engages in a chronological inquiry in order to shew the greatly superior antiquity of Moses to the founders of Grecian philosophy, and he acknowledges himself indebted to the previous investigations of the same question made by Tatian in his work addressed to the Greeks, and by Cassian (whose name is here spelt with a single s in the MS. of Clement, but not in those of Eusebius) in the first book of his *Eregetica*. Vallarsi (ii. 865) alters without comment the Cassianus of previous editors into Cassianus, in Jerome's Catalogue 33, a place where Jerome is not using Clement directly, but is copying the notice in Eusebius

(H.E. vi. 13). Jerome adds that he had not himself met the chronological work in question. In the second passage (*Strom.* iii. 13, et seq.) Cassian is also named in connexion with Tatian. Clement is, in this section, refuting the doctrines of those Gnostics, who, in their view of the essential evil of matter, condemned matrimony and the procreation of children; and having considered some arguments urged by Tatian, he proceeds to say that similar had been used by Julius Cassianus whom he describes as the originator of Docetism (ὁ τῆς δοκῆσεως ἑξάρχων), a statement which must be received with some modification [DOCETAE]. He quotes some passages from a treatise by Cassian on Contenance (περὶ ἐγκρατείας, ἢ περὶ ἐννουχίας), in which he wholly condemned sexual intercourse, and referred its origin to instigations of our first parents by the serpent, alleging in proof 2 Cor. xi. 3. Cassian quoted Isaiah lvi. 3, Matt. xix. 12, and probably several other passages which are discussed by Clement without express mention that they had been used by Cassian. Cassian also uses certain alleged sayings of our Lord, cited likewise in the so-called second epistle of the Roman Clement to the Corinthians, cap. xii., as well as in the *Excerpta Theodoti*, lxvii. p. 985. Lightfoot notices (*Clement, l.c.*) that Cassian, by the omission of a clause, makes the Encratite aspect of the passage much stronger than it appears in the citation of the Pseudo-Clement. Clemens Alexandrinus makes no complaint of unfairness in the quotation; but while he remarks that the sayings in question are not found in the four Gospels which had been handed down, but only in the Gospel according to the Egyptians, he gives a different explanation of them, it must be owned far less natural than that of Cassian.

Another specimen of Cassian's arguments in this treatise is preserved in Jerome's Commentary on Gal. vi. 8. Jerome there answers an Encratite argument founded on this text, viz. that he who is united to a woman soweth to the flesh, and therefore shall of the flesh reap corruption. This argument is introduced with words which, according to the common reading, run, "Tatianus qui putativam Christi carnem introducens, omnem conjunctionem masculi ad foeminam immundam arbitratur, tali adversum nos sub occasione praesentis testimonii usus est argumento." There is little doubt that we are to read instead of Tatianus, Cassianus. The Benedictine editor who retains the old reading notes that Cassianus is the reading of two of the oldest manuscripts, while Vallarsi admits Cassianus into his text stating it to be the reading of every manuscript he had seen.

The Docetism of Cassian was closely connected with his Encratism, for it was an obvious answer of the orthodox to his doctrine on Contenance, that if the birth of children were essentially evil, then our Lord's own birth was evil, and His mother an object of blame. This was met by a denial of the reality of our Lord's body. Cassian also taught that man had not been originally created with a body like ours, but that these fleshly bodies were the "coats of skin" in which the Lord clothed our first parents after the Fall. This notion, probably derived from Valentinus (Irenaeus, I. v. p. 27), was one which had considerable currency. References to those who entertained or who controverted it will be found

in Huet's *Origeniana*, ii. Qu. 12, viii., and Beausobre, *Manichéisme*, ii. 135).

Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 8) enumerates among the followers of Valentinus one Cassian, by whom, no doubt, Julius Cassianus is intended; for many greater inaccuracies in the names are to be found in the present text of Theodoret, and Theodoret would have found authority in Clement for classing Cassian with Valentinus.

The coincidences between Tatian and Cassianus seem too close to be accidental, but we have not data to determine their relative priority. If Cassian were really the founder of the sect called Docetae, he must have been some time antecedent to Serapion (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 12). His country may be conjectured to have been Egypt [DOCETAE; ENCRATITES]. [G. S.]

CASSIANUS (3), an exceptor or clerk who threw down the tablets and refused to record the sentence of Aurelianus Agricolaus against Marcellus at Tangier (A.D. 298?). Marcellus broke into a smile of gladness, Agricolaus into a passion of rage. Cassianus was imprisoned, and on his examination, repeated Marcellus's answers almost verbatim, and was martyred Dec. 3* (*Mart. Hieron., &c.*). His acts are given by Ruinart as a contemporary record, p. 315. He is mentioned by Prudentius (περὶ στεφάνων, iv. 44). (Tillem. v. 6; Ruin. 311.)

(4) Deacon of Rome (Tillem. v. 30, 103; De Rossi, *Rom. Sott.* i. 203, 204), sent by Pope Melchisedes to receive back the confiscated catacombs at the close of the persecution, and identified by the Donatists (not at their conference with Augustine, but afterwards) with a Cassianus who had been a traditor; an identification which Augustine (*Post Coll. ad Don.* 13, t. ix. p. 662) indignantly repudiates. But it must be admitted that the identity of a second name, besides that of Strato, in the list of deacons employed at the recovery of peace, and the list of betrayers of books in the persecution, considering that it would be upon the deacons that the demand for the books would first press, and that the number of deacons was limited to seven, considerably strengthens the case of the Donatists. The deacons were sent by Melchisedes with letters from the emperor Maxentius and the prefect of the guard, to receive back from the prefect of the city the places that had been taken from the Christians in the time of persecution. It is observable that Augustine does not here seem inclined to pass any other judgment than the Donatists do on the employment of a traditor, if it were the fact; it is the fact that he denies.

(5) One of the Donatist bishops who petitioned Julian (A.D. 362) to be recalled from exile and restored to the possession of their basilicas. They spoke of justice as the only plea that had any weight with the apostate. He wrote back that "this too at the supplication of Pontius, Rogatianus and Cassianus, and the other bishops and clergy is added to crown the grant, that those things be abolished, which without a rescript have been done amiss in their regard, and all things recalled to their former status." The prayers of the church to the Lord for the unity of Christ are more ancient, exclaims Augustine, than the prayers of these men to Julian

* Tillemont (iv. 579) has Nov. 3 by a misprint.

for the party of Donatus (*contra litteras Piti-
liani*, c. 97, vol. ix. 334).

CASSIANUS (6), bishop of Autun. The date we assign to him will vary according as we attach more weight to the ancient Life of him, which professes to be based on a contemporary record (*Acta SS.* Aug. 5, vol. ii. p. 64), as Ruinart prefers to do, or to a casual statement by Gregory of Tours, who was shewn his tomb (*Glor. Conf.* 74, 75), as is done by Tillemont, and the Bollandists. The life tells us that he was born of noble parents in Alexandria, and brought up by a bishop Zonis; that he made his house a Christian hospital in the time of Julian, liberated his slaves, and built a church to St. Lawrence at Orta in Egypt, at which place he was made bishop against his will in the time of Jovian, A.D. 363. After his old master had been martyred in the next persecution (A.D. 373?), he vowed a missionary pilgrimage, sailed about for six months, then was carried to Marseilles, and proceeded to Autun, where he sat and prayed by the shrine of St. Symphorian, and the bishop Simplicius heard of it, and came out to greet him with hymn and cantic. He helped in the conversion of the pagans of that place, and would have proceeded to Britain, but Simplicius detained him. Simplicius dying three years later, left the see vacant for a year, during which Cassian celebrated at his grave daily, and then was unanimously appointed his successor. He held the see for twenty years.

The chief difficulty in this account (apart from the fact that bishop Zonis and the town of Orta in Egypt are quite unknown) is that Simplicius is represented in the Acts of Germanus as surviving at the time of his election (A.D. 418). See the preface to the life of Simplicius, June 24, in *Acta SS.*

Tillemont (x. 835) supposes that the legend of the Egyptian origin of this Cassian is due to a confusion with John Cassian.

Gregory, after describing Cassian's tomb, tells that Simplicius was buried in the same, then gives the life of Reticus, and says, "Cassian, whom we mentioned above, succeeded him. After him Hegemonius took the chair, on whose death Simplicius was set over the church." We have manifestly only to transpose one sentence to bring Gregory into agreement with the acts, and make the order, Reticus, Hegemonius, Simplicius, Cassianus.

The tomb of Cassian was famous. A stain in the form of a cross appeared on it, which is said to have prompted Germanus to hold a conversation with the saint in his tomb. He asked him how he lid, and the saint answered that he was at rest. This is told in his life, and may explain the great eagerness to obtain dust scraped from the stones of his tomb, which was almost bored through in consequence, as testified by Gregory. [E. B. B.]

(7) A presbyter who took part in the council of Aquileia (Ambrose, *Ep.* 843). [J. L. D.]

(8) One of those martyred with Saturninus and Dativus.

(9) One of the eighteen MARTYRS of SARAGOSSA; being one of the four whom Prudentius calls Saturninus (Tillem. v. 229).

(10) A Christian schoolmaster, and apparently shorthand-teacher at Imola (Forum Corneli) in

Romagna, who on refusing to sacrifice was given up to the boys of his school to kill with their styles and tablets. So Prudentius was told, on the authority of ancient acts then extant, by the verger of the church where his picture was shewn (*περί στεφάνων*, x.). Here Prudentius made vows for a safe voyage. His martyrdom is assigned to Aug. 11 or 13, on which latter day it has been celebrated from the 8th century onwards. There is a sermon in his honour by Peter Damiani. He is said to be buried under the altar of the cathedral at Imola, which is dedicated to him (Tillem. v. 53). A similar death is recorded of a senator under Caligula, of a martyr under Julian, and of Erigena at Oxford.

[E. B. B.]

CASSIANUS (11) JOHANNES, has been called the founder of Western monachism and of the Semipelagian school. More exactly, he was the first to transplant the rules of the Eastern monks into Europe, and the most eminent of the writers who steered a course between Pelagianism and the tenets of St. Augustine. Like St. Chrysostom, St. John Damascene, and others, he is usually designated by his agnomen. His birth is dated between 350 and 360 A.D.; his birthplace is not known. Gennadius calls him "Scythia" (Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.* s. v.); but this may be merely a corruption from Scetis or Scyathis, where Cassian resided for some time among the monks of Nitria.^a Possibly "Cassianus" points to Casius, a small town in Syria. Modern commentators are inclined to assign to him a Western origin; but the fact of his writing in Latin is by no means conclusive; for his parents, of whose piety he speaks gratefully (*Coll.* xxiv. 1), sent him to be educated in a monastery at Bethlehem; and there he would have frequent intercourse with pilgrims from the West. This cannot have been, as some have thought, the monastery of St. Jerome, for that was not then in existence, nor does Cassian ever refer to Jerome as his teacher. Here Cassian became intimate with Germanus, the future companion of his travels.

The fame of the Egyptian monks and hermits reached Cassian and his friend in their cells. About 390 A.D. they started, with leave of absence for seven years, to study by personal observation the more austere rules of the "renunciates," as they were called, in the Thebaid. At the end of seven years they revisited Bethlehem; and thence returned very soon to the Egyptian deserts (*Coll.* xvii. 31). Thus Cassian collected the materials for his future writings; he and his friend conversing usually with their hosts by means of an interpreter (*Coll.* xvi. 1). Among other voluntary hardships he speaks of the monks having to fetch water on their shoulders a distance of three or four miles (*Coll.* xxiv. 10). Evidently in his estimation, as in that

^a On the other hand Gennadius, from his connexion with Marseilles, speaks with authority. Theodoret mentions the conversion of nomad Scyths on the Danube by Chrysostom (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 30); and in the beginning of the 5th century there must have been a large Roman element in the population on the Danube. "Patriá Romanus" (in Photius) may mean, in this way, of a mixed descent, or, born within the Roman empire. Cave (*Hist. Literar.* s. v.) makes him by origin a native of the Tauric Chersonese. Honorius Augustodunensis (ii. 60, ap. Fabric. v. s.) calls Cassian "Afer," probably from his residence in Egypt.

of his contemporaries generally, the vocation of a solitary is holier than even that of a coenobite.

About A.D. 403 we find Cassian and Germanus at Constantinople, perhaps attracted by the reputation of Chrysostom. By him Cassian was ordained deacon, or, as some think, appointed archdeacon; and in his treatise *De Incarnatione* (vii. 31) he speaks of Chrysostom with affectionate reverence. Cassian and his friend were intrusted with the care of the cathedral treasures; and, after the expulsion of Chrysostom, they were sent by his adherents on an embassy to Rome about A.D. 405 to solicit the intervention of Innocent I. No further mention is made of Germanus; nor is much known of Cassian during the next ten years. Probably he stayed on at Rome, after the death of Chrysostom, A.D. 407, until the approach of the Goths under Alaric. Possibly he met Pelagius there and thus acquired a personal interest in the Pelagian controversy.

After quitting Rome it has been inferred from a casual expression in the *De Institutis* (iii. 1) that Cassian visited the monks of Mesopotamia; some say, that he returned for a time to Egypt or Palestine; and by some he is identified with Cassianus Presbyter, sent by Alexander of Antioch on a mission to Rome. More probably Cassian betook himself from Rome, as the Pelagians were devastating the monasteries of Bethlehem, to Massilla (Marseilles), a city famous then, as in the time of Cicero, for the pursuits of literature. In this neighbourhood he founded two monasteries (one afterwards known as that of St. Victor^b) for men and women respectively. Tillemont says that the rule was taken from the fourth book of the *De Institutis*; and that many monasteries in that part of Gaul owed their existence to this foundation. As Cassian is addressed in the *Epistola Castoris* as "abbas," "dominus," and "pater," it is argued, but not with certainty, that he presided over his new monastery. Here he devoted himself to literary labours for many years, and died at a very great age, as far as can be ascertained, between A.D. 440-450.

The *De Institutis Renuntiantium*, in twelve books, was written about A.D. 420 at the request of Castor, bishop of Aptia Julia, in Gallia Narbonensis (Praef. *Inst.*). Books i.-iv. treat of the monastic rule; the others of its especial hindrances. The former were abridged by Eucherius Lugdunensis. The *Collationes Patrum in Scithico Eremo Commorantium*, in which Cassian records his Egyptian experiences, were evidently intended by him as a sequel and complement of his previous work; his purpose being to describe in the *De Institutis* the regulations and observances of monachism; in the *Collationes* its interior scope and spirit: in the former he writes of monks, in the latter of hermits. The *Collationes* were commenced for Castor, but after his death Collat. i.-x. were inscribed to Leontius, a kinsman of Castor, and Helladius, bishop in that district; xi.-xvii. to Honoratus, abbat of Lerins, and Eucherius, bishop of Lugdunum (Lyons); xviii.-xxiv. to the monks and anchorites of the Stoechades (Hyères). The *Collationes* have been well called a "speculum monasticum:" St. Benedict ordered them to be read daily; they were

highly approved also by the founders of the Dominicans, Carthusians, and Jesuits. But the orthodoxy of the *Collationes*, especially of the third and thirteenth, on the subject of Grace and Freewill, was impugned by St. Augustine and Prosper of Aquitania. [See SEMIPELAGIANS.] An attempt was made by Cassiodorus and others to expurgate them. Cassian's last work, *De Incarnatione Christi* (cf. i. 3, v. 2), was directed against the Nestorian heresy, about A.D. 429, at the suggestion of Leo, then archdeacon and afterwards pope. Probably Cassian was selected for this controversy, as having been a disciple of Chrysostom, the illustrious predecessor of Nestorius in the see of Constantinople. (*Inc.* vii. 31.) The treatises *De Spirituali Medicinâ Monachi*, *Theologica Confessio*, and *De Confictu Virtutum ac Vitiûrum* are generally pronounced spurious.

Cassian is remarkable as a link between Eastern and Western Christendom, and as combining in himself the active and the contemplative life. It is difficult to overestimate his influence indirectly on the great monastic system of mediaeval Europe. His writings have always been in esteem with monastic reformers; especially at the revival of learning in the 15th century. Even his adversary Prosper calls him "insignis ac facundus." Cassian shews a thorough knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; with a good deal of quaintness often in his application of it. His style, if not so rich in poetic eloquence as that of his great opponent, is clear and forcible; and he is practical rather than profound. His good sense manifests itself in his preface to the *Instituta*, where he announces his intention to avoid legendary wonders and to regard his subject on its practical side. He insists continually on the paramount importance of the intention, disclaiming the idea of what is called the "opus operatum;" for instance, on almsgiving (*Inst.* vii. 21), fasting (*Coll.* i. 7), and prayer (*Coll.* ix. 3); and he is incessant in denouncing the special sins of cloister-life; as pride, ambition, vainglory. The life of a monk, as he portrays it, is no formal and mechanical routine; but a daily and hourly act of self-renunciation (*Coll.* xxiv. 2). On the other hand, he is by no means free from that exaggerated reverence for mere asceticism, which in his day led so many to the abandonment of their social duties; and, while encouraging the highest aspirations after holiness, he allows too much scope to a selfish desire of reward. As a casuist he is for the most part sensible and judicious; as, in discriminating between voluntary and involuntary thoughts (*Coll.* i. 17). But he presses obedience so far as to make it unreasonable and fanatical (*Inst.* iv. 27, &c.), and under certain circumstances he sanctions deceit (*Coll.* xvii.).

On the subject of Predestination Cassian, without assenting to Pelagius, protested against what he considered the fatalistic tendency of St. Augustine. In the *Collationes* he merely professes to quote the words of the Egyptian "fathers;" and in the *De Incarnatione* he distinctly attacks Pelagianism as closely allied with the heresy of Nestorius (i. 3, vi. 14). Still, it is certain from the tenor of his writings that Cassian felt a very strong repugnance to any theory which seemed to him to involve an arbitrary limitation of the possibility of being saved. It has been well said,

^b See Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 266.

that St. Augustine regards man in his natural state as dead, Pelagius as sound and well, Cassian as sick. [v. SEMIPELAGIANS.] Never formally condemned, and never formally canonised, Cassian occupies an ambiguous position. In the Latin church he is usually styled only 'beatus,' though dignified by the title of 'Saint' in the Greek. The local commemoration of Cassian is on July 23. The estimation in which he is generally held is well summed up by Maldonatus: "Fuit Cassianus auctor Catholicus ac bonus; nullum tamen tam pulcrum est corpus ut naevo careat."

The opinion that Cassian wrote in Greek hardly needs refutation. His own words expressly imply the contrary (*Praef. Coll.*, and iii. 15), nor is there any Greek version of his works extant.

The first complete edition of his works was in 1559 (cf. Migne's *Prolegomena*). The most noteworthy editions are these: Cuychii, Antverpiae, 1578 [a very elegant edition]; Ciaconii, Romae, 1588; Lugduni, 1606; Romae, 1611; ALARDI GAZAELI, Duaci, 1616; Atrebatii, 1628 [revised by A. G., but published after his death; containing, besides valuable annotations, *Prosperi de Grat.*; P. Coelestini *Epist.*; *Canones Ildi Conc. Arausiac.*; *Prosperi Epist. Regula S. Pachomii*, &c.]; Parisiis, 1642; Francofurti, 1722. See also G. F. Wiggers, *Tractatus de Cassiano*, Rostochii, 1824, 4to. There is an Italian version of Cassian's works, Venezia, 1663, 4to; and a French version, without the thirteenth *Coll.*, Paris, 1667, 8vo. [I. G. S.]

He is mentioned as the "beatissimus Cassianus qui Limerensi monasterio beatum Honoratum habuit comparem," in the catena which handed down the *Cursus Scotorum* from St. Mark, in a MS. of probably the 8th century, printed in Spelman (i. 176), Wilkins (*Concil. iv. App. 741*, 742), in Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, i. 138).

[C. H.]

CASSIDANUS, CASSIDUS. [CASSAN.]

CASSIODORUS, MAGNUS AURELIUS, senator, and chief minister to the Ostrogothic princes of Italy, was born at Scylacium (Squillace) in Bruttium, 469-70, of a noble and wealthy family, already distinguished for patriotic services; his grandfather having delivered Sicily and Bruttium from the Vandals under Genseric (*Var. i. Ep. 4*), and his father, who held the posts of "notarius" and "tribunus" under Valentinian III., having been employed in the embassy of Pope Leo, 451, which diverted Attila from his purpose of marching upon Rome (*ibid.*). With characteristic modesty the son, in commending Leo the Great on account of this embassy (*Chron. 394*), omits all mention of his father; but the retreat at Squillace, which he describes with enthusiastic affection (*Var. xii. 15*), seems to have been presented to the elder Cassiodorus by the Emperor, in acknowledgment of his services on this occasion. In the seclusion of this delicious region young Cassiodorus was brought up under circumstances highly favourable to his education, which included the study of grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, music, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, mechanics, anatomy, Greek, and the sacred Scriptures. His learning and accomplishments early attracted the notice of Odoacer, the first barbarian ruler of Italy, by whom he was made "comes pri-

vatarum," and subsequently "comes sacrarum largitionum" (*Var. i. 4*). After the final defeat of Odoacer by Theodoric at Ravenna, 493, Cassiodorus retired to his patrimonial estate in Bruttium, and secured the wavering allegiance of the provincials to the cause of the new ruler; for this service he was appointed by Theodoric to the official government of Lucania and Bruttium. Happy in the art of ruling to the satisfaction of the governed without neglecting the interests of his master, he was summoned, upon the conclusion of his prefecture, to Ravenna, and advanced successively to the dignities of secretary, quaestor, master of the offices, praetorian prefect, patrician, and consul. Meanwhile he enjoyed an intimacy with the prince, which, reflected as it is in his 'Varieties,' has given to that work much of the character and value of a state journal. Illiterate himself, Theodoric employed the eloquent pen of his minister in all public communications, and spent his leisure time in acquiring from him erudition of various kinds (*Var. ix. 24*). It would seem to have been the ambition of Cassiodorus, whose genius for diplomacy was consummate, to bring about a fusion between the Arian conquerors and the conquered Catholic population of Italy, to establish friendly relations with the eastern empire, and possibly to create at Rome a peaceful centre to which the several barbaric kingdoms which had established themselves in Gaul, Spain, and Africa might be attracted. The progress of Theodoric to the capital, where the schism between Pope Symmachus and his rival, Laurentius, was then raging, A.D. 500, was probably planned by him in view of this result (*Var. xii. 18, 19*; cf. Gibbon, *Decl. and Fall*, ch. 39); but the temper of Theodoric's declining years must have disappointed the hopes of his enlightened minister, and in 524 he wisely resolved to divest himself of his honours, and to seek shelter in his Calabrian retreat from the storm which proved fatal to his co-senators, Boethius and Symmachus. After the death of Theodoric, 525, Cassiodorus again became conspicuous as the trusted adviser of his daughter Amalasuntha, widow of Eutaric, who acted as regent for her son Athalaric (*Var. ix. 25*). By his influence the Goths were kept in subjection to the new rule, notwithstanding the Roman proclivities of Amalasuntha as displayed in the education of the young prince. The threatened danger of an invasion by Justinian was likewise averted by the ready aid of his purse and pen (Procop. *B. G. i. 3*). Upon the enforced acceptance by Amalasuntha of Theodatus as co-regent, Cassiodorus again submitted to circumstances (*Var. x. 6, 7*), and wrote letters in the name of either soliciting the goodwill of the senate and the emperor (*Var. x. 1, 2, 3*). At this time he held the office of Praetorian Prefect, and with this title he continued to serve under Theodatus after the untimely death of Athalaric and the treacherous murder of Amalasuntha. In comparing the even felicity of his career with the tragic end of Boethius, one is tempted to suspect the nobleness of a character which, no matter how infamous the ruler, could accommodate itself with such singular tact to every change of government; but Cassiodorus was no mere time-server. His writings shew him to have been animated by a truly patriotic spirit; and if

he adapted himself skilfully to the varying humours of the court, it was from no interested motives, but that he might have it in his power to alleviate the inevitable misfortunes of his conquered countrymen. Thus upon the invasion of Sicily by Belisarius, in consequence of the murder of Amalasuntha, he is found raising taxes for the defence of Italy in such a way as to cause the least possible distress to the provincials (*Var.* xii. pass.). When the sacred vessels from St. Peter's are pawned by Theodatus, to provide for the embassy of pope Agapitus to Justinian, his intercession prevails with the unscrupulous prince to restore them (*Var.* xii. 20). When famine presses heavily on the northern districts of Italy, he exerts himself to lighten fiscal burdens and relieve the sufferers (*Var.* xii. 26). Under Vitiges, who succeeded to the kingdom upon the assassination of Theodatus, he continued his administration (*Var.* x. 31), and found increased scope for his charitable efforts in moderating the extortion and violence consequent upon a more vigorous prosecution of the war.

This was the last public ministry of Cassiodorus: upon the triumph of Belisarius and the downfall of the Ostrogoths, being now seventy years of age, he withdrew to his native province, and founded the monastery of Viviers at the foot of Mount Moscius, which he describes (*Var.* xii. 15). Various reasons have been assigned for this retirement, but the true motive would seem to be indicated at the close of his treatise on the soul, where, addressing Christ in a strain of pious exaltation, he exclaims, "Tibi nobilissimum est servire quam regna mundi capessere." For fifty years he had laboured to preserve authority from its own excesses, to soften the manners of the Goths, and to uphold the rights of the Romans; but he was weary of the superhuman task, and seems to have turned to the cloister for repose and freedom. His activity, however, was not to be satisfied with the ordinary occupations of monastic life. Hence while the summit of the mountain was set apart for the hermits of the community (Monasterium Castellense), there sprang up at its base, beneath his own immediate auspices, a society of cenobites, devoted to the pursuit of learning and science (Monasterium Vivariense). Foiled in his efforts to save the state of Italy from barbarism, he directed his remaining energies to elevating the standard of knowledge among ecclesiastics, and preparing the cloister to become the asylum of literature and the liberal arts. With this purpose he endowed the monastery of Viviers with his Roman library, containing the accumulations of half a century, which he continued to augment until his death (*Div. Lit.* c. 8). Not only were the monks incited by his example to the study of classical and sacred literature; he trained them likewise to the careful transcription of manuscripts, in the purchase of which large sums were continually disbursed. Bookbinding, gardening, and medicine were among the pursuits of the less intellectual members of the fraternity (*Div. Lit.* 28, 30, 31). Such time as he himself could spare from the composition of sacred or scientific treatises he employed in the construction of self-acting lamps, sundials, and water-clocks, for the use of the monastery. Nor was the influence of his example confined to his

own age or institution. The system of which he was the founder took root and spread beyond the boundaries of Italy, so that the multiplication of manuscripts became gradually as much a recognised employment of monastic life as prayer or fasting; nor is it too much to say that on this account alone the statue of Cassiodorus deserves an honourable niche in every library. The date of his death is uncertain. He composed his treatise on orthography in his ninety-third year (*De Orthogr. praeef.*), and he is even reported to have completed his century (Bacon, *Hist. Vit. et Mort.* 96). There seems, however, to be no evidence for this, unless the words he uses in speaking of himself at the close of his commentary on Psalm ci. (centenarii numeri fecunditate provecum) be taken to indicate the exact measure of his age.

It has been asserted that Cassiodorus adopted the rule of St. Benedict; but the elaborate effort of his Benedictine editor, Garetius, to disprove the opinion of Baronius to the contrary fails to establish anything more than a remote possibility that Viviers borrowed from Monte Casino.

Of the extant writings of Cassiodorus the twelve Books of Varieties, consisting principally of letters, edicts, and rescripts, are the only work of real importance: apart, however, from the study of these pages, it is hardly possible to obtain a true knowledge of the Italy of the 6th century. The very style of the writer, possessing, as it does, a certain elegance, yet continually deviating from pure idiom and good taste, is singularly characteristic of the age which witnessed the last flicker of Roman civilisation under the Ostrogothic rule. It is as though the pen of Cicero had been dipped in barbaric ink. The general result is artificial and bizarre; but though the meaning of the writer is frequently obscured by his rhetoric, his manner is not as unpleasing as is often asserted. It will be sufficient to enumerate here the other writings of Cassiodorus, a more detailed account of which is given in Smith's 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography.' (2) *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Tripartitae*, Libri xii., being an epitome of the ecclesiastical histories of Sozomen, Socrates, and Theodoretus, as digested and translated by Epiphanius Scholasticus. (3) *Chronicon*, chiefly derived from Eusebius, Hieronymus, and Prosper. (4) *Computus Paschalis*. (5) *Expositio in Psalmos*, principally borrowed from St. Augustine. (6) *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*, of doubtful authenticity. (7) *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*, an interesting work as illustrating the enlightened spirit which animated the monastic life of Viviers. (8) *Complexiones in Epistolas Apostolorum, in Acta, et in Apocalypsin*, first brought to light by the Marquis Scipio Maffei at Florence, in 1721. (9) *De Artibus ac Disciplinis Liberalium Litterarum*. (10) *De Oratione et de Octo Partibus Orationis*, of doubtful authenticity. (11) *De Orthographia*. (12) *De Anima*. Of the lost writings of Cassiodorus the most important work would seem to have been *De Rebus Gestis Gothorum*, Libri xii., of which we have the abridgement of Jornandes.

The first edition of the collected works of Cassiodorus was published at Paris, 1584, 4to, with the notes of Fornerius. An excellent edi-

tion was published by J. Gareit at Rouen, 1679, 2 vols. fol., and reprinted at Venice, 1729. This edition, together with an appendix containing the commentaries discovered by Maffei, is reproduced in Migne's *Patrologia*, vols. lxi. lxx.

The authorities for his life are the *Vita Cassiodori* prefixed to Gareit's edition; *La Vie de Cassiodore, avec un abrégé de l'histoire des princes qu'il a servi*, by Denis de Ste. Marthe, Paris, 1694, 8vo; and *Leben Cassiodors*, by De Buat, in the 'Transactions of the Royal Academy of Munich,' vol. i. p. 79. [E. M. Y.]

CASSIUS (1) Bishop of Tyre, who in the year 198 attended the synod held at Caesarea under the presidency of Theophilus, the bishop of that city, and Narcissus, of Jerusalem, to settle the paschal controversy. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 25.) [E. V.]

(2) (St. Cassi) of Auvergne, about the time of Crocus, king of the Alemanni (probably A.D. 260), was found by Victorinus, the officer of the idol priest, in a village that was called the village of the Christians. Victorinus is said to have been so touched by his preaching and miracles that he became a Christian and a miracle-worker himself, and the two were martyred together, May 15 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* i. 31, iv. 12; *Acta SS.* May, iii. 454; Tillem. iv. 224). The acts written by Projectus are not extant. [E. B. B.]

(3) Numidian bishop addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* 70 (Syn. Carth. Bapt. Haer. i.), and speaks 22nd in *Sentt. Epp.* Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. as bishop of Macomades near Cirta. [E. W. B.]

(4) Jailor at Byzantium, kept ACACIUS in custody in A.D. 306, and gave evidence that he had heard from the fellow-prisoners, and seen with his own eyes, that many splendid soldiers, advocates, and physicians attended on him in his cell, but disappeared immediately the door was unlocked. He was flogged for the assertion, but persisted in it, and offered to die for it, according to Simeon METAPHRASTES. (Till. *Mem.* v. 389; *Vita Acacii*, 17, 18; *Acta SS.* May 8.)

(5) Martyr at Bonn, Oct. 10, along with Sr. GERYON (Usuard; Tillem. iv. 429).

(6) Bishop of Narni, said to have freed the swordbearer of Totila from a devil by signing him with the cross (Greg. *Dial.* iii. 6, p. 289); celebrated daily, and was told the day of his own death, June 29, by a vision of one of his priests seven years before he died (*ib.* iv. 56, p. 468). He is commemorated on that day. [E. B. B.]

CASTALIUS, bishop at the council of Sinuessa A.D. 303 (Labbe, *Conc.* i. 940). [E. B. B.]

CASTINUS of Tivoli, father of pope Simplicius (Anastas. ii. p. 362). Was this the same as the Castinus who was consul under John in 424 and banished by Placidia in 425 (v. Tillem. xiii. 1013-14)? [E. B. B.]

CASTOR (1) A correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen, whose friendship Gregory prized very highly. We have two letters of Gregory to Castor: one (*Epist.* 93) sent by his young friend and spiritual son Sacerdos, whose society Castor

was very anxious to enjoy, whom Gregory begs he will not detain long. The second (*Epist.* 94) contains complaints of his own health which chains him to the spot, and threatens Castor in playful terms if he does not soon send back a lady whom he calls "their common sister," of whose services he stood greatly in need. [E. V.]

CASTOR (2) Presbyter of Treves under St. Maximinus, retired, and became a hermit at Caerden much below the town. He died Feb. 13. (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 7-16; Tillem. vii. 250.) [E. B. B.]

(3) Confessor, and bishop of Apt in Provence. He appears to have been born at Nismes, and to have founded a monastery between the years 419-426. He is commemorated on the 21st of September (*Acta SS.* Boll. Sept. vi. 249).

(4) A priest of Coblenz. This saint is said to have performed many miracles, but his history is uncertain and his date is unknown (*Acta SS.* Boll. Feb. ii. 663). [H. W. Y.]

(5) Father of pope Felix IV.

CASTORINA, maternal aunt of St. Jerome. His letter to her (13, ed. Vall.), written when he was in the desert, shews that there had been some disagreement between them. [W. H. F.]

CASTORIUS (1), Brother of the constable Nicostratus, converted and martyred with him (see Acts of St. Sebastian, Tillem. iv. 521, 528). His feast is marked July 7, but Tillemont observes that they could not have suffered before the 17th. Claudius the jailor and his sons, Felix and Felicissimus, were also converted and martyred along with them, A.D. 286. [SEBASTIAN.] But the whole story is a confusion with one of the QUATUOR CORONATI.

(2) Martyr at Nicomedia, March 16 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(3) Martyr at Tarsus, March 28 (*ibid.*).

(4) The name of three Roman presbyters in A.D. 303, one condemned, along with Marcellinus, for apostasy, and also for betraying the granaries of the church, the other two condemning him (Labbe, *Conc.* i. 939-943). [E. B. B.]

(5) Brother of MAXIMIANUS (q. v.). We meet with him in the year 402. (Tillem. xiii. 388; *Conc.* ii. 1101.) The brothers were Donatists, and became Catholics. Maximian was chosen to the see of Vagina, but a scandal was raised against him, so, saying that he had joined the church for the sake of unity and would not cause a schism, he retired, and Castorius was urged to take his brother's place by Augustine and Alypius (*Ep.* 69, vol. ii. 230), whom Tillemont supposes to have been then at Vagina, where Castorius had been elected and whence he had retired. They besought him to shew the people that it was not for his own ease, but for their peace, that his brother had retired. They do not seem to have persuaded him (v. Tillem. xiii. 991).

(6) Notary and representative or nuntius of pope Gregory I. at Ravenna, against whom the people of that town laid complaints (Greg. *Ep.* vi. 31).

CASTORIUS (7) Bishop of Rimini, ordained reluctantly by Gregory I., at the request of the people, resigned from growing infirmity (Greg. *Ep.* ii. 35), and the see remained vacant for six years (Greg. *Ep.* viii. 19).

(8) Deacon, charged with examining into the life of the bishop of Pesaro and his presbyters (Greg. *Ep.* v. 28). [E. B. B.]

CASTRENSIS, ST., celebrated in South Italy as an African bishop of note, who in some barbarian persecution, both of clergy and laity (fancied by Tillemont to be under Thrasamond, i.e. between A.D. 496 and 522), was taken with eleven other bishops and put on board an old rotten ship, which carried them to Sinuessa, or Volturno, where he died, Feb. 11 (Tillem. xvi. 607, 608). It seems more probable that the name is only the title taken from his see, and that he may be the Candidianus bishop of Castra, in Mauritania Caesariensis, who is given in a list of bishops persecuted by Hunneric (A.D. 484), with the note "*per.*" (= *perit*) after his name. (*Conc.* iv. 1147.) His legend is given from two MSS. in the *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 523 [E. B. B.]

CASTRICCIA, a rich and fashionable matron of Constantinople, the widow of Saturninus (consul in A.D. 383), a leading member of the female cabal formed against Chrysostom at the court of the empress Eudoxia. [CHRYSOSTOM.] [E. V.]

CASTRUTIUS, a blind man of Pannonia, who about A.D. 394 undertook a voyage to see St. Jerome, but when he had reached Cissa was persuaded by his friends to give it up. Jerome writes to thank him and to console him. He begs him not to suppose his blindness to have been sent in punishment for his sin, and quotes the question of the disciples and our Lord's reply respecting the man who was born blind. He concludes by telling him the story of St. Anthony and blind Didymus (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxviii, *ad Castrutium*, in *Patrol. Lat.* xxii. 651). [E. B. B.]

CASTULUS (1), *Zetarius* or manager of the summer and winter dining-rooms of the palace of Diocletian or Maximian, lodged in a garret in the palace, and sheltered the Christians there (Acts of St. Sebastian). He was put to the question thrice, then thrown into a pit, and then buried alive. He is now commemorated March 26, and a cemetery on the Via Lavicana is said to bear his name. Acts of him, chiefly drawn from those of Sebastian, are given by the Bollandists on that day. But in the Mart. Hieron. *Castula* is marked on that day in that place, and Castulus seems to be joined with other noted martyrs of that time, Euprepes, Saturninus, CHRYSANTHUS, and Maurus, Nov. 30 (v. also CARINUS). [E. B. B.]

(2) An Arian presbyter, whom Ambrose rescued out of the hands of the orthodox multitude at the time of the conflict about the basilicas at Milan (Ambrose, *Ep.* 20. 5). [AMBROSIIUS.] [J. L. D.]

(3) Martyr along with ZOTICUS in Egypt or in Africa, Jan. 12 (Mart. Hieron.).

(4) Martyr at Ancyra in Galatia, Jan. 23 (*ibid.*). [E. B. B.]

CASTURUS, ST. Confessor, and bishop of Vienne. Nothing certain is known of this saint. He is supposed to have lived about the 8th century (*Acta SS. Boll.* Oct. vi. 545). [H. W. Y.]

CASTUS (1), bishop of Sicca Venerea (Kef) in proconsular province, near Musti, on borders of Numidia (town of Arnobius), spoke 28th in order in *Sentt. Epp.* Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

CASTUS (2) and AEMILIUS, two men who lapsed, and then made renewed confession. They are mentioned by Cyprian in his book on the Lapsed, written under Decius, as having suffered some time since (Cyp. *Laps.* c. 13; Tillem. iii. 125). They are commemorated in the calendar of Carthage by Bede, etc., on May 22, and there is a sermon on their festival by Augustine (*Serm.* 285, c. 5, p. 1293), mentioned by Possidius (Index, c. 9). The sermon alludes to Cant. i. and John x., which seem to have been the lessons for the day.

(3) Bishop, imprisoned along with pope STEPHEN, A.D. 257 (Anast. I. 1390, ed. Migne; Tillem. iv. 31).

(4) Bishop at the council of Sinuessa A.D. 303, and of Rome A.D. 324 (Labbe, *Conc.* i. 940 1545).

(5) Bishop of Saragossa at the council of Sardica A.D. 347 (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 658 d, 662 d, 678). [E. B. B.]

(6) A presbyter of Antioch, who in conjunction with Valerius, Diophantus, and Cyriacus, maintained the cause of Chrysostom and the orthodox clergy against the tyrannical intruder Porphyrius, by whom they were grievously persecuted. Chrysostom wrote to these four presbyters frequently during his exile, commending them for their firm adherence to the truth, consoling them under the trials and persecutions they had to endure for the truth's sake, giving them particulars of his own condition, excusing himself for not writing more frequently, and begging them to write to him (*Epist.* 22, 62, 66, 107, 130, 222). At their request Chrysostom wrote to a presbyter named Romanus, who had a high reputation for piety, who had expressed a great desire to receive a letter from him (Chrysost. *Epist.* 22, 23). Castus and his companions made common cause with the presbyter Constantius, and shared in his sufferings for the faith. We have a letter of Constantius to Castus written while the former was taking refuge at Cucusus, expressing his eager desire for intelligence how things were going at Antioch (*Epist.* 240). When Constantius returned to Antioch, Chrysostom wrote to Castus and his friends, begging them to support him to the utmost of their power, and do what they could to prevent any judicial proceedings being taken against him (*Epist.* 62). They fully responded to his appeal, and Chrysostom wrote again thanking them for the successful issue of their efforts (*Epist.* 65). [E. V.]

(7) Donatist bishop of Cella, at the council of Carthage A.D. 411 (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1379).

(8) Bishop of Porto in the 3rd Roman synod, A.D. 501, the 4th, A.D. 502, and the 6th, A.D. 504 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1326, 1334, cf. 1377). [E. B. B.]

CASULANUS, addressed by Augustine in his *Ep.* 36 (86), was a young presbyter of some

other African diocese (§§ 1, 32), who may or may not have had any personal intercourse with him, but who had written to him twice, sending him a treatise of some Roman ecclesiastic, whose name he kept back, on the subject of the Saturday fast observed by the church of Rome throughout the year, except between Easter and Whitsuntide (§ 18), but in most other places only in Passion Week (DICT. OF CHRIST. ANTIQ. 'Fasting,' i. 663).^a

The letters of Casulanus which pleased Augustine, are not extant; and of the Roman treatise, which irritated him by its want both of reason and of charity, we have only such fragments as are contained in his answer.

These anonymous fragments, however, demand notice as discovering the existence of tendencies in the Roman church at the beginning of the fifth century to recoil violently from the luxury of the great city, to enforce Roman church customs, under pain of hell, upon the whole church, to ignore the real relations of the old and new covenants, and so to marshal Christianity against Judaism (an attempt pushed almost to Marcionism), as really to transform Christianity itself to a Jewish type. This may have been one cause of the welcome that Pelagianism found for a while at Rome.

The date of the epistle is debated, and must be determined by internal considerations. Augustine's readiness to confront the pope himself on equal terms, to excommunicate a Roman churchman, 'whoever he might be,' for his levity in wielding anathemas, if Casulanus had not purposely prevented it, by keeping back the writer's name, points to a time when the bishop of Hippo was already a great authority in the church at large. The Benedictines must therefore be wrong in assigning it to a period before the death of Ambrose. On the other hand, from the attitude of Augustine on the question of justification, we may infer that the controversy with Pelagianism had not yet assumed importance. Tillemont (xiii. 266) suggests that if the brother mentioned (c. 12, § 27), as credibly reported to have abstained from food for forty days together, be Simeon Stylites, he did not begin to do so till A.D. 413. This date, therefore, on the whole, seems most probable, and the Roman treatise must have been written not very long before.

Augustine first (ii.-x. 3-24) examines the Roman tract, then (xi.-xiv. 25-32) expounds his own view. We give his extracts and replies.

(1.) "When the apostles plucked and ate corn on the sabbath, the time for fasting was not yet come, and the tradition of the elders forbade their fasting." *Ans.* "Did it not forbid their working?" (ch. iii.). "How, if we fast only twice a week, shall we escape the damnation of the Pharisee?" *Ans.* "What if we pay tithes? Besides, there are five days on which we can fast, besides Saturday and Sunday." But Augustine does not meet the legalism of his antagonist

directly on evangelical grounds; partly because he is answering him with repartees, according to his folly; partly, it would seem, in consequence of the view he took of justification: partly, perhaps, also from his unwillingness to admit that the Pharisee was damned; we are only told that the publican was justified rather (ch. iv.).

(2.) *The notion of a weekly fasting communion* Augustine shows himself unable even to understand. "We ought more and more lawfully to fast, that of six days even a slight error may be washed away by the fountains of fasting, prayer, and almsgiving, that so refreshed with the Sunday banquet we may all with equal heart be able to sing, 'Thou hast satiated the empty soul'" (ch. v. § 9). The word for banquet, *alogia*, is said by Ducange, *in voce*, to mean a meal partaken in silence. But Augustine (§ 11) interprets it as unreason, so that it would have been a slang term, and a horrible one indeed to apply to the holy Eucharist, which, as Augustine observes (§ 19) is not *alogia*, but *eulogia*. That such was the application of the term by the Roman was not perceived by Augustine, but appears from another paragraph, where the author interprets the "sacrifice of praise" to mean the fast that is offered with the lights and incense of the sabbath eve, and says that we shall have houses to eat and to drink in, when the celebration is complete on the Lord's-day morning (ch. viii. § 19). Thus the real object of the Saturday fast is as a preparation for the reception of the Lord in early communion on the Sunday. And this appears from the appeal to the example of the three friends who ate pulse with Daniel and afterwards "received their Lord" in the furnace (chaps. vi. vii.). The result of this preparative fast appears to be that a sensuous delight in the feast is blended with the spiritual. Augustine (§ 11) is severe on the notion that bodily food can be spoken of as satiating the soul. Yet the sacrifice seems to be regarded by the Roman as consisting not in the elements, but in hearts mortified by fasting, fired by prayer, and united to Christ by communion. "In Christ the *ara* yields to the *altare*, sword to fast, fire to prayers, beast to bread, blood to chalice" (ch. x. § 24). Augustine replies by asking, Who fasts all the six days? or what is to be done for an error on Sunday? or is a good breakfast the only security for a sinless day? or does Saturday's fast wash out the last six days' sins? for if so, Saturday is the holier day.

(3.) *The Roman's notion of the primacy of the pope* is another of his reasons. "The life of sheep hangs on the will of the shepherd." Augustine commends the obedience of the Roman church to their bishop, but rebukes them for condemning the whole Christian world if it did not follow them, and is cautious about accepting the legend of the fast whereby Peter overcame Simon Magus. The author attributes the primacy not to Peter but to Rome, as though Peter had converted Rome, and Rome had converted the world. (See the 2nd epistle of James to Clement.) Augustine answers that there were other apostles besides Peter, and their unity did not lie in externals (ch. viii. ix. § 20-22).

(4.) *The Roman's tendency to Marcionism*, though inconsistent with his use of the Old Tes-

^a This epistle shows that ordinary fasts consisted of the omission of the luncheon, before which it was at no time customary to take anything (§ 16, *ad fin.*), so that on fast days nothing was taken till dinner time (§ 28, *ad fin.*); but the same term was applied to total abstinence from food for days together, and the Roman appears to intend the fast to stretch from Friday night to Sunday morning (§ 19).

tament, appears at last in his asking, "Why do we murmur at offering the sacrifice of praise to a better Lord? (viii. 18)" (which Augustine supposes to be a copyist's blunder,^b and in his exclaiming, "Let us be Christians or Jews; we cannot serve two masters," to which Augustine replies that He to whom the Lord's day belongs is none other than the Lord of the sabbath.

Augustine's own view is that the old things have yielded only to their own fulfilment and verity (§ 24), that fasting is enjoined in the New Testament; but fasts are not prescribed, and that Paul's teaching on this head is in agreement with Christ's own (Matt. xi.). Fasting on Sunday he considers scandalous, because the Manicheans and Priscillianists insisted on it; but prolonged fasts may include Sunday (ch. xii. 27-29). He gives his view of the order of the events of Passion Week, believing the Last Supper to have been the regular passover. He neither "regards all days alike," nor considers the fourth commandment as still binding, but regards Christ as abrogating the rest, and leaving the day specially holy, not like G. Herbert, as "unhinging" the day. He distinguishes the rest of the departed, which might be typified by a fast, from "the rest that remaineth," when the redeemed body shall share in the feast, and makes the sabbath express both. Monica was troubled to know whether she might lawfully break her custom of fasting on Saturday, as the church of Tagaste did, and imitate the Milanese, who breakfasted. Augustine, then a catechumen, thought the point very unimportant, but to satisfy his mother he questioned Ambrose. The bishop answered, "How can I teach more than I do?" Augustine took this to mean that they should breakfast, but he went on, "Here I do not fast, at Rome I do." We see that Augustine retained in later years the same indifference to such matters, and the same readiness to enter into them for the sake of others, as in the eagerness of his first inquiries. Casulanus is advised, for his own part, to conform to the custom of his bishop. [E. B. B.]

CASWALLON (Camden, *Britann.* iii. 234, ed. Gough), British king. [CAEDWALLA (1).]

CATALDUS. [CATHALDUS.]

CATAN (CATHAN, CADAN, CEDDAN, KEDDAN), bishop and confessor; tutor of St. Blane, has his festival in the Irish calendars on Feb. 1, and in the Scotch on May 17. From Colgan's Memoir (in *Acta SS.* 233-4), following Archd. Newton of Dunblane, we learn that his father was Madan, son (or grandson, *ibid.* p. 313, n. 4) of Calbaidh, a prince of Dalaradia, and as *Mart. Doneg.* states, of the race of Irial, son of Conall Cearnach, who is of the Clanna-Rudhraighe. (For these, see Reeves, *Eccles. Ant.* 336, 352.) He is said to have been first connected with St. Patrick in Ireland, and then to have come to Scotland and settled in Bute, where he built his cell at Kilcathan or Kilchattan, and educated his nephew St. Blane [BLANE]. But the exact dates of his life are unknown, and whatever may be made of his reported relations to St. Patrick, he could scarcely

have flourished before the middle of the 6th century. Colgan thinks he flourished about A.D. 550, and died after A.D. 560, but others would place him even in the 7th century. According to the Irish tradition he was buried in Ireland, and St. Cadan's tomb is to this day shewn beside the church of Tamlaght Ard, county Londonderry, but according to the Scotch he lies at Kilchattan. His memory is honoured by many dedications in the west of Scotland. The traditions of a Scotch and an Irish Catan are possibly mixed up together. (Petrie, *Round Towers*, 454 sq.; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 279; *Brev. Aberd.* pars aestiv. fol. lxxviii.; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 299; Fordun, *Scotichr.* lib. xi. c. 21; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. i. 210 sq.) There was a Catan who died abess of Kildare, A.D. 853 (*Four Mast.*). [J. G.]

CATAPHRONIUS (1), pontiff of Thrace in A.D. 304. See PHILIP OF HERACLEA (Tillem. v. 305).

(2) The persecutor of EULALIA is called by this name in some copies of her acts, in others Datian (Tillem. v. 322).

(3) Supposed by Tillemont (vii. 632) to have been an Apollinarist, companion of Timotheus, and, on receipt of a letter from him, to have written to others of the same sect named Pausorius, Uranius, Diodorus, and Jovius. But from the passage to which he refers (Leontius Byz. *adv. Fraud. Apollin.* Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxvi. 1954), it appears rather that Cataphronius was an imaginary personage in a dialogue dedicated by Timotheus to Pausorius and the others.

(4) Praefect of Egypt in A.D. 356, established the Arian bishop George at Alexandria, and persecuted the Catholics (Tillem. viii. 157, 677; Athanas, i. 847). [E. B. B.]

CATAPHRYGIANS. [MONTANISTS.]

CATAW. Welsh saint. [CADO.]

CATELL (Cadell), king of Powys, died A.D. 808 (*Annal. Cambr., Brut y Tywys.*, in *M. H. B.* 834, 843). [C. H.]

CATENAE. [INTERPRETATION, BIBLICAL.]

CATGABAIL, king of Guenedota, called also CATGUOMMED, i.e. "qui pugnam renuit," viz. A.D. 655 (Nennius, *Hist.* c. 66, in *M. H. B.* 76). [C. H.]

CATGUALART, son of Catgualaum, king of Guenedota. He died of an epidemic disorder, A.D. 682 (Nennius, *Hist.* c. 66, *Annal. Cambr.*, in *M. H. B.* 76, 833). [C. H.]

CATGUBLAUN (Nennius, *Hist.* c. 66), CATGUOLLAAN, CATGUOLAUM, CATGUOLLAUN (*Annal. Cambr.*), king of Guenedota (*M. H. B.* 76, 832, 833). [CAEDWALLA (1).] [C. H.]

CATHALDUS, CATHAL. Colgan cites several of this name in Ireland, from the middle of the 8th century to the 11th; but the most famous is the bishop of Tarentum—March 8 and May 10. Of this saint Colgan (*Acta SS.* 544 sq.) gives two Lives two books on the finding of his

^b It appears from § 18 that the corrector of a MS. was generally a man of far more culture than the copyist.

Book of Prophecy and on his *Miracles*, a copy of his Office, and an appendix of great interest and learning on his feasts, time, country, and writings. The first short life is "Ex Petro de Natalibus, lib. 4, c. 143," and the second, by Barth. Moroni, is taken from the archives of Tarentum. His father was Euchus, Eucha or Eochaidh, and his mother Achlena or Athena. Dempster would make him an Albanian Scot, but there can be no doubt as to his having been a native of Munster, though the exact locality, called Rachau and Catandum, cannot now be identified; it was probably not far from Lismore, of which he became a professor some time after the death of St. Carthach, and where scholars came to him from all quarters. There he is said to have dedicated a church to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and to have been himself consecrated bishop for the church of Rachau. Some time after, in company with twelve disciples, called also bishops, he set out on a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre. On landing at Tarentum on his way back to Ireland, he found the city so full of wickedness that he stayed there, teaching and working many miracles, and is said to have been at length chosen bishop. His brother Donatus became bishop of Leece. The year of St. Cathaldus's death is unknown, but the day as observed at Tarentum is March 8, while other two days are observed with more or less variety, as May 8 for his invention, and May 10 for his translation. For the burial, the finding of his body, its translation, his miracles, and the honours bestowed on him at his tomb, see Moroni's account in Colgan (*Acta SS.* 549 sq.). As to the period when he lived there is great divergence of opinion; we cannot put his death sooner than the end of the 7th century. Lanigan says his appointment as bishop of Rachau probably took place about A.D. 670. Several writings are attributed to him by Dempster, but without foundation; the only one that seems to have any authority is his *Book of Prophecies*, which was found at Tarentum, A.D. 1492, in the time of pope Innocent VIII., but it too is evidently a forgery, adapted to the history of the time. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 5, ii. 121 sq.; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* Dubl. 1704, pp. 2-3; Ussher, *de Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Dubl. 1639, p. 751 sq.; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 195 sq.; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 363 sq.; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 198; Bollandists, *Acta SS. Maii*, tom. ii. 569 sq. The last two follow the *Rom. Martyrol.* in placing his dedication on May 10.)

[J. G.]

CATHAN. [CATAN.]

CATHARI. [NOVATIANS.]

CATHARINE (CATHARINA, CATHERINE, etc.), ST., virgin and martyr of Alexandria.

The legends connected with this saint are a remarkable instance of the exuberant growth of fiction in the guise of ecclesiastical history during the middle ages, and shew on how very small a basis of facts an elaborate superstructure could be erected. Tillemont writes, in the 17th century, that it would be hard to find a saint more generally revered than St. Catharine, or one of whom so little was known on credible authority, and adds that no single fact about her is certain (*Mém. Eccl.* vii. p. 447). In another

passage he pronounces all the materials for her biography worthless (*M. E.* p. 761). Papebrocius, as quoted in Baronius, echoes the words of Tillemont, and, while stating that in his own country, Belgium, no city or town is without some church or altar to her glory, adds that the whole story of her martyrdom, etc., is very difficult and obscure (Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* ed. Theiner, iii. *ad an.* 307). Baronius himself speaks more than doubtingly of the traditionary "Acta Stae Catharinae," and protests against attempting, in cases of this kind, to eke out the little that can be gleaned from more ancient records by imaginary interpolations. "Melius silentium," he wisely adds, "quam mendacium veris admixtum" (*ib.*). The accretion of fable is indeed in this case, to say the very least, out of all proportion to the scanty fragment of real history, the few lines of Eusebius, which we find imbedded in it.

The earliest mention of St. Catharine in the Eastern Church (*v. Menology of Basil*) under the name of *Hikathapla* (possibly a corruption of *ἡ καθάρις*, diminutive of *καθάρως*, pure), is about the end of the 9th century (Tillem. v. s.; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, tom. viii. Nov. 25); in the 13th century it appears in the Latin Martyrologies (Baillet, *ib.*), the crusaders having brought back to Europe the fame of this virgin-martyr among other marvels from the East. It seems that some time in the 8th or 9th century the monks on Mount Sinai disinterred the body, as they were eager to believe, of one of those Christian martyrs whose memory they fondly cherished. Eusebius relates how a lady of Alexandria—he omits her name—was one of the victims of the cruelty of Maximinus in the commencement of the 4th century (*H. E.* viii. 14). It was easy enough to identify the corpse as that of the anonymous sufferer, and to invent a name for it; easy too for Greek ingenuity to embellish the bare statement of Eusebius, and to bridge over the distance between Alexandria and Mount Sinai. In the pages of Simeon Metaphrastes, a legendist of Constantinople in the 10th century, we have a lengthy recital of St. Catharine's martyrdom, with all the horrible details of her tortures, with an exact report of her dispute in public with the philosophers of the city, and of the learned oration by which she converted them, the Empress Faustina, and many of the court who were present, and how her saintly corpse was transported to Mount Sinai by the hands of angels (Martin, *Vies des Saints*, tom. iii. pp. 1841, *et seq.*) But, as the writers already quoted have remarked, the whole story is in itself plainly unhistorical, even apart from the significant fact that there is no external testimony to its authenticity. For in Eusebius the emperor's exasperation is provoked, not, as in the legend, by a refusal to abjure Christianity and to sacrifice to his gods, but by a refusal to gratify his guilty passion; and the punishment inflicted is merely exile, not torture and death. Baronius suggests that possibly Catharine may have returned from her exile, and subsequently suffered martyrdom for the faith at Alexandria; that "Dorothea," the name assigned by Rufinus (*Hist. Eccl.* viii. 17) to the nameless victim in Eusebius, may perhaps have been her name before her conversion to Christianity, and that "Maxentius," as the emperor is called in the

Acta, should be corrected to "Maximinus." But even Baronius, as has been already noticed, hesitates to accept the narrative as historical, while his commentator, with Tillemont and Baillet, abandons altogether the hopeless attempt to reconcile Simeon Metaphrastes with Eusebius (v. s.).

The martyrdom of St. Catharine is commemorated in the Latin and Greek calendars on November 25; the discovery ("invention") of her body on Mount Sinai on May 13 in the French Martyrology (Baillet, v. s.). In England her festival was promoted from the 2nd class (on which field labour, though no other servile work was permitted), to the 1st class of holidays in the 13th century (*Conc. Oxon. A.D. 1222, c. 8. Conc. Vigorn. A.D. 1240, c. 54*), and retained as a black-letter day at the Reformation. It was left untouched in Germany at the time of the retrenchment of holidays in A.D. 1540. In France it was gradually abolished as a holiday, although the office was retained in the 17th century (Baillet, v. s.). A few instances may be given of the reverence in which her name was held in Europe during the middle ages. Louis IX. of France erected in Paris a costly church in her name; and the famous Maid of Orleans claimed her special favour and tutelage (Martin, v. s.). The head of St. Catharine was alleged to be preserved in the church of her name in the Piazza of St. Peter's at Rome. She was regarded generally as the patron saint of schools, probably from the tradition of her learned controversy with the philosophers at Alexandria.

Moroni gives a brief account of a semi-monastic order, the Knights of Mount Sinai or of Jerusalem, instituted in Europe A.D. 1063 in honour of St. Catharine, under the rule of St. Basil. They bound themselves by vows to chastity, though not to celibacy ("castità conjugale"), to entertain pilgrims; and in rotation, each for two years, to guard the holy relics. Their dress was a white tunic, and embroidered on it a broken wheel, armed with spikes, in memory of the jagged wheel on which, according to the legend, the tender limbs of the saint were racked, and which was, in the first instance, miraculously shattered by divine interposition. The order became extinct after the fall of Constantinople; but in the 17th century the Basilian monks at Paris gave the badge of the order to any candidates for it who would take the vow of chastity and of obedience to the rule of St. Basil (Moroni, *Dizion. Eccles.* Reference to Giustiniani, *Historie Chronolog. degli Ordini Equestri*, p. 121; Bonami, *Catalogo degli Ord. Equest.* p. 21).

See Lippomano (Luigi), *de Vitis Sanctorum*, a Surio emendata; Venet. 1581, fol. (November 25). Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, Paris, 1701-12, 4to. (tom. vii.) Baillet (Adrien), *Les Vies des Saints*; Paris, 1739, 4to. (tom. viii.). Martin (Simon), *Les Vies des Saints*; Bar-le-Duc, 1858, 8vo. (tom. iii.). Baronius (Caesar), *Annales Ecclesiastici*; Barri Ducis, 1864, 4to. (tom. iii.). Bollandus Joannes, *Les Actes des Saints*, &c.; Lyons, Besançon, 1865, 8vo. (November 25). [See also CHARITANA.] [I. G. S.]

CATHARISTAE. [MANICHAEANS, MANES.]

CATHBADH (CATHUBIUS). There are two of this name commemorated in the Irish

Martyrologies on July 1 and Sept. 16. It is said that when St. Patrick first came into the north-east of Ireland, he built several churches, and among them one in the country belonging to the descendants of Aengus, the father of Eochaidh Muinreamhar: over it he placed two disciples, Cathbadius, a priest, and Dimanus, a monk. The former is perhaps the Cathubius, son of Fergus, abbat of Achadh-cinn, who, according to the *Four Mast.*, died in the year 554, aged 150. Colgan seeks to identify Achadh-cinn with the present Aughakeely in the barony of Kilconway, and on the confines of the ancient Dalriada and Dalaradia. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 146, c. 130, 182 n. ¹⁹⁵, 267, col. 2; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 267, n. ²², ii. 103; Archdall, *Monast. Hib.* 1; Reeves, *Ecccl. Ant.* 89, 322.) [J. G.]

CATHCAN, called also Catallus and Cathal, is commemorated as bishop of Rath-derthaighe on March 20, in the Irish calendars, and at Lathrisk in the parish of Falkland, Fifeshire, there was a dedication to a St. Cattell. Colgan suggests that Cathneus, one of St. Patrick's disciples, may have had his name corrupted to Cathcan. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 130, c. 6, 173, n. ²²; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 81, 371; *Retours*, File, No. 144; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 299.) [J. G.]

CATHEL (CATHAL, CATTEL) is perhaps Cathcan of March 20, in the Irish calendars [CATHCAN]. [J. G.]

CATHERIN, CATHERNA, has dedications in Scotland and Ireland. She is probably St. Catharine the martyr of Alexandria. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 299.) [J. G.]

CATHIRIUS (1), bishop of the Cimmerian Bosporus, was present at the Council of Nice (Tillem. vi. 643; Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 54).

(2) Bishop of Aspona at the heretical council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 711).

(3) Bishop at the council of Saragossa, A.D. 381. In this and the previous case the name is spelt Catherius; the last name with a variation, Cartherius. In Gams's *Series Episcoporum* the name of the bishop of Aspona is given as Cartherius. [E. B. B.]

CATHLON, king of the Britons (*Annal. Tigern.*, O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scriptt.* ii. 191). It is apparent from this passage that Caedwalla is the person meant:—"Proelium gestum a Cathlano et Anfratho qui decollatus est, in quo Oswaldus filius Ethelfredi victor erat et Cathlon rex Britonum cecidit." [CAEDWALLA (1).] [C. H.]

CATHMAEL. [CADOC.]

CATHUBIUS. [CATHBADH.]

CATHWINE (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1740, in *M. H. B.* p. 785), archbishop of Canterbury. [TATWINE.] [C. H.]

CATINA, mentioned by St. Jerome (V. 12, ed. Vall.) as an author (Catina quidam) who gave a mystical interpretation of Ezek. i. 7, &c. [W. H. F.]

CATOSUS, a Christian cook of Hippo (Aug. *Civ. Dei*, XXII. viii. 9, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* tom. xli. 766). [E. B. B.]

CATTEL. [CATHEL.]

CATTWG DDOETH. [CADOC.]

CATULINUS (1), or CATULLINUS, subdeacon at Circa, with Marcucius, SILVANUS, and Carosus under Paul the bishop, A.D. 303. On May 19 in that year, after the church furniture had been given up, he was called upon to surrender the books, but only produced one very big volume, as the readers had the rest. When called upon to tell the readers' names, both he and Marcucius refused. Though *traitors* they would not be traitors (*proditores*). They were arrested; but we do not hear of the end of his imprisonment. If this Catulinus were identical with the following, it is strange that Augustine should not allude to the fact in citing these *gesta*, in *Crescon*. iii. 29 (33), p. 513.

(2) the deacon, martyr at Carthage, with Januarius, Florentius, Pollutana, Julia, and Justa, buried in the basilica of Faustus in that city, commemorated July 15 (*Kal. Karth. Mart.* Hieron.; *Mart. Rom.*, &c.) and honoured with a sermon by Augustine, according to Possidius, which is no longer extant (Tillem. v. 554).

[E. B. B.]

(3) was the sixth bishop of Embrun (Ebre-dunum). He subscribed at the council of Epaune (Epaunum, Epaonum), which was held in the year 517, when Sigismund was king of Burgundy, and Hormisdas pope. While executing the decrees of this synod in his city, he was ejected by the Arians, and took up his residence at Vienne, with Avitus the bishop. He passed many years of exile devoted to good works, and left a saintly reputation. (*Gall. Christ.* iii. p. 1060.)

[D. R. J.]

CATULLINUS (1). [CATULINUS.]

(2) Proconsul of Africa under Constantine the Great (Godofred. *Cod. Theod.* t. vi. p. 354).

[E. B. B.]

CATUUAL, an abbat succeeding to Bec-tunus, mentioned in a charter of Cynewulf king of Wessex, A.D. 789 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 104).

[C. H.]

CAUIATHAN (*Kaviathan*), one of the twelve "maternal" angels in the system of JUSTINUS (Hippol. *Ref.* v. 26). Harvey conjectures that we should read Caulacau, but if any correction be necessary a simpler change is Schneidewin's conjecture LEVIATHAN.

[G. S.]

CAULACAU. This name (handed down with varieties of spelling which it is needless to particularise) was a sacred word in some of the Gnostic systems, in many of which great virtue was attributed to the knowledge of the true names of the unseen powers. To give an example of which we shall presently have occasion to make use, in the Gnostic book PISTIS SOPHIA (pp. 20 *et seq.*) the passage of our Lord between the earth and the highest regions is described. He wears a robe of light, on which are inscribed the names of the rulers of each of the intervening regions through which he must pass. As he enters the dominion of each, when the ruler sees his own name written on our Lord's robe he is filled with terror, falls prostrate, and adores; but our Lord himself he cannot see by reason of the light which surrounds him; and so elsewhere (p. 99) our Lord is described as passing without the knowledge of any of the

powers. In the same book (p. 233) it is taught that each of the souls which find admission to the kingdom of light, when it leaves the world goes to inherit a place in that region, the mystery of which it has received, being enabled by that mystery to pass without hindrance through the intervening regions. The book (p. 125) contains a revelation of some of these sacred names, but the names are only written in cypher, the explanation no doubt being a matter of traditional instruction. The teaching of Pistis Sophia may be recognised in the account which Epiphanius gives (*Haer.* 26) of those whom he calls Phibionites. They too taught (c. 10) that each soul when it left the world was stopped by the archons and powers who ruled the regions to which it came. If it possessed the secret of knowledge it passed safely through their dominions. If not, it was swallowed up by the great dragon, and after a time of punishment passing through its tail was sent back again to the world. The Phibionites too held the doctrine of Pistis Sophia concerning the descent of our Lord. Epiphanius tells (c. 9) that some of the worst of them taught that the disciple who had thoroughly put in practice the vilest of their lessons would be enabled to say, "I am Christ, for I have come down from above through the names of the 365 archons."

The earliest extant mention of the name Caulacau is to be found in the account which Irenaeus (i. 24) gives of the Basilidians. The passage, which is unfortunately corrupt, tells that they taught "mundus nomen esse, in quo dicunt descendisse et ascendisse Salvatorem, Caulacau esse." Two of the best MSS. read "Caulagau deum." Some have here made the obvious conjecture "mundi" for "mundus," and understand that it was to the world the name Caulacau was given. But this is forbidden by what we read in Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 4), who in this place borrows his account from Irenaeus, and who tells that it was to the Lord and Saviour that they gave the name Caulacau. We need not delay to theorise as to how the word "mundus" got into the text, or to examine Harvey's conjecture that it represents an adjective in the Greek original; for after what has been already said it is easy to understand the statement that Caulacau was the name in which the Saviour descended and ascended. He knew the mystery of the names of all the inferior powers, but that was his own sacred name, which none of them could penetrate. And this view is confirmed by what follows in Irenaeus. He says that the members of this sect, had no scruple to escape persecution, by concealing their doctrines and denying their faith. For they taught that he who had learned these mysteries and knew all the angels and their causes became invisible and incomprehensible to all angels and powers, as Caulacau also had been. And as the Son was unknown to all, so also ought they to be known by none, but, knowing all to pass through all, themselves invisible and unknown. Their maxim was, "Do thou know all, but let none know thee."

We have less scruple in illustrating the doctrines of the Basilidians of Irenaeus by those of Pistis Sophia and of the Phibionites, because of other coincidences between these sects. Pistis Sophia and the Phibionites both hold the doc-

trine of 365 archons, which is one of the peculiar points of Basilidian teaching. It is fairly probable that the Phibionites used the name Caulacau, for Epiphanius tells (*Haer.* xxv. 3) that it was used by some of the Gnostic sects which he enumerates, and among which the Phibionites are included, though he does not specify in which of the sects it was used. The name Caulacau may have formed part of the teaching of Pistis Sophia, but if so, it naturally was one of the mysteries veiled in cypher, as has been already mentioned. But there is another point of contact between that book and the Basilidians. We find in it (p. 354) the phrase "one out of a thousand, or two out of ten thousand," by which Irenaeus says the Basilidians expressed the paucity of numbers of the true disciples.

The next earliest mention of Caulacau of which we have knowledge occurred in the earlier work of Hippolytus on heresies, which Lipsius has largely recovered (see HIPPOLYTUS) by means of the use made of it by Epiphanius, Philastrius, and Pseudo-Tertullian. In that work the name was mentioned, not under the heading of Basilidians, but under that which next followed in the treatise, the Nicolaitans. Under this heading Hippolytus, who ascribed the origin of Gnosticism to Nicolas, the deacon, described the doctrine of certain Gnostic sects, which are marked by their terminology as akin to the Ophites described by Irenaeus (i. 30). Some of these were said to have applied the name Caulacau, according to the version of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 25), to a certain archon, according to that of Philastrius (*Haer.* 33) to a man, the meaning of which expression will appear presently. Caulacau was said to be one of a number of barbarous words invented to impose by their sound upon the simple.

Some coincidence of language on this point suggests that Jerome had before him this same work of Hippolytus, when writing on this word Caulacau (in *Isaiae* cap. 28) he tells of a use made of it by certain impure heretics who taught their disciples to do honour to this name in the gratification of fleshly lusts. We infer from all the authorities that Hippolytus had charged all the sects called Nicolaitans with teaching impurity. Among these sects Epiphanius classes the Phibionites already mentioned, and he makes concerning them a statement similar to that of Jerome. The same thing is told by Irenaeus (i. 31) of a section of Ophites. Another possible source of Jerome's information is the work of Agrippa Castor against Basilides, where also (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 7) similar remarks had been made as to the use of barbarous names.

In the later work of Hippolytus, the Refutation of all Heresies, though the origin of Gnosticism is still traced to Nicolas, there is no discussion of a sect of Nicolaitans, and the use of the word Caulacau is ascribed to the Naassenes, a word equivalent to Ophites. Philaster's word "man," already referred to, is explained by the fact on which great stress is laid in the Refutation, that the Naassenes used the word "man" in speaking of the principle of the universe, a point also mentioned in the account of these sects given by Irenaeus. This principle they held to be threefold, and Hippolytus tells that they gave the names Caulacau, Saulasau, and Zeesar, the first to the blessed nature of the heavenly man, the

Adam who is above, the second to the mortal nature below, the third to that of those who had been raised from earth to receive the heavenly birth, by which it is to be supposed their own disciples are indicated. In language which would suggest a different explanation of the "ascended and descended" of Irenaeus these last are described as the Jordan which flows upwards; for it was taught that as when the stream flows downward from the heavenly Adam to the mortal nature, there takes place a mortal birth of men; so when the stream is rolled upwards, as Jordan was by Joshua, there takes place a birth of gods (*Ps.* lxxxii. 6). Hippolytus, in evident ignorance of the origin of the names Caulacau and the rest, still speaks of them as high-sounding barbarous words invented to strike terror in the unexperienced; but Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxv. 4) correctly pointed out that they were taken from the Hebrew of Isaiah xxviii. 10,

צוֹ לָצוּן לוֹ וְצִיר שָׁם, the words which are translated in our version "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little." It is not obvious what connexion the words in Isaiah have with the Gnostic use of them, though commentators have found explanations almost with equal facility, whether the rendering of our version or of the LXX be adopted, and whether the word Caulacau be supposed to be given to a world or to a being (see Neander, *Genet. Entwick.* p. 85, Harvey, Irenaeus *l.c.*). It seems necessary then first to ask whether the words might not have been simply taken for their sound, without regard to their meaning. This would be more likely to have occurred if the Gnostic writer had been ignorant of Hebrew, and had found the words untranslated in a version; but except the version of Aquila, concerning which we have no information, all the versions, Oriental as well as Greek, translate the words, so that we may conclude that the Gnostic used the Hebrew text. And that he had regard to the meaning of the words is proved by the inversion of the words Caulacau and Saulasau from the order in which they stood in the Hebrew; doubtless, because the first word, rendered by the LXX "hope upon hope" was that best fitted to denote the heavenly principle, and the second, rendered "affliction upon affliction," was best fitted to denote the mortal principle. The remaining name, "here a little," may, as Harvey suggests, have been considered applicable to the true Gnostics, who in the context of the passage in Irenaeus are described as one in a thousand, or two in ten thousand.

Reviewing these authorities, it may be pronounced that the Naassene writer of the Refutation was not the first to introduce the word Caulacau. He is clearly different from those described in the earlier work of Hippolytus, for instead of sanctioning the impurity attributed to them, his doctrine tends to the discouragement of all sexual intercourse. And his teaching includes so many heathen elements that it is difficult to believe that he was a born Jew, or one likely to have read the Hebrew scriptures in the original. It seems probable then, that he was a later writer who used the language which he found current in his sect, converting what had been in their case mere mythology into philosophic speculation, and that his work only became

known to Hippolytus in the interval between his two treatises. It is unnecessary to discuss the priority with regard to the origination of the word between the claims of the Basilidians of Irenaeus and the Nicolaitans of Hippolytus, if the view taken in the article **CAINITES** be correct, as to the difficulty of drawing a very sharp line of distinction between these sects. To the points of agreement mentioned in that article between these Basilidians and the Ophites, may now be added their common use of the name Caulacau, their belief in 365 archons, their theory concerning the descent and ascent of our Lord, and (if Jerome's statement refers to Basilidians) the impure use of the names of the unseen powers. [G. S.]

CAUTINUS, bishop of Clermont about A.D. 562 (Till. *H. E.* iv. 473), formerly deacon at Issoire (Iciodorensis). The character of Cautinus in his episcopate is described by Gregory of Tours (who died A.D. 595), in his history of the Franks. The details may be given as illustrative of the times.

The first appearance of Cautinus after a reminiscence of his diaconate is at the death of St. Gallus, bishop of Clermont. He is at this time archdeacon. The people wished to have for their bishop Cato, a presbyter of vainglorious and turbulent character, who was exceedingly kind to the poor. The bishops who had come to bury St. Gallus were indeed only deterred by his vanity from effecting his appointment with the young king Theodobald. Acting already as bishop, though not consecrated, Cato now began publicly to threaten Cautinus, with whom he always had a quarrel. Cautinus, to appease him, offered to go to the king's court, and obtain the final sanction to his election. Ridiculed, however, by the aspiring Cato, the archdeacon went by night to the king, and obtained the episcopate for himself before the appearance of the messengers of his rival. Cautinus was well received by the greater part of the clergy and people of Clermont.

There was now a schism in that see; part held with Cautinus the bishop, part with Cato the presbyter. Cautinus at last took away from his opponents all church property; restoring it only to those who became reconciled to him.

We next find Cautinus seeking to obtain for Cato the see of Tours, on the death of Gunthar the bishop. This was probably in order to get rid of a thorn in his side; for we find Cato repudiating the offer, getting up a pageant of beggars, who called on their good father not to leave them, and entering on an agreement with Chramnus son of the existing king Chlothacarius, that if he should come to the throne, Cautinus should be turned out of the see of Clermont and Cato put in his place.

The next chapter of Gregory's history is left out in certain editions. It represents Cautinus as earning the execration of all men, addicted beyond measure to wine, and generally so intoxicated that four men could scarcely carry him from table. From this habit he became epileptic. The Jews are said to have been much attached to him, as he gave long prices for works of art. He is described also as abominably avaricious, swindling land from the powerful by quarrels and scandals, from the smaller owners by violence. The story of the burying alive of Anastasius, the

presbyter, if authentic, implies a lawlessness and iniquity that must be unparalleled in episcopal annals. Because Anastasius refused to give up to this tyrant the title-deeds of his lands, he is said to have been interred in a marble tomb, from which he escaped only by personal strength and perseverance, assisted by the drunkenness of the guard of soldiers, and the axe of a passing countryman. Anastasius, the story continues, escaped to king Chlothacarius with his title-deeds; the bishop appeared, was convicted, and retired in confusion; and all exclaimed that neither Herod nor Nero had done the like. We may remark that had this occurred, and had all expressed such an opinion, the bishop even in those times would hardly have retained his see.

The next adventure of Cautinus is the hostility of Chramnus the king's son, who lived at Clermont or Arvernum. Seeing one day a company of men riding down upon him, "Woe is me," exclaimed the bishop, "for these be they whom Chramnus has sent to take me!" Mounting his horse and urging it with both spurs, he galloped half dead to the portico of the church of St. Julian.

The last mention of Cautinus is at the time of a pestilence which devastated Clermont, and which was probably brought on by the loose and intemperate habits of the people. Cato the presbyter, the old rival of Cautinus, did his duty, buried the people, said the sacred offices to each sufferer, and died at his post. The terrified bishop, on the contrary, fled from place to place in vain; for returning at length to his episcopal city, he died at Easter of the plague. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. §§ 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 155, 173, 175, 490, 881, 918, Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.*) [W. M. S.]

CAVADES. [CABADES, CHOSROES.]

CAWRDAF, Welsh saint of the 6th century, king of Brecknockshire, distinguished in the Triads for his extensive influence, which was such that whenever he went to battle the whole population of the country attended his summons. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 270; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 497.) [C. H.]

CAYMAN. [CAEMHAN.]

CEADDA. The eighth bishop of Hereford. His date falls between 758 and 777, as in the latter year his successor, Aldberht, describes himself as *electus*, and his predecessor, Hecca, attests a charter of 758. (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* nn. 193 and 131.) During his episcopate Offa was king of Mercia; Bregwin and Jaenbert archbishops of Canterbury. [S.]

CEADDA, or **CHADD**, bishop, a Northumbrian by birth, and one of four brothers, of whom Cedda was one (Beda, *H. E.* iii. 23). Part of his early life was spent in a monastery in Ireland (*ibid.* iv. 5), and we also find him a monk at Lindisfarne, and one of the disciples of bishop Aidan (*ibid.* iii. 28; Simeon, *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* cap. iv.). He was brought up, therefore, in the tenets of the Scottish party.

In A.D. 664 bishop Cedda died at his monastery of Lastingham, of which he was the abbat, and Ceadda succeeded him there by his appoint-

ment (*H. E.* iii. 23). In the same year the synod was held at Whitby, which resulted in the defeat of the Scottish party, and the retirement of bishop Colman from Northumbria. Wilfrid was thereupon raised to the see of York, but staying too long in France, whither he had gone for consecration, king Oswiu prevailed upon Ceadda to become bishop of York. He then sent him to archbishop Deusdedit to be consecrated. When Ceadda reached Kent the archbishop was dead, and no successor appointed. He found a consecrator, however, in Wini of Wessex, who joined with himself in the rite two British or Welsh bishops. Beda, who had no love for Ceadda's tenets, does full justice to the excellence of his life. His brother Cedda and his preceptor Aidan were his models. After the primitive fashion he journeyed through his diocese on foot, preaching and doing good everywhere (*H. E.* iii. 28).

Wilfrid, on his return from France, submitted to the change which had been made in his absence, and Ceadda continued to act as bishop of York. In A.D. 669 archbishop Theodore held a general visitation of England, and detected the irregularity of Ceadda's consecration. On his reproving him for it, Ceadda, full of humility, resigned his see, an act which Theodore eventually sanctioned, although he made Ceadda's title to the episcopate good by correcting the informality of his consecration. Ceadda retired without a murmur to his old privacy and office at Lastingham. He was not to die there. In the same year Jaruman, bishop of Mercia, died, and Wulfhere, the king of that province, desired Theodore to nominate his successor. He requested Oswiu to allow Ceadda to be appointed, who was prevailed upon to accept the office. Ceadda had the charge of Mercia, the Middle-English and the Lindiswaras, or Lindsey, the seat of his large diocese being at Lichfield (Lyccidfelth). Wulfhere gave him land sufficient for fifty families, on which he might construct a monastery, at Ad Baruae (Barrow?). Ceadda was a most exemplary bishop. He journeyed on foot after his old fashion, and it was only at Theodore's most urgent bidding that he made use of a horse. When he was at home a great part of his time was spent in prayer in the company of seven or eight friends, the old Celtic number. Beda, who seems to be singularly attached to Ceadda's memory, records every trait of his character that he could recover, especially his devout bearing during storms. One of the most beautiful pictures in his Ecclesiastical History is his description of Ceadda's decease, which took place at Lichfield on 2nd of March, 672. Quini, the good bishop's attendant, heard angelic songs announcing the deliverance of his master. Far away in Ireland Ecgberht, an old companion of Ceadda, saw in a vision, as he said, the soul of Cedda descending with a retinue of angels, and returning with that of his brother, who had been absent from him so long (*Beda, H. E.* iii. 28; iv. 3; Eddius, *Vita S. Wilfridi*, capp. xiv. xv.). Ceadda was interred at Lichfield, near St. Mary's church, by the water-side (Hickes, *Dissert. Ep.* 118), and when it was rebuilt his remains were translated and enshrined in the cathedral that succeeded it. Miracles are said to have been wrought at his tomb (*H. E.* iv. 3). He obtained a place in the Calendar, and became one of the more popu-

lar of the English saints, the 2nd of March being assigned to him. There is preserved in the library of the dean and chapter of Lichfield, by the gift of Frances Duchess of Somerset, a richly decorated copy of the Gospels, which is said to have belonged to Ceadda. There is a page of it in the works of the Palaeographical Society, No. 35. In the *Journ. Arch. Inst.* xxxiii. 72, etc., is a very curious account of the rediscovery of some relics of Ceadda.

There is a short life of Ceadda in the *Acta SS.*, compiled from Beda, and another in Capgrave (*Nova Legenda*, pp. 58-9). See also (*Fasti Eboracenses*, i. 47-55; *The Kites of Durham*, 43; Gunton's *Peterbro'*, 164, 337-8. A little work called *Life and Legends of St. Chad*, by Rev. R. H. Warner, M.A., was published in 1871. [J. R.]

It was in the society of one of the most interesting of all the characters in Bede, a young man of noble family, a fellow-Angle of Northumbria, Ecgbert by name, that Ceadda spent some of his early days in an Irish monastery, both of them there "praying, observing continency, and studying the holy scriptures together." "Father Ecgbert," as Bede affectionately calls him, never came home again, and never forgot the friend of his youth.

The original episcopate of Ceadda is closely connected with important diocesan movements in Northumbria, the restoration of York's episcopal honours, and the development of the ecclesiastical province of the north. In the year 664 the council of Whitby was rapidly followed by two vacancies at Lindisfarne, and the election of Wilfrid, who proceeded into Gaul for his consecration. While he lingered abroad, king Oswy sent Ceadda, who was then abbat of his late brother's monastery of Lastingham, into Kent to be ordained bishop of the church of York (*Beda, H. E.* iii. 28). In this abrupt manner is his appointment introduced, and no synodal election is recorded (cf. v. 19, 'jubente rege Oswio'). Here the bishopric of York first re-occurs in history after the departure of Paulinus in A.D. 633. The old Roman city and military centre of the north was but a provincial town to the Angles as they worked their way inland from the coast. The lofty rock of Bamborough on the sea, further north, was the Northumbrian capital, and maritime Lindisfarne, hard by it, was the head-quarters of the Northumbrian church. But the ancient greatness of York, its being the capital of Deira, the southern limb of the kingdom, and its former episcopal dignity, would naturally mark it out for spiritual honours again when a second bishopric was to be formed. In appointing Ceadda to revive that see, there appears no intention to supersede the absent Wilfrid; but we are much mistaken if it does not very clearly reveal a policy of Oswy to cut in two the vast bishopric which had hitherto been co-extensive with the kingdom. The Scottish bishops of Northumbria had up to that time been humble-minded men of apostolic simplicity; but the possible spiritual dominion of a man of Wilfrid's magnificent ideas and splendid tastes and talents was certainly something to be feared by a prudent king. It was to erect two bishoprics out of one, to limit Wilfrid to Bernicia and Lindisfarne, that Ceadda was appointed, as we believe, to govern the church in Deira from

York. He is reckoned the second bishop of York, as Paulinus was the first (Stubbs, *Regist.* 180).

The consecration of Ceadda illustrates the position of the see of Canterbury in the church of England and the attitude of the British church to its Anglo-Saxon rival. He was sent by Oswy, with Oswy's presbyter or chaplain Eadhaed to accompany him into Kent. On their arrival the archiepiscopal chair, vacant by the death of Deusdedit, was still unoccupied; but the narrative does not hint that this circumstance proved the least difficulty, for the two presbyters turned their steps towards Wessex to find a consecrator there. In fact, the time had not then arrived for the see of Canterbury to occupy the unquestioned position of mother and mistress of English sees. Neither the mission of Gregory nor the seat of Augustine had been sufficient of themselves to create the primacy. The West Saxon bishop was Wina, and from him, with two bishops of the Britons (as Bede vaguely words it) assisting, Ceadda received his consecration. But we get light from another source as to whence these British bishops came. A letter of Aldhelm, to which attention is directed in Haddan and Stubbs (i. 124), strongly suggests the country of Dumnonia, the present Devon and Cornwall, which was included in the Wales of that period. The letter (Aldhelm, *Opp.* ed. Giles, 1844, in *Pat. Ecc. Angl.* pp. 83, 86; also in *Patrol.* tom. 89), written when Aldhelm was abbot of Malmesbury, about A.D. 690, is sufficiently contemporaneous for our purpose. It is addressed to Geruntius, king of the Dumnonian Britons, and though blaming them for their wilful Easter and their very wrong torture, is couched in cordial terms; while the Britons beyond the Severn are referred to as refusing every sort of intercourse, not only in worship, but at table. It is not probable therefore that Wina's fellow-consecrators could have come from Cambria, but without a doubt they were of the schismatic Tessareskaidekatitai party, as Aldhelm calls them.

The usual date of this consecration, A.D. 664, is that of the Saxon Chronicle; but the chronology here needs some rectifying. Ceadda was sent into Kent, while Wilfrid lingered abroad. The date of Wilfrid's consecration too is commonly stated to be A.D. 664; but Pagi (ad Baron. *Annal.* ed. Theiner, 1867, xi. 547) points out how the year 664 would thus be crowded to impossibility, and contends that 665 is the earliest date for Wilfrid's consecration and therefore for Ceadda's, even if there were no other reason. But another reason there is, that appears to settle the question. Ceadda is expressly said to have held his York bishopric three years (Bede, *H. E.* v. 19; Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ed. Thorpe, i. 28; cf. Edd. *Vit. Wilf.* cap. 15, p. 213, ed. Caxt. Soc.). His deposition by Theodore can be ascertained with very little risk of error, as that prelate first arrived at Canterbury May 27, 669 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 2, init.; cf. Hardy on Malmesb. *G. R.* i. 21), and soon afterwards ("mox," Bede) commenced his visitation. The deposition must therefore be placed in the summer of 669, and calculating three years back, we arrive at the summer of A.D. 666 as the date of Ceadda's ordination to the see of York (Pagi also argues for this date, *ut sup.* 547, 548). At this period

the episcopate was nearly extinct. Of the seven bishoprics then existing in England, four, Canterbury, Rochester, East Saxons, Lindisfarne were vacant. The Mercian bishop Jaruman was of Scottish ordination; Wina of Wessex had been ordained by French bishops; and Bertgils or Boniface of Dunwich by archbishop Honorius. What objection existed in the case of Bertgils does not appear; but Bede states (*H. E.* iii. 28) that when Ceadda was consecrated there was no other bishop in all Britain canonically (canonice) ordained but Wina. Lingard is mistaken in saying that Wina was the only bishop then alive among the Anglo-Saxons. If, therefore, a quarteimanian vitiated the succession, the episcopate had arrived at a precarious point. Another remark may be made in reference to Ceadda's episcopate. The bishoprics throughout England were few and large, conterminous with the kingdoms, corresponding with the manner of their original introduction and the first scarcity of qualified men. Wina had been made a second bishop in Wessex not long before Ceadda received his appointment in Northumbria, and it may have been more than a bare coincidence that brought the two together. At all events, these cases betoken a movement for subdividing spiritual authority, and this would serve the double purpose of securing a more numerous succession in the country and keeping episcopal power within bounds. It was evidently from royal suggestion that it started, and it is plain that it was met with reluctance by the great prelates in possession, whose ideas indeed must have kept expanding rather than contracting from the examples of continental episcopates at that period.

Ceadda's deposition and re-consecration have given rise to another difficulty. Lingard inquires (*Angl. Sac. Church*, i. 131) whether the ordination by Wina was regarded as void, or as only incomplete on account of some omission. His own solution does not appear to satisfy him, as there is not only Bede's account to deal with, but that of Eddius also, who was earlier, and who was obliged to relate the circumstances in their bearing on his patron Wilfrid. Theodore, according to Bede, chided the bishop of York as not having been "rite consecratum." If a ritual informality had been the only thing to allege against him, we should have expected the archbishop to have at once supplied the deficiency. Bede implies that this is just what was done, and that Theodore "ipse ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit" (iv. 2). About that time the Mercian bishopric fell vacant, and Ceadda (who was then in his monastery, as Bede remarks in passing, without accounting for it) was sent to occupy the post. But Eddius's story is this: Ceadda not only was charged with a defective consecration, but actually deposed from his office, reduced to the ranks, as Wharton expresses it, and retired to Lastingham. When the Mercian vacancy occurred, Ceadda was recalled from his monastery, and it was then that he was re-consecrated—re-consecrated in every sense; "per omnes gradus ecclesiasticos plenè eum ordinaverunt," is this language of Eddius (*Vit. Wilf.* c. 15) which evidently perplexes Lingard, who sees something more here than an original ceremonial defect. We believe the difficulty can be cleared up. Wilfrid must be taken into account. As soon

as Ceadda had been appointed to York in 666, Wilfrid came home from his long sojourn in Gaul, but instead of entering on the duties of his bishopric at Lindisfarne, he at once shut himself up in his monastery of Ripon, meaning by that step (as we interpret it) that if he was not to have the great Northumbrian bishopric in its undivided extent in his hands, he would have nothing. In that seclusion he had been three years (Edd. cc. 14, 15) when Theodore came into the north, and this was one of the great difficulties the new archbishop had to deal with. The only solution then practicable was to make Ceadda give way. He was therefore sent into retirement, on the pretext of an invalid consecration, for a merely defective one could have been easily remedied if it had not been resolved to get rid of him. The occurrence of the Mercian vacancy gave another opening for Ceadda, for whom personally a deep respect was felt; but as he had been dismissed on the plea of his consecration having been null and void, it was now necessary to repeat it *de novo* as so unambiguously expressed by Eddius. Without a doubt the real cause of Ceadda's deposition was that he stood in Wilfrid's way; and when Ceadda was removed we find his able rival in high honour, administering, as Bede describes (iv. 3), the bishopric of York, and that of all the Northumbrians, likewise that of the Piets, as far as the authority of Oswy could stretch. The ancient author who places this event in its right light is Roger Wendover (*F. H. ed. Coxe*, i. 159), who says that Wina consecrated Ceadda, "*licet contra statuta canonum, quia vivente adhuc Wilfrido non debuit alius subrogari*." But, he adds, this error was afterwards corrected, and the correction, which he relates, was a re-ordination. Again he remarks: Theodore ascertained that Ceadda "*non ritè ad Eboracensem archiepiscopatum promotum*," and therefore deposed him. This explains the *ritè*, which in this story relates rather to rule and canonicity than to ceremonial.

Ceadda was the 5th bishop of the Mercians, but the first whose see was fixed at Lichfield. His predecessors had all received their consecration in the Hiberno-Scottish communion; he was the first consecrated by an archbishop of Canterbury. Ceadda was likewise the last bishop of an English see at whose consecration any bishops out of the Roman communion are recorded to have assisted (see Stubbs, *Regist.* 3 sq.). The active administration of Theodore soon replenished the English episcopate, which never dwindled down again. Previous Mercian episcopates had been but transient, and Ceadda's proved no exception. At his death there had been five bishops in much less than twenty years. He could not, therefore, have ranked as "apostle of the Mercians," and no other seems to have been honoured with that appellation. But it was Ceadda that localised the episcopate, and so gave birth to the first cathedral; and this it has been, with his saintly devotedness, not omitting his fellowship with the dominant communion, that has written Ceadda with the saints, and handed him down under the familiar and affectionate monosyllable. As he died on March 2, according to Bede (iv. 3), who does not give the year, and as his episcopate lasted two years and a-half (Flor. Wig. ed. Thorpe, i. 30), we obtain by calculation the beginning of Sept. 669 for

the date of his re-ordination, so that his Lasting-ham life as a deposed bishop could not have been more than a very few weeks. All trace of his monastery Adbaruae, "*ad nemus*" in the province of the Lindissi (Bede, iv. 3) has disappeared. Winfrid, his successor, was buried there (*ibid.* cap. 6). The Anglo-Saxon version writes it Aetbearwe. Smith (ad Bed. iv. 3) conjectures it to have been Barton-on-the-Humber, opposite Hull, where the river used to divide the Roman road, and where it still divides the railroad. By others (cf. *Acta SS.* March, i. 143) the spot is thought to be Barrow, three miles from it, where ancient earthworks and barrows still exist.

Original materials for the life of Ceadda will be found in Hardy, *Descr. Cat.* i. 275-277.

[C. H.]

CEADUALLA (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 1, edd. Smith, M. H. B., Stevenson, Moberly); CEADWALA (Flor. Wig. Chron. edd. M. H. B., Thorpe, ad ann. 634); CEADWALE (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1233, in M. H. B. 779); king of the Britons. [CAEDWALLA (1).]

[C. H.]

CEADUALLA (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 506; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, 253 sq.); CEADWALA (Flor. Wig. Chron. ad ann. 661, M. H. B. 531); CEADWALE (Gaimar, *Estorie*, vv. 1521, 1529, in M. H. B. 783); CEADWALL (A. S. C. transl. Ingram, ad ann. 685-688); CEADWALLA (Bede, *H. E.* ed. Giles, iv. 15; v. 7, 8, 24; Flor. Wig. Chron. ad ann. 685-688, in M. H. B.; A. S. C. transl. M. H. B., Thorpe, ad ann. 685-688; Asser, *Annal.* Gale, xv. Scriptt. 147; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, 252), king of the West Saxons. [CAEDWALLA (2).]

CEADWAL. [CAEDWALLA.]

CEASWALA (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* index), British king. [CAEDWALLA (1).]

CECROPIUS (1), bishop of Nicomedia, in Bithynia, a Semiarian, who was translated from Laodiceia by Constantius in the year 351. Athanasius speaks with much severity of him, and charges him, together with Auxentius, of Milan, and Epictetus, with having secured their elevation by their calumnies and plots against the orthodox (Athan. *contr. Arian.* p. 290). In the year of his appointment to Nicomedia, he attended the synod at Sirmium, and took part in the deposition of Photinus (Athan. *Ep. ad Solit.* p. 800). Cecropius was one of the bishops who attended the consecration of the church erected by Basil at Ancyra in 358, to whom a letter was addressed by George of Laodiceia, representing the danger the faith was exposed to in consequence of the recognition of Aetius and his disciples at Antioch by Eudoxius, and urging them to take bold measures for their deposition (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 13). A deputation was accordingly sent to Constantius, who cancelled his former decision in favour of Eudoxius, and ordered that Aetius and some of his followers should be brought before Cecropius to answer to the charges brought against them (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 24). Cecropius perished in the earthquake which devastated Nicomedia in 358, and prevented the proposed council from being held there; but not, as was commonly reported, in the church. Sozomen tells us that he was at a distance from

it when the catastrophe occurred (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 16). [E. V.]

CECROPIUS (2), bishop of Sebastopolis, took a leading part in the council of Chalcedon, 451. At the second session of the council, Oct. 10th, Cecropius strenuously opposed the formation of any new definition of the faith, and required that the Nicene creed and the letter of pope Leo to Flavian should be read, for the acceptance of the assembled fathers. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 338-340.) He was one of the deputation sent to serve the second citation on Dioscorus, and refused to accept his plea of illness as a reason for refusal to attend (*ib.* p. 390). At the fifth session he vehemently urged that all present should sign the definition of faith then presented, or leave the council (*ib.* 559). [E. V.]

CEDDA, CEDD, bishop, a native of Northumbria, and one of four brothers, all of whom were priests. In A.D. 653, Penda, the ruler of the Middle-Angles, son of Penda king of Mercia, was baptized in Northumbria, through the influence of his brother-in-law, prince Alchfrith, and took four priests home with him to convert his people, of whom Ceda was one. They had great success in their missionary work, and Penda, himself a pagan, allowed them to preach in his kingdom of Mercia. About the same time Sigberht, king of Essex, embraced Christianity at the persuasion of Oswiu, who prevailed upon Ceda to visit that kingdom, to convert it. He went, and his work prospered greatly. Ceda's good work in Essex induced Finan, bishop of Lindisfarne, whilst his friend was staying at his monastery, to consecrate him bishop of that province. This took place in A.D. 654 or thereabout, and a great impulse was at once given to the spread of Christianity in Essex. Ceda was indefatigable in his labours. On the death of Sigberht in A.D. 660, he baptized Suidhelm, who succeeded him on the throne.

Ceda, during this time, kept up his connexion with Northumbria. Aethelwold, king of Deira, became acquainted with him through his brother Caelin, who was that monarch's chaplain or priest, and begged him to accept a site for a monastery in which he himself might worship and be buried. The place selected was Laestingaen (Lastingham), a lonely spot on the North Yorkshire moors. The way in which Ceda set it apart for sacred uses is an interesting fragment of Celtic ritual. Of this house at Lastingham Ceda was the abbat, his brother Cynibill acting as his deputy in his absence.

In A.D. 664 Ceda was present at the synod of Strenæshalch (Whitby), acting as an interpreter between the contending parties (Beda, *H. E.* iii. 25). He left it a convert to Wilfrid's arguments (*ibid.* iii. 26).

Ceda died soon after the synod. There was a great pestilence that year, and Ceda went to Lastingham, of which he was still abbat, a place which any contagious disease would not be likely to reach. He sickened, however, and died there, having first given his monastery to his brother Ceadda. His remains were interred, in the first instance, outside the church, which was probably of wood; but when a building of stone was erected, his body was removed to the right side of the altar. In the crypt of the present church there are preserved some fragments of early crosses which are

probably contemporaneous with Ceda. As soon as Ceda's decease was known in Essex a party of some thirty persons came to Lastingham wishing to live or die near the remains of their old master. All were carried off by the pestilence save one.

Almost everything that we know about Ceda is in Beda's *H. E.* iii. capp. xxi-iii. From him are taken the accounts given by the Bollandists, and by Capgrave, fol. 56. Ceda found a place in the Calendar, and his day is Jan. 7. [J. R.]

In calling Ceda the second bishop of London, as Florence of Worcester (*Chron.* ad ann. 625; *Nom. Episcop.* M. H. B. 617) and all moderns do, we should observe what the writer in the *Acta SS.* (Jan. i. 373) points out, that although Cedd was bishop of the East Saxons, whose capital was London, and whose territory answered to the subsequent diocese of London, there is no evidence that London was the actual seat of his bishopric. The distinction is worthy of notice, and carries us back to the circumstances of the appointment. Neither was the East Saxon king consulted about the consecration, for anything we are told, nor was the archbishop of Canterbury the consecrator; but the missionary Ceda being home on a visit went to his old monastery to consult with Finan, and the latter, finding how great his success had been, "made him bishop of the church of the East Saxons" (Bede). Here was no real interference with the royal prerogative. It was quite according to precedent that the Northumbrian bishop could bestow episcopal grade upon the missionary, but only the king's grant could make him bishop of London, and this Ceda is not called. The see of Canterbury too might seem to have been slighted; but the time had not yet come when the chair of Augustine had an acknowledged primacy in all the other kingdoms; the separate churches had not yet coalesced in one church of England. For Ceda's consecration Finan summoned two other bishops, who must have come from the British church, and the accepted date is A.D. 654 (Stubbs, *Reg.*) or about that (Wharton, *Decan. et Episc. Lond.*). His Mercian mission was therefore a very brief one (cf. Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad ann. 653). When he came among the East Saxons, it was some thirty-eight years since the death of king Sebert, the retirement of Mellitus, and the failure of the first extension of the Canterbury mission. Ceda was the second apostle of the East Saxons, and the instrument of their permanent conversion (cf. Bede, *H. E.* iii. 22, init.).

The rise of Ceda brings into view the growth of the native Anglo-Saxon church at the end of its first half-century. The missionaries of the Roman succession had just died out with Birinus the apostle of Wessex; in the person of Ceda, an agent of the same stamp, an "apostle" of native origin was produced. With Ithamar, A.D. 644, had begun the native episcopate, which was soon to root itself through England. Ceda saw the Roman line terminate at Canterbury, and at his death the Scottish mission expired at Lindisfarne. The expansive and aggressive vigour of native Christianity shews itself in the north rather than in Kent; and the circumstance (so pointedly mentioned by Bede) of four ordained brothers in one family, Ceda, Ceadda, Caelin, Cynibill, two of them eminent bishops, appearing in less than forty years

[PAULINUS] among the race that was to give England its name, was full of symptoms for the future.

Returning as a bishop to his mission Ceddā pressed on with redoubled effect, building churches in various places, and ordaining presbyters and deacons to assist in teaching and baptizing—an indication apparently that materials for a native ministry had already begun to appear among the East Saxons. Two spots are mentioned by Bede as the centres and pivots of his ministry; but neither of them is London; the principal one being the city of Ithancester on the Pente, and the other Tilaburg on the Thames. Camden shews that the Pente, or Pante, is the Essex river Froshwell or Blackwater, one of the springs of which was in his day named Pante-well, while the parish of Pantfield near Braine-tree, on the left bank, still testifies to the ancient name. On the shore of the estuary somewhere near Maldon he places the lost Roman fortress town Othona, and this by a very probable identification he makes Ithancester (Camden, *Brit. ed.* Gough, ii. 44, and map; see also Morant's *Essex*, ii. 405). Tilaburg is plainly Tilbury, and more exactly West Tilbury (Cam. ii. 41). The nature of Ceddā's ministry at these two places is described by Bede. There he gathered a flock of the servants of Christ, and taught them to maintain the discipline of a regular life as far as the rude people were yet capable of receiving it (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 22). This language suggests monasteries, and so Cressy understands (*Ch. Hist. of Brittany*, xv. 17), but Camden's editor does not allow that. From a remark of Camden respecting Tilbury, that "formerly it was the seat of bishop Ceddā when about A.D. 630 he baptized the East Saxons," later writers place Ceddā's episcopal see here, and even a second one at Ithancester (as Morant, *Essex*, 1768, i. 232), which has put more careful writers to the pains of rejecting the two sees, if not the monasteries likewise (Smith, ad Bed. *H. E.* iii. 22; Tanner, *Notit. Essex*, xli. ed. Nasmyth; Gough's Camden, *l. c.*). Sigebert and the whole body of his subjects rejoiced to see the daily growth of Ceddā's success. Of his personal character we have a view in Bede's narrative of the king's tragic end [SIGEBERT]. He was as pontifical in bearing as he was apostolic in devotion.

The conversion of the East Saxons under Ceddā has to be considered in relation to the main church controversy of that day, which expressed itself in the apparently unimportant questions of the calculation of the Easter period and the form of monastic tonsure, questions which had never slept since the arrival of Augustine. The further addition of the church created by Ceddā augmented the growing preponderance of the Scottish or anti-Roman school. The new Mercian church too, which was coming into existence contemporaneously, was an offshoot of the Northumbrian Scottish mission. Kent, Wessex, and East Anglia were therefore being decidedly overbalanced when the genius of Wilfrid triumphed at the council of Streoneshalh (Whitby) in 664, and fixed the current of Anglo-Saxon Christendom.

In that assembly Ceddā naturally was present, both as a bishop of ten years standing and as having a footing in the north through his monastery of Lastingham, which lay not far

off. Amid the keen contentions of the synod Ceddā's attitude was that of "interpres vigilantissimus utriusque partis" (Bede), a mediator between opposing extremes, and it was a prelude to his own surrender.

Lastingham monastery, besides being the foundation and the burial-place of Ceddā, has the additional interest of having been the earliest of the ten established in Yorkshire during the period of the heptarchy (Burton, *Monast. Eborac.* 54). But Burton's date, A.D. 648, which is John of Tinemouth's, must be wrong, as Bede expressly states that Ceddā was exercising his bishopric among the East Angles when the grant of the land was made to him (iii. 23, ad init.). The date Cressy gives, A.D. 660, must be nearer the truth (*Ch. Hist. of Brit.* xvi. 12). There are no traces of it left. When it began to revive at the Norman period out of its long desolation from the Danish deluge, the abbat and his new colony were invited to York, where they erected the abbey of St. Mary (Burton, 56). Of that incomplete revival, the present church of Lastingham, standing on a beck that falls into the Yorkshire Severn, is probably a relic. It is one of the most venerable and architecturally interesting ecclesiastical structures in the kingdom (Lewis, *Top. Dict.*). Ceddā's holding possession of this monastery all through life, though a bishop, non-resident, and out of the diocese, appointing its superiors and leaving it to his brother, is all in keeping with the times, and illustrates the sort of private right which founders of those institutions enjoyed. It was from the brethren of this house that Bede derived his information about Ceddā (*H. E.* Praef.), and there was preserved the tradition of Ecgbert's vision in Ireland, relating to his brother's soul [CEADDA]. The authority for the date of Ceddā's death is Florence of Worcester (*Chron.* ad ann. 654); but it is corroborated by Bede's mention elsewhere of the destructive pestilence that prevailed over the country in that year (comp. *H. E.* iii. 23 with cap. 27). The East Saxons were nearly two years without a bishop after Ceddā's death, and his successor was Wina, A.D. 666. All the materials that exist for Ceddā's life are mentioned by Hardy (*Descr. Cat.* i. 260); but besides what is derived from Bede, there is only an inedited Lansdowne MS., apparently of no importance. [C. H.]

CEDMON (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad ann. 680; Higden, *Polychron.* Gale, xv. Scriptt. 241), poet. [CAEDMON.] [C. H.]

CEDOALDUS (Paul. Diacon. *de Gest. Longob.* vi. 15, in *Patrol.* xcv. 632), king of the West Saxons. [CAEDWALLA (2).] [C. H.]

CEDOL, early Welsh saint, of uncertain date, patron of the chapel of Pentir, otherwise Llangedol, subject to Bangor in Carnarvonshire; commemorated on Nov. 1. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 306.) [C. H.]

CEDONIUS, ST., confessor, and bishop of Aix in Provence. His name occurs in the *Martyrologium Gallicanum* and in the *Breviary of Aix*, but his date and acts are quite uncertain. He is otherwise called Sidonius (*Acta SS. Boll.* Aug. iv. 591), [H. W. Y.]

CEDUALLA (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 288, 352, 354); **CEDUALLAN**, -NUS (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 28, 29); **CEDUALLA** (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 506); **CEDUALLA** (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 353); **CEDVALA** (Eddius, *Vit. Wulf.* Gale, xv. Scriptt. 73); **CEDWALE** (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1525, in M. H. B. 783); **CEDWALLA** (Hen. Hunt., *Hist.* in M. H. B. 718-734; Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilt. 204, 233; Wend. *F. H.* ad ann. 686-689; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, 252; Higden, *Polychron.* Gale, 242), king of the West Saxons. [CAEDWALLA (2).] [C. H.]

CEDWALA (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* in M. H. B. 528); **CEDWALLA** (Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 720, 721; Higden, *Polychron.* Gale, xv. Scriptt. 230; Wend. *Flor. Hist.* ad ann. 686); **CEDWALLADRUS** (Higden, *Polychron.* Gale, 243), king of the Britons. [CAEDWALLA (1).] [C. H.]

CEDWYN, Welsh saint of the 6th century, reputed patron of Llangedwyn, a chapel under Llanrhaidr in Montgomeryshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 280). [C. H.]

CEGGA, ST. [BEGA.]

CEIDIO AB CAW, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Rhodwydd Geidio, subject to Llantrisant in Anglesey, and of Ceidio in Carnarvonshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 227). [C. H.]

CEINWEN, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Llanginwen and of Cerrig Ceinwen in Anglesey; commemorated on October 8 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 151). [C. H.]

CEITHO, Welsh saint of the 6th century, presumed founder of Llangeitho in Cardigan-shire; commemorated on August 5 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 213). [C. H.]

CELADION succeeded Marcus II. as bishop of Alexandria, in the year 153. He held the see fifteen years, and was succeeded by Agrippinus, in the year 168. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11. *Id. Chron.* apud Hieron. sub anno 2171.) [E. V.]

CELANTIA. A noble Roman matron, a letter to whom is included among those of St. Jerome (148, ed. Vall.), though it is probably by some other hand. The letter is full of moderate counsels as to asceticism, and blames her for taking a vow of continence without her husband's consent. [W. H. F.]

CELBES. [ACEMBES.]

CELE-CHRIST. Bishop of Cill-Cele-Christ, in Ui-Dunchadha, in Fotharta in Leinster—March 3. Cele-christ or Christicola, the 'vassal' or rather the 'companion' of Christ, was a native of Ulster, being son of Eochaidh, descended from Eoghan, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages. His brother was Comgall of Both-conais (Sept. 4) in Inisegain, now Inishowen, in the county of Donegal. He left his native province, and going to the west of Leinster built a church (oratorium) in the district called Hy Donchada, which was afterwards known as Cill-Cele-Chriost. There, apart from the world, he wished to flee all earthly honours and devote himself to heavenly contemplation, but honour pursued him, and

"invitus ad pontificalis dignitatis apicem rapitur." With some others, "cum aliquot sociorum caterva," he went on a pilgrimage to Rome. He died in 722, some time after his return. He is venerated on March 3. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 162; Kelly, *Cal. Ir.* SS. 82; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 63, 241 n.)

[J. G.]

CELE-CLERECH. — Bishop and martyr, commemorated July 8. He is given in *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 191) as martyred along with Aedh and Tadhg, in Würzburg, in Franconia. Dr. Todd, in his note on the entry, says there can be no doubt but this bishop and his fellow-martyrs are really the same as Cilian and those who were put to death with him. [See **CILIAN**.] [J. G.]

CELE-PEADAIR, the "Servant of Peter," was abbat of Armagh, and the *Four Masters* give his obit, A.D. 757. He was a native of Uí-Breasail-Macha (now Clan-brasil, on the south side of Lough Neagh in the county of Armagh), and succeeded Congus, bishop at Armagh, in A.D. 750, as abbat and bishop. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 192; Harris's *Ware's Bishops*, 41; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 294, col. 1; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 361.) [J. G.]

CELER (1), proconsul of Africa in A.D. 429 (*Cod. Theod.* l. vi. 354, ed. Godofred), is addressed by Augustine in two epistles (56, 57, or 237, 210), which shew him to have been a Donatist. The date of the epistles demands investigation. The Benedictines put them about A.D. 400. Their chain of reasoning is as follows. The conference at Carthage in A.D. 411 is not mentioned in the letter, therefore it is beyond doubt earlier than that conference; therefore A.D. 400 is a suitable date. The first of the two letters was written on a tour of episcopal visitation, which hindered Augustine from performing his promise of reading some of his own works to Celer. He therefore sent them by a presbyter, named Optatus, who was to be at the service of Celer whenever the latter had leisure. Celer was at this time a man of high character, and had been bred a Donatist, and the books he had wished to hear seem to have included one on preparation for death. He was also anxious to know if the African Donatist church had any good reason for severing itself from the church catholic. We learn from the second letter, if we are right in supposing it to refer to the things mentioned in the first, that his desire had been signified to Augustine by his son Caecilius, who seems to have been a Catholic. In this second letter he is requested to give more diligent charge to his men, Paternus and Maurusius, to bring about catholic unity in the region of Hippo. Allusion is also made to the multitude of his occupations. We may infer that this letter was written after Honorius had begun to pass laws against the Donatists, which Celer, though as yet a Donatist himself, was officially bound to execute. It will therefore be not earlier than A.D. 405. The book Augustine had sent him had then been by him *non paucis diebus*, but Augustine is not sure whether he has read it. It seems that Optatus was to read some of Augustine's writings to Celer, and if he were duly grateful, he should have an interview with Augustine, or copies of

that and other works of Augustine's for himself. He had received those copies some weeks or months before Augustine wrote again. The first transactions seem to belong rather to the time when the Donatists were eagerly reading Augustine's writings and proud of their great African divine (Tillem. xiii. 193), than to the time when they were embittered by legal penalties, which Augustine took care to see enforced. In the second letter there is an allusion to a matter which commentators have left unexplained. Celer had an estate at Hippo; his bailiff was Spondaeus, a friend of Augustine. This bailiff seems to have allowed the Donatists some illegal advantages, a place of meeting or the like, on the estates of Celer. Augustine expostulated with his friend, who sent back word by one Caius that he was afraid of making some of his people violent. It was reported that he had Celer's orders. Augustine begs Celer to support his own demands, and then the man will have nothing to fear. Afterwards, in A.D. 412, when Macrobius, Donatist bishop of Hippo, had forcibly, with a gang of followers, opened some of the closed basilicas, Spondaeus stopped his proceedings; but when Spondaeus had gone to Carthage, Macrobius opened basilicas and held meetings on Celer's own estates (*Ep.* 139 or 158). In A.D. 422, Augustine writes to pope Celestine, that Celer, of whom the young bishop Antonius had complained, both before the council of bishops that deprived him of his see and afterwards to pope Boniface, for oppressive use of authority against him, held no office, whether in Africa or elsewhere, either then or since. We may note that Augustine's form of address to the Donatist, whom he was urging not illegally to protect the adherents of his sect, is "domine dilectissime, meritoque honorabilis ac suscipiende fili."

[E. B. B.]

CELER (2), misnamed **CELLOR** by Theophanes, an Illyrian (according to Malelas), "a learned, eloquent, wise, and brave man, full of the grace of God," *magister* or captain of the body-guard to Anastasius, sent by him (A.D. 503) with a fresh armament against Cabades, king of Persia; because the former armaments under Areobindus, Appho, and Romanus on the one hand, and Patricius the Phrygian and Hypatius the emperor's nephew on the other, needed to be united under a single head. Indeed, a large part of both the former armaments had been destroyed. The advance guard of the fresh army under Patriciolus and Vitalianus his son arrived in Mesopotamia in September; Celer himself in December. He found that Cabades had been called home by an Ephthalite invasion. He had orders to remit the taxes throughout Mesopotamia. He sent the troops into winter-quarters till March; then despatched Timostratus to attack the horses and herds of the Persian army which were feeding on mountains near Nisibis, and himself collected the forces to join Patricius in the blockade of Amida. He forbade assaults on the walls. In July he made an inroad into Arzanene. He forbade his men under pain of death to spare the life of any male above the age of twelve in the villages of the enemy, or to leave a single house standing. He was compelled by the severe winter of A.D. 504-5 to purchase the departure of the Persian garrison from Amida by payment of 1000 pounds of gold. He was then commis-

CHRIST. BIOGR.

sioned to conclude peace, which was finally effected in A.D. 507. During the delay of the negotiations he sought a site for a Roman fortification on the Persian frontier. He fixed on Daras, which, according to Malelas, was on the site of the battle of Arbela. He then returned to Edessa, where he had been unpopular, and was received with great pomp. The treaty was signed there. But the fortification of Daras became a new cause of grievance, and Anastasius had to content Cabades with a new payment of money. (Procop. *Bell. Pers.* i. 8, 9; Theophanes, A.M. 5998; Malelas, p. 399, ed. Bonn; Ceillier, x. 583, 586.) See for further information Rawlinson, *Seventh Mon.* p. 357 ff.; and Josué le Stylite (*introduction par* Paulin Martin, Leipzig, 1876), cc. 55, 61, 65-103.

This is the Celerus, a senator, to whom Avitus writes (*Ep.* 43), in A.D. 496, about a captive of king Gondebald. (*Patrol.* lix. 260; Ceillier, x. 562.) In A.D. 508 he was consul.

He was nearly murdered in A.D. 512 by the rabble, who were excited at the change in the Trisagion introduced by Anastasius. Marcellin. *Chron.* (*Patrol.* li. 937). [E. B. B.]

CELER (3) Martyr of the primitive Welsh church, patron of Llanelgar in Carmarthenshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 306). [C. H.]

CELERINA (1). Mart. Rom. (Cyp. *Ep.* 39). See **CELERINUS**. [E. W. B.]

(2) The deaconess to whom Theodoret writes his *Ep.* 101. [E. B. B.]

CELERINUS (1), a confessor at Rome, tortured apparently before Decius himself, "anguis major, metator antichristi" (Cyp. *Ep.* 22). He writes in agony of mind to LUCIANUS (*q. v.*), the Carthaginian confessor, to beg a *libellus* for his two sisters, Numeria and Candida, the latter of whom had sacrificed, and, to avoid sacrificing, the former, called also Eteucusa, paid money ("dona numeravit," an apparent play on the name—cf. Mart. *Ep.* iv. 38. 8, "numeres oportet aliquid"—if Numeria is indeed a praenomen at all, which Varro says it could not be: *L. L.* ix. 33, ed. Spengel), when she was already ascending the Capitol (*Ep.* 21). They endeavoured to atone for their fall by their care of the Carthaginian refugees at Rome, whom they met at Portus, and provided for to the number of sixty-five at one time. They had been heard before the Roman presbytery (*praepositi*) after their lapse, and their readmission was postponed until the election of a new bishop. Cyprian, disapproving the letter of Celerinus, still praises his "verecundia." The date of the letter is after Easter 250. The true text (preserved in Codex T, see Hartel, *pref.* xlviii.) gives it in the vulgar African latin. The various coincidences can leave little doubt that he was a Carthaginian, though it is nowhere so stated. See MACARIUS for names of other Christian sufferers. The Celerinus whom Cyprian ordained in his retirement near Carthage, in Dec. 250 (*Ep.* 37 and 39), must be the same person; for he comes from Rome, and from the famous group of confessors, Moyses, Maximus, &c. (whose part is most important in the affairs of the lapsed and of Novatianism); is a confessor "primus ad temporis nostri proelium," "inter Christi milites antesignanus," "cum ipso infestationis principe et auctore congressus." He was warned by a vision, while wavering, to take holy

orders. He belonged to a family of martyrs. His grandmother Celerina, and two uncles, Laurentinus and Ignatius, Roman soldiers, died by martyrdom, and (which is unaccountable unless the family had a previous connexion with Carthage^a) were commemorated at Carthage before his ordination. Their day in the [Carthaginian] kalendar is Feb. 3, on which he also is celebrated as deacon conf.^b Augustine preached sermon 48 in St. Celerina's church, which under Genserici was given up to the Arians. (Morc. p. 65.)

Again the Celerinus mentioned in Cornelius's letter to Fabius, bp. of Antioch (Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.* vi. 43, πῶς βαρβάρους διενέγκας . . . κατὰ κράτος νενίκηκε τὸν ἀντικειμένον), must be the same confessor on whose unusual sufferings (stocks, starvation, wounds) Cyprian enlarges (*Ep.* 39). He is there said to have abandoned Novatian along with Maximus, Urban, Sidonius (i.e. in Nov. A.D. 251; compare Cyp. *Ep.* 49: Moyses had died beginning of Jan. 251). His presence with Cyprian, Dec. 250 (as well as the fact that he was apparently out of prison even in Apr. 250), explains his not being mentioned in the correspondence with the other confessors, while he may well have sided with them in adhering to Novatian at the election of Cornelius in March 251 (the true date), and withdrawing from him the following November. If it is observed from what a large number of scattered incidental notices this story is reconstructed, it will appear how strong a body of evidence it affords for the genuineness of the documents.

[E. W. B.]

CELERINUS (2) Father of Ageruchia (*g. v.* St. Jerome, Letter 123, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

CELESTINUS I. Pope. [COELESTINUS.]

CELESTIUS. [COELESTIUS.]

CELESIUS, a magistrate, perhaps chief of the police, at Nazianzus, to whom Gregory Nazianzen wrote three letters, placed by Tillemont in the Lent of A.D. 382, which was passed by Gregory without uttering a word to anyone. Celestius having complained of being received by his friend in perfect silence, Gregory retorted that he had graver complaints to make against him on account of his negligence of the Lenten fast, and for his exhibiting immoral spectacles in the theatre. A second remonstrance elicited a still severer rebuke. The third letter is much longer, and couched in a more friendly and playful spirit. (Gregor. Nazianz. *Epist.* i. 74, 75 (71, 72).)

[E. V.]

CELFRIETHUS (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 198), abbat of Wearmouth. [CEOLFRIED.]

[C. H.]

CELIN (1) (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 23, ed. Giles), priest. [CAELIN.]

[C. H.]

(2) (Eddius, *Vit. Wilf.* c. 61, in Gale, xv. Scriptt. 87), monk. [CAELIN (2).]

[C. H.]

CELLACH (CELLAN, KELLACH). Colgan

derives this name from Ceall or Cill, a cell, and enumerates thirty-three saints bearing the name between the years 657 and 1148, but few of them have much bearing on history, or lived before the 9th century. They are also so indistinct in their biographical outlines as to prevent any sure assignment to places or days of dedication.

CELLACH (1)—April 1. This seems to be the dedication of St. Cellach, son of Sarguse, anchorite, abbat and bishop of Armagh, in the end of the 9th century, and of Ceallach, abbot of Iona. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 93; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 334, n. 7, and *Tr. Thaum.* 500, col. 2.) Ceallach, son of Conghal, was nineteenth abbat of Hy A.D. 802–815, and during his presidency the monastery of Kells in Meath was founded, or re-organised after its original foundation by St. Columba, and was made the chief station of the Columbian order, on account of the danger and sufferings to which the community at Iona was exposed from the attacks of the Northmen. O'Clery mentions also a Ceallach, son of Conmach, who was blind, deaf, and lame. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 278, 388; Grub, *Ecl. Hist.* *Scotl.* i. 125; Lanigan, *Ecl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 131, iii. 252; *Four Masters*, by O'Donov. i. 413; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 93.)

(2) Deacon in Glendaloch in Ui-Mail (*Mart. Doneg.*)—October 7. *Mart. Tallaght* calls him a Saxon. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 510, c. 9) says St. Kellach, son of Saran, abbat of Fothan (now Fahan, near Lough Swilly, in the barony of Inishowen and county of Donegal), was successor of Mura; died, according to the *Four Masters*, A.D. 657, and was venerated on October 7. These may have been placed upon the same day, but can hardly be the same person.

(3) Bishop of the Mercians. [CEOLLACH.]

CELLAH (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 307), bishop of Mercia. [CEOLLACH.]

[C. H.]

CELLANUS, a native of Ireland, and a monk in France, in the monastery where the uncorrupted body of St. Furseus rested, which was (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 19; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 933) at Peronne. He wrote to Aldhelm begging some of his discourses, and received from him a favourable reply (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 333, 337).

[C. H.]

CELLOR. [CELER (2).]

(2) Said to have been 5th bishop of Toul. (Ceillier, x. 400.)

(3) Bishop, who signs first at the council of Valencia, A.D. 524 (*Conc.* iv. 1620).

(4) Bishop of Valencia at the council of Toledo, A.D. 589 (*Conc.* v. 1017).

[E. B. B.]

CELRED (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 243; Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1650, in M. H. B. 784); **CELRETH** (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 2041, M. H. B. 789), king of Mercia. [CEOLRED.]

[C. H.]

CELREDUS (SELREDUS, SELFREDUS), abbat of Medeshamstede (afterwards Peterborough), brother of Siward, abbat of Croyland; occurs A.D. 806; his successor Hedda occurs A.D. 833. (Ingulph, *Hist. Gale*, Scriptt. t. i. p. 7; Willis, *Mit. Abbeys*, i. 144; *Monast. Anglic.* i. 346; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 192; Birch, *Fasts Monast.* 57.)

[C. H.]

CELSA, A.D. 632, succeeded Rusticula as

^a So also we find him (Euseb. vi. 43) in company with SIDONIUS; and the MACARIUS (in the same group, *Ep.* 21) is connected with Carthage.

^b The Martyrology, Feb. 3, "Celerini Diac. Conf. item SS. m. m. Celerinae aviae ejus, Laurentii patris, Ignatii avunculi," is a note from Cyp. *Ep.* 39, iii. (3). Cf. ARISTO.

abbess of the nunnery founded by Caesarius of Arles. (*AA. SS. Ord. S. Bened.* xii. 28, vol. i. 355; Ceillier, xi. 695.) [E. B. B.]

CELSINUS, a writer, probably a Platonist, from whom Augustine quotes (*Contra Academ.* li. ii. (5), vol. i. 921).

CELSUS (1). Of the personal history of this, the first great polemical adversary of Christianity, we know nothing with certainty. Nor is this to be wondered at; since Origen, from whom the whole of our knowledge of Celsus is derived, was himself in the same predicament. It appears that the work of Celsus, entitled *ἀληθὴς λόγος*, or the *True Discourse*, had been placed in Origen's hands, without any hint of the history or date of its author; and hence Origen in different parts of his reply makes various conjectures, as to the value of which we are as capable of judging as he was himself. For instance, he tells us that he has "heard" that there were two Celsuses, both Epicureans; and he assumes for the most part that the Celsus against whom he writes was an Epicurean. But the *ἀληθὴς λόγος* is manifestly, from its whole tenor, the work of a Platonist; and hence Origen is reduced to suppose that Celsus, for the sake of making a better impression on the world, dishonestly concealed his Epicureanism—a needless and improbable hypothesis. (Origen, *cont. Cels.* i. 9.) Manifestly, until far better evidence to the contrary has been produced than is ever likely to be produced, we are entitled to assume that the Celsus of Origen was a genuine (and by no means an unlearned or unskilful) Platonist. And this has often been considered to prevent his identification with that Celsus to whom Lucian (who was an Epicurean) dedicated one of his works, and who wrote a treatise "against magicians." Dr. Keim, however, has shewn considerable grounds for the identification, which certainly adds a point of interest to the name of Celsus.

But far more interesting questions than any that concern Celsus personally are raised by his attack on Christianity, of which enough has been preserved by Origen in his work *Contra Celsum* to convey to us a very tolerable idea of its nature. In judging of it, we must be on our guard at once against disparaging it too much, or on the other hand thinking too highly of its ability. Origen indeed, who to all appearance is a very fair antagonist, speaks of it with contempt. But the estimates which even fair controversialists give of their opponents are not to be hastily assumed; and Celsus had at any rate this merit, that if he attacked others, he gave them their revenge by presenting his own views to be criticised. He was not a mere polemical assailant; he was a philosopher on his own account, and held in certain respects by no means unenlightened opinions. He had strong faith in reason. "What evil is it," he asks, "to be learned and to have cultivated the intellect with the best pursuits, to be and to appear wise? What obstacle are these things to the knowledge of God? Do not they rather lead and assist to the attainment of truth?" Nor had that similarity between the human and the animal frame, which the natural science of our own day insists upon, escaped his notice. Hence he deduces that ants "converse, have reason, notions of general truths, speech," &c. (iv. 84), and even that they

have knowledge of God. It would be hard, again, to cavil at his ideas of the Divine Nature; he speaks of men "burning with the love of it" (i. 8); he is intolerant of the association of it with anything that is mortal or perishable. It would, however, be premature to conclude from these passages that Celsus was a great philosopher; for from the mere fragments of his work which are preserved, it is impossible to know certainly with what degree of energy, vigour, and originality, he put forward his positive opinions; whether they were mainly his own, or a mere reflection of those of others. And without this knowledge, any judgment of him must be uncertain. He was not free from superstition; he believed in magic, and declared that serpents and eagles were more skilled in it than men (iv. 86).

Baur says, that "in acuteness, in dialectical aptitude, in many-sided cultivation, at once philosophic and general, Celsus stands behind no opponent of Christianity." Admitting that this panegyric is not groundless, we must add, that in vital insight Celsus was deficient. As an opponent of Christianity, the chief characteristic of Celsus is a strong, narrow, intolerant common sense. To him Christianity is an "exitabilis superstitio;" he gives credence to every story against it on which he can lay his hands; he dwells with coarse jocularity on the Jewish tradition of Panthera and the Virgin Mary (i. 28, sqq.); he unearths a certain Diagramma, a figure symbolising the world, and consisting of a circle called Leviathan enclosing ten other circles, which apparently was used in the rites of some sect more or less approximating to the Christians (vi. 22). He has no idea of regarding Christianity from the inside, and of inquiring into the reason of its influence; from not looking at a belief in its truth as the most distant possibility, he uses jest for argument, and interprets everything in a bad sense. Treating of the flight of Jesus into Egypt, and afterwards (as he alleges) before the betrayal, he asks, "Had God need to fly from his enemies? Does fear belong to God?"

In such instances as these, it is evident that Celsus wholly misapprehended the force of the doctrine that he was attacking. There are cases, indeed, in which he shews himself more acute. He challenges the evidence of Christianity, and asks, "Who saw the dove lighting on the head of Jesus after his baptism?" As to the resurrection, he makes the remark which has been made by Renan and others, that it was Mary Magdalene, "a fanatical woman," who was the first witness of the resurrection, according to all the accounts (ii. 55). He also remarks on the disbelief that was invariably given to such accounts as those of the resurrection of Zanolxis, Pythagoras, Orpheus, Protesilaus, Hercules, and Theseus. But the most remarkable portions of his attack are those which are directed against the general character of Christianity, and which shew the great resemblance, in some points where we should least expect it, between the religion as it existed then and as it exists now. For instance, he dwells on the numerous sects of Christians, all of whom said, "Crede, si salvus fieri velis," and asks how one is to judge between so many? Nor does Origen deny the fact of the number of these sects; but he maintains that

this is a proof of the importance of that on which they debated, and further that they all set forth Jesus alone as the means of salvation (vi. 11). Celsus accuses the Christians of lawlessness, and of keeping wholly to themselves, and not caring for those outside. It is needless to observe that this diversity and contest between the laws, spiritual or ecclesiastical, which Christians have appointed to themselves, and the political institutions which govern the world, has endured to the present day. He complains vehemently of the Christians as discouraging learning, wisdom, and thought; as rejecting the authority of reason; as being the patrons of sinners, whereas to the heathen mysteries only "the holy and virtuous" were invited. He makes a great point of the opposition between the Old and New Testaments in the morality recommended by them; in respect of the earthly success which is the crowning happiness of the former, and which is so strongly reprobated by the latter. Finally he maintains that no revelation of the Supreme Being can be made; but that, if it could be made, it must be of universal and compelling efficacy; that, however, all that is possible is revelation by an angel or demon, which sort of revelation he yet does not allow to Judaism or Christianity.

The form of Celsus's work, the *ἀλλοθὺς λόγος*, is well known. He begins with a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian, in which the Jew sets forth the objections to Christianity which come from his point of view. It must not, however, be inferred from this that Celsus had any partiality for Judaism; much the reverse. He treats Moses and the Jewish scriptures with a contempt which amusingly contrasts with the uncritical reverence which he pays to the Galatophagi of Homer, the Druids, and the Getae, whom he terms "wise and ancient nations" (i. 16); and with which he accepts the stories of Linus and Musaeus, though afterwards he rejects those of Perseus and Amphion (i. 64). And in one of the most unpleasing passages of his work, he compares Jews and Christians to a set of worms or frogs sitting in the mud, squabbling, and saying, "God is, and we are next to him, and it is for our sake that the whole world is made; and God will come and take us up to heaven, except those who are bad, whom he will burn with fire."

Our only ancient authority for Celsus is, as has been said, the work of Origen against him. This is a work, as a whole, of much controversial merit and philosophical breadth. Origen, indeed, like Celsus, is not free from the superstitions of his time; thus he defends the star whose appearance is told in the second chapter of St. Matthew by a reference to comets, which, he remarks, portend future events, such as wars and pestilences. But, on the whole, there are few works of the ancient Fathers which can be read with mere pleasure and profit. In modern times, F. C. Baur has written an elaborate critique on Celsus in his work on *Christianism and the Christian Church in the First Three Centuries*, Tübingen, 1853. But the work to which reference should be made by all who wish to obtain a thorough knowledge of Celsus (in so far as this is now attainable) is Professor Theodor Keim's monograph (*Celsus's Wahres Wort*. Zürich, 1873). Dr. Keim gathers toge-

ther, and translates, the fragments of Celsus contained in Origen; and adds disquisitions of much interest, both on Celsus himself, and on two of his contemporaries, Lucian of Samosata and Minucius Felix. Both Baur and Keim appear to the present writer to rate Celsus too highly; but the general tendency of Christian writers has naturally been to underrate him. The date of Celsus's treatise is fixed by Keim at the year 177 or 178 A.D. [J. R. M.]

CELSUS (2) Fifth bishop of Treves, who died, it is said, in 141. His body was discovered in 977, and miracles are reported to have been wrought by it, but his history is uncertain (*Acta SS. Boll.* Feb. iii. 393). [H. W. Y.]

(3) Bishop of Iconium, who allowed a layman named Paulinus to preach, as Demetrius is informed by Alexander (*Eus. H. E.* vi. 19).

(4) (Baron. A.D. 309, § 36; *Acta SS.* Jan. 9). A boy, otherwise called Hircitalus (a corruption of some name derived from *εἰρκτός*), son of the praefect Marcianus and Marcionilla, converted by St. Julian's constancy under his tortures at Antioch (or by a vision of angels), was imprisoned with him, converted his own mother, and they were martyred, together with seven other brethren, on the Feast of the Epiphany—perhaps in A.D. 309. It is just possible there may be so much truth in the Acts, which are one of the finest specimens of a monkish romance.

(5) Domitius Celsus, Vicarius of Africa (A.D. 316), to whom Constantine addressed his letter against the Donatists, promising to come to Africa himself, and hear and judge and settle the matter, by destroying one party or the other. Petronius, Annianus, and Julianus, the praefects, also write to inform him that at the bidding of the sovereign they have given a conveyance and a competence of provision to bishops Lucian, Capito, Fidentius, and Nanitius, and presbyter Mammarius, as far as the port of Arles, on their return from pleading before the court in Gaul to their homes in Africa. These letters are given in the appendix to Augustine, vol. ix. 789. The emperor's letter, and the law which he addressed to Celsus (*Cod. Theod.* bk. i. tit. 10, l. 1), forbidding an officer employed in distraining a house to drag a matron into the street, under heavy penalties, even death, to himself and his employer, are given by Baronius (*ad annum* 66, 70). He remarks that the law was a vindication of old Roman rights against the libidinous violence that had come in with the persecutions.

(6) Praefect of Syria, A.D. 362 (Baron. *ad ann.* 53), came to meet Julian at the gates of Cilicia and Cappadocia, was greeted by him with a kiss, and taken up into his chariot, where he sat by him till they reached Tarsus. See Ammianus Marcellinus, xii. 9, where Valesius has the following note: "This was a disciple of Libanius, a Cilician by race, son of Hesychius. He pronounced a panegyric on Julian on his entrance into Cilicia, as Libanius says in his Funeral Oration (p. 300), and in his epistle (634) to Celsus. Libanius boasts of this disciple in his speech against the cavillers at his teaching, and said that it was he who, when he had come to Athens, was author of the decree whereby he (Libanius) was called to the chief professorial chair

at Athens. Celsus came to that seat of learning by Basil's persuasion, as Libanius tells us in his epistle (143) to Basil" (Vales. *Amm.* p. 322). Baronius (l. c.) gives Sozomen as his authority for saying that Celsus was afterwards banished by Julian, but we have not found the statement in that historian.

CELSUS (7) Mentioned by Augustine as having compiled an epitome of the opinions of all philosophers, simply stated without vindication or refutation (*Aug. c. Haer.* vol. viii. 23).

(8) A messenger of Paulinus of Nola to Augustine, who writes by him his 80th (65th) epistle, in a hurry, as Celsus came late at night to tell Augustine he sailed early in the morning. The date is fixed to A.D. 405, as the return of Thrasius and Evodius was expected. Augustine had written a few days before by Fortunatianus, and sent the letter round by way of Rome. Paulinus had said, in answer to some former letter of his, that he meant to stay where he was, unless the will of God became clear that he should go. Augustine writes back to beg him to explain how, when we are left free to choose between two courses, both good, and have no direct revelation to guide us, we are to know which is God's will.

(9) Son of Pneumatius and Fidelis, kinsfolk of Paulinus of Nola, who writes a poem on his death. He had been christened, and was just beginning grammar. Paulin., poem 35, p. 666 (*Patr.* lxi. 676). [E. B. B.]

(10) Abbot at the council of Rouen, which gave privileges to the abbey of Fontenelles, A.D. 682 (*Labbe, Conc.* vi. 1241). [E. B. B.]

(11) rendered into Latin from the Greek *The Dialogue of Jason and Papias*, by Aristo of Pella. His version is not extant, but only his dedication of it to a certain bishop VIGILIUS. This is given in Migne (vi. 58). It used to be appended to the works of Cyprian. See VIGILIUS. [E. B. B.]

(12) St. Confessor of Limoges. Certain relics of this saint are preserved in St. Stephen's cathedral at Limoges, but his history and date are unknown (*Acta SS. Boll.* Aug. ii. 191). [H. W. Y.]

CELUULF (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 275; Sim. Dun. transl. Stevenson, 443); **CELWLUFUS** (Sim. Dun. in M. H. B. 659), king of Northumbria. [CEOLWULF.] [C. H.]

CELUULFUS, brother of Kenulf king of Mercia, occurs in a charter marked spurious or doubtful in Kemble (*C. D.* No. 192). [C. H.]

CELYNIN, Welsh saint of the 7th century, patron of Llangelynin in Merionethshire; commemorated on November 20 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 302). [C. H.]

CENA, CENE (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 246; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 435, 436), archbishop of York. [ETHELBERT.] [C. H.]

CENA, a lady who writes (A.D. 733, editorial date) to St. Boniface, assuring him of her prayers and begging his; she rarely sees him, but would gladly serve him or any of his party should they come into her province. To her place of resi-

dence the letter gives no clue (St. Bonif. *Ep.* 34, ed. Würdtwein; *ibid.* Migne, *Patrol.* tom. lxxxix. p. 733). [C. H.]

CENANNAN—March 26. On Inishman or the middle Isle of Arran, in Galway Bay, stands the roofless ruin of a small church, built of immense stones, and called Teampull Ceannanach. St. Cenannan or Kenanach is said to have been a king of Leinster's son, and the patron of Ballynakill, in the barony of Ballynahinch or Connemara. (Petrie, *Round Towers*, 188-9; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 715, col. 2.) [J. G.]

CENAUC (Le Neve, *Fasti*, i. 288), bishop of St. David's. [CYNOG.] [C. H.]

CENBURG (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1677, in H. M. B. 784), sister of Ina king of the West Saxons and of the abbess Cuthburga. [CUENBURGH.] [C. H.]

CENEGITHA, called the queen his wife by Kenulf king of Mercia, in a charter of A.D. 799, marked doubtful or spurious by Kemble (*C. D.* No. 177). In the genealogy of the kings of Mercia (Flor. Wig. in M. H. B. 630) the wife of Kenulf, there Coenwulf, is Aelfthryth. [C. H.]

CENEU (1). (KAYNE, KEYNA.) Recluse of Keynsham—Oct. 8. This saint, whose memory is greatly honoured on both sides of the Severn, is said to have been the third daughter of Brychan, of Brycheiniog, and thus the sister of St. Canoc (Feb. 11), and the aunt of St. Cadoc (Jan. 24), the son of Gwynllyw Filwr or Gundleus: yet it is more probable that, while retaining her relationship to the other persons here named, she was either the granddaughter of this Brychan, or the daughter of another Brychan, who lived at a later period, emigrated to Armorica, and was the father of St. Winwaloc (March 3). According to the legend, she was dedicated to God from her youth, forsook her own country, and, crossing the Severn, took up her abode in a wood or desert place near the Avon, where the abundance of serpents made the place uninhabitable. But having by prayer performed the miracle of changing the serpents into stones, as is still related of her in that district, she remained for many years where Keynsham now stands, and only apparently in her old age returned to Brecknock at the request of her nephew St. Cadoc; there she died in the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century, but the place of her interment is unknown. Dempster would wish as usual to place "St. Keina" among the Scotch saints, but she was undoubtedly Welsh, and her name is perpetuated at St. Keyne, a parish in Cornwall, and at Keynsham in Somerset. (*Vita S. Keynae Eremitae*, in Capgrave, *Nov. Leg. Angl.* 204, and, with a very useful *Commentarius Praevius*, in the Bollandists' *Acta SS.* Oct. 8, tom. iv. 275-77; Rees, *Cambr. Brit. Saints*, 605-7 n.; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 418; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 157; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, x. 210, Oct. 8; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 311, cc. 3, 4.) [J. G.]

(2), son of Coel, Welsh saint of the 4th century (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 102, 104). [C. H.]

(3) (KENEU), bishop of St. David's in the 6th century, founder of a church named Llangeneu, once existing in Pembrokeshire, all

traces of the situation of which were obliterated by the Flemings who settled in that county (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 245, 274). He was the third bishop according to one text of Giraldu Cambrensis, but according to another he is absent from the list (Giraldu Camb. *Opp.* vi. ed. Dimock, 102). See also *Hist. of St. David's*, by Jones and Freeman, 249; Le Neve, *Fasti*, i. 288.

[C. H.]

CENGILLE, -LLUS (CINGISLUS, CYNEGYS-LUS, COENGILS, KENGILLUS, KEMGISEL), abbat of Glastonbury, A.D. 729-743, succeeding Echfrid (*Mon. Angl.*), whom Malmesbury calls Atfrith and Aethfrid. He is said to have received for the abbey a grant of land at Polonholt, Torric, and Brunantun, from Ethelhard king of Wessex and his wife. In conjunction with abbat Ingeld and the presbyter Wietberhtus, he addresses a proposal of mutual intercessory prayer, the first of the kind on record, to the abbat Aldhun and the abbesses Cneuburga and Coenburga, who replied in acceptance of it. His name appears in attestation of a charter of king Ethelhard, A.D. 737, marked doubtful or spurious by Kemble. (*Malm. Antiq. Glast.* Gale, xv. Script. 313, 328; *Monast. Anglic.* i. 2; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1002; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 343, and notes; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 60.)

[C. H.]

CENNFAELADH (1). Abbat of Bangor—April 8. The Cáin Adamnain states that Cennfaeladh, abbat of Bangor, was among the saints who went security for liberating the women (of Ireland) from military service, &c. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 99.) He was grandson of Aedh Breac, and died A.D. 704 (*Four Masters, Ann. Ul.*).

(2) The most remarkable man of his age was Cennfaeladh "the learned," "a paragon of wisdom," "the wise," as the Irish Kalendars term him. He was son of Oilioll, son of Baetan, and said to be of Daire Lurain (now Derrylohan, in Tyrone). In youth he was a soldier, and severely wounded in the battle of Magh Rath (now Moira or Moyragh, in the barony of Lower Iveagh, co. Down), in A.D. 634. He was carried off the field, and committed to the care of St. Bricin of Toomregon [BRICIN, Sept. 5], with whom he was not only cured bodily, but instructed in all the learning taught in St. Bricin's three schools, his retentive memory treasuring up the lectures given to the pupils by St. Bricin and his professors. He afterwards went out and founded similar schools and colleges. (O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Irish*, ii. 77, 92-3.) He was a poet, and his verses, of a martial character, are often quoted in the *Four Masters*. He also wrote a work on the synchronisms of the Irish monarchs with the Roman Emperors (*Four Masters*, by O'Donov. i. 161, n. 9). He died A.D. 679 (*Ann. Tigb.*; Ware, *Ir. Writ. Dubl.* 1704, p. 11).

[J. G.]

CENNYCH, early Welsh saint, patron of Llangenny in Carmarthenshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 306).

[C. H.]

CENNYDD (CENYDD), Welsh saint of the 6th century, at first a member of the college of Cattwg, and afterwards founder of a religious society at a place in Gower, Glamorganshire, where the church of Llangennydd is now situated (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 257; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 497).

[C. H.]

CENRED (1) (COENRED, KENRED), the father of Ina king of Wessex (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 688, 855; *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad ann. 688; *ibid. App.* M. H. B. 641; *ibid. Geneal. Reg. W. Sax.* M. H. B. 633; *Ethelw. Chron.* M. H. B. 512; *Hen. Hunt.*, *H. A.* M. H. B. 723). He was the son of Ceolwald the brother of Cyneigils (Asser, *R. G. Aelf.* M. H. B. 468; *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad ann. 849; *Sim. Dun. G. Reg. Angl.* M. H. B. 674).

[C. H.]

(2) (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 702, trr. M. H. B., Thorpe; *ibid.* ad ann. 704, trr. Ingram, Thorpe; *Flor. Wig. Geneal. Reg. Merc.* M. H. B. 630; *Hen. Hunt. Hist.* in M. H. B. 723, 725, 727, 735), king of Mercia. [COENRED.]

[C. H.]

(3) (*Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad ann. 716; *A. S. C.* trr. Ingram, Thorpe; *Hen. Hunt. Hist.* in M. H. B. 724, 734), king of Northumbria. [COENRED.]

[C. H.]

CENSORINUS. [CHRYSE.] (*Κενσούρινος*. *Sic* in the Acts referred to.)

[G. S.]

CENSORIUS, count, sent by Aetius to restore peace in Spain, at the request of Idacius, A.D. 432 (*Idac. Chron.* 41, 8; *Patrol.* li. 880).

[E. B. B.]

CENSURIUS, St. Confessor, and bishop of Auxerre. It is a disputed point when this saint ruled that see, but, according to Gams (*Series Episcoporum*, p. 501), it was from A.D. 472-502. His history is not certain (*Acta SS. Boll.* Jun. ii. 277).

[H. W. Y.]

CENTURIUS, a Donatist layman, who brought to the church at Hippo a book written against Augustine by the Donatists, consisting of a compilation of Scripture testimonies to the nullity of baptism by unworthy ministers (*eg.* Prov. v. 15-17). Augustine wrote a short answer, mentioned *Retract.* ii. 19, *Possid. Ind.* 3, not now extant.

[E. B. B.]

CENTWINE (KENTWINE), king of the West Saxons, 676-685. He was a son of Cyneigils and brother of Coinwalch. On the death of Escwin he succeeded in making himself master of part of Wessex, but his reign occurs during that period which Bede describes as a ten years' interregnum, during which the ealdormen of the nation took the kingdom and held it divided amongst them (*H. E.* iv. 12). The events recorded of Kentwine's reign are that in 682 he drove the Britons to the sea (*A. S. C.* 682; Lappenberg, ed. Thorpe, i. 256), and that for a short time he entertained Wilfrid during his exile. His wife was a sister of Eormenburga, the wife of Ecgfrith of Northumbria, and owing to her hostility Wilfrid was driven out of Wessex into Sussex (*Edd. F. Wilfridi*, c. 39). Among the poems ascribed to Alcuin is one "Ad templum Bugge," in which Entwine, king of the West Saxons, the father of Bugge, is described as a victorious king who had won three great battles, and afterwards retired into a monastery, where he died. This seems to be Kentwine, as his successor is named Ceadwalla (*Alc. Opp.* ii. 519). Kentwine is mentioned in a spurious charter of Baldred to Aldhelm, dated in 688 (*Kemble, C. D.* No. 28).

[S.]

The reign of Centwine offers some material for the ecclesiastical history of Wessex. The episcopal see of the nation, which ever since the baptism of Cyneigils in A.D. 635 had been established at Dorchester, north of the Thames, was

now, as far as can be ascertained, removed to Winchester, the capital. The date A.D. 679 assigned by Rudborne for this event, with which he couples the transference of the bones of Birinus to the new cathedral, is discussed by Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, iii. 127), who hold that the exact point of time is uncertain. Wessex, with the exception of one brief interval, A.D. 662-666, when a second bishop, Wina, sat at Winchester, had been hitherto an undivided diocese, and so it continued, Hedda being the sole bishop all Centwine's time. The archbishop of Canterbury during the reign was Theodore, whose administration, so important for the rest of England, had no special contact with Wessex. There is a decree attributed to him, but on no sufficient grounds, forbidding the Wessex bishopric to be divided in the lifetime of Hedda (Haddan and Stubbs, *l. c.*). The Wilfrid controversy was then engrossing general attention, and it was more or less affecting other kingdoms besides Northumbria, but Wessex was scarcely touched by it (cf. Edd. *Vit. Wilf.* c. 39). Of missionary operations within the bounds of the kingdom we vaguely get a sight. Abingdon monastery was founded by Centwine's nephew Heane, but the assigned date, A.D. 675, places it just beyond the reign; the abbey, however, of Redbridge, near Southampton, circ. 680, seems to fall better within it. No other institutions of this nature are known to have originated in Wessex during this reign (Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 5-7). It was only at this period that the South Saxons accepted Christianity, through the preaching of Wilfrid; and thus the long gap between Canterbury and Winchester was filled up, as well as Anglo-Saxon Christendom completed at last. Centwine was buried at Winchester cathedral (*Annal. Eccles. Wint.* in Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* i. 288), and was succeeded by Caedwalla. His name is otherwise spelt CENUINE, CENWINE, CHENWINE, KENTWINUS.

[C. H.]

CENULF (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 508), king of the West Saxons. [CYNEWULF.]

[C. H.]

CENUALCHUS (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 162), bishop. [COENWALCH.] [C. H.]

CENUALH (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 506); CENWAILLE (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1356, in M. H. B. 781); CENWALCH, -CHIU (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* in M. H. B. ad ann. 643-672); CENWALH (A. S. C. ad ann. 643-672, tr. M. H. B.; Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ed. Thorpe, ad ann. 643, 672; Flor. Wig. *Geneal. Reg. Merc.* in M. H. B. 630; Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 716-719), king of the West Saxons. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

CENUULPHUS (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 162); CENWULF (A. S. C. ad ann. 819, trr. Ingram, M. H. B., Thorpe); CENWLF (Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 732-735), king of Mercia. [KENULF.] [C. H.]

CENWINE (Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 718, 719), king of the West Saxons. [CENTWINE.] [C. H.]

CEODE. [CAETL.]

CEOLBURG, CEOLBURGA, CEOLBURH (CEOLBURGA), abbess of Beorclea or

Berkeley. From a charter issued in a synod at Acle, A.D. 804, relating to the disposal of her son Ethelric's property, we gather that she had married into a family of considerable landed property, which Ethelric desired should go ultimately to the monasteries of Worcester, Gloucester, and Deerhurst; that her husband Ethelmund was buried at Deerhurst, where also Ethelric wished to lie. Her name is attached to a charter of Offa king of Mercia, A.D. 793, marked spurious or doubtful by Kemble. From her being mentioned in the Saxon Chronicle and Florence, where her death is placed in A.D. 805, "i.e. probably 807" (Had. and St.), she must have been a person of some note. (A. S. C. and Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad ann. 805; Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 163, 186; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 548-9; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 56.) [C. H.]

CEOLF (Ethelw. *Chron.* in M. H. B. 507), king of Northumbria. [CEOLWULF.] [C. H.]

CEOLFRID, CEOLFRITH, abbat of Jarrow and Wearmouth. He was born about A.D. 642, and began his monastic life about the age of 18 in the monastery of Gilling, co. York (in-Gaetlingum), of which his brother Cynfrid was some time the abbat. After residing there for several years, in consequence of a pestilence (probably that of A.D. 664), Tunberht, the abbat of that place, and many of his brethren, deserted Gilling, and took up their residence at Ripon, at Wilfrid's invitation. Ceolfrid migrated with the rest, and when he was 27 Wilfrid ordained him priest. Immediately after his ordination, he visited Kent to gain a further acquaintance with monastic life. After this he profited by the instruction of Botulf, a Lincolnshire abbat, and returned to Ripon with a justly deserved reputation for discipline and learning. Among the domestic cares of the house, Ceolfrid had the charge of the bakehouse. About A.D. 674 he was induced by Benedict Biscop to go to him at Wearmouth to assist in ruling his fraternity and in building the monastery, of which he made Ceolfrid prior. The strictness of his rule made him enemies, and he went back to Ripon to seek for peace, but Benedict prevailed upon him to return. After the house of Wearmouth was built, Benedict and Ceolfrid went to Rome. One of the results of their journey was the bringing back with them John, abbat of St. Martin's at Tours, who instructed the inmates of the various monasteries in the north in the art of singing as practised at Rome (Beda, *H. E.* iv. 18). In 682 a gift of land from king Egfrith to Benedict enabled him to found the monastery of St. Paul at Jarrow, which is distant a few miles from Wearmouth, but on a different river. Of this new house Ceolfrid and Easterwini were made joint abbats; but the chief labour of building the church and moderating the brotherhood seems to have fallen on Ceolfrid.

The dedication stone of Jarrow is still preserved in the church, upon which Ceolfrid is mentioned as the sole abbat (Surtees's *Durham*, ii. 67; Hübner, *Inscr. Brit. Christ.* 71). After a time Benedict made Ceolfrid abbat of Wearmouth as well as of Jarrow, wishing to unify the teaching and discipline, and to have one house in two places. Ceolfrid made an excellent ruler, and was a pattern to all the northern monasteries. He was the means of enriching his

houses with gifts of various kinds, and procured for them from pope Sergius a grant of privileges such as Agatho had previously made. The most interesting incident, perhaps, in Ceolfrid's life is the mission that was sent to him by Naiton, or Nectan, king of the Picts, asking for architects who could erect for him a church of stone after the Roman fashion, and desiring accurate information on the old debatable subjects of the observance of Easter, the tonsure, etc. Bede gives at length Ceolfrid's reply (*H. E.* v. 21), from which we learn that it was probably through Ceolfrid's influence that Adamnan and the monks of Hii (Iona) had given up their old Celtic practice in the matter of the tonsure. The architects were sent, and the instructions of Ceolfrid carried out (cf. Dr. Stuart's Pref. to the *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, ii. 13). The Roman court had no surer agent in the north of England for bringing about uniformity in discipline and creed than Ceolfrid.

The date of Naiton's letter is supposed to be 710. Six years afterwards Ceolfrid gave up his abbacies with the intention of ending his days at Rome. The brethren commended him to the pope, and Ceolfrid started on his journey. He died on the way, at Langres, in France, on Sept. 25, 716, and was buried there in the church of the Twin Martyrs. His remains are said to have been brought to England, and to have been carried from the north to Glastonbury by king Edmund (*Malmesbury, de Gestis Pontiff.* 198). Ceolfrid found a place in the Calendar on Sept. 25.

His life has been twice written. First by an anonymous author, contemporary with Ceolfrid. This is printed by Mr. Stevenson, with his edition of Bede, *Opp. Minora*, 318-334, from MS. Harl. 3020. Secondly by Bede himself, in his *Lives of the Five First Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow*. Bede was under Ceolfrid's charge at Jarrow (Symeon, *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* i. cap. viii.), and it was at Ceolfrid's desire that he was ordained priest by bishop John in 691 (*H. E.* v. 24). (See also *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.* ed. 1733, saec. III. i. 292-4; Bolland. *Acta SS.* sub Sept. vii. 123.) [J. R.]

The rule of Ceolfrid had its successive stages, and occurs therefore with various dates. He was "abbot" of St. Peter's at Wearmouth "from the commencement of that house," but only as "adjutor" of the founder (Bed. ed. Smith, *Hist. Abbat.* 295), and the house was built A.D. 674 (*ib.*), i.e. it was completed in that year. Huaetbert's letter of June 716 accordingly states that Ceolfrid had then governed above forty years, "jure abbatibus" (*ib.* 301); but when he adds the "monasteries" he is incorrect, as the younger house had not been built so long. The founding of St. Paul's at Jarrow was, under Benedict Biscop, the special work of Ceolfrid, who "fundavit, perfecit, rexit" seven years, after which he ruled both the houses for twenty-eight years, one of these being the last of the life of Benedict (*ib.* 299), who died Jan. 12, 690. If the "one year" and the "seven years" were to be measured with absolute precision, Ceolfrid's independent abbacy of both houses would have commenced at the beginning of A.D. 689, and St. Paul's been founded in Jan. 682; but January was not a good month for beginning to build in the north of England. The summer or autumn of 681 was more likely, and this figure suits

better also in other respects. In another computation Bede makes him at his death to have been abbat "35 years, or rather 43 from the time St. Peter's began to be built" (*ib.* 302), and this statement takes us back to about the summer of A.D. 673 for the foundation of St. Peter's. Ceolfrid's being in the position of abbat so early as that indicates that the fraternity was formed before its abode was built, and doubtless the members were their own builders. His position among them is clearly shewn when he is said to have been to Benedict "comes individuus, cooperator, et doctor regularis et monasticae institutionis" (*ib.*). On Thursday, June 4, 716 (*ib.* 301), he resigned and quitted the monastery, at the age of 74, having been a presbyter 47 years (*ib.* 302). He was abbot therefore, reckoning all the stages, in the reigns of Ecgrid, Aldfrid, and Osred, kings of Northumbria; he was under the first five bishops of Hexham—Eata, Trumbert, John of Beverley, Wilfrid, Acca; and he witnessed all the troubles of the Wilfrid controversies.

The Life of this abbat, coming from the pen of Bede, his own contemporary in his own abbey, affords the most authentic material we possess for a picture of an English monastery during the Heptarchy. The twin houses were about six miles apart, and each had ready communication with the sea: St. Peter's, on the north shore of the Wear, at its mouth; St. Paul's at Jarrow, three miles up the Tyne. If the latter occupied the site of the modern ruins, it stood on an elevation curving round a capacious haven, now called the Slake, in which the largest fleets of that early period were moored in security (Hutchinson, *County of Durham*, 1787, ii. 470). As both establishments lay between the two rivers, there was easy passage from one to the other. Bede's biblical labours and numerous writings are alone sufficient to assure us that the brethren must have had access to a valuable library. One of its art treasures, called by Bede "Cosmographum Codex," purchased at Rome by Benedict Biscop, was superb enough to tempt a king, the study-loving Aldfrid of Northumbria, who considered "land of 8 families" not an extravagant price to give the monastery in exchange for it (*ib.* 300). Of the whole Latin Bible there are four copies specially mentioned, one of them being in what was then termed the old version (cf. *Dict. of Bible*, art. 'Vulgate'), which was another fruit of Benedict's journeys to Rome, and three in the new version, which were the addition of Ceolfrid, who on his departure took one with him as a present to Rome and left the other two to Wearmouth and Jarrow respectively. In other ways also Ceolfrid was a liberal benefactor to the home where so much of his life was spent. He added to the buildings "plura oratoria," and provided for the altar and the church vessels and vestments of every kind.

The foundation of Benedict Biscop was sure to be in intimate relations with Rome; the neighbourhood of a port facilitated pilgrimages thither, and these appear to have been not unfrequent. A deputation of monks went out to pope Sergius and procured a *privilegium* like that obtained from Agatho by Biscop; a full synod of King Aldfrid and the bishops confirmed it; and so the way was preparing for that severance of the

monastery from the diocese in favour of a distant master which in after years fixed the whole system of ultramontaniam in the church of England. Here, at the mention of pilgrimages, we linger for a moment, and the name of Ceolfrid authorises our doing so. The close of his abbacy marks the period when that stream of intercourse with the Roman city, so emphatically noticed by Bede and Boniface, had begun to flow in its strength. The royal names of Caedwalla, Coenred, Offa, Ina, illustrate the movement; but Bede, who witnessed it all, writes that "de gente Anglorum" all were outdoing one another, noble and ignoble, laymen and clerics, men and women (*H. E.* v. 7, fin.). It was indeed an interesting juncture in Anglo-Saxon history. One century had elapsed since the mission of Augustine, and the Christian civilisation of the Teutonic tribes in England was perhaps at its summit. Another century was yet to elapse before the Danes would wreck it all. It was just while this climax lasted that the flocking of the Anglo-Saxons to Rome occurred. The attitude in which they felt themselves towards the ancient mistress of the world must have been of a special character. They had never been subject to her, and had no memories to resent. They were among those who had succeeded to her empire, but they had not helped to break it down. In every part of Britain they found themselves in association with its departed greatness, the material fruits of which survived with only three centuries of antiquity upon them; they dwelt beside the old ramparts of deserted towns; they marched along the marvellous roads now named from their own divinities, and viewed the great barrier wall of the north, more wonderful still. The Roman empire was still current in the East, helping them to realise what it all meant. The once sovereign city survived in Italy, and was now fast gathering a new dominion of willing adherents, among whom the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were not the least important. The great schism among themselves had been obliterated, and the sense of unity under one mother was fresh. All that was artistic and scenic in worship had been recently propagated among them, and the model of it was Roman. But Rome had as yet made no domineering demands, and shewed no insolence of assumption; for which indeed her own period had not then arrived. There was therefore just then more to attract and less to alienate than at any period of the relations of the Anglo-Saxon race with Rome. Roman supremacy existed without a doubt; but it was a supremacy in rank, honour, and influence; one very different from that which subsequent history caused to be associated with the word.

On the 4th of June, 716, abbat Ceolfrid yielded himself to this tide, and in Bede's eye-witness account of the day we see the father and the flock of those times. We see likewise a piety not unsophisticated, and the forms of it such as suited the cloister more perhaps than the popular taste; forms which had probably been diffused by the founder of Jarrow and his friend Wilfrid the more easily, because the Christianity of England was at that period worked almost entirely from monastic centres. In the church of St. Mary and the church of St. Peter there was early mass, when "all present communicated." This

over, the farewell services began. The whole brotherhood assembled in the church of St. Peter, and after the lighting of incense and the offering of prayer at the altar, the abbat holding the thurible pronounced the peace from the steps. As the congregation retired, the voice of weeping mingled with the litanies which they chanted. At the oratory of St. Lawrence over against the dormitory they re-assembled for the last time, and there the venerable man pronounced his farewell address, exhorting them to mutual love and the correction of faults in the spirit of the gospel, offering his pardon, craving theirs, and finally asking for their intercessions. They then proceed down to the river; there they exchange the kiss of peace; they kneel, and he offers prayer; a numerous suite accompanies him into the vessel which is to ferry them over, the deacons of the church attending with lighted tapers and the golden cross. They reach the opposite shore; he "adores the cross," mounts his horse, and six hundred brethren in the twin monastery have parted from their father. With so much heart evidently on both sides, why does the old man leave? Sacred memories of earlier days, when he was the companion of Benedict and the sharer of his enthusiasm, were fascinating his soul: "ad suae tamen diu desideratae quietis gaudia sancta pervenit; dum ea quae juvenem se adiisse, vidisse, atque adorasse semper recordans exultabat." The sensuous religion of the day could not have been more pithily expressed than by those three words, "adiisse, vidisse, atque adorasse," and with this the pious Bede himself is in full sympathy. The pilgrimages of the 8th century, founded in piety of that complexion, could not exclude the scandals which Boniface deplored.

On Wednesday, June 7, Ceolfrid is still waiting for the vessel to begin her voyage, when a deputation from Wearmouth comes out announcing the election of Huaetberet in his room, and bringing a letter from their abbat feelingly commending him to the pope. Ceolfrid confirms the election, and they return. Of the route he pursued we see but little. He appears to have been a full day upon the sea, and on land we must suppose that he travelled from one monastery to another, making a long stay at each, since in three months he had not accomplished half his pilgrimage. But whether moving or resting, he journeyed like a man going to his grave: the canonical hours of prayer were observed, and twice a day besides the psalter was chanted to him in regular course. He became too unwell to ride, and was carried in a horse litter; but even then daily mass was sung, and he made the offering "salutaris hostiae" to God, until within three days of his death. On Friday, Sept. 25, at about the third hour of the day, he reached Langres, and there at the tenth hour he died. On the day following he was buried "honorifice." It was a tearful funeral; and at its close the "more than 80 Angli," his fellow-pilgrims, returned home, except a few whom an inextinguishable affection still bound to his tomb in the strange town.

Ceolfrid was commemorated on Sept. 25 in the English calendar. The manuscript materials for his life may be seen in Hardy (*Desc. Cat. i.* 412-414).

[C. H.]

CEOLHELM, one of four presbyters of the diocese of Dunwich, attesting an act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 547.)

[C. H.]

CEOLLA. [CELLACH.]

CEOLLACH, the second bishop of the Mercian church. He was a Scot by nation; appointed bishop by Oswy, whilst that king was still supreme in Mercia, before the end of the year 658; and, like his predecessor Diuma, was consecrated by Finan. His episcopate was very short; immediately, as it would seem, on the evacuation of Mercia by Oswy, he retired to Iona (Bed. *H. E.* iii. 21–24) in or about 659 (*Ang. Sac.* i. 425).

[S.]

In the Scotch Kalendars he appears as Colachus, Colathus, Ceolla, and Colace. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 237, 299, 302; *Retours*, Aberdeen, No. 453.)

[J. G.]

CEOLMUND (1), the single abbat of the diocese of Selsey attesting an act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803. Nothing is known of the monasteries within that diocese at this period. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 547, 548 n.; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57.)

[C. H.]

(2), the eleventh bishop of Hereford; he attests Mercian charters from 788 to 793 (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 621; Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 153, 156, &c.).

[S.]

CEOLNODUS, abbat of St. Peter's, Chertsey, received a grant from Offa king of Mercia, issued in a synodal meeting at Acleah or Acle, i.e. Ockley in Surrey (Hadd. and St.), A.D. 787. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 151; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 463, and note as to the genuineness of the charter; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57.)

[C. H.]

CEOLRED, king of the Mercians, 709–716. He was the son of the great Ethelred by his wife Osthrytha, the daughter of Oswy, and succeeded, in 709, on the resignation of his cousin Coenred. He fought a battle against Ini and the West Saxons at Wodnes-beorh in 715, but with doubtful result. It was on his way to visit Ceolred that Wilfrid died in 709 (Edd. *V. Wilfr.* c. 61). His reign is mentioned by St. Boniface as the period at which the privileges of the churches began to be attacked in England (ed. Jaffé, *Ep.* 59). He died at a banquet in 716, possessed, according to Boniface, by an evil spirit (*ibid.*). Boniface relates the story of a vision in which his soul was contested between angels and devils (*ibid.* *Ep.* 10). He was buried at Lichfield (*A. S. C.* 716). There is a spurious grant of Ceolred to Evesham, in Kemble (*Cod. Dipl.* No. 62). His widow, Werburga, is said to have died in 782 (*A. S. C.* 782).

[S.]

A previous great battle at Wodnes-beorh (*A. S. C.* ad an. 591) and the name Mons Wodeni (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 592) point to some strong position. Such Camden (ed. Gough, i. 87, 95) finds for it at Wanborough near Swindon, in north-east Wilts (on Ina's territory), and speaks of its old importance, Roman coins, and Saxon camp.

Two monasteries in the west, Tewkesbury and Deerhurst, if not a third at Bredon, all clustering together by the Severn, and Peykirk in North-

amptonshire, are considered to have been founded in this reign (Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 7). No definite events besides in Mercia occur under Ceolred for the church historian (cf. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, 284–300). The four sees of the kingdom remained as they were. Lichfield, in the centre, was still occupied by Hedda; on the western border there was Egwin at Worcester and Tortore at Hereford. At the opposite extremity of Mercia either Eadbert or Kenbert was bishop of Lindsey. The archbishop of Canterbury during this reign was Brihtwald. Ceolred was succeeded by Ethelbald. The variations of his name are CEOLRET, CELRED, CELRETH, CHELRUDUS. No wife or children are attributed to him in Florence's *Genealogy of the Mercian Kings* (M. H. B. 630).

[C. H.]

CEOLRET (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1640), king of Mercia. [CEOLRED.]

[C. H.]

CEOLUE, bishop, attests an undated charter of Coinwalch king of Wessex, marked spurious or doubtful by Kemble (*C. D.* No. 985); possibly intended for Ceollach.

[C. H.]

CEOLULF, -FUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* in M. H. B. 541, 542, 544); CEOLUULF, -FUS, -PHUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron. Append.* in M. H. B. 639; Sim. Dun. *G. R. A.* in M. H. B. 657; Bede, *H. E.* Praefat. and v. 23, 24, edd. Smith, Stevenson, M. H. B., Moberly); CEOLWLF, -FUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ed. Thorpe, i. 51, 54, 57, ed. M. H. B. 632; Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 726–734; Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1727, in M. H. B. 785; Sim. Dun. *G. R. A.* in M. H. B. 663), king of Northumbria. [CEOLWULF (1).]

[C. H.]

CEOLULFUS, CEOLUULFUS (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 120, 122, 123, 134, 137, 138, 139*, 140, 143, 145*, 152, 155, 156, 157, 159*, 161*, 162*, 164, 165, 167, nearly all charters of Offa king of Mercia, between A.D. 772 and 794 or 6, those marked * being considered spurious or doubtful; Sim. Dun. *G. R. A.* in M. H. B. 669; Flor. Wig. *Chron. Append.* M. H. B. 625), bishop of the Lindisfari. [CEOLWULF (2).]

[C. H.]

CEOLULFUS, sacerdos, attests a charter of Offa king of Mercia, A.D. 777. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 131.)

[C. H.]

CEOLWULF (1), king of Northumbria from A.D. 729 to 737. He is chiefly known from the circumstance of Beda dedicating to him his *Ecclesiastical History*. "The most glorious Ceolwulf," the great writer calls him, an epithet due to the king's religious character rather than to any aptitude that he possessed for ruling (Hodgson, *Hist. of Northumberland*, i. pt. i. 99). In 734 Ceolwulf was the means of his cousin Ecgbert being raised to the see of York, and of his seeking and receiving the long absent pallium (Simeon, *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* ii. cap. xviii.). In a well-known letter which Beda wrote to the new prelate he spoke in hopeful terms of the help which Ceolwulf would give him, and urged him to secure by his leave the appointment of the number of suffragans laid down of old by pope Gregory. Ceolwulf's reign was of a very chequered character. Beda closes his history in 731, describing the prosperity of the Northumbrian kingdom (*H. E.* v. 23). In the same year there seems to have been an insurrection, in

which bishop Acca was banished, and Ceolwulf seized and forcibly tonsured, as if to mock his ecclesiastical tastes (*Nor. Annales*, apud Bedam, ed. Smith, p. 223; Simeon, *de Gestis*, p. 11, puts this a year later). In 737 (Simeon, p. 13) Ceolwulf gave up his kingdom and became a monk at Lindisfarne, to which monastery he was a rich benefactor (*Hist. de S. Cuthberto*, apud Simeonis Opp. i. 141; Simeon, *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* ii. cap. xvi.). One of the results of his munificence was that the monks were henceforward able to drink ale instead of milk. Ceolwulf died at Lindisfarne in 764. After a time his body was removed by bishop Egred to the church of Norham, and at a still later period his skull was taken to Durham, where it had a conspicuous place among the saintly relics, of which St. Cuthbert was the centre (*ibid.*; Simeon, *de Gestis*, p. 21).

[J. R.]

Ceolwulf was the son of Cutha, the son of Cuthwine, and the seventh in descent from Ida (*A. S. C.* and *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad an. 731; Hen. Hunt. in *M. H. B.* 727). Lappenberg makes him the son of Cuthwin. An earlier Ceolwulf of the West Saxons was the son of another Cutha (*A. S. C.* ad an. 597). It may here be remarked that the failure of the attempt to incapacitate Ceolwulf for the crown by a forcible act of tonsure shews that the superstition on this point, so strong in the Eastern empire, could not be relied on in Northumbria. Nor did it prevail in Kent in the days of Eadbert Praen.

On the death of his brother Coenred, a former king, Ceolwulf was set aside in favour of Osric; and since he afterwards appears as a man of literary tastes and acquisitions, we may conclude that he either spent the period of Osric's reign in the retirement of a monastery, or that he otherwise devoted himself to study. The fact of his cousin Egbert being a monastic student favours the idea; and as Bede visited Egbert in his retreat for the purpose of learned intercourse (Bede, *Epist. ad Ecgb.* ad init.), he may have become acquainted with Ceolwulf under similar circumstances. Osric before his death designated him ("decrevisset," Bede, *H. E.* v. 23) or adopted him (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 80) as his successor, a sufficient indication that Ceolwulf had not attempted to disturb the peace of his supplanter. The date of his accession is A.D. 731 in the *Saxon Chronicle*, which is the year given by Bede's Continuator for his forcible tonsure. Simeon's date is A.D. 729 (Sim. Dun. *Hist. Eccl. Dun.* c. xiii.).

Malmesbury observes that Ceolwulf had acquired a skill in letters by the close application of an active and studious mind; and he adduces as a proof of his literary merit that at a period when Britain particularly abounded in learned men Bede should have singled him out from all the Angli for the criticising of his history (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 80). It has been said that Bede undertook the composition of this work at Ceolwulf's request. But there appears no sufficient proof of this. What passed between them is clear from Bede's dedicatory Preface: "At your desire, O king, I most willingly send this Ecclesiastical History of the Anglian nation, which I lately published, as formerly to be read, so now to be copied and perused more fully at your leisure." Before its publication Ceolwulf revised the work; when it

was published, he was allowed to make a copy of it for his own use. Here we get a hint as to how such learned works were "published" in those days, and we imagine Bede's manuscript going the round of courts and monasteries for the copies to be taken by those who desired to have them. From the compliments of this Preface we learn of the king's earnest attention to Holy Scripture; the deep interest with which he acquaints himself with the words and deeds of illustrious ancients, those of the Anglian nation especially; his anxiety to bring his subjects acquainted with them; the privilege of the people committed by God's providence to his rule. Here too is disclosed Bede's own ethical purpose in the production of his famous history, the attentive perusal of which amply confirms what he states. It was to revive the ancient piety in priests, bishops, monasteries, as well as people, in a degenerating age, and not simply to diffuse historical and antiquarian information. The great teacher's death in A.D. 735 was an event sufficient to mark this reign. It was but two years afterwards, A.D. 737 (Sim. Dun., *A. S. C.*, Bed. Cont.), that Ceolwulf abdicated and "received St. Peter's tonsure" (*A. S. C.*). Bede's Continuator makes a point of recording that the king took this step of his own free will; while Henry of Huntingdon, dilating on the occurrence, tells us how it arose from Ceolwulf's intimacy with Bede and his constant meditation on those examples of royal abdication recorded in his work. Six previous instances are adduced by Huntingdon, Ceolwulf completing "the hebdomad of perfect kings." Sigebert of East Anglia, Caedwalla of Wessex, Sebbi of the East Saxons, Ethelred of Mercia, Coenred of Mercia, Ina of Wessex. He forgets Offa of East Anglia. Four of these also went to Rome after abdicating—Caedwalla, Coenred, Offa, and Ina. The eight instances occurred within almost exactly a century, and reckoning from the second, which followed the first by half a century, we have seven royal abdications through motives of religion, though not all of them for monastic seclusion, within the space of another half-century. Among the retiring kings were some by no means inactive, unwarlike, or unsuccessful men, and the resignation of Ceolwulf's successor Eadbert, who also entered a monastery, was a national loss. It was a singular feature in the social condition of Northumbria that Ceolwulf's abdication was no isolated and individual eccentricity. For some reason there was at that time a general flocking towards the monasteries, and that from quarters where we should least look for monks. Simeon of Durham writes that when peace and tranquillity succeeded to the early misfortunes of the reign, many of the Northumbrians, nobles as well as private persons, laid aside their arms, accepted tonsure, and made their choice of a monastic life (Sim. Dun. *Hist. Eccl. Dun.* cap. xiii.). But it is not to be forgotten that the monastic life in England during the Heptarchy was not the close restraint of the Benedictine discipline. It was a much freer seclusion, and in fact Bede's own pen discloses abuses that were springing up in this respect (Bede, *Ep. ad Ecgb.* ed. Smith, p. 309; ed. Moberly, p. 399). Simeon and Bede may here be accepted as incidentally illustrating one another, and in a manner

by no means pleasing to think of. The Epistle to Egbert, which was written after the Preface to Ceolwulf, was the dying testimony, "tanquam Baedae cygnea cantio," as Smith expresses it, of the pious historian of Jarrow, and discloses the general state of religion in Northumbria which the *Historia Ecclesiastica* was meant to improve, and before which Ceolwulf retired.

Adverting to Northumbrian ecclesiastical affairs during this short reign, we notice first that the kingdom remained divided into four sees; Lindisfarne, York, Hexham, Withern (Flor. Wig. Chron. ad an. 731): the first was occupied by Ethelwold; the second by Wilfrid II. and Egbert; the third by Acca; the fourth by Pecthelm and Frithwald (Stubbs, *Registr.*). The restoration of the see of Galloway at Withern belongs to an uncertain date prior to A.D. 731 (Hadd. and Stubbs, iii. 310). The archbishops of Canterbury were Brihtwald, Tatwine, Nothelm, Cuthbert (Stubbs, *Registrum*). Beyond the important event of the reception of the pallium from Rome, which occurred now for the first time since the days of Paulinus and Edwin (Sim. Dun. *H. E. D.* c. xviii.; see also Bede, *Ep. ad Ecgb.*; Hadd. and Stubbs, iii. 312, 313), constituting the diocese of Northumbria a separate ecclesiastical province, no illustrative public measure is related. A monastic foundation is recorded, that of Elmete in the county of York (Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 7), as probably belonging to this reign.

Passing now with Ceolwulf from the palace to the monastery, from the rock of Bamborough to the island of Lindisfarne, we find him not going empty-handed. He "gave to St. Cuthbert his royal treasures and lands, that is to say, Bregesne and Wercworde, with their appurtenances, together with the church which he had built there, and four other villis also, Wudecestre, Hwittingham, Eadulfingham, and Eagwulfingham." Of these, Wercworde is now Warkworth; Bregesne is doubtful, but thought to be Brainshaugh in the parish of Warkworth, which is on the Coquet and near the sea. Wudecestre or Woodchester seems lost (Raine, *North Durham*, p. 68); the other three (two of them containing a portion of the donor's name) are easily recognised in Whittingham, Edlingham, and Eglingham; all of which, like Warkworth, are in the neighbourhood of Alnwick, and preserve in their modern ecclesiastical relations a memory of the distant past; for they are still in the patronage either of the see or of the chapter of Durham, the successor of Lindisfarne. Warkworth also is in episcopal patronage, that of the bishop of Carlisle. On the boundaries of the entire grant, see Leland (*Collect.* i. 370); Hutchinson (*Northumb.* 1776, ii. 139); Raine (*North Durh.* p. 68).

Of the monastic life of Ceolwulf we have no details. He was not abbat, since Lindisfarne was the seat of a bishop, who was himself the abbat. During the ex-king's residence the see was occupied for a short time by Ethelwold, but chiefly by Cynewulf. Ceolwulf outlived his successor's reign, and saw the recommencement of civil disturbances, for which the religious condition of the province quite prepares us. The Gens Anglorum in the north, when it produced its Church History, had reached its meridian. The saintliest pen of the age, supported by a sympathising king, had done what it could to mend the evils of which

it testified. But a revival was not to be, and Ceolwulf's death marks the beginning of that national decline which must ever attend the fall of religion and morals. For above a century the powerful throne established by Edwin, Oswald, and Oswy had given promise of its occupants one day ruling a united Britain, but a career of final disorder and weakness was now beginning (cf. Sim. Dun. *G. R.* ad an. 758 sq.; *H. E. D.* c. 19 sq.), and the historical interest of the Heptarchy passes mainly into the other two great states, Mercia and Wessex. Ceolwulf died A.D. 760, according to the *A. S. C.* and Florence of Worcester. Simeon gives A.D. 764, describing the winter of that year such as had never been known for severity, destructiveness, and duration (*G. R.* ad an. 764, M. H. B. 663). The lasting winter of Northumbria's discontent had set in. The varieties of this king's name are CEOLULPHUS, CEOLULF, CEOLULF, CEOLWLF, CEOLF, CHELWULFUS. No wife or issue are assigned to him. [C. H.]

CEOLWULF (2) The seventh bishop of the Lindisfari, at Sidnacester. According to Simeon of Durham he was consecrated in 767, at the same time with Archbishop Ethelbert of York, on the 24th of April (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 663). His name appears miswritten "Edeulfus Lindensis Faronensis episcopus" among the attestations of the legate synod of 787 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 460), and is very frequently attached to Mercian charters from 767 to 796. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle mentions his departure from the land (M. H. B. 338) and death (*ib.* 339) in the year of Offa's death, 796; see also Sim. Dun. *ibid.* 669. [S.]

CEONWALH (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, vol. i. 41), king of the West Saxons. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

CEORRA, deacon, attests a charter of Denebert bishop of Worcester, about A.D. 802. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 181.) [C. H.]

CEOWLF (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1913, M. H. B. 786), king of the West Saxons. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CEPHAS (Gal. ii. 11) was distinguished from Peter, and said to be one of the seventy disciples, by Clement of Alexandria in the fifth book of his *Hypotyposes*, as recorded by Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 12). Hence he appears in the list of the seventy ascribed to Dorotheus, and is specified as bishop of Cannia, but is omitted in the Latin version. In the Menology of Basil he is commemorated along with Sosthenes, Apollos, Tychicus, Epaphroditus, Caesar, and Onesiphorus, on Dec. 9, but nothing is said of him in the Synaxarion there given. Dr. Lightfoot refers to Jerome (t. vii. p. 408), Chrysostom (t. iii. p. 374) and Gregory the Great on Ezekiel (l. 2, hom. 6) as combating this supposition. The Armenian calendar commemorates Apollos and Cephas as disciples of Paul, Sept. 25 (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. 648). Dr. Lightfoot also refers to the constitutions of the Egyptian church as representing him as one of the Twelve distinct from Peter (Galatians, p. 128). [E. B. B.]

CEPONIUS, a Gallician bishop, to whom, in A.D. 447, the bishop of Astorga sent his refutation of the Priscillianists, and who was ordered

by pope Leo to assemble a council against them (Leo, *Ep.* 15, p. 711; *Patrol.* liv. 692, 693).

[E. B. B.]

CERA. [CIAR.]

CERASIANUS, bishop at the council of Sinuessa, A.D. 303 (*Conc.* i. 940). [E. B. B.]

CERATIUS, St. (or CERACIUS), of Simorra, bishop, said to have been born of a princely Burgundian family, and to have been a pupil of St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan. But in an ancient inscription in the church of Eause he is called a disciple of Saturninus Tolosanus episc. He is called St. Ceratius of Simorra, because his remains were translated to, and preserved in, the Benedictine monastery of St. Mary in Simorra. There is some doubt as to the precise diocese over which he ruled. By some writers he is called bishop of Eause, or Euse (Elusa), in Gascony, while others say that he was bishop of Grenoble. According to the biography given of him in the Bollandists, his title was "Episcopus Gratianopolitanus," of bishop of the ancient French district called "*le Graisivaudan*," comprising the basin of the Isère. Hauréau (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. p. 221) mentions a Ceratus as 6th bishop of Gratianopolis.

He is said to have had a long dispute with one of the sect of the Saducaei, to whom he expounded the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and whom he converted. On that account there arose against him a bitter persecution, which ended in driving him from his bishopric. He then fled with his two deacons, Gervasius and Protasius, to an obscure place in Gascony, called Saintes, where he won for himself great renown as a saint.

St. Ceratius is commemorated on the 6th June (*AA. SS. Boll.* Jun. i. 708). [D. R. J.]

CERAUNIA, wife of Namatius, to whom in the 6th century Ruricius, bishop of Limoges, writes (*Ep.* 4, lib. ii.), to console her and her husband on the death of their daughter, and again (*Ep.* 14, *ib.*), when sending her a painter in his employ, for whose services she had asked. She seems at this time to have lost her husband also, and to have taken charge of some children (*Patrol.* lviii. 83, 94, 97). [E. B. B.]

CERAUNIUS, St. Bishop of Paris. This saint appears to have been bishop of Paris from 614 to 625, and it is said that he was present at the fifth council of Paris in 615 (*Acta SS. Boll.* Sept. vii. 485). [H. W. Y.]

CERAUNUS. [CARAUNUS.]

CERBAN (CORBANUS, CUIRBIN), bishop of Feart-Cearbain, at Teamhair, is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 473, c. 4) as one of St. Ciaran of Saighir's disciples, and is identified "dubio procul" with St. Corbanus, the friend of St. Mochteus (March 24), who is venerated as Cuirbin the Devout on July 20. Colgan calls him presbyter Corbanus, and says a church was dedicated to him in Galway, and named after him Kill-Corbain. Feart-Cearbain, "The Grave of Cerban," was the name of a church, now entirely defaced, situated to the north-east of Tara Hill. He died A.D. 504 or shortly before, according to the Irish Annals. (Petrie, *Hist. and Antiq. of Tara Hill*, 200; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* Ir. i. 419 sq.; *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, 161 n.) [J. G.]

CERBONIUS, bishop of Populonium (Gregor. Magn. *Dial.* iii. 11). Divers miracles regarding him are there related. Gams (*Series Episc.* p. 755) assigns his appointment to the year 546 A.D. [E. B. B.]

CERCYLINUS, fabulous king of Corcyra, in the 1st century, under a Roman governor, Carpianus (*Acts of Jason and Sosipator, Men. Basil.* Apr. 27). [E. B. B.]

CERDIC, presbyter, attests a charter of Cynewulf king of the West Saxons, A.D. 759 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 104). [C. H.]

CERDICE, king of the Britons, by whom Hereric and Breguid, the parents of Hilda, were exiled (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 23). It has been suggested (note on this passage, M. H. B. 236) that he may be the Certeic king of Elmet, in Yorkshire, expelled by Edwin of Northumbria, who then occupied his dominions (Nennius, *Hist.*, M. H. B. 76). The circumstance that Hilda belonged to the family of Edwin (M. H. B. 234 n.) countenances this suggestion. That the name of Cerdic was not uncommon in Elmet seems probable from an earlier Cerdicelm, who also occurs in Nennius (M. H. B. 65). An identification with Cereic of the *Ann. Camb.* who died A.D. 616, is also suggested in M. H. B. 236 n. The note of Mr. Moberly on the passage in Bede in his edition of this author, 1869, may be consulted. See also COROTICUS. [C. H.]

CERDO (Ι) (Κέρδων), a Gnostic teacher of the first half of the 2nd century, principally known as the predecessor of MARCION. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 41) and Philaster (*Haer.* 44) assert him to have been a native of Syria, and Irenaeus (i. 27 and iii. 4) states that he came to Rome in the episcopate of Hyginus. This episcopate lasted four years, and Lipsius (*Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe*) places its termination A.D. 139-141. Having in regard the investigations of M. Waddington concerning the year of Polycarp's martyrdom, we prefer the earlier date, if not a still earlier one, and are disposed to put Cerdos' arrival at Rome as early as A.D. 135. Eusebius in his *Chronicle* (*Schöne*, i. 168) places it under the last year of Hadrian, A.D. 137; Jerome substitutes a date three years later. So, likewise, Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 24) places the Roman activity of Cerdo under the reign of Antoninus.

According to the account of Irenaeus, Cerdo had not the intention of founding a sect apart from the church. He describes him as more than once coming to the church and making public confession, and so going on, now teaching his doctrine in secret, now again making public confession, now convicted in respect of his evil teaching, and removed from the communion of the brethren (ἀφιστάμενος τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν συνοδίας). Some understand this to mean that Cerdo voluntarily withdrew himself from communion, but we prefer to understand the word passively, with the old translator of Irenaeus, "abstentus est a religiosis hominum conventu." It seems to have been an inaccuracy of Epiphanius that he gives a heading to a sect of Cerdonians. Preceding writers speak only of Cerdo, but not of Cerdonians; and it is probable that his followers were early merged in the school of Marcion, who is said to have joined himself to Cerdo soon after his arrival in Rome.

It does not appear that Cerdo left any writings, nor is there evidence that those who report to us his doctrine had any knowledge of it independent of the form it took in the teaching of his Marcionite successors. Consequently it is not possible now to determine with any certainty how much of the teaching of Marcion had been anticipated by Cerdo, or to say what points of disagreement there were between the teaching of the two. Hippolytus, in his *Refutation* (x. 19), makes no attempt to discriminate the doctrines of Cerdo and Marcion. Tertullian, in his work against Marcion, mentions Cerdo four times, but each time only as Marcion's predecessor. The account given by Irenaeus of the doctrine of Cerdo is that he taught that the God preached by the law and the prophets was not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; for that the former was known, the latter unknown; the former was just, the latter good. The account given by Pseudo-Tertullian (*Haer.* 16) may be regarded as representing that given in the earlier treatise of Hippolytus, which was also made use of by Philaster and Epiphanius. It runs that Cerdo introduced two first principles (*ἀρχαί*) and two gods, the one good, the other evil, the latter of whom was the creator of the world. Here we are to note the important difference that to the good god is opposed in the account of Irenaeus a just one; in that of Hippolytus, an evil one. In the later work of Hippolytus already cited, Cerdo is said to have taught three principles of the universe, *ἀγαθόν, δίκαιον, ἕλην*. Ps.-Tertullian goes on to say that Cerdo rejected the law and the prophets, and renounced the Creator, teaching that Christ was the son of the higher good deity, and that he came not in the substance of flesh but in appearance only, and had not really died or really been born of a virgin. He adds that Cerdo only acknowledged a resurrection of the soul, denying that of the body. Ps.-Tertullian adds, but without support from the other authorities, that Cerdo received only the Gospel of St. Luke, and that in a mutilated form; that he rejected some of Paul's epistles and some portions of others, and completely rejected the Acts and the Apocalypse. There is every appearance that Ps.-Tertullian here transferred to Cerdo what in his authority was stated of Marcion. For a discussion of his other doctrines we refer to the article on MARCION.

In the place already cited from the first book of Irenaeus, in which he speaks of the coming of Cerdo to Rome, all the MSS. agree in describing Hyginus as the ninth bishop from the apostles; and this reading is confirmed by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 11), by Cyprian (*Ep.* 74, ad Pompeium), and by Epiphanius. On the other hand, in the passage from the third book, though Eusebius here too reads "ninth," the MS. evidence is decisive that Irenaeus here describes Hyginus as the eighth bishop, and this agrees with the list of Roman bishops given in the preceding chapter, and with the description of Anicetus as the tenth bishop a couple of chapters further on. Lipsius hence infers that Irenaeus drew his account of Cerdo from two sources, in which Hyginus was differently described; but this inference is very precarious. In the interval between the composition of his first and third books, Irenaeus may have been led to alter his way of counting by the investigations concerning the succession

of the Roman bishops which he had in the meantime either made himself or adopted from Hegesippus. As for the numeration "ninth," we do not venture to pronounce whether it indicates a list in which Peter was counted first bishop, or one in which Cletus and Anacletus were reckoned as distinct. [G. S.]

CERDO (2) Succeeded Abilius as bishop of Alexandria, in the year 98. He held the see eleven years, and was succeeded by Primus, in the year 109. (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 21, iv. 1. *Id. Chron. Armen.* apud Hieron. sub anno 2113.) According to the legendary "Acts of St. Mark," Cerdo was one of the presbyters St. Mark ordained (Bolland. *AA. SS.* Apr. 25). [E. V.]

(3) A Manichean who taught his doctrines in the reign of Tacitus, according to Jo. Malalas (*Chron.* xii. p. 399). Hody (*ad oc.*) conjectures that it may possibly refer to Manes himself. [E. B. C.]

CEREALIS (1), a vicarius sent by Adrian to arrest the two brothers Getulus and Amantius, tribunes, Christians at Tivoli. He was converted by them, baptized by Sixtus I., arrested with them by one Licinius, and beheaded, June 10, circ. 124 (Tillemont, ii. 242; *AA. SS.* June 10, ii. 264).

(2) A soldier converted by his prisoner, pope CORNELIUS, and beheaded along with him; as also his wife Sabina, whom the pope had cured of palsy (Tillem. iii. 744, from Ado.).

(3) Consul at Rome (A.D. 358), praefect A.D. 353, sought the hand of St. Marcella in marriage, but she would not consent. (Hieron. *Ep.* lxxv. ed. Migne, or 127, ed. Vall. *ad Principium Virginitatis*, cf. Godofred, *ad Cod. Theod.* lib. ix. tit. 25, l. 1, p. 196.)

(4) Commended by Paulinus of Nola to Rufinus (*Ep.* 47, p. 275; *Patr.* lxi. 389-98).

[E. B. B.]

(5) **AFER**, bishop of Castellum in Numidia, the author of a *libellus contra Maximinum Arianum*. His own episcopal city and the neighbouring towns having been devastated in the religious war carried on by Hunneric and his nephew Gundamund against the Catholics, Cerealis took refuge in Carthage, c. 485, where he was confronted by Maximus, the Arian prelate of the Ariomanitae (or Ammonitae), who reproached him with the calamities which had fallen on those of the orthodox faith, as a proof of the displeasure of God. Being challenged by Maximus to prove the points at issue between the Arians and the orthodox from Scripture alone, he accepted the challenge on twenty assigned heads, each of which he demonstrated in favour of the Catholics by two or three quotations from the Bible. Maximus deferred his reply from day to day until he allowed judgment to go against him by default. (Gennadius, c. 96; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 460; Migne, *Patrolog.* lviii. 755-768; Tillemont, xvi. 516). [E. V.]

CEREALIS, or **CERYALIUS**, one of the judges of PHOTINUS (Epiph. *Haer.* 71, p. 829).

[G. S.]

CEREDIG, of Cardigan, Irish saint, son of Cunedda Wledig. [COROTICUS.]

CERENICUS, St., deacon of Civitas Sagurum (Séaz), in the province of Lugdunensis Secunda, under the metropolitan of Rouen. Cerenicus or Serenicus and Serenedus were two brave men of illustrious families, sprung from the city of Spoletum (Spoleto, Spoleti), the capital of the province from which the name is derived, situate on the Maroggia, to the north of Rome. Cerenicus gave early signs of ability, and was entrusted by his parents to tutors, under whom he made extraordinary progress, and became saturated with apostolic doctrine.

When he grew up he was not content with the teaching of his former masters, but he and his friend Serenedus studied the Scriptures and the orthodox Fathers for themselves. The two friends are compared to bees collecting honey from various flowers.

Their next step was to carry out literally the injunction to forsake father, mother, and home, contained in St. Matt. x. 37, xix. 29, and with that view they went to Rome, where they were ordained deacons. In the Life of St. Serenedus it is stated that after a moderate time the pope ordained them both cardinals of the church, but this is supposed by the Bollandists to be a mistake, as the name of cardinal, if it then existed, only rose to a dignity after A.D. 1000.

At Rome Cerenicus had a vision, in which an angel appeared to him, urging him to carry out to perfection the resolution which he had made to leave father and mother: "It is not here that the Lord wishes you any longer to stay, but He indicates another place. For since for the love of Him you have given up your dear relations, you must not remain near them, but go farther west, where, having forgotten them, you may be able to give your mind up more freely to divine contemplation. Wherefore arise; you must, as a brave athlete, pursue victory to the end. The rewards are promised not indeed to him who begins, but to him who perseveres to the end."

Cerenicus communicated this order to his friend, and they immediately obeyed it by quitting Rome and crossing the Alps. After much difficulty they arrived in Gaul, travelled through many cities, and visited many shrines, fully persuaded that the farther they went from home the nearer they approached heaven. For a time they lived at Mayence, "a very fertile country, conspicuous for long-lived persons;" but Cerenicus, feeling that this pleasant land was not his destination, bade farewell to his companion, and set out alone, in quest of a place more favourable to contemplation, austerity, and solitude. His destination appears to have been Hiesmes in Normandy, where he adopted a little boy named Flavardus, who became his disciple.

Cerenicus lived to an old age, and was buried in the church of St. Martin, which he had founded, and which was afterwards called after his own name.

At that time Clotaire reigned over Gaul, and his wife Balthildis piously raised a sepulchre over the remains of Cerenicus. It is said that there was a cathedral formerly at Hiesmes, and that the see was afterwards translated to Séaz.

Cerenicus founded the monastery of Cenomanum (Le Mans), and had 140 disciples. When this monastery was pillaged by Charles Martel and his soldiers, they were attacked, routed, and many of them killed by the bees of the monastery.

Several churches were dedicated to Cerenicus, and Odericus Vitalis mentions a *Castrum Sancti Serenici* as a stronghold in the days of the Dukes of Normandy.

He lived towards the end of the 7th century, and is commemorated on the 7th May (*AA. SS. Boll.* May, ii. pp. 162-166; Du Saussay, *Martyrolog. Gallic.*, Paris, 1637; Johannes Bondonnetus, *Hist. Episcop. Cenomanor.*; Ordericus Vitalis, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. p. 464). [D. R. J.]

CERETIC (1) of Cardigan, son of Cunedda Wledig, Irish saint. [COROTICUS.]

(2) Died A.D. 616, *Ann. Camb.* in M. H. B. 832. [CERDICE.] [C. H.]

CERETIUS, a bishop who writes to Augustine, sending him two books which had been recommended to him by one Argyrius. Augustine found them to be Priscillianist writings, and to include an apocryphal hymn said to have been sung by Christ and His disciples before they went out to the Mount of Olives (*Aug. Ep.* 237 (253), ii. 1034).

(2) The above may be the same as the bishop who in A.D. 441 signs the canons of the council of Orange, and who writes, in conjunction with Salonius and Veranus, to pope Leo, begging him to correct their copy of his letter to Flavian, and make any additions that occurred to him, and thanking him for the ability with which he provided for the prevention, as well as the cure, of heresy (*Conc.* iii. 1434, 1452). [E. B. B.]

CERICUS (*Acta SS.* June, iii. 17), infant martyr. [CYRICUS.] [C. H.]

CERINTHUS. Among the traditional opponents of the teaching of St. John is Cerinthus. Tradition associates with his name facts which, if exaggerated, are yet sufficient to establish his existence, and opinions historically consonant with the stirring thoughts of the age in which he is placed. It will probably always remain an open question whether the fundamentally Ebionite sympathies of this man inclined him to accept Jewish rather than Gnostic additions. Modern scholarship has therefore preferred to view his doctrine as a fusing together and incorporating in a single system tenets collected from Jewish, Oriental, and Christian sources; but the nature of that doctrine is sufficiently clear, and its opposition to the instruction of St. John as decided as that of the Nicolaitan.

Cerinthus was of Egyptian origin, and in religion, whether by proselytism or birth it is impossible to tell, a Jew. He received his education in the Judæo-Philonic school of Alexandria. On leaving Egypt he visited Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Antioch. Tradition has not left his visits to these cities unnoticed. Thus, he is "one of the circumcision" who contended with St. Peter, rebuking him for his breach of the law in eating with Cornelius and uncircumcised men (*Acts* xi. 2): he is one of the unauthorised self-appointed propagandists who went out from Jerusalem "troubling with words" the Gentile brethren in Antioch (*Acts* xv. 1, 23-4): he and his fellow-thinkers are the authors of the disturbance raised in Jerusalem against St. Paul, for his alleged introduction of the polluting presence of Trophimus the Ephesian into the sacred precincts of the Temple (*Acts* xxi. 27):

he and his fellow-workers are the *ψευδοπόστολοι* (2 Cor. xi. 13), the *παρείσακτοι ψευδῶδελφοί* (Gal. ii. 4), so hateful to St. Paul and his brother-missionaries. Again, according to tradition, his antagonism to St. Paul is undisguised: he scornfully rebukes the Apostle for preaching—"If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. v. 2-4): he vilifies martyrdom, and honours the traitor Judas: he rejects the Acts of the Apostles and all the Gospels except that of St. Matthew. Even that Gospel does not entirely satisfy him, and he will only accept it in a form mutilated like that of the 'Gospel to the Hebrews': he excludes the history of the miraculous conception of Christ, but admits the opening genealogy of the Gospel because it confirms his Christological views: he quotes from it the Master's words, "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master," &c. (Matt. x. 25), as an argument in behalf of circumcision and of the observance of the law against the obnoxious "freedom" of the Pauline school.

From Palestine Cerinthus passed into Asia and there developed *τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπωλείας βάραθρον* (Epiph. xxviii. 2). Galatia, according to the same authority, was selected as his head-quarters; and from thence he went out circulating his errors. On one of his journeys he arrived at Ephesus, and met St. John in the public baths. The Apostle, hearing who was there, fled from the place as if for life, crying to those about him: "Let us flee, lest the bath fall in while Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is there." History and tradition are alike silent about the close of his life (Irenaeus, the 'Philosophumena,' Theodoret, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Eusebius).

The value of these traditions is confessedly not great; that for instance of the meeting with St. John in the bath is worthless, it being told of "Ebion" as well as of Cerinthus: but a stratum of fact probably underlies them, and they are at least indications of the feeling with which the early "Churchmen" regarded him. Epiphanius, in whose work the majority are preserved, derived the principal portion of his statements partly from Irenaeus, and partly, as Lipsius has shewn with high probability, from the now lost earlier work of Hippolytus on heresies.

To turn from the man to his doctrines. These may be conveniently collected under the heads of his conception of the Creation, his Christology, and his Eschatology. His opinions upon two of these points, as preserved in existing works, support the view now usually current that Cerinthus rather than Simon Magus is to be regarded as the predecessor of Judæo-Christian Gnosticism.

Unlike Simon Magus and Menander, Cerinthus did not claim for himself a sacred and mystic power. Caius the Presbyter can only assert against him that he pretended to angelic revelations (Eusebius, Theodoret). But his mind, like theirs, brooded over the *co-existence* of good and evil, spirit and matter; and his scheme seems intended to free the "unknown God" and the Christ from the bare imputation of infection through contact with nature and man. Trained as he was in the philosophy of Philo, the Gnosis

of Cerinthus did not of necessity compel him to start from *opposition*—in the sense of malignity—of evil to good, matter to spirit. He recognised opposition in the sense of difference between the one active perfect principle of life—God, and that lower imperfect passive existence which was dependent upon God; but this opposition fell far short of malignity. He therefore conceived the material world to have been formed not by "the First God," but by angelic Beings of an inferior grade of Emanation (Epiph.). More precisely still he described the main agent as a certain Power (*δύναμις*) separate and distinct from the "Principality" (*ἡ ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα αὐθεντία*, v. Suicer, *Theos*. s. v. *αὐθ.*) and ignorant of *τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντα θεόν*. He refused in the spirit of a true Jew to consider the "God of the Jews" identical with that author of the material world who was alleged by Gnostic teachers to be inferior and evil. He preferred to identify him with the Angel who delivered the Law (Epiph. and Philastr.). Neander and Ewald have pointed out the legitimate deduction of these tenets from the teaching of Philo. The conception is evidently that of an age when hereditary and instinctive reverence for the Law served as a check upon the system-maker. Cerinthus is a long way from the bolder and more hostile schools of later Gnosticism.

The Christology is of an Ebionite cast and replete with traits of the same transition character. It must not be assumed that it is but a form of the common Gnostic dualism, the double-personality afterwards elaborated by Basilides and Valentinus. Epiphanius, who is the chief source of information, is, to many, a mere uncritical compiler, sometimes following Hippolytus, sometimes Irenaeus. Now it is *Christ* who is born of Mary and Joseph (Epiph. xxviii. 1), now it is *Jesus* who is born like other men, born of Joseph and Mary; He differs from others only in being more righteous, more prudent, and more wise; it is not till after Baptism when Jesus has reached manhood, that Christ, "that is to say, the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove," descends upon Jesus from above (*ἔναθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἕνω Θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα αὐθεντίας*, Iren.), revealing to Him and through Him to those after Him the "unknown Father." If, as Lipsius thinks (p. 119), Irenaeus has here been influenced by the later Gnostic systems, and has altered the original doctrine of Cerinthus as given in Hippolytus, that doctrine would seem to be that he considered "Jesus" and "Christ" titles given indifferently to that One Personality Which was blessed by the descent of the Holy Spirit, the Power on high (*ἡ ἄνωθεν δύναμις*). This Power enables Jesus to perform miracles, but forsakes Him at His suffering, "flying heavenwards." Again: it is *Jesus*, according to one passage of Epiphanius, Who dies and rises again, the Christ being spiritual and remaining impassible; according to a second, it is *Christ* Who dies, but is not yet risen, nor shall He do so till the general Resurrection. The same confusion suggests the same explanation, and adds another paragraph to the history of "variation" in doctrine. That passage, however, which allows that the human body of Jesus had been raised from the dead separates its author completely from Gnostic successors.

The Chilastic eschatology of Cerinthus is very

clearly stated by Theodoret, Caius, Dionysius (Euseb.), and Augustine, but is not alluded to by Irenaeus. His silence need perhaps cause no surprise: Irenaeus was himself a Chiliast of the spiritual school, and in his notes upon Cerinthus he is only careful to mention what was peculiar to this system. The conception of Cerinthus was highly coloured. In his "dream" and "phantasy" the Lord shall have an earthly kingdom in which the elect are to enjoy pleasures, feasts, marriages, and sacrifices. The capital of this kingdom is Jerusalem and its duration 1000 years: at the end of that period shall ensue the restoration of all things. Cerinthus derived this notion from Jewish sources: neither Christianity nor philosophy could dispossess him of his convictions as a Jew. His notions of eschatology are radically Jewish: they may have originated, but they do not contain, the Valentinian notion of a spiritual marriage between the souls of the elect and the Angels of the Pleroma.

One or two peculiar features of his teaching still remain to be noticed. He held that if a man died unbaptized another was to be baptized in his stead and in his name, that at the day of resurrection he might not suffer punishment and be made subject to the *ἐξουσία κοσμοπόλου* (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 29). He had learned at Alexandria to distinguish between the different degrees of inspiration, and attributed to different Angels the dictation severally of the words of Moses and of the Prophets; in this agreeing with Saturninus and the Ophites. He insisted upon a partial observance of the "divine" Law, such as circumcision and the ordinances of the Sabbath; resembling, in this severance of the genuine from the spurious elements of the Law, the school which produced the 'Clementina' and the 'Book of Baruch.' He did not even scruple (acc. to Epiph.) to call him who gave the Law "not good," though the epithet may have been intended to express a charge of ethical narrowness rather than an identification of the Lawgiver with the *πρωτός* of Marcion.

Epiphanius admits that the majority of these opinions rest upon report and oral communication: they have consequently little claim to critical value. It was no uncommon practice to attach to some prominent man views which were not really his, but which, existing in sects Judaistic or Gnostic, were equally opposed to the opinions of the chronicler. This fact, coupled with the evident confusion of the statements recorded, must always make it difficult to assign to Cerinthus any certain place in the history of heresy. He can only be regarded generally as a link connecting Judaism and Gnosticism. It is possible that the traditional relations of Cerinthus to St. John have done more to rescue his name from oblivion than his opinions. Allusion has been already made to the meeting at the baths: in the course of time popular belief asserted that St. John had written his Gospel specially against the errors of Cerinthus, a belief curiously travestied by the counter-assertion that not St. John but Cerinthus himself was the author not only of the Gospel but of the Apocalypse. It is not difficult to account on subjective grounds for this latter assertion. The Chiliasm of Cerinthus was an exaggeration of language current in the earliest ages of the Church; and, of all the volumes of the sacred Canon, no work reproduced that lan-

guage so ingeniously as the Apocalypse. The conclusion was easy: Cerinthus was in reality the author, he had but ascribed the Apocalypse to the Apostle to obtain credit and currency for his forgery. The "Alogi" argued upon similar grounds against the fourth Gospel. It did not agree with the Synoptists, and though it disagreed in every possible way with the alleged doctrines of Cerinthus, yet the false-hearted author of the Apocalypse was certainly the writer of the Gospel.

The followers of Cerinthus, known by the name of Merinthians as well as Cerinthians, do not appear to have struggled through a very long existence. If any are identical with the Ebionites mentioned by Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 48), some of his followers gradually diverged from their master in a retrograde direction (Dorner, p. 320); but the majority were engulfed in sects of greater note. One last allusion to them is found in the ecclesiastical rule applied to them by Genadius Massiliensis: "Ex istis si qui ad nos venerint, non requirendum ab eis utrum baptizati sint an non, sed hoc tantum, si credant in ecclesiae fidem, et baptizentur ecclesiastico baptismo" (*De Eccles. Dogmatibus*, 22; Oehler, i. 348).

The literature upon Cerinthus is summed up in the following primary and secondary authorities: Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* i. cp. xxv. (Lat.) (i. 253, ii. 725, 867, ed. Stieren), cp. xxi. (Gk.) (i. pp. lxxi, 211, ed. Harvey).—S. Hippolyti *Refutatio omn. Haeres.* ('Philosophumena'), vii. § 33 (ii. 404 sq. ed. Duncker).—Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab. Comp.* ii. § 3 (iv. 390, ed. Migne).—Epiphanius, *Epit. Panar.* i. (i. 358, ed. Dindorf); *Haer.* xxviii. (ii. 72 sq. ed. Dind.).—Philastrius *de Haeret. lib.* 36, 50 (i. 40, 61, *Corp. Haeresolog.* ed. Oehler).—Augustine *de Haer. lib.* viii. (in *Corp. Haer.* ed. Oehler, i. 198).—Pseudo-Tertullian, *Lib. adv. omn. Haeres.* x. (and others contained in Oehler's work above named).—Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 28, iv. 14 (iii. 94 sq. ed. Heinichen, 1870).—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 43 sq. (ed. Bohn).—Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volk. Israel*, vii. 176 sq. (ed. 1859).—Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* i. 116 (ed. Davidson).—Lipsius, *Zur Quellen-Kritik d. Epiphanius*, 115–22.—Kurtz, *Hist. of the Chr. Church*, § 31, 49 (pp. 67, 102–3, ed. Edersheim, Edinb. 1866).—Niedner, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 222 (ed. 1866).—Hilgenfeld, *App. Väter*, pp. 43, 243–4.—Hagenboch, *Vorlesungen d. Kirchengesch.* i. 124 (ed. 1869).—Art. on 'Cerinth' in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*.—Hase, *K. G.* § 35 (p. 36, ed. 1867).—Werner, 'Cerinth' (Wetzer u. Welte's *K. Lexicon*).—Pressensé, *Hist. des trois premiers siècles*, ii. 363 sq.—Baur, *K. G. der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, pp. 190, 296 (ed. 1863).—Ritschl, *Die Entsteh. d. A. Kath. Kirche*, pp. 59, 157, 453 (ed. 1857).—Lechler, *Das Apost. u. d. Nach-Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 444 sq. (ed. 1857).—Baur, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 204 sq., 519, 603 sq., 651, 803.—Dorner, *Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, pp. 314 sq., 1019.—Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, ii. 65 (ed. 1867).—Robertson, *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* i. 31 (ed. 1854).—Westcott, *Canon of the N. T.*, p. 243 (ed. 1866). [J. M. F.]

CERNACH, CERNATH. [CAIRNECH (1).]

CERO, monk of St. Gall. [KERO.]

CERTIC (Nennius, *Hist.*, M. H. B. 76), king of Elmet. [CERDICE.]

CETHECH, bishop of Cill-garadh—June 16. He is usually known as St. Patrick's bishop. His father belonged to Meath, and his mother was of the race of Oilidus or Tirellil: he was born at Donnagh Sarige, near Duleek, and when St. Patrick was going westward through Roscommon, he gave the church of Cill-garadh to St. Cethech, who was afterwards buried there at the end of the 5th century: he had many churches under his charge. Benignus is said to have been a brother, but with little probability. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 135, 136, 176, 267; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist.* i. 244–6, 258; Reeves, *Ecccl. Ant.* 137.) [J. G.]

CETHEGUS, *patricius* of Sicily, informed by Pelagius I. (*Patrol.* lix. 414) of the ordination of a bishop of Catania, and of a married bishop, with much delay and many cautions, as no other could be found, for Syracuse. [E. B. B.]

CETHUBERIS, CETUMBRIA, ETHEMBRIA. A virgin whose Joceline, in his *Life of St. Patrick* (c. 79) calls Cethuberis, and afterwards (in c. 188), Ethembria, and whose name assumes a great multiplicity of forms, as Cectamaria, Cectumbria, and perhaps Eadhmair, &c., is said to have been the first who received the veil of virginity in Ireland from St. Patrick at her monastery of Druim Duchain, near Clogher. She is supposed by some to be the “*una benedicta Scotta*,” alluded to in St. Patrick's Confession, and by others to be St. Cinna (Feb. 1). (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 235, c. 4, and *Tr. Thaum.* 83, c. 79, 107, c. 188, 112, n. 82; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 381; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 266.) [J. G.]

CEWYDD AB CAW, Welsh saint of the 6th century, founder of Aberedw and Diserth in Radnorshire, and of Llangewydd, an extinct church near Bridgend in Glamorganshire. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 230.) [C. H.]

CHAD of Wessex. [CEADDA.]

CHAD (*A. S. C.* ad an. 664, tr. Ingram); **CHADDE** (*MS.* Life attributed to Robert of Gloucester, Hardy, *Descr. Cat.* i. 277), bishop of Lichfield. [CEADDA.] [C. H.]

CHADOENUS, ST., bishop of Le Mans. He is also called Caduindus, Clodoenus, Harduinus, Hadwinus, Chadoin, Hardoin. He was 12th or 13th bishop of Le Mans, about the year 623. He was present at the council of Rheims, A.D. 625. His will and a charter given by him to the monastery of Anisולם are to be found in vol. lxxx. of the *Patrol. Lat.* p. 567.

Mention is also made of him in the council of Cabillon, A.D. 644, where abbat Chagnoald represented him. (*Gallia Christiana*, xiv. p. 349; Le Cointe, *Annal. Eccl. Franc.* vol. iii. ad ann. 644 and 653.) He died in 653, and is commemorated on August 20, the day of his death. [D. R. J.]

CHAENULFUS. A letter of his exists addressed to Desiderius, bishop of Cahors from A.D. 629–654. (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. lxxxvii. p. 262; Ceillier, xi. 734.) [W. M. S.]

CHAEREMON (1) (Χαρήμων), aged bishop of Nilus, fled from the Decian persecution to the Arabian mountains with his wife, and could

never be heard of more (Dionys. Alex. *ad Fabium*; Euseb. vi. 42). [E. B. B.]

CHAEREMON (2), Deacon of Alexandria. Faustus, Eusebius, and he were the only three left alive by the plague, and accompanied DIONYSIUS, when he came before Aemilian, in the time of Valerian. He is commemorated along with him, Oct. 4, in the Menology of Basil, and represented as surviving *backwards* till the time of Decius, when he was beaten to death. The rest of the legend seems to belong rather to Eusebius (*Eus. H. E.* vii. 11). [E. B. B.]

(3) ST., recluse, probably lived in the 4th or 5th century, or in both, as he died at the age of 100 years, the greater part of which he spent in seclusion in the wilderness of Mount Scete in Libya. The memory of this saint is chiefly confined to the Greeks, who commend him as a pattern of patient labour.

There is a short chapter on him in Palladius (*Hist. Lausiaca*, cap. xcii. § 765, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxiii. p. 118c). The Bollandists cite Petrus de Natalibus (xi. cap. 57), who calls the recluse Theron, and says he was so bent with age and prayer that he crawled on the ground like an infant. They also cite *Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae* (ed. Cotelierus), tom. i. p. 707, among *Apophthegmata Patrum*, to the effect that the cell of Chaeremon was forty miles from a church and twelve miles from any water.

Commemorated on the 16th August (*AA. SS.* Boll. Aug. iii. p. 291). [D. R. J.]

CHAGNOALDUS, ST., sixth bishop of Laon. Called also Chainoaldus, Chanoaldus, Agnoaldus, Cainaldus, Rainaldus, Hagnoaldus, and Chagnulfus. The same saint appears to be referred to in an ancient MS., under the name of Eudoaldus alias Lugdunensis Oudoaldus, as bishop of Lyons, for no St. Eudoaldus or Oudoaldus occurs amongst the bishops of that diocese, although Chagnoaldus does. This remark is extracted from *AA. SS.*, but Chagnoaldus was Episcopus Landunensis, not Lugdunensis, i. e. of Landun or Laon, not of Lyons. (Jacobus Severtius, *Chronologia Historica Archiep. Lugdun.* num. 39, and 1, 2, and 3; Jonas and Bede agree in this opinion.) The explanation is that Landunum was often called Lugdunum by the ancients, as may be seen in Adriani Valesii *Notitia Galliarum*. He is commemorated on the 6th September, but in several calendars different days are assigned to him, e. g. in the ancient MS. calendar of the Benedictine Saints the 31st Jan., in another the 8th Feb. Gabriel Bucelinus in the *Menologium Benedictinum* commemorates him twice, first on the 23rd Aug., and then on the 6th Sept. In the Benedictine Martyrology his death is commemorated on the 23rd August, and no mention is made of the 6th Sept. In the *Index Sanctorum* he is put down for 23rd Aug. and 6th Sept. In the *Martyrologium Gallicanum* 6th Sept.

His father, who was called Hagnericus, Chagnericus, or Agnericus, was a very powerful count of Burgundy, and, according to Mabillon, his ancestors were Burgundofarones, i. e. barons of Burgundy (Sec. 2, Benedict. p. 438). His mother's name was Leodegundis, “*patri nobilitate*,” and much commended for her piety and wisdom. He had two brothers, Faro or Burgundofaro, bishop of Meaux, and Walbertus, and one sister, St. Fara, with whom he entered the monastery of

Luxeuil, and made great progress in his studies. What dignity St. Walbertus or Waldebertus held is uncertain. Some writers make him successor to St. Eustasius, as abbat of Luxovium (Jonas, p. 625), when Eustasius died in 665, but the Bollandists think he was bishop of Meaux. In the monastery of Luxeuil Chagnoaldus had, as his preceptors, two eminent ecclesiastics, St. Eustasius and St. Columbanus. Not much is known of him while under these saints, except where he is mentioned here and there in the lives of the abbats, from which he appears to have been distinguished for his sanctity from his earliest years. Mabillon says that in those days the abbats were accustomed to have one of the monks to serve them (Mabill. tom. i. annal. ad annum 610), and it appears that Chagnoaldus was not only a disciple but also servant to Columbanus, and that it was part of his duty to be always present with the abbat, even when he retired into the desert. On these occasions he was witness to the virtues of his master, and learned to attract the birds and wild beasts. His fellow servants were a little boy, Domvalis, and also Eustasius himself.

In 610 Columbanus was sent into exile by Theodoric, king of Burgundy, instigated by his wife Brunichildis. Chagnoaldus then, probably, remained at Luxeuil, as according to the royal edicts, no one, unless he happened to be a Briton or a Scot (qui Scotus aut Britannus non esset), was allowed to follow the abbat to his place of exile. After the banishment of Columbanus, the monks of Luxeuil were strictly confined to their monastery, until, through the intercession of St. Agilus, Theodoric and Brunichildis revoked the order. As soon however as the royal edict forbidding the monks to leave the monastery had been repealed, Chagnoaldus, in company with Eustasius, followed his master into exile.

About this time Columbanus visited Chagne-ricus, the father of Chagnoaldus, by whom he was kindly received. It was during this visit that he blessed the whole family, and received the profession of Burgundofara or St. Fara, the sister of Chagnoaldus. Hence Columbanus, and with him Chagnoaldus, went to Brigantia (Briganza), where they remained till A.D. 612, when Theodbert, king of Austrasia, was killed by his brother Theodoric, king of Burgundy, by order of Brunichildis.

In 613 Columbanus went to Italy, and Chagnoaldus to Luxeuil, where Eustasius occupied the place of the abbat. Here Fara had established a sisterhood under the rule of Columbanus, who had sent Eustasius from Italy to be their director, and the latter ordered Chagnoaldus and his brother Waldebertus to undertake the building of the new monastery, over which their sister was to preside. This monastery was called Farae monasterium, and afterwards Faremoutier (Bourg de Brie, Seine-et-Marne), of the order of Benedictines, and when Eustasius went on his mission to Clotharius, Chagnoaldus was placed in charge of the monastery. [FARA, ST.] Chagnoaldus was made bishop of Laon, probably in A.D. 619, while Theodericus was bishop of Lyons. (*Gall. Chr. tom. iv. col. 39.*)

The first mention of him as bishop is in the synod of Rheims, at which, according to Flodo-

ardus, he was present. But this synod was held about A.D. 625. (Le Cointe, *Annal.*) He was still living in 631; for on the 22nd November of that year, he subscribed the charter of cession made by St. Eligius in favour of the Benedictine monastery of Solignac (Solemniciensis), of which St. Remaclus was then head.

He died the year after signing this charter, as Le Cointe gathers from a letter of bishop Paulus of Verdun, to St. Desiderius bishop of Cahors, in which the death of Chagnoaldus is announced.

The charter above referred to was signed x. Kal. Dec. anno x. regni Dagoberti, while the will of St. Burgundofara was made in the 5th year of the reign of Dagobertus, 26th October, 632. That will mentions "Chagnulfus" as a consenting party, and Mabillon thinks that Chagnulfus = Chagnoaldus (Mabill. tom. i. annal. ad annum 614, num. 10). If this be true, Le Cointe is not right in fixing the death of the saint on 6 Sept. 632. Mabillon thinks he died in August (tom. i. annal. ad annum 632, num. 29). The Bollandists appear to consider the date doubtful, but think it probable, after examining the best authorities, that Chagnoaldus died in 632, certainly between 631 and 638. He is supposed to have died of apoplexy, and was buried in the Benedictine monastery of St. Vincent, not far from his own episcopal city, and in that monastery, which was in ancient times the mausoleum of the bishops of Laon, the relics of the saint were preserved (*A.A. SS. Boll. Sept. ii. pp. 689-692*, and *Gallia Christiana*, ix. 510). [D. R. J.]

CHAIL, Coptic bishop. [COPTIC CHURCH.]

CHAINCHOOOCH, one of the "triple powers" [PISTIS SOPHIA, p. 361]. The word is written Bainechooch, p. 387. [G. S.]

CHALCEDONIUS, abbat (probably the first) of Viviers, one of the twin monasteries established by Cassiodorus (A.D. circa 469-563), who was chancellor and prime minister of Theodoric, king of Italy, and afterwards himself abbat of Viviers. The two monasteries were within one cloister; Viviers was for cenobites, Castel for anchorites. In his *Institution* addressed to the two abbats, Cassiodorus styles them both men of great sanctity. Viviers had gardens watered by several streams, abundance of fish from the sea and the little river Pellene, mills, and baths for the sick. (Cassiodorus, *de Instit. cap. xxxii., Patrol. Lat. lxx. p. 1147, § 556; Ceillier*, xi. 234, 235.) [W. M. S.]

CHALCIDIA, a Christian lady, residing probably at Antioch, to whom Chrysostom addressed several letters during his exile, expressing a very warm and long-standing attachment and the most affectionate solicitude for her health, which was very feeble, and for the troubles brought upon her by her fidelity to his cause. These letters are sometimes addressed to Chalcidia separately, sometimes conjointly with Asynertia, with whom she was united by the closest ties of friendship if not of relationship. From the deep concern manifested by these ladies in the persecutions suffered by Constantius at the hands of Porphyrius of Antioch, the conjecture has been hazarded by Tillemont that they may have been

very nearly related to him, perhaps his mother and sister. Chalcidia and Asyncritia were desirous of visiting Chrysostom at Cucusus, but were deterred by the severity of the winter, and by the danger of falling into the hands of the Isaurian marauders (Chrysost. *Epist.* 242). Chrysostom wrote to Chalcidia from Arabissus in the spring of 406, consoling her under some very severe trial, which surpassed those in which her life from its commencement had been spent (ib. 105). It is probable that the trial referred to was the persecution of Constantius and his friends by Porphyry. Chrysostom's warm affection for Chalcidia breathes in every line of his letters, which always contain the request that she will write often, and send news of her health and circumstances (Chrysost. *Epist.* 29, 39, 60, 76, 98, 105, 242). [E. V.]

CHALCIDIUS, a translator of, and author of a commentary on the Timaeus of Plato, printed at the end of Hippolytus, in the *Spicilegium Patrum Tertii Saeculi*, by J. A. Fabricius, Hamburg, 1718. His commentary was undertaken at the instigation of one Hosius. If this was the great Hosius, bishop of Cordova, we may approximately fix his date, c. 330. But this identification is doubtful. The faith of Chalcidius is also very uncertain; but he is usually classed among Christian writers, although there is no allusion to his religion in his commentary. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 199.) [E. V.]

CHALDAEAN CHRISTIANS. [NESTORIANS.]

CHAM or **HAM**, son of Noah; prophecies attributed to him were used by the Valentinians, and by Pherecydes (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 6 fin.). [E. B. B.]

CHAMMAK is a name which is frequently found in the designation of churches in the west of Scotland, indicating the existence of a local saint of that name, or more probably Coman. (*Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. 29 sq.; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 299.) [J. G.]

CHANEMUNDUS, ST., Chaquemundus, Chaumond, Chaumont or Hannemond. [DALFINUS, St., bishop of Lyon.] [D. R. J.]

CHAPTERS, THE THREE. [MONOPHYTES. JUSTINIAN I.]

CHARACHAR, a cat-faced archon presiding over the second division of the place of punishment. [PISTIS SOPHIA, p. 320.] [G. S.]

CHARALAMPES or **CHARILAMPES**, (1) Bishop of Magnesia, stripped of his priestly attire and flayed alive. The prefect Lucian tried to tear him with his own hands, and his hands were cut off then and there (through his eagerness and the awkwardness of his men, we may suppose), and we are told that the saint prayed and made him whole. The licitor Porphyrius, and Adametus, and three women who saw it, thereupon believed, but the ungrateful prefect had them all beheaded. The story has evidently grown a little. The circumstances seem to belong to the persecution of Diocletian, but it is referred to that of Severus, A.D. 198 (*Men. Basil.*), Feb. 10. [E. B. B.]

CHARALAMPES (2) Martyr at Nicomedia, with Eusebius, Romanus, Mentius, and Christina, and many others probably, in the persecution of Diocletian, May 30 (*Men. Basil.*). [E. B. B.]

CHARARIC, ST. A king (probably of the Morini; Malebranche, ii. 38) dethroned by Clovis and ordained priest, his son being at the same time ordained deacon. Clovis was enraged because in the struggle between him and Siagrius Chararic had remained neutral. It would appear that they were ordained against their will; for during a conversation between father and son, the young prince, in order to console him, said: "These hairs which have been cut off (referring to the tonsure) are only the leaves and branches of a green tree, which will sprout again in time, and I only hope that he who has brought us to this condition may soon perish." Clovis, to whom these words were reported, immediately sent and had the two princes beheaded. (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* II. cap. 41, § 98, *Patrol. Lat.* lxi. p. 253; Ceillier, tom. xi. p. 395.) [D. R. J.]

CHARAUNUS. [CARAUNUS.]

CHARENTINUS, 8th bishop of Cologne, called also **CHARETERNUS**. He succeeded Domitian, and was followed by Ebregesilus. The date assigned to him is 570, and he is commemorated by Fortunatus in an elegiac poem, which praises his virtues, his kindness to all, his watchfulness, his splendid character, his zeal in restoring and beautifying churches, the serene tranquillity of his mind, the sweetness of his conversation, the refreshing brightness of his face. (*Gall. Chr.* iii. pp. 624, 625; Venantius Fortunatus, *Miscell.* cap. xix., *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. p. 140.) [D. R. J.]

CHARIATHO (1), one of the bishops addressed (A.D. 452) by Leo of Bourges, Victorius of Le Mans, and Eustochius of Tours, in a letter ordaining that, as the emperors have given the bishops the power of judging civil cases, ecclesiastics shall appeal to them, and never to lay judges, under pain of excommunication. The teaching of the letter was adopted in a council held at Angers next year in which Chariatho took part. (Tillem. xvi. 394; Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 1420, iv., 1020.) [E. B. B.]

(2) The name occurs in the *Mart. Hieron.* as belonging to a martyr in Syria with Martin and Peter, March 5, and to a martyr at Rome, with Stercorius, Clement, Julian, Emeritus, &c., July 25. [E. B. B.]

CHARIBERT (CARIBERT), the second of the four sons of Cloataire I., amongst whom their father's kingdom was divided in 561. Caribert's capital was Paris, and his kingdom embraced Aquitaine, Provence, Touraine, Beauce, together with the territory of Valois and Brie (Greg. iv. 22; Bonnell, *Anfange d. Karol. Hauses*, pp. 206-11), according to the usual principle in these partitions that each son should obtain a share in the old Frankish land, and a share in the lands conquered by the Franks. In 567 Caribert died, according to Gregory (*De Mirac. St. Martini*, quoted by Löbell, *Gregor von Tours*, p. 232) as a judgment for seizing some land belonging to the church of Tours. His kingdom was divided among his surviving brothers. Caribert was the father of Bertha, who married Ethelbert,

king of Kent, and assisted Augustine in his missionary work (Greg. iv. 26). On the chronology see Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte*, i. s. a. 567. n. 1. [T. R. B.]

CHARICLES, a priest in the 5th century, rebuked by St. Nilus of Sinai (*Ep.* iii. 243) for imposing hard penances on an humble penitent named Faustinus, and refusing him absolution till they were performed. Nilus points out that this conduct tends to Novatianism, and reminds him of David and Nathan, of the woman that was a sinner, of the penitent robber (Ceillier, viii. 222). [E. B. B.]

CHARIMIR, ST., bishop of Verdun, succeeded St. Airic in the bishopric in 588. He was referendarius to king Chilbert II. In his *Gloria Confessorum*, Gregory of Tours gives a story of bishop Charimir. The tomb of St. Médard, bishop of Noyon, was celebrated for curing the tooth-ache. Labouring under this malady, Charimir heard of the marvel. He hastened to the church, but found it locked. Trusting that the virtue of the holy man was not confined to the interior, he took a splinter from the door, touched his tooth, and was healed. (Greg. Turon. *de Gloria Confess.* cap. xcv.; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. p. 899, § 977; Ceillier, xi. p. 373.) [D. R. J.]

CHARIS, in the system of VALENTINUS an alternative name with Ennoea and Sige, for the consort of the primary Aeon Bythos (Iren. i. 4). The name expresses that aspect of the absolute Greatness in which it is regarded not as a solitary monad, but as imparting from its perfection to beings of which it is the ultimate source; and this is the explanation given in the Valentinian fragment preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 6), διὰ τὸ ἐπιερχομένην αὐτὴν θησαυρίσματα τοῦ Μεγέθους τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Μεγέθους. The use of the word Charis enabled Ptolemaeus (quoted by Irenaeus, i. 8) to find in John i. 14 the first tetrad of Aeons, viz., Pater, Monogenes, Charis, Aletheia. The suspicion arises that it was with a view to such an identification that names to be found in the prologue of St. John's Gospel were added as alternative appellations to the original names of the Aeons. But this is a point on which we have no data to pronounce. Charis has an important place in the system of MARCUS (Irenaeus, i. 13). The name Charis appears also in the system of the BARBELITAE (Irenaeus, i. 29), but as denoting a later emanation than in the Valentinian system. The word has possibly also a technical meaning in the Ophite prayers preserved by Origen (*Contra Celsum*, vi. 31), all of which end with the invocation ἡ χάρις συνέστα μοι, καὶ πᾶτερ, συνέστα. [G. S.]

CHARISIUS (1) Presbyter, and oeconomus of the church of Philadelphia, who presented himself at the sixth session of the council of Ephesus, July 22, 431, and laid before the assembled prelates an accusation against two presbyters, named Antonius and Jacobus, who had visited Lydia with commendatory letters from Anastasius and Photius, presbyters of Nestorius's party, and had received into their communion some simple-minded clergy and laymen of Philadelphia, who had formerly adhered to the Quartodeciman rule,

but convinced of their error, had been desirous to unite themselves to the Catholic church. Charisius complained that these emissaries of Nestorius had induced these Lydians to sign a creed, of which Theodore of Mopsuestia was the author, containing articles of a decidedly heretical character, and had excommunicated him because he refused to accept it. In confirmation of his statement Charisius laid the creed before the council, together with a list of those who had signed it, and their anathemas of their former errors. He also gave in a confession of his own faith, in perfect harmony with that of Nicaea. The council condemned the creed produced, as full of Nestorian impiety, carefully abstaining, however, from naming Theodore as its author, and denounced deposition and anathematization on all who should accept it. (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 673-694; Cyril, *Epist.* 54, p. 200; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 417.) [E. V.]

CHARISIUS (2) Bishop of Azotus, one of the subscribers to the Semiarian Council of Seleucia (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73, p. 874). [G. S.]

CHARISTERIUS. In the Valentinian fragment preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 6) this name is given to one of five Aeons without consorts [or rather "Prunici," for in this fragment the name Aeon is given to none but the first principle] whose generation takes place at a late point in the series of emanations. To these five there corresponds in the Valentinian system expounded by Irenaeus (i. 3) a single Aeon Horus, for whom, however, are given five other alternative appellations, three of these being identical, or nearly so, with three of the names in the fragment. [G. S.]

CHARITANA or **CHARITINA**, female slave of one Claudius or Claudian, was reported to Count Domitius in the Diocletian persecution to be a Christian woman, so he wrote to her master to send her for examination. Her master was grieved, and put on sackcloth, and bewailed her; but she consoled him, saying, "Be not grieved, my lord, for I give my relics for my sins and thine." And he said, "Remember me before the heavenly king." Then she was sent to the count, and confessed herself a Christian, and was cruelly beaten, her head shaved, and boiling pitch poured on it. They tied her up with a stone hung about her, and threw her into the sea. But the stone slipped the fastenings; "she received the water as a baptism," was carried to land, slipped her bonds, and could not resist presenting herself again to the count. "And when he saw her he was astonished, and commanded that there should be a wheel, and the saint should be bound there, and under the wheel should be put coals of fire. And this was done, and the saint was punished. Then her teeth were pulled out," and her fingers and toes cut off, "and out of the meek anguish and the unbearable labour she gave up her spirit to God." The story is told in the *Menology of Basil*, Oct. 5, and Jan. 15. The picture on the first day represents her being cast into the water, and in the legend there is no mention of the wheel. The picture on the second day represents the cutting off her toes, which is only mentioned

in the letterpress on the first. The suggestion may arise whether this is the story of St. Catharine and her wheel. Catharine seems much better Greek than Charitina, but we cannot pronounce that Charitina is an impossible form. Charitina occurs in the acts of Justin, perhaps because Charito has just preceded. Ruinart conjectures that Catharine is the same lady of whom Eusebius tells (8, c. 14), in relating the persecution A.D. 306-312, "And the women, no less than the men, endured with manful vigour by the teaching of the divine words, some of them underwent the same struggles as the men, and bare away the like prizes; and others, when haled for defilement, yielded their lives up to death sooner than their bodies to that ruin. At any rate, alone of the women with whom the tyrant played the adulterer, a Christian lady, most eminent and brilliant of those in Alexandria, overcame the impassioned and unchastened soul of Maximin by a most manful resistance; one who was glorious otherwise for wealth, and birth, and education, but who put all in the second rank in comparison with modesty; with whom he pleaded hard, and though she was ready to die, he could not find in his heart to slay her, as his lust prevailed over his wrath; but he punished her with banishment, and robbed her of all her substance." Eusebius does not name this lady; Rufinus supposes her to be Dorothea. We may here have the origin of the transference of St. Catharine to Mount Sinai, if that was her place of exile. Eusebius says distinctly that the lady was a Christian. The *Menology* tells a story of Aicaterina that might suit a Manichean equally well, except for the mention of baptism at the close, and makes no mention of the lust of Maximin; and is at variance with Eusebius in saying that the lady was beheaded. If the two ladies be the same, the account in Eusebius is preferable where they differ, but the details supplied in the *Menology*, some of them well agree with the eager, philosophical, and ritual revival of paganism under Maximin.

If two real persons of widely different, but equally noble and characteristic type, had thus been blended into one St. Catharine, it would help to account for the great hold that saint has had upon the popular imagination. The story of St. Agnes is a tale of the good shepherd rescuing his lamb, but the human interest of it is in her maidenly loveliness; whereas both the above histories are relations of the moral grandeur of womanhood, as it is in Christ, and borrow as little as possible of their interest from accidental circumstances.

[E. B. B.]

CHARITINA and CHARITO. In the Acts of Justin Martyr we are told that they confessed Christ, and were scourged and beheaded.

[E. B. B.]

CHARITY, derived usually from the Latin "caritas," whose Greek equivalent is ἀγάπη throughout its conjugates; which the Latin has, in most cases, to supply from "diligere." Yet it has been questioned whether the Latin equivalent for "charity" should not, as the English word still suggests, be written "charitas," and derived from the Greek word χάρις. For charity,

considered in its Christian acceptance, and from the Latin point of view, is no natural habit or affection at all, but a theological virtue, forming a triplet with faith and hope, and, like them, wrought in the heart by the action of the Holy Ghost in answer to prayer (*Dict. of Ant. art. "Charisma"*), and then made permanent by co-operation on the part of man. Charity, thus understood, would have the love of God and of our neighbour for its joint aim, and might be defined to be the habit of mind disposing to the fulfilment of both duties in truth. Yet no less a person than the master of the Sentences, Peter Lombard, fell into the error of confounding the infused virtue with the Holy Ghost, its giver (Corn. a Lap. in *Rom. v. 5*). Indeed there are several passages in the epistles of St. Paul where interpreters are not agreed as to which is meant (*Estius, ib.*). Probably the first work which treats of it dogmatically is the 'Enchiridion' of St. Augustine. The tract or sermon of Zeno, bishop of Verona, may be somewhat earlier (*Op. Tract. ii.*), but all after St. Augustine trod in his steps. "Faith," says the bishop of Hippo (c. 8), "may exist, but cannot profit without love; hope cannot exist without love, nor love without faith and hope." So far he is merely repeating Origen, who remarks (*In Rom. lib. iv. § 6*), "Puto quod prima salutis initia, et ipsa fundamenta fides est: profectus verò et augmenta aedificii spes est: perfectio autem et culmen totius operis caritas; et ideò 'major omnium,' dicitur 'charitas.'" But here we may need to be reminded of the distinction which St. Augustine draws elsewhere (*De Doct. Christian. iii. 10*), "Charitatem voco motum animi ad fruendum Deo propter Ipsum, et se et proximo propter Deum. Cupiditatem autem motum animi ad fruendum se et proximo, et quolibet corpore, non propter Deum" . . . "He that has love in Christ," says St. Clement of Rome, "should keep the commands of Christ. Who can declare the bond that the love of God is? who can portray the greatness of its beauty, or express the height to which it soars? Love knits us to God; love covers a multitude of sins; love bears all things, supports all things. There is nothing sordid or overweening either in love. Love knows of neither schism nor strife; love brings all things into unanimity. All the elect of God were made perfect in love, nor is anything acceptable to God without love. The Lord assumed us in love. Through the love which He bore us, Christ our Lord, by the will of God, gave His blood for us. His flesh for our flesh; His soul for our souls" (*Ep. i. 49*). "They love all men, and are persecuted by all," says the author of the epistle to Diognetus of His earliest followers (c. 5).

Neither the Latin "charitas," nor the English "charity," can mislead any. But when we employ their every-day synonyms, "love" requires as much limitation to be rightly construed as "amor." For as St. Augustine says at the close of his dogmatic work: "Regnat carnalis cupiditas, ubi non est Dei caritas. Sed cum in altissimis ignorantiae tenebris, nullâ resistente ratione, secundum carnem vivitur, haec sunt prima hominis. Deinde cum per legem cognitio fuerit facta peccati, si nondum divinus adjuvet Spiritus, secundum legem volens vivere vincitur, et sciens peccat, peccatoque subditus servit—

'A quo enim quis devictus est, huic et servus addictus est,' id agente scientiâ mandati, ut peccatum operetur in homine omnem concupiscentiam, cumulo praevaricationis adjecto, atque ita quod scriptum est impleatur. 'Lex subintravit ut abundaret delictum.' Haec sunt secunda hominis. Si autem respexerit Deus, ut ad implenda quae mandat Ipse adjuvare credatur, et agi homo coeperit Dei Spiritu, concupiscitur adversus carnem fortiore robore charitatis: ut quamvis adhuc sit quod homini repugnet ex homine, nondum totâ infirmitate sanata, ex fide tamen justus vivat, iustèque vivat, in quantum non cedit malae concupiscentiae, vincente delectatione iustitiae. Haec sunt tertia bonae spei hominis: in quibus si piâ quisque perseverantiâ quisque proficiat, postrema pax restat, quae post hanc vitam in requie spiritûs, deinde in resurrectione etiam carnis implebitur. . . . Omnia igitur praecepta divina referuntur ad charitatem, de quâ dicit Apostolus: 'Finis autem praecepti est charitas de corde puro, et conscientiâ bonâ, et fide non fictâ.' Omnis itaque praecepti finis est charitas: id est, ad charitatem refertur omne praeceptum. Quod verò ita fit, vel timore poenae, vel aliquâ intentione carnali, ut non referatur ad illam charitatem, quam diffundit Spiritus Sanctus in cordibus nostris, nondum fit quemadmodum fieri oportet, quamvis fieri videatur. Charitas quippe ista Dei est et proximi: et utique, 'in his duobus praeceptis tota lex pendet et Prophetae'. . . . (c. 118-21). Haec enim regula dilectionis," as he says elsewhere, "divinitus constituta est: 'Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum; Deum verò ex toto corde, et ex totâ animâ, et ex totâ mente' . . . ut omnes cogitationes tuas, et omnem vitam, et omnem intellectum in illum conferas, a Quo habes ea ipsa quae confers. Cum autem ait, 'toto corde, totâ animâ, totâ mente,' nullam vitae nostrae partem reliquit quae vacare debeat, et quasi locum dare, ut aliâ re velit frui; sed quicquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum, illuc rapiatur, quod totus dilectionis impetus currit. Quisquis ergò rectè proximum diligit, hoc eum eo agere debet, ut etiam ipse toto corde, totâ animâ, totâ mente diligit Deum. Sic enim eum diligens tanquam se ipsum, totam dilectionem sui et illius refert in illam dilectionem Dei, quae nullum a se rivulum duci extrâ patitur, cuius derivatione minuatur" (*De Doct. Christian.* i. 22). "Neque enim verâ dilectione diligeremus invicem," he continues on St. John (*Tract.* lxxxvii. 1), "nisi diligentes Deum. Diligit enim unusquisque proximum tanquam se ipsum, si diligit Deum: nam si non diligit Deum, non diligit se ipsum." Finally, where this is, as Origen pertinently remarks, "ubi erit peccati locus?" (*In Rom.* lib. v. 10). There is a magnificent peroration of this teaching in a letter of St. Augustine to Volusianus, which it would spoil to translate: "Quae disputationes," he says, "quae literae quorumlibet philosophorum, quae leges quarumlibet civitatum, duobus praeceptis, ex quibus Christus dicit totam legem Prophetasque pendere, ullo modo sint comparandae: 'Diliges Dominum Deum,' etc. Hic Physica, quoniam omnes omnium naturarum causae in Deo Creatore sunt. Hic Ethica, quoniam vita bona et honesta non aliunde formatur, quacum ea quae diligenda sunt, quemadmodum diligenda sunt,

diliguntur: hoc est, Deus et proximus. Hic Logica, quoniam veritas lumenque animae rationalis, nonnisi Deus est. Hic etiam laudabilis reipublicae salus: neque enim conditur et custoditur optimè civitas, nisi fundamento et vinculo fidei, firmaque concordiae, cum bonum commune diligitur, quod summum ac verissimum Deus est: atque in Illo invicem sincerissimè se diligunt homines, cum propter illum se diligunt: Cui, quo animo diligant, occultare non possunt." (*Ep.* cxxxvii. c. 5.) And there is yet another point of view in which we may regard it with St. Leo, who says: "Diligatur Deus, diligitur et proximus: ita ut formam diligendi proximi ab eâ quâ nos Deus diligit dilectione sumamus, Qui etiam malis bonus est, et benignitatis suae donis non solum cultores suos confovet, sed etiam negatores. Amentur propinqui, amentur extranei: et quod debetur amicis supererogetur inimicis. Quamvis enim quorundam malignitas nullâ humanitate mitescat, non sunt tamen infructuosa opera pietatis, nec unquam perdit benevolentia quod praestat ingrato." (*Serm.* xx. al. xix. f. 3.) This is as excellent as it is exclusively Christian, and in strict harmony with the words of our Lord (St. Matt. v. 43-8), on which those three beautiful homilies of St. Chrysostom, 'De Davide et Saule,' that drew so many tears from his hearers, were virtually preached (*Op.* iv. 748 *et seq.* ed. Mont.). Charity like this "never faileth," as the apostle says in his celebrated description of it (1 Cor. xii. 8). "He had shewn," says Theodoret, "that gifts would cease, and that charity would alone remain. But he shews further how it excels even those glorious qualities which belong to the mind. For faith itself is superfluous in a future life, where everything is made apparent. Hope, too, is superfluous, according to the maxim: 'What a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?' But charity waxes stronger than ever in that blessed place, where all passions are stilled, and all bodies clothed with immortality, and souls no longer choose this at one time, and that at another" (in loc.). Comp. Estius *ad Sent.* iii. 27; and on 1 Cor. xii.; Pouget, *Inst. Cathol.* pt. ii. § ii. c. 4; Maréchal, *Concord. Pat.* i. 146, and ii. 84 and 164; Fessler, *Inst. Patrol.* vol. ii. 1043, s. v. [E. S. Ff.]

CHARITY, martyr. [CARITAS.]

CHARLEMAGNE. [CHARLES THE GREAT.]

CHARLES, called the GREAT (French, Charlemagne), son of Pippin, king of the Franks, was born about the year 742 or 743. The place of his birth is unknown. (See Abel, pp. 8-14. Many brochures have been written on the subject both of the time and place of his birth; e.g. two by Polain, *Quand est né, and Où est né Charlemagne*, Brussels, 1856.) Of his youth little is known, except that he and his brother, Carloman, were anointed (*in reges*) by pope Stephen in 754, when he crossed the Alps to seek for help against the Lombards (*Ann. Laur.*). In 768 Pippin died. Charles and Carloman were raised to the throne and the kingdom of Pippin divided between them. Peace was with difficulty maintained between the two brothers, but, fortunately for the Frankish realm, in 771 Carloman died, and Charles became sole king of the Franks.

The subject will be divided thus: I. The authorities for the reign of Charles. II. The

literature of the subject. III. The personal life and character of Charles. IV. Charles as king and emperor. V. His laws and institutions. VI. Modern conceptions of Charles.

I. The authorities for the history of Charles are of four classes. (i.) *Annals*. At the head of this list stand the *Annales Laurissenses Majores*, the official chronicle of the court, according to the conjecture of Ranke (see below). It is the work probably of two authors, and contemporary from 788 to 813. Next come the *Annales Einhardi*, written after 829, probably not by Einhard himself; in great measure a *réchauffé* of the *Annales Laurissenses* with the addition of good special tradition. The *Annales Petaviani*, *Laureshamenses*, *Mosellani*, and others, are of local rather than of general value. All the above chronicles are to be found in the first volume of Pertz, *Scriptores Rer. Germ.* (ii.) *Biographies*. That of Einhard is a sketch of what Charles was, rather than a real biography. As its purpose is to give a picture, it does not relate the facts either completely or minutely, but still the picture it gives is a true one, and though written after Charles's death it ranks as a contemporary authority. That by the Poeta Saxo, though compiled at the end of the 9th century, makes use of good material not now extant. The Monk of St. Gall wrote his life about the same time. Already in his narrative legend has begun to grow around the name of Charles. The large number of anecdotes related, though of slight authenticity as facts, are valuable as illustrations of manners. These three biographies are to be found both in Pertz (*l. c.*) and in Jaffé's *Monumenta Carolina*. (iii.) The *Capitularies and Laws* of Charles, contained in the first vol. of the *Leges* of Pertz and in the collection of Baluzius. (iv.) The *Letters* of Charles, of Einhard, of Alcuin, and of the popes to Charles and his two predecessors, the last-named forming the *Codex Carolinus*, are to be found in Jaffé. For an account of the lesser authorities and generally see Abel, pp. 1-7, and Wattenbach *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, i. ch. 2.

II. *Literature of the Subject*.—Besides the histories of Gibbon, Hallam, Martin, Luden, &c., which treat of Charles and his reign as part of a larger subject, the following are some of the best works of reference. First and foremost is Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, vols. 3 and 4, exhaustive on all matters of legislation and internal history. Similar in scope, but less detailed, is Lhuérout, *Histoire des Institutions Carolingiennes*. Then there are the *Geschichte der Deutschen Kaiserzeit* (vol. i.) by Giesebrecht; and Döllinger, *Kaiserthum Karls des Grossen* in the *Münchener Hist. Jahrbuch* for 1865. The best life and narrative (but unfortunately reaching no further than 788), is Abel, *Jahrbücher des Fränkischen Reichs unter Karl d. Grossen*, 1866. The other biographies of Bredow, Dippoldt, Hegewisch, Capefigue, Gaillard, &c., are either out of date or of little intrinsic value. Many lesser works, such as Warnkönig and Gérard, *Histoire des Carolingiens*, Sporschil, *Karl der Grosse, sein Reich und sein Haus*, &c., contain little or nothing that is not better and more fully treated of by Waitz.

III. *Personal Life and Character of Charles*.—According to Einhard Charles was a man of more than ordinary stature, with large eyes and nose,

fair hair, and cheerful expression. Though his neck was thick and short and he was inclined to obesity, yet his presence was dignified. Like the rest of his countrymen he was fond of all field sports and exercises. He enjoyed robust health till within four years of his death (*Vita*, § 22). In his habits he was simple, wearing the ordinary Frankish dress, except on state occasions. The Roman costume he was only twice prevailed upon to wear, once by pope Adrian, the second time by pope Leo, on both occasions at Rome. In eating and drinking he was most temperate. During meals he invariably caused something to be read or recited, some tale of his ancestors' deeds or an extract from St. Augustine's works, especially from the *De Civitate Dei*. Whilst dressing he frequently gave audiences, without detracting from the royal dignity. Not only was he eloquent in his own language, but he could express himself with equal fluency and precision in Latin. Greek he understood, but did not speak. Though he attempted he was never successful in learning to write. He was a warm and constant friend, and, according to the ideas of his age, merciful towards his enemies. He was at once a firm believer in the Christian faith and careful in the performance of his religious duties, and a large alms-giver to the faithful poor, not only in his own land but in heathen countries. He built and restored churches throughout his dominions, the most important being the church at Aix-la-Chapelle. He paid particular veneration to the bishop of Rome and the church of St. Peter, that so it might not only be safe against all foes, but might excel all other churches in wealth and magnificence (*ib.* 23-27). In family life he took particular delight. He was a dutiful son, an affectionate husband, and an indulgent father; though according to our notions his morals were not very strict. His first wife, a Lombard princess, whom he married at his mother's request, was repudiated in a year's time. Hildegard the Saxonian was his second wife, and by her he had three sons, Charles, Lewis, and Pippin, and three daughters. By his third wife, the East-Frankish Fastrada, he had two daughters. Liudgard his fourth wife, of Alemannian descent, bore him no children. He is also related to have had several concubines (*ib.* 18). Upon the education of his children, both sons and daughters, he bestowed much care. The latter he kept at his palace all his lifetime, and refused to allow them to marry or leave him (*ib.* 19)—not without pernicious consequences according to Einhard (§ 19). The suggestions of Gibbon are without foundation.

The court of Charles has become famous both in history and in legend. There were two elements in the court, one political and military, the other ecclesiastical and learned. The former consisted chiefly of the officers of state, the Apocrisarius, &c., and the body guard or 'satellites.' The latter consisted of all the learned men whom Charles could induce to stop there for a longer or a shorter time. He delighted in cultivated society and in literary pursuits. Thus he took measures to correct the Latin text of the Scriptures by comparing it with the Syriac and other versions; he propounded questions on biblical criticism and on grammatical subjects to Alcuin and others. He attempted to write a

grammar of his native tongue, but in that he got little encouragement from his ecclesiastical friends. They formed together a kind of literary guild, and the letters of Alcuin reveal the easy terms of friendship on which they stood to one another. As such they assumed to themselves literary names. Charles was king David or king Solomon, Alcuin Placcus, Einhard Besaleel or Calliopius. Closely connected with this side of Charles's character is the establishment of the palace school, the only place within the kingdom at which the higher branches of learning were taught. The establishment of this school was primarily Charles's own work, and in its development he took the highest interest. Nor was he less careful for elementary education. In 787 on his return from Rome he brought with him into Francia masters in the arts of grammar and arithmetic, and gave commands for the expansion everywhere of the literary studies (*Ann. Laur. addit.*, quoted by Jaffé, *M. C.* p. 343, note), and in the following year he urges the abbot of Fulda to look after the schools in that city (*Ep. Car.* 3 Jaffé; cf. *Epp.* 25, 26, 42). Again, in 802, in a general capitulary the principle is laid down that "every one shall send his son to learn letters, and the child shall remain at school with all diligence until he become well instructed in learning" (Pertz, *Leges*, i. 107). In this respect also legend has grown round the name of Charles; as Alfred is the legendary founder of the University of Oxford, so is Charles the legendary founder of the University of Paris. Charles encouraged art as well as literature. The palaces of Nimwegen and Ingelheim have disappeared. The church at Aix, built after the model of San Vitale at Ravenna, and adorned with the marbles of that city, remains a monument of his taste and magnificence. Another distinguishing trait in his character is his carefulness for posterity in all his work. Thus the *Constitutions* and other state papers were all preserved in several copies in different places for consultation, notably in the archives of the palace (Einh. *Ann.* 813, cf. Wattenbach). In 791 he caused all the letters which had been directed by the apostolic see to his father, his grandfather, and himself to be collected and transcribed for the benefit of his successors. This collection is the *Codex Carolinus*. Further, it has been conjectured, originally by Ranke (*Abhand. d. Berliner Akademie*, 1854, p. 434), and the conjecture has since been accepted and elaborated by Pertz (*Script. i.*, introd.), Giesebrecht (*Münch. Hist. Jahrb.* 1864), Waitz and others, that an official chronicle was kept by Charles's command, of which we have the remains in the *Ann. Laurisenses* and *Ann. Einhardi* (see especially Giesebrecht *l. c.* and Wattenbach, pp. 142 ff.). The ceremony and costume of the court on gala occasions were similar to those of Constantinople, in all such matters the model for Western Europe. An amusing anecdote is told by the monk of St. Gall of the means which Charles took to impress the ambassadors from Constantinople with a due regard for the riches and dignity of his empire (ii. 9). Compare also ii. 11 and 12 for similar tales of the reception of the Mahometan envoys. On the subject of Charles's court see generally Waitz, vol. iii. ch. 5, pp. 410-52, and *Karl's des Grossen Privat- und Hof-leben*, by F. Lorentz, in Raumer's *Hist. Taschenbuch*, 1832. Of the

legends connected with Charles from Turpin downwards two classes may be distinguished; (i.) those which treat of historical subjects, *e. g.*, the wars with the Saracens in Spain or the Saxons in the north; (ii.) those which transport into the times of Charles historical facts of a later epoch, especially those which attribute to him a crusade, and those which introduce ideas of feudal independence belonging to a subsequent age. So Potvin, *Nos premiers Siècles Littéraires*, Bruxelles, 1870. The most complete work on the legendary Charles is the *Histoire Poétique de Charlemagne*, par Gaston; Paris, 1865.

IV. Without writing a political history of the reign of Charles, which space forbids, it will suffice to mark his general policy and the character and importance of the different external enemies with whom he had to contend. Charles is an important personage in the world's history and in the history of civilisation in Western Europe, not only as the first of the new line of Roman emperors in the West, but as securing Europe and Christendom by his conquest of the Avars and the Saxons against the future recurrence of heathen invasion and devastation. The south-western frontiers of civilisation had been made secure against the Saracens by his grandfather, Charles Martel. Nevertheless it was necessary for Charles, with a view to more serious work upon the north-east, to prevent the risk of being harassed in the rear by lesser enemies, such as the Bretons and the Basques. With the exception of the famous attack on the rearguard at Roncesvalles this was done without mishap, and the Spanish and the British (*i. e.* Breton) marches were put in an effective state of defence. The Eastern frontier, as Einhard (*Vita*, § 7) says, was much more difficult to define or defend. There was no marked boundary of mountain or of forest. The most powerful tribe in this quarter was the Saxons, a Teutonic race still maintaining their old free institutions of village communities. The war against them was not only a war against barbarism, for the Saxons had shewn no tendency to develop a civilisation of their own or to adopt that of the West, it was also one of Christian against heathen, of monarchy and centralisation against what, for lack of a better name, must be called popular and local self-government—of the Teuton Romanised against the original pure Teuton. Into the long details of these wars it is unnecessary to enter. From 772 to 804 an expedition against the Saxons is noticed almost yearly in the chronicles. Hostages were given, truces and treaties made and broken. Charles waged this as most of his other wars principally by means of lieutenants. He himself, according to his biographer (Einh. V. § 8), was only twice engaged in pitched battle with the Saxons. Eventually the contest became a war of extermination. Four thousand prisoners who had surrendered were massacred on a single occasion. The winter of 797-8 confirmed the supremacy of the Franks. Charles established his own quarters on the Weser and distributed his army throughout the country. In spring he laid waste with fire and sword the whole territory between the Weser and the Elbe (*Ann. Laur.*). Even when subdued he took measures, like the old Persian kings, to prevent future revolt by removing 10,000 families and settlements of the Saxons and distributing them

in new quarters in Gaul and Germany (Einh. V. § 7).

Beyond the Saxons were the Slavonic tribes. Against them too predatory incursions were undertaken, against the Wiltsians, the Sorabi, and the Bohemians. It was apparently part of Charles's policy to make alliances with one of these tribes against the other, so that whilst no regular opposition was made to their intestine contests, a pretext for interference was ever ready at hand. On the south-east, after removing the seditious Tassilo from his chieftainship of the Bavarians and appointing a royal prefect in his stead, Charles had to meet another foe, the Avars or Huns, only less formidable than the Saxons. They too were heathens, they too were pressing westward. Eight years the war in Pannonia lasted, though on one occasion only did Charles appear in person at the head of his forces. It too was a war of extermination. The devastation of Pannonia and the destruction of the Avar power were complete. Conversion followed upon conquest. Bishoprics were established, churches were built. To the bishops and priests who entered on the work Charles gave full powers political as well as ecclesiastical. The conquered heathen paid not tribute, but tithes.

There had ever been a close political connexion between the Roman pontiffs and the Arnoldingian house. Deserted by his imperial master at Constantinople and ever exposed to the ruthless attacks of the Lombards, the bishop of Rome had sought protection from the rising Frankish power beyond the Alps. Charles Martel, occupied by the weightier matter of repulsing the Saracens, was never able to accede to the request. Pippin, his son, had both leisure and inclination more actively to interfere. The Lombards were defeated, and the pope was rescued from immediate danger. Pippin's reward was the confirmation by the head of Christendom of his assumption of the kingly title. He thus became the first European king "anointed of the Lord," and "reigning by the grace of God." The defeat of the Lombards was only temporary, and in the second year of his sole reign in 773 Charles received a request for help from pope Hadrian. That winter Desiderius, the Lombard king, was shut up in Pavia, in the spring of 774 he and the city surrendered, and the "end of the war was the subjugation of Italy" ("finis hujus belli fuit subacta Italia," Einh. V. 6). Some years afterwards the prince of Beneventum was brought to terms (cf. Waitz, iii. 307, 8), and, with the exception of the small possessions still pertaining to the Greek empire in the south, all Italy was apparently subject to Charles. There had, however, been a moment when the alliance between the papacy and the Frankish monarchy seemed upon the point of being dissolved, when Charles in the first year of his reign was persuaded by his mother to marry a Lombard princess, the sister of Desiderius. Inclination and interest quickly dissolved this union, and Charles rendered certain his adhesion to the traditional policy of his race by ratifying or renewing his father's gifts of his Italian conquests to the pope. What the exact purport of this donation was we cannot tell, nor its limits. The original documents have perished, nor is there any contemporary authority to vouch for the details. The

fact of the donation, however, cannot be called in question (v. Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung des Kirchenstaates*, Leipzig, 1854, p. 23, note; also *De Donatione a Car. Mag. sedi Apostolicæ anno 774 oblatæ*, by Th. D. Mock, Munich, 1861). The gift rested only on the right of conquest, for the title of *Patricius Romanorum*, bestowed as it was by an usurped claim of the papacy, conveyed with it no power. It is in like manner hard to determine the nature of the authority in the gift-lands purported to be conveyed. In theory, to judge from his letters, pope Hadrian considered himself as much an absolute sovereign within these lands as Charles himself was in his own Transalpine kingdom (*Cod. Carol.* 85, ap. Jaffé). One point however is certain, viz., that the donation was a donation of the Greek Exarchate, and not of Lombard Italy (Anast. *Lit. Pont.* is sufficient authority for this, cp. Sugenheim, p. 27, note). Henceforward Charles always styles himself "*rex Francorum et Longobardorum et Patricius Romanorum*." His authority too in Northern Italy, the immediate territory of the Lombard kings, was as complete and direct as in the Frankish land (v. *Ann. Laur.* 776, 779, 781, 786).

During the next few years Charles was engaged with his Saxon and Spanish enemies, but at the first prospect of peace he determined to revisit Rome. His son Pippin accompanied him, and at the Easter festival, 781, was anointed "king for Italy" (*rex in Italiam*) by the pope. Again for six years Charles was occupied beyond the Alps, and on his next visit in 787 he spent but a few days with Hadrian, proceeding southward to defend the patrimony of St. Peter and the peace of Italy against the Lombard duke of Beneventum. For the next thirteen years Charles remained to the north of the Alps. The Saxons and the Avars were thoroughly brought into subjection. In 790 Hadrian died, and Leo III. was elected in his stead. The new pope, foreseeing how soon he might require the strong arm of Frankish help, immediately despatched to Charles, as tokens of submission, the keys and standard of the city and the keys of the sepulchre of St. Peter. A few years afterwards (799) a terrible riot broke out in Rome. The pope was assaulted and almost killed. He fled for help to Charles. Charles received him at Paderborn and promised assistance. In the month of August (800), at the national Frankish assembly at Mainz, the king gave notice of his intended journey, and forthwith started. At Nomentum he was met by the pope and escorted with every honour to Rome (Nov. 800). Seven days after his arrival in the city, Charles held an assembly and made known for what causes he had come, and from that day applied himself to their settlement (*Ann. Laur.*). The chief and the only one mentioned by the chronicle is the investigation of the charges brought against pope Leo, and the violence done to him. No witness could be found to prove the charges, nor is their nature known; nevertheless the pope in St. Peter's publicly and solemnly read a declaration of his own innocence. He particularly deprecated, however, that this declaration of his should be taken for a precedent, and it was probably only under the suasion or compulsion of Charles that he went through the ceremony at all.

Charles celebrated the festival of Christmas, 800, in St. Peter's, and whilst kneeling in prayer before the altar, the pope placed a crown upon his head, all the people of the Romans shouting out, "To Charles, Augustus, crowned by God, great and pacific emperor of the Romans, life and victory." Forthwith, after the custom of the princes of old, he was adored by the pontiff, and thenceforth dropping the name of patrician was styled emperor and Augustus. Such is the brief account of this great event in the *Annales Einhardi*. [For the other narratives, see Waitz, iii. 174, note.] In the *Vita* (§ 28) Charles is said to have frequently declared that had he known what was to take place he would not have entered St. Peter's on that day. From this we are bound to infer that at any rate the moment at which the coronation actually took place was not selected by the emperor himself. That the coronation was not simply an unpremeditated action of the pope is undoubted. On the other hand, too much weight must not be given to unsupported statements such as that of the Italian chronicler, John the Deacon (Muratori, *R. I. S.*, ii. 312), when he asserts that Leo had promised at Paderborn to confer the imperial crown on Charles if he would defend the pope against his enemies. It is very improbable that any such contract existed. The idea had apparently occurred to Alcuin, and had at least been suggested by him to Charles (see Waitz, iii. 171, note 2). The author of the *Annales Laures-hamenses* (Pertz, vol. i.) attributes the resolution primarily to "Leo, the holy fathers assembled, and the rest of the Christian people." Hence, if not originally conceived, the idea was at least brought into prominence by ecclesiastical influence.

Historically the coronation of Charles, and the revival of the empire in the West, may be looked at in three relations: (i.) to the old empire at Constantinople; (ii.) to Roman and Teutonic civilisation; (iii.) to the papal and ecclesiastical power.

i. Legally the coronation, at least on the pope's part, was an act of rebellion against the Eastern emperor. Charles appears also to have looked on it as such, and perhaps it was in order to put himself technically on the right side of the law that he proposed to marry Irene, and so reunite the two realms (Theophanes, quoted by Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. v.). However it was by no means the first occasion on which the pope had broken his allegiance to the emperor at Constantinople. The nomination of Pippin and Charles to the dignity of the patriciate affected to confer on the part of the pope what was a purely imperial dignity. Still more overt acts of rebellion were the sending of the keys of the city to the Frankish kings, and the acceptance from them of the temporal sovereignty over the Greek possessions in Italy. Most men in the West however took a rational and common-sense view of the coronation. The Greek emperor, they said, had deserted Rome and Italy, the nation of the Romans and the Roman tongue; Charles possessed Rome, the seat of the Caesars, as well as Gaul, Italy, and Germany, wherefore it seemed just that he should have the name as well as the reality of the imperial power (*Mon. Sangall.* i. 26). So Anskar formulates what was afterwards recognised as the legal mode of

looking at the coronation: "The imperial power," he says, "which from the time of Constantine had rested with the Greeks at Constantinople, was now transferred by the election of the Roman people to the dominion of the Franks" (*Vita Willehadi* 5, quoted by Waitz, iii. 184, note). In western lists of the emperors, therefore, Charles follows immediately on Constantine VI. Irene's usurpation and the notoriety of her crimes were taken advantage of as an afterthought by those who wished to give the new Teutonic emperors a colourable title.

ii. Charles himself meant, and his contemporaries took him to mean, by his coronation the setting up again of a Roman emperor at Rome. Though recollection went back rather to Constantine and Theodosius than to Julius and Augustus, still the new emperor was emphatically *Romanorum* imperator. Henceforth he is *Romanum* regens imperium. He was adored by the pope "more antiquorum principum" (*Ann. Laur.*). The old emperors are his "antecessores." The first thing Charles does after his coronation is to summon to his presence those who had attempted to depose the pope, and judging them by "Roman law," he condemned them to death as guilty of treason (*majestatis rei*, *Ann. Einhardi*). In like manner, on his return to the Frankish kingdom, he compelled all his subjects to take a new oath to him as "Caesar," as they had formerly done to him as king (*Capit. Aquisg.* 802, cap. 2). The imperial titles are thoroughly Roman. In full Charles's title is "serenissimus Augustus a Deo coronatus, magnus et pacificus imperator, Romanum gubernans imperium, qui et per misericordiam Dei rex Francorum et Longobardorum" (*Capit. ap. Waitz*, iii. 206, n.). Nevertheless it was little more than the titles and dignities of ancient Rome, and not her institutions, that Charles attempted to revive. The Frankish kingdom was overshadowed in dignity by the empire, but it was only in name that it was absorbed in it. The Teutonic element was the essence of the Carolingian empire. The emperors were Teutons, the Frankish nation was Teutonic, and as yet, even in the West, not much Romanised. The centre of the empire was far north of the Alps, and in the central part of the Frankish territory, on the left bank of the Rhine in the valleys of the Meuse and the Moselle. Above all, the Teutonic institutions of the kingdom remained the Teutonic institutions of the empire. The great assemblies of the nation still met together in the open air and gave their assent to the measures proposed for the common good. The different nationalities of the Saxons, the Burgundians, the Lombards, &c., still retained and were judged by their own codes.

iii. Just as his wars with the Saxons and the Avars were to Charles as much missionary enterprises as political conquests, so as emperor he always assumed the position of champion of Christendom. To Offa, king of Mercia, he had styled himself "defensor sanctae Dei ecclesiae" (*Ep. Car.* 7), and to pope Leo he writes (v. Waitz, iii. 163, n.), "It is our privilege, according to the favour vouchsafed to us by the divine mercy, to defend by arms in all places the holy church of Christ from the incursions of pagans and unbelievers without, and within to fortify it by the recognition of the Catholic faith." The

empire is, as it were, an ordinance of God for the community of Christians, and the emperor is the God-appointed protector of Christianity against all foes (Giesebrecht, i. 115).

The foundations of the empire were therefore as much religious as political, and the conception of it by Charles himself and the maxims of government which he adopted were drawn much more from the theocracy of the Old Testament than from the despotism of the Roman empire. It was with him, as it became still more strongly in profession with his "Holy Roman" successors, God's kingdom upon earth. Though practically the unity of the empire rested on that of the Frankish nation, and of the imperial laws and administration and on the individuality of the emperor, theoretically it was based on the unity of Christendom, on the unity of belief and of moral law within the Catholic church. In Charles's empire there is, therefore, an absolute identification of church and state. He appoints bishops as he appoints counts; the great councils of the nation are as much ecclesiastical as they are civil assemblies. Charles's relation to the papacy was evidently assumed by him to have undergone a change when he became emperor. It had ever been at the pope's own request that the Frankish kings had intervened in Italian affairs. Leo discovered that even at the risk of some temporary political subjection it would be desirable to have the Frankish king as a really efficient and permanent protector against dangers near home. It thus seems probable that the idea first suggested itself to the papal mind of conferring the imperial dignity upon Charles. To him as emperor the pope was but the bishop of the capital city of his empire, and as he designated or appointed the bishops of lesser sees, so no doubt, although no vacancy occurred during the remainder of his lifetime, he claimed the right of filling the most important ecclesiastical office in his realm. Thus the first actions of Stephen I. and Paschal IV., Leo's successors, when tumultuously elected by the Roman clergy and people, were to compel the Romans to swear allegiance to the empire, and to despatch envoys to the emperor Lewis, to deprecate his displeasure at having assumed the pontifical office without awaiting the imperial confirmation. Shortly after Charles's death the weakness of his successors enabled the growing papal power more and more to assert the principle of ecclesiastical independence. In this respect the imperial idea under Charles differs from that of the Otthos and Frederics (v. Lancizolle, *Die Bedeutung der Römisch-Deutschen Kaiserwürde*, Berlin, 1856, p. 14). So also the notion of the emperors as lords of the world with all sovereigns as their under-kings, &c., was of later growth than Carolingian times. Charles laid claim to little power which he could not if necessary enforce. As "defender of Holy Church" he considered that all Christians had a right to appeal to him for help and assistance, and it was in this regard that he was bewailed after death as "pater orbis."

Charles, after spending the winter of 800-1 in settling the affairs ecclesiastical, civil, and domestic of Rome and Italy, left for the north after Easter. The remaining fourteen years of his life were passed in Transalpine countries, and though he traversed his kingdom less frequently,

he was none the less active in promulgating laws for the better government of his subjects. The Saxons were thoroughly subdued, and their settlement ecclesiastical and civil completed. The empire began, however, to suffer from two new foes, both maritime, the Normans on the coasts of Gaul and Germany, the Saracens on the shores of the Mediterranean. Charles's energy was equal to meeting these new enemies. He ordered fleets to be constructed, and one of the last journeys that he took was to Boulogne to inspect the naval force and the construction of a lighthouse at that harbour (*Ann. Einh.* 811). During the last ten years of his life Charles was generally resident at Aix-la-Chapelle. There he received frequent embassies from various potentates, from the Christian kings of Galicia, from the Caliph, and from the Eastern emperor. It was not till 812 that the last-mentioned prince was induced to acknowledge his Western brother's imperial title (*imperatorem et basileum appellantes*, *Ann. Einh.*). At the assembly of 806 Charles had made provision by will for the division of his kingdom into three parts, and had exacted an oath of acceptance thereto from the Frankish chiefs present; and in 813 he summoned Lewis from the sub-kingdom of Aquitaine to Aix, and himself placed a crown on his son's head, whom he thus made his colleague in the imperial dignity (*coronam illi imposuit et imperialis nominis sibi consortem fecit*, *Ann. Einh.*). Not long afterwards Charles sickened, and, on the 28th of January 814, died. He was buried where he died, at Aix, in the church which he had there built. The story of the opening of his tomb by Otho III. in the year 1000 is well known. The marble chair in which the dead emperor was seated is still preserved in the gallery of the cathedral. It was not till the time of, and at the instance of, Frederic Barbarossa that Charles was enrolled amongst the saints. The "Office of the Blessed Charles," if not still recited, can still be read by the curious in the works of Charles. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* tom. 98, p. 1565.)

V. Of the laws and institutions of the kingdom and empire of Charles it will be unnecessary to speak in detail. A thorough and masterly treatment of the whole subject is to be found in Waitz. Compare also the monograph by Von Wyss, *Karl der Grosse als Gesetzgeber*, Zürich, 1869.

The great period of Charles's legislative activity was after his imperial coronation, just as his warlike activity had been principally previous to that event. It was during these fourteen years, 800-814, that most of his capitularies were published. Although many ordinances might be found which were to apply only to certain sections of the empire, to Italy or Saxony, the empire was none the less a unity of which Italy and Saxony were integral parts. This unity of the empire was formulated not only in the laws which were designed to be valid throughout the realm, but in the system of administration, which was the same in Gaul, Italy and Germany. Thus on all the frontiers "marches" were established for protection against barbarous foes. The counts, or prefects, of the marches were the most powerful officers in the empire. They alone united under their power more than one countship (*Mon. Sangall.* i. 13).

The countship, the successor of the old Teutonic village community, and generally co-extensive with it, was the administrative unit (Waitz, iii. 319, ff.). The dangers of this system, especially the tendency in the countship to become hereditary and independent—a tendency which had ere this shewn itself under Merovingian rule—Charles was not blind to, and did his best to ward off from himself and his descendants. The count's office was nominally for life, but could be and was taken away in cases of misconduct. Charles's endeavour always was to make the counts be, and be considered to be, state officials, and not quasi-independent territorial princes. As a bond to keep all together, and to see by personal inspection to the due administration of justice in all parts of his vast dominions, Charles instituted the "Missi," or rather developed an institution which already existed in the Frankish kingdom. The "Missi" were generally nominated at the great assemblies, and the empire was divided into different districts (legationes or missatica). Though often appointed for special service, the ordinary duties of the "Missi" were to look after the due administration of justice, the interests of the crown and its property, the maintenance of public peace, and of the liberties and privileges of the clergy (Waitz, iii. 371, *sqq.*). To the office both laymen and ecclesiastics were eligible, according to the principle of the fusion of things ecclesiastical and civil throughout the realm. In ecclesiastical administration Charles at once insisted on obedience within the church, *a.g.* of suffragans to metropolitans, &c. and on the subjection of ecclesiastical as of all other authority to the kingly and imperial. The appointment of bishops he kept in his own hands, and he generally exercised it well. Amusing stories on the subject are given by the monk of St. Gall (i. 4, 5, 6). Instances of popular election occur, but generally if not solely in Italy. Three years after his father's death Lewis surrendered the right of election to the clergy and people, but at first probably the surrender was rather nominal than actual. Charles fixed the metropolitan seats at Mainz, Cologne, and Treves. The pallium was conferred on the metropolitans by the pope, but only with the assent of the emperor. Bishops and counts were alike summoned in the same terms to the great national assemblies. These assemblies, in origin coeval with that of the Teutonic race itself, were held generally in the open air, and the participation of those present was still limited to the assenting shout. Time and place varied, but the former was always during the summer months, the latter was fixed at each assembly for the next occasion. The assemblies were at once military, being sometimes held by the army on its march and in foreign lands; legislative, because it was through them that the capitularies were generally promulgated; and ecclesiastical, because they took cognizance of matters touching religious doctrine and discipline. It was ordinarily before them that foreign ambassadors were received in the name of the nation, and envoys despatched to foreign princes. There was a subsidiary assembly of the king's chief counsellors (and Charles was always eager to gather the chief men of his kingdom around him), to meet sudden emergencies and to consult on matters to be submitted to the great assemblies

of the nation (see gen. Waitz, iii. pp. 460–520).

VI. Charles has become not only the centre of a legendary cycle, but a watchword in modern politics. Caesar and Charlemagne were the imperial models of Napoleon Bonaparte. (Numerous pamphlets on the subject survive in the British Museum and other collections.) Charles had before the birth of a rational school of historical inquiry been long appropriated as a Frenchman. This fallacy is only to be equalled by that which speaks of him without qualification as a Belgian or a German. In the modern sense of the terms he is neither a *roi de France*, a *roi des Belges*, nor a *Deutsche Kaiser*. In this respect the distinction between Teuton and German ("Germanen" and "Deutschen" in modern German) must ever be borne in mind. The Franks were essentially a Teutonic race, and it was in the comparatively stable Teutonic kingdom which they established that the foundations of modern European civilisation were laid. The conquered inhabitants of the western part of the Frankish kingdom still possessed a vigorous Roman civilisation, and the conquerors in that part became rapidly Romanised. To the east of the Rhine, on the other hand, the semi-Romanised Teutonism of the Franks began to react on the pure Teutonism of the Saxons. But this pure Saxon Teutonism, though conquered in the field, retained the vigour of its laws and institutions. The Franks, therefore, exposed to two different influences, each more vigorous than any indigenous civilisation which they themselves possessed, succumbed to both. And thus arose modern France on the one side, modern Germany on the other, with a debatable land between. The coronation of Charles may rightly, therefore, be taken to symbolise the recognition by Romanism of the victory of Teutonism, and the devolution to the victorious Teuton by Rome of her dignity as mistress of the world. That this imperial dignity descended eventually to the kings of the eastern and more Teutonic division of the Frankish kingdom was due to a series of political accidents.

Lastly, there is very considerable discrepancy in the way in which modern historians have estimated the permanent value to civilisation of Charles's empire and institutions, as also of the real share which Charles himself had in the laws and institutions which go by his name, and how far they were original in idea, or a development of the polity of his Frankish predecessors. Waitz has devoted an *Excursus* to the subject (*Anmerkung 2* on chap. 3, vol. iii. pp. 286–9). It will be sufficient to indicate the two extremes: "There is not," says Lezardière, "one of the rights of liberty that is not recognised and protected by the conduct or by the laws of this sublime prince." On the other hand, Potvin speaks thus: "Charles cast the liberties of the Frankish nation a second time into the gulf of Roman decadence; . . . such a despotism is unworthy of the respect of free Belgium" (*Nos premiers Siècles*, &c., pp. 27, 30). [T. R. B.]

CHARLES MARTEL, Charles surnamed the Hammer (on the sobriquet and its late origin, and on the name Charles, see Breysig, *Jahrbücher des Fränkischen Reichs*, 714–41, *Die Zeit Karl Martells*, Leipzig, 1869, p. 8, n. 3, and ref.), son of Pippin the Elder and Alpaïda (*Gesta R. F.* 49; *Fred.*

Cont. 103), was born about the year 688 (Breysig, 7 n. 5). The place of his birth is unknown. The above work by Breysig, and that by Cauer, *de Karolo Martello*, Berlin, 1846, are the best monographs upon the subject. The value of the various authorities is estimated by G. Richter. (*Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, 1873, i. s. a. 715 n. 1; cf. also Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, Berlin, 1873, esp. book i. §§ 9-11, and book ii. §§ 1 and 3.) Of Charles's youth nothing is known except that he was remarkable for his physical strength and vigour. He married when about sixteen; his wife's name has been conjectured to have been Chrotrud (Breysig), her origin is unknown. On the death of the two elder sons of Pippin by Plectrudis, Drogo in 708 and Grimoald in 714, Charles became the eldest male representative of the family of the mayor of the palace. His father, however, did not recognise him as such, and Plectrudis, on Pippin's death in 715, became regent for the young king Dagobert III., and for her grandson Theodald as mayor (Breysig, 9, 10). The Neustrian nobles, indignant that a child like Theodald should be made mayor of the palace, set up Raganfred, one of their own number, in his place, got possession of the king Dagobert, and hard pressed Plectrudis in Cologne. Charles meanwhile escaped from the prison into which Plectrudis had thrown him (*Gesta Reg. Fr.* 51), and proceeded to form a party of his own in Austrasia. Dagobert died in 715, and Chilperic II. was set up by the Neustrian party in his stead. For the first time for twenty-five years there was a Merovingian king of full years, and a mayor (Raganfred) outside the family of the Pippins. In the campaign of the year 716 Charles was at first unsuccessful, being defeated by Ratbod, the heathen chief of the Frisians and ally of the Neustrians; but he effected a surprise of the victorious Neustrian army on its homeward march at Amblève (*Gesta*, 53); and in the spring of 717 he gained a bloody and decisive victory over Raganfred and the Neustrians at Vinçy (*Fred. Cont.* 106). His position in Austrasia was thus for the present secured. On his return to Austrasia he deposed the bishop of Rheims, Rigobert, who had not given him the assistance he expected during the campaign, and appointed one of his own party, Milo, bishop of Trier, to the see. Charles, recognising the great political power of the bishops, never lost sight of his own political interests in the episcopal appointments that he made. In like manner, at a later date, 732, he shewed himself a stern repressor of attempts at independence on the part of the higher clergy by his deposition and banishment of Eucherius, bishop of Orleans (*Vita S. Eucherii*, Bouquet, iii. 656). In the autumn of the same year, 717, Charles was further successful in obtaining possession of Cologne, which Plectrudis had hitherto held. Having thus become the recognised chief of the eastern Franks, he set up a king of his own in opposition to Chilperic, Clotaire IV. During 718, matters being quiet in Neustria, Charles seized the opportunity to secure his eastern frontier by an attack upon the Saxons (*Ann. Amaldi et Petav.*, s. a. 718); and it was fortunate that he did so, for the Neustrians had prepared a combined invasion for the next year. Eudo, semi-independent duke of Aquitaine, was to attack Charles from the

south-west, the Neustrians on the west; Charles however anticipated their design, threw himself first upon Eudo, and drove him back, then wheeling to the north, attacked and defeated the Neustrians at Soissons. Raganfred and Eudo fled. Charles entered Paris and established for the rest of his life his authority over the whole Frankish realm. At this time Clotaire opportunely died, and Charles recognised Chilperic, whose mayor he became.

Christianity in Gaul was exposed to danger on three sides, the Saracens on the south, the Saxons on the east, and the Frisians on the north; and Charles Martel was no less a bulwark of Christendom than his great namesake and successor. In the year 719 Ratbod, chief of the Frisians, died, and his successor Aldgisel, whether converted himself or not, seems to have favoured the extension of the Christian faith. Three years later the conversion of the Frisians had progressed so far that Wilbrord, "the apostle of the Frisians," was set up and recognised by Charles as bishop of Utrecht. In the same year Wynfrith or Boniface obtained from pope Gregory II. his mission for the conversion of the heathen east of the Rhine. Boniface demanded and obtained the support and protection of Charles upon his missionary enterprise (cf. Jaffé, *Mon. Moguntina*, 84 ff. n. 24, 159 n. 55; Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 27, v. BONIFACIUS). Heathendom was by no means subjugated in Frisia, nor was the conversion of the Frisians accomplished without the sword. For during 733 and 744 Charles was engaged in ravaging the country, forcibly suppressing heathen worship, and utterly breaking down the independence of the Frisian nation (*Fred. Cont.* 109). The Saxons in like manner were a source of continual danger to the Frankish kingdom, and the policy pursued by Charles Martel was that which was completed by Charlemagne, namely, frequent predatory expeditions in which the whole country was laid waste far and wide. Such expeditions took place in the years 718, 720, and 738. The third foe of Gallic Christendom, the Saracens, crossed the Pyrenees for the first time in 720, capturing Narbonne: the following year they laid siege to Toulouse, but were defeated under its walls by Eudo of Aquitaine. It was not till 732 that the great Mahometan invasion took place under Abderaman. Aquitaine was overrun, Eudo fled to Charles. The forces of the Mahometans and the Franks met between Tours and Poitiers in October 732. The victory of Charles was complete, Abderaman was killed, and the Saracens driven back into Spain. (On the importance of this battle see Waitz, iii. 23 n. 2.) This campaign, however, by no means closed Charles's wars with the Saracens, for the Burgundians shortly afterwards in their faction quarrels did not scruple to call in infidel aid. Arles in 735, and Avignon in 737, were betrayed to the Saracens, but afterwards recovered by Charles. In the latter year Charles appears to have inflicted a considerable defeat on them on the river Berre in Septimania, though he was unable to recover Narbonne (*Fred. Cont.* 109).

In the year 720 Chilperic had died, and a boy, Theodoric IV. was placed upon the throne, in whose name Charles continued as mayor to wield royal power. After Theodoric's death in 737,

Charles appears to have ruled directly, without setting up another puppet king (v. Richter, *s. a.* notes and reff.). Aquitaine on the one side and Bavaria on the other appear to have acknowledged the supremacy of Charles's power, but in internal affairs to have been practically independent (cf. Breysig, 75, 77).

In 739 pope Gregory III. besought Charles's help against the Lombards, sending him the keys of the sepulchre of St. Peter as a token that to him its protection was entrusted. Gregory seems to have had the further intention of withdrawing his allegiance from the Eastern emperor, and offering it to Charles with the title of consul (eo pacto patraturo a partibus imperatoris recederet et Romanum consulatum. . . . Carolo sanciret. Fred. *Cont.* 110, and cf. *Chron. Moiss. ap. Pertz, Mon. i. p.* 292). Charles neither gave active assistance, nor accepted the proffered allegiance, but appears to have endeavoured to mediate between the pope and the Lombards. (On this whole transaction and on the title of Patricius borne by Charles, see Richter, i. 200, notes and reff., and Veltmann, *de Karoli Martelli patriciatu*, Münster, 1863.)

On the 21st October, 741, Charles died at Kiersy. Shortly before his death "he divided his kingdoms between his sons" (filiis suis regna dividit, Fred. *Cont.* 110), Carloman obtaining Austrasia, Alamannia, Thuringia; Pippin, Neustria, Burgundy, and Provence; Bavaria and Aquitaine, as already stated, remained under nominal subjection, but in practical independence. The expression of the chronicler above quoted shews how the mayor of the palace had really come to be looked upon as king, and how what were still nominally realms of the Merovingian princes were treated as hereditary possessions of their own by the Carolingian mayors. [T. R. B.]

CHARMAIG—Commemorated March 16 (cir. A.D. 640). In the west of Scotland a saint of this name is found in the church-dedications. He is identified with St. Abban, Mac Ua Corbmaic, of Magh-Ar-naidhe in Ui-Ceinnsealaigh, in Leinster, who is mentioned in St. Aengus's Litany. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 77; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 299 sq.) [J. G.]

CHARMON, one of the ministers of **ARIEL**. [*PISTIS SOPHIA*, p. 380.] [G. S.]

CHARMOSYNUS. A presbyter, agent with the presbyter Theognostus and the deacon Leontius, for Cyril of Alexandria, at Constantinople, A.D. 433, on the subject of restoring peace with the Orientals. He was present also at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, as a presbyter and oecumenus of the Alexandrian church, with Euthalius, an archdeacon, and other Alexandrian churchmen. To them was signified the sentence against Dioscorus. (St. Cyril. Alex. *Epist.* xxxviii., *ol. xl.*, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. p. 167; Ceillier, viii. 295; *Concil. iv.* 462; Ceillier, x. 689.) [W. M. S.]

CHARTENIUS, ST., is supposed to have been bishop of Marseille. He took part with Avitus bishop of Vienne at a conference of Catholic and Arian bishops, held at Lyon about 499, when king Gondebad was present. He is spoken of by Avitus in a letter referring to the

council at which they had both been present; and it is certain that there was present at the conference at Lyon a bishop whose name has the same termination as that of St. Chartenius, but nothing more is known of him (Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs sacrés*, x. 560; Avit. Vien. *Epist.* xxviii., *Patrol. Lat.* lix. p. 244).

[D. R. J.]

CHARTERIUS, the ninth bishop of Périgueux (Petrogoricum), in the latter half of the 6th century. In the year 581, a quarrel having arisen between Guntchramnus and Chilperic, Chilperic seized upon the occasion to extend the boundaries of his kingdom, sent Desiderius with an army into Aquitaine and took possession of that province, more especially Périgueux. This was the cause of great trouble to Charterius in the year 582, and is thus referred to by Gregory of Tours:—"King Chilperic, having invaded his brother's territories, made new counts . . . In those days two men were apprehended by Nonnichius, a count of the city of Limosin, as they were bearing letters (written) in the name of Charterius, bishop of the city of Périgueux, which contained many injurious statements against king Chilperic. Among other things it was stated in the form of a complaint by the bishop, that he (the bishop) had descended from paradise to hell (se a paradiso ad inferos descendisse), that is because he had from being under the sovereignty of Guntchramnus been made subject to Chilperic. These letters, together with the men upon whom they were found, were sent by the aforesaid count under a strong guard to the king, who quietly sent for the bishop in order to discuss the matter with him and ascertain whether the allegations made against him were true or not.

"When the bishop arrived, the king had the two men brought face to face with him, and asked the bishop if the letters had been directed by him. The bishop denied that they had been directed by him. But the men were asked from whom they received them. They say from the deacon Frontonius. The bishop is questioned about the deacon, and replies that he is his principal enemy, and that there could be no doubt that he was the author of this wickedness, as he had so often plotted against the bishop. The deacon is brought up without delay, and being interrogated by the king, he says, 'I dictated this letter by order of the bishop, who often complained as if he had been deposed from the bishopric.' The king moved with compassion forgave them both, mercifully interceding with the bishop in behalf of the deacon and asking for his prayers. Thus was he sent back with honour to his city."

The whole of this chapter is rejected as spurious by Le Cointe for two reasons. 1. Because it is wanting in the Corbeian Codex, in the Colbertine, and in that of Metz. 2. Because it does not accord with the known character of king Chilperic, who being severe in inflicting punishment, ought either to have condemned the bishop of high treason, or the deacon Frontonius for calumny. But these two arguments have been confuted by Ruinart. 1. Because eight MSS. codices of Gaul and Italy contain that chapter, as well as all the common editions of Gregory. 2. That Chilperic was not so cruel

as he is represented; that if he was cruel it was because in this respect he followed the wishes of his wife more than his own. Adrianus Valesius says that Chilpericus, when not under the influence of his furious spouse, was easy of approach, gentle and patient of injury. Fortunatus praises his lenity.

In the year 585 Gondovaldus, who called himself the son of Clotarius and claimed the kingdom, visited Angoulême. Having received the oaths of the soldiers, he proceeded to Périgueux and left the bishop (Charterius) seriously offended because he had not been received by him. In the same year Charterius was present at the second synod of Mâcon (Matisconensis). (Gregor. Turon. *Hist. lib. vii. cap. 22 and 19, lib. vii. cap. 26; Gall. Christ. ii. pp. 1453, 1454.*) [D. R. J.]

CHASTITY. [CELIBACY in *Dict. of Christian Antiquities.*]

CHAZINZARIANS (CHATZITZARI). [STAULATRAE.]

CHEBIUS (Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Britt.* xvi. 9). Welsh saint. [CYBL.] [C. H.]

CHEDDUS (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. 138*), bishop of the East Angles. [CEDDA.] [C. H.]

CHEDWALLA (1), -US (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. 70*), king of the Britons. [CAEDWALLA (1).] [C. H.]

CHEDWALLA (2) (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. 46, 51, 52, 55*), king of the West Saxons. [CAEDWALLA (2).] [C. H.]

CHELIANUS, presbyter of Llandaff, succeeds St. Samson as archbishop of Dol, in the time of king Arthur, according to Geoffrey of Monmouth (*lib. ix. c. 15, ed. Giles*). [C. H.]

CHELIDONIUS and **HAEMATERIUS**, brothers, soldiers, martyred at the Gascon town of Calagurris (Calahorra, in Castile). The date of their martyrdom is wholly uncertain. They are honoured with a hymn by Prudentius, *περὶ στεφάνων* 4 (1), which is quoted by Gregory of Tours (*Glor. Mart.* 93). The poet laments (vv. 73 ff.) that the official record of the trial and execution had been purposely destroyed by the persecutors. In this lack of genuine *acta* a marvellous legend gained currency, that the ring of one saint and the handkerchief (orarium) of the other had been seen flying up to heaven when they were beheaded. This legend is accepted by Prudentius (vv. 81 ff.) and Gregory. Other acts, which add little or nothing to our knowledge, are given by the Bollandists (*AA. SS. March, i. 229 ff.*) The day of the martyrdom of the saints is fixed to March 3 by Gregory. For the origin of the legend we can only conjecture that the pagans were as anxious to make away with all relics of the saints as with the records of their martyrdom, and that the faithful consoled themselves by fanciful explanations of natural aerial phenomena in the clouds. In his hymn to Hippolytus (v. 237), Prudentius couples their festival with those of Cyprian and Eulalia. The names appear in the so-called *Martyrology* of Jerome in the following forms: March 3, "Depositio reliquorum Emeritae, Cellidoni . . . item Emeriti . . . item Ecaeledoni." And on Sept. 29 we

find, "et alibi Januarii, Sosii, Ampuni, Celedoni, Justini." (D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, t. iv.) [E. B. B.]

CHELRED (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. 111*), king of Mercia. [CEOLRED.] [C. H.]

CHELWULFUS (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. p. 80*), king of Northumbria. [CEOLWULF.] [C. H.]

CHENEHART (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1839, M. H. B. 786), etheling. [CYNEHEARD.] [C. H.]

CHENEWALCHIUS (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. pp. 51, 52*), king of the West Saxons. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

CHENEWLF (1) (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1687, in M. H. B. 785), etheling. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

(2) (Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 727), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

(3) **CHENEWOLF** (Gaimar, *Estorie*, vv. 1821, 1825, M. H. B. 786), king of the West Saxons. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CHENEWOLD (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1300, in M. H. B. 780), king of the West Saxons. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

CHENRET (Gaimar, *Estorie*, vv. 1566, 1611, 1647), king of Mercia. [COENRED.] [C. H.]

CHENRIZ (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1789, in M. H. B. 786), etheling of Wessex. [CYNRIC.] [C. H.]

CHENTWINUS (Malm. *G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. pp. 45, 51, 52, 55*); **CHENWINE** (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1432, M. H. B. 782), king of the West Saxons. [CENTWINE.] [C. H.]

CHEULF, bishop, attests a charter of Offa, king of Mercia, A.D. 777, marked doubtful or spurious by Kemble (*C. D. No. 130*). [C. H.]

CHILDEBERT I., one of the four sons of Clovis, among whom their father's kingdom was divided in 511. Childebert's capital was Paris, and his share embraced the territory between the Seine, Loire, and the sea, including part of Armorica (Bonnell, *Anfänge d. Karolingischen Hauses*, pp. 200-201). On the death of Clodomir and the murder of his sons [CHLODOMERIS] Childebert acquired Orléans, and the surrounding territory. (Bonnell, p. 202.) During the absence of Theodoric in his war against the Thuringians, Childebert attempted to make himself master of the Auvergne, on an invitation from certain disaffected subjects of Theodoric in that country. For the probable causes of this disaffection, see Fauriel, *Histoire de la Gaule Méridionale*, ii. 111 ff. Theodoric returned, and Childebert retired. (Greg. Tur. iii. 9-10.) Childebert then (531) proceeded to attack the Visigoths in Narbonne. He rescued his sister Clotilda; Amalaric was killed, and Childebert came home with much treasure. (Greg. iii. 10.) In the following year 532, Childebert, with his brother Clotaire, attacked the Burgundians, laid siege to Autun, and conquered the country. Theodoric refused to join in this expedition, but dying the next year his son Theodebert, whom Childebert and Clotaire had previously tried to depose, shared at any rate in the division of the conquered territory. (Greg. iii. 11, 23.) See G. Richter,

Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter, i. sub anno 532, notes and reff. In the war between the Eastern empire and the Ostrogoths in Italy, it appears that at first (535) an alliance was concluded between Justinian and the Frankish kings by which a sum of money was to be paid to the Franks, and they were to be allowed to make themselves masters of Provence. In the following year, on the other hand, a secret alliance was made with Vitiges against Justinian. At all events Childebert appears to have become the actual possessor of Provence. (See Bonnell, p. 204; Richter, s. a. and notes.) In 542 Childebert and Clotaire undertook a joint expedition against Theudes, the Visigothic king in Spain. They took Pampeluna, besieged Saragossa, and laid waste the lands on both sides of the Ebro; but were eventually compelled to retreat. (Greg. iii. 29; Richter, reff.) Pope Vigilius appears to have instructed his vicar in Gaul, the archbishop of Arles, to endeavour to maintain friendly relations between Childebert and Justinian, in the years 545 and 546 (Jaffé, *Regesta*, Nos. 593 and 596), and later, in 550, to induce Childebert to write to the Goths and their king in Rome to abstain from doing anything to the prejudice of the church. (Jaffé, No. 605; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, p. 33. Cf. also for Childebert's relations with pope Pelagius, Jaffé, 622, 627-30; Bouquet, iv. pp. 71-74; Baxmann, p. 35.) In 557, during Clotaire's absence on a campaign against the Saxons, Childebert was induced to help Chramnus, Clotaire's son, in a rising against his father. The rising was, however, unsuccessful, and on Clotaire's return Childebert retired. The following year, 558, Childebert died at Paris, and Clotaire became king of the united Frankish realm. (Greg. iv. 16-20.) [T. R. B.]

CHILDEBERT II., son of Sigebert I. and Brunechilde, was only five years old at the time of his father's murder in 575. He was proclaimed king by the Austrasian nobles at Meaux (Greg. v. 1) or Metz (*Hist. Epit.* 72). In 577 Childebert was adopted as heir and successor to Guntram his uncle, king of Orleans and Burgundy (Greg. v. 18). During the civil wars of this time the Austrasian nobles caused Childebert to change from the side of Guntram to that of Chilperic, and *vice versa* as suited their own advantage. It was during Childebert's minority that the Frankish nobility first seriously began to encroach upon the royal authority (cf. Löbell, *Greg. von Tours*, 190 sqq.). In 585 Childebert apparently went with a Frankish force against the Lombards in Italy, in accordance with a treaty previously concluded with the Eastern emperor, by which Maurice gave a sum of money on condition that the Franks should expel the Lombards from Italy (Greg. vi. 42). The Frankish chiefs quarrelled amongst themselves and the expedition was without result. Compare a letter from Pope Pelagius II. (Jaffé, *Regesta*, No. 684), in which he bids the orthodox kings of the Franks, who were by the divine grace the neighbours and protectors of Rome and Italy, to separate themselves from all friendship and connexion with the Lombards (cf. also Bouquet, iv. 82-91; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, 39). In 538 another expedition was made against the Lombards but

the Franks were severely beaten (*tanta fuit strages de Francorum exercitu, ut olim similis non recolatur*, Greg. ix. 25). In the following year a treaty was made, but in 590 Childebert again invaded Northern Italy, taking a number of fortresses, and penetrating as far as Verona, but eventually having to retire on account of famine and disease (Greg. x. 3; Paul. Diac. iii. 30). Peace was concluded in the following year (Paul. D. iv. 1). In 587, after the repression of a conspiracy of the chiefs against Brunechilde and Childebert, a treaty was concluded at Andelot between Guntram and Childebert and Brunechilde. The territorial limits of the two kingdoms were fixed, Childebert obtaining certain territories between the Marne and the Oise; also Touraine, Poitou, and part of Aquitaine (Greg. ix. 10, 11; Bonnell, *Anfänge d. Karol. Hauses*, 217); Childebert was declared Guntram's heir. In 593 Guntram died and Childebert became king of Austrasia, Burgundy, and of all the Frankish land south of the Loire. He made an unsuccessful attempt against his cousin Clotaire's kingdom. In the East he subdued the Warni in Northern Suabia (Fredegar, 15), and appointed Tassilo duke of the Bavarians (Paul. Diac. iv. 7). In 596 Childebert died, not without suspicion of poison. Gregory, who was a contemporary, speaks of him as "*vir sapiens atque utilis, ut de multorum annorum aevo vix ita cautus homo reperiri possit ac strenuus*" (viii. 4). We find the beginning of relations with pope Gregory the Great during Childebert's reign. The pope writes to his vicar, the archbishop of Arles, to induce Childebert to do away with simony (Jaffé, *Regesta*, Nos. 1004-6), also he commends Augustine and his missionary monks to Brunechilde's protection on their way to England (Jaffé, 1073; cf. Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste*, 84; Rückert, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 477 sqq.; Fehr, *Staat und Kirche im fränkischen Reiche bis auf Carl dem Grossen*, 301-4).

[T. R. B.]

CHILDEBERT III. was raised to the throne of the Franks in 695, on the death of his brother Clovis III. He reigned under Grimoald, son of Pippin, as mayor of the palace, sixteen years, dying in 711. He was buried at Choisy, and succeeded by Dagobert III. (Fredegar, *Cont.* 101, 104). For his benefactions to monasteries see documents, *ap. Bréquigny*, vol. ii.) [T. R. B.]

CHILDERIC I. (CHILDERICH), king of the Salian Franks, and father of Clovis, according to the *Gesta Reg. Franc.* 9, reigned from 458 to 481. There is little to record of his life. The story of his banishment and subsequent restoration, as related by Gregory of Tours (ii. 12), is probably legendary. See Junghans, pp. 11 sq. (*Die Geschichte der Fränkischen Könige Childerich und Chlodovech, kritisch untersucht*, von Wilhelm Junghans, Göttingen, 1857), and on the other side Löbell, *Gregor von Tours, Excursus*. Childeric appears to have been in close connexion with the Roman power in Gaul, and to have fought as Ægidius's ally against the Visigoths in 463. Cf. Junghans, p. 18; Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, ii. 48. Though a heathen, Childeric had friendly relations with the Catholic church. He had the greatest reverence for St. Geneviève, and reprieved some prisoners at her instance

(*Vita S. Genovefæ*, ap. Bouquet, iii. 370). Compare also Greg. Tur. ii. 23, and Junghans, p. 17. Ruckert (*Culturgeschichte des Deutschen Volkes in der Zeit des Übergangs aus dem Heidenthum in das Christenthum*) has a chapter on the relations of the Frankish kings to Christianity before the conversion of Clovis. Childeric's capital was Tournai, and there, in 1653, his tomb was discovered and opened. See J. J. Chiflet, *Anastasis Childerici I.*, Antwerp, 1655, and Cochet, *Le Tombeau de Childéric I^{er}, restitué à l'aide de l'Archéologie*, Paris, 1859. Also see generally *Annalen der Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, von Dr. Gustav Richter, vol. i. 1873. [T. R. B.]

CHILDERIC II. (CHILDERICH), son of Clovis II., was chosen king of the Eastern or Austrasian Franks in 660 (*Vita S. Balthildis*, 5). His mayor of the palace was Wulfoald. In 670, on the death of Clotaire III., the Neustrian king, Ebroin, his mayor, endeavoured to place Theodoric (afterwards Theodoric III.) upon that throne. The Neustrian chiefs however rose, deposed both Ebroin and Theodoric, and made Childeric king of the united realm. Bishop Leodegar was the leader in this movement against Ebroin, and he directed the affairs of the Western kingdom until 673, when he was overthrown and banished to the monastery of Luxeuil. Wulfoald's rule soon became equally distasteful, and at the end of the same year Wulfoald was banished, and Childeric with his wife murdered in the Forest of Bondy (*Gesta Fr.* 45; Fredegar, *Cont.* 94, 95). Childeric was buried in the church of St. Germain des Prés at Paris. He appears as a benefactor to various monasteries. See the documents in Bréquigny's *Collection*, Pardessus' edition; see also generally G. Richter's *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, vol. i. sub annis. [T. R. B.]

CHILDERIC III. (CHILDERICH), the last Frankish king of the Merovingian family, supposed to have been the son of Chilperic II., though his actual parentage is uncertain, was placed upon the throne by Carloman and Pippin, mayors of the palace, sons of Charles Martel, in 743, after an interregnum of six years since the death of Theodoric IV. in 737. (For the chronology see Richter's *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, sub anno 743 n.) Childeric is reputed to have been of weak intellect: anyhow the power was entirely in the hands of the mayor of the palace, and in 751 Pippin, with the assent of pope Zacharias, deposed Childeric, cut off the long hair, the token of royalty, and shut him up in a monastery, himself assuming the royal title (cf. *Ann. Laur.* sub an. 749, "Et Zacharias papa mandavit Pippino, ut melius esset illum regem vocari, qui potestatem haberet, quam illum qui sine regali potestate manebat; ut non conturbaretur ordo, per auctoritatem apostolicam jusset Pippinum regem fieri"). On the question of the 'rois fainéants,' see Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 47 n. 3; and Warnkönig et Gérard, *Histoire des Carolingiens*, i. 137. [T. R. B.]

CHILIANUS, Hiberno-Scottish martyr in Franconia. (Hardy, *Descr. Cat.* i. 340.) [CHILIAN.] [C. H.]

CHILIASTS, from the Greek word for 1000, whom the Latins for the same reason called "Millenarians." As St. Augustine says, in speaking of the followers of Cerinthus—the heretic against whose errors St. John is said to have published his gospel—"Mille annos post resurrectionem in terreno regno Christi secundum carnales ventris et libidinis voluptates futuros fabulantur: unde etiam Chiliastræ sunt appellati" (*Haer.* viii.). Of course they held other errors besides this: and even as regards this, it was for characterising it as a reign of sensual enjoyments that they were called heretics. This, however, Cerinthus, who was a Jew by birth, inherited probably from tradition—"Mille annorum Judaiacam δευτέρωσιν," as St. Jerome calls it (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 18)—rather than invented, and then, having been educated at Alexandria, developed from the Pythagorean and Platonic schools (Heyne *ad Aen.* vi. 743–51, *Excurs.* xiii.). Later, he seems to have propagated his opinions in Asia Minor (Euseb. *E. H.* iv. 14); but they survived him in Egypt, for it is Dionysius of Alexandria who tells us that the views entertained by him on the millennium were current there still; and that a bishop named Nepos, amongst others, had espoused them: but that he had at length succeeded in getting them disavowed. Dionysius adds, apropos to this subject, that some of his own predecessors had, in consequence, gone so far as to maintain that instead of the Apocalypse being by St. John, it was but a work published by Cerinthus in his name. This, however, was an opinion in which he owns he could not concur himself (*ib.* vii. 24).

We now come to those who maintained a millennium, but without these errors. Eusebius himself, in speaking of Papias bishop of Hierapolis, a hearer of St. John and fellow-disciple with St. Polycarp, charges him with teaching several things more mythic than true; and among them that after the resurrection a period of 1000 years would ensue, during which the kingdom of Christ would be established upon earth bodily; misinterpreting, in the opinion of Eusebius, what he had learnt from the apostles, and misleading others, of whom St. Irenæus was one (*ib.* c. 39). St. Irenæus, however, it must be allowed, was less likely to have been misinformed on what the apostles taught than Eusebius; and the Apocalypse being admitted to be the work of St. John, whatever we find in it is no longer a Jewish tradition but a Christian verity. Since then, in ch. xx. of that book, the period of 1000 years is identified no less than six times with the duration of the reign of Christ and his saints, and with that alone, it is quite clear that in whatever sense this was intended, a millennium would be taught with truth. It is another thing whether that sense has been ascertained as yet; and it must be admitted anyhow that no view of the millennium has been propounded hitherto which has obtained general credence, or rather which has not been opposed. St. Justin Martyr, in depositing to his own entire belief in it, and to its being held by others, admits frankly that there were many good Christians who denied it (*Dial. c. Tryph.* § 80–82). His idea was that the 1000 years would be spent in Jerusalem rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, in the way described by Ezekiel and the other prophets, Isaiah lxx. 17 sqq. particularly. St. Irenæus, if the Latin version of

the last five chapters of his fifth and last book against heresies was all translated from what he wrote, is still more full and explicit in interpreting prophecy to the effect that it is a literal reign upon earth which is there contemplated; and such, he adds, was not merely the view entertained by Papias, but presbyters who had been acquainted personally with St. John, remembered to have heard him say it was what our Lord had taught of those times Himself (*ib.* xxxiii. 3, 4). St. Jerome, nevertheless, in crediting Tertullian, (*De spe fid.* &c. Marc. iii. 24), Victorinus (*in Apocal.*), Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* vii. 24-26), Apollinarius, and Severus, with similar opinions, calls them Jewish fables in one place (*in Ezek. c. xxxvi.*): in another, indeed, he admits he cannot condemn them, though unable to accept them, as having been held by so many churchmen and martyrs (*in Jerem. c. xix.*). The only complete commentary on the Revelation in patristic literature, that of Primasius bishop of Utica, who must have known all that St. Jerome and others had said of them, makes no allusion to them whatever. On the other hand, St. Augustine, the great oracle of the African church, owns to having held them himself at one time (*De Civ. xx. 7*). Then, in giving his reasons for subsequently dissenting from them, he sketched the outlines of another theory, which although he left unfinished, anybody may fill up for himself with ease. Thus he saw clearly that the binding of Satan and the reigning of Christ covered the same period, commencing with the foundation of the Christian church—hence called so commonly “the kingdom of heaven”—by its divine Founder, and lasting to the end of time—“*Regnat itaque ecclesia cum Christo nunc primum in vivis et in mortuis . . . sed id eo martyrum tantum animas commemoravit, quia ipsi praecipue regnant post mortem, qui usque ad mortem pro veritate certaverunt . . . Neque enim piorum animae mortuorum separantur ab ecclesia, quae etiam nunc est regnum Christi. Alioquin nec ad altare Dei fieret eorum memoria in communicatione corporis Christi . . . cur enim fiunt ista, nisi quia fideles, etiam defuncti, membra ejus sunt?*” (*ib.* 9, § 3). And thus the period of 1000 years is *their* sabbath, or rest in heaven—the seventh day that “has no evening”—and is coincident with the 2000 years foreshadowed by “the morning and evening” of the sixth day, and predetermined to be spent on earth by the church-militant. Wherever reigning on earth is contemplated in the Apocalypse, it is a future thing, nor is it said to be with Christ, nor is any limit to its duration suggested; wherever reigning 1000 years is contemplated, it is what is then going on, and said to be with Christ, but without any mention of earth: a resurrection which is, however, before the general resurrection, and in which *only souls* reign. Both Primasius and Bede saw plainly whither his suggestions tended, but paused on the threshold. Even the learned editor of the Oxford translation of Tertullian (note D. p. 120) has apparently failed to appreciate them while contributing a mass of information on the subject in general. [E. S. Ff.]

CHILLIANUS SCOTUS (Fordan, *Scotichr.* lib. iii. c. 44, ed. Skene, vol. i. 129). [CHILLIAN.]

CHILON (1), a solitary, instructed in the

duties of a monastic life by a letter attributed in one copy to NILUS, but generally included in the works of BASIL the Great (*Ep.* 42). Ceillier (*iv.* 435-437) points out that this and the four succeeding letters must, as far as the criterion of style can decide, stand or fall together, and that the 5th is cited entire as Basil's by Metaphrastes, though it has been rejected by critics, because it speaks of the saint's visit to Jerusalem, by no means an improbable event, but one of which we have no other evidence. The advice given to Chilo is to the effect that he should deprive himself of pleasures one by one, patiently and quietly; avoid ostentation; pray for people, instead of going to pray over them; spend his time in reading the New Testament chiefly, since many have done themselves harm by the perusal of the Old; avoid profusion in hospitality; dread money, and if people try to intrust him with a stock for charitable purposes, bid them do their charities themselves; not let the desire of attending church services entice him from his retreat.

CHILON (2) A church servant, who is severely rebuked by Nilus (*Ep.* ii. 158, p. 195) for his inability to keep a secret. [E. B. B.]

CHILPERIC I. (CHILPERICH), the youngest of the four sons of Clotaire I., amongst whom their father's kingdom was divided in 561 (*Greg. Tur. iv. 3*). Chilperic, thinking himself unfairly dealt with, seized Paris, and attempted to increase his share by conquest. His brothers drove him out of Paris, and on a division being made Chilperic obtained the original kingdom of Clotaire I. with Soissons as capital, including also Cambrai, Tournai, Rouen, &c., together with the greater part of Armorica. On the death of Charibert in 567 Chilperic obtained as his share a third part of Paris, which thus became a kind of federal capital (*Greg. vi. 27, vii. 6*), together with some possessions in Aquitaine. See Bonnell, *Anfänge d. Karol. Hauses*, pp. 214, 215. During Siegebert's absence on a campaign against the Avars, Chilperic invaded his kingdom and took Rheims. Siegebert returning victorious expelled Chilperic and made himself master of Chilperic's capital of Soissons (*Greg. iv. 23*). About this same time Chilperic married Galsuintha, the elder sister of Brunehilde, daughter of the Visigothic king Athanagild. He very speedily, however, caused her to be murdered, and married his former concubine Fredegund (*Greg. iv. 28*). Compare for this marriage, and for the domestic relations generally of the Merovingian kings, Löbel, *Gregor von Tours*, pp. 23 sqq. In 573 a second civil war broke out between Childebert and Siegebert, and for two years Gaul was devastated. Its miserable state and that of the church are forcibly depicted by Gregory (*iv. 48*), “*fuit illo in tempore pejor in ecclesiis gemitus, quam tempore persecutionis Diocletiani.*” In 575 Siegebert, having carried everything before him and shut up Chilperic in Tournai, was treacherously murdered at the instance of Fredegund, leaving a child [CHILDEBERT II.] of five years old to succeed him (*Greg. iv. 52*). The rest of the reign of Chilperic was one of almost uninterrupted civil war against his nephew Childebert and against Guntram his eldest brother, whose capital was at Orleans, and who ruled over Burgundy. There was treachery on all sides, and disaffection within Chilperic's

own family of his son Merovechus, who had married Brunehilde (Greg. v. 1). In 584, in the midst of his wars, Chilperic was murdered at Chelles, leaving as his successor an infant son Clotaire II. (Greg. vi. 46).

Chilperic is the most conspicuous instance of the unrestrained character of the Merovingian kingship; cf. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, ii. 150-3. His despotic nature shewed itself in every field. His taxation was oppressive (Greg. v. 29), and when it caused an émeute the rising was put down with the greatest severity, blinding being one of his punishments. When prompted by passion he was utterly uncontrolled; nevertheless, he was seldom wanting in acuteness, and for the attainment of his ends he was often content to bide his time (Greg. v. 44, 50; vi. 36; vi. 22). He invented four new letters, and insisted on their being adopted in the instruction of youth. He wrote two books of poems, which Gregory scoffs at, but Fortunatus praises. He had rationalistic views upon the doctrine of the Trinity, which he characteristically wished to force upon the church (Greg. v. 45; Rückert, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 145, n. 5); whilst at the same time he was superstitious (Greg. v. 14, vi. 27-41) and an intolerant persecutor of the Jews (Greg. vi. 5-17). As regards his relations to the church, Gregory, who calls him the "Nero and Herod" of his age, adds that churches were the special objects of his hate, bishops the most frequent butts for his jokes; "Lo," he would say, "our purse is empty, our wealth is transferred to the church, none but bishops really reign, our dignity is gone, gone to the bishops" (vi. 46). On this passage and on Chilperic's relation to Gregory himself, v. Löbell, *Gregor von Tours*, pp. 278 sqq., also pp. 30-33, and pp. 160 sqq. for his character generally. At pp. 175 sq. the same author, quoting Greg. v. 35, endeavours to shew, as against Guizot, Sismondi, Waitz, &c., that, notwithstanding all their oppression, the throne of the Merovingian kings was firmly rooted in the hearts of the people. [T. R. B.]

CHILPERIC II. (**CHILPERICH**), son of Chilperic II., on his father's murder in 673, was confined in a monastery and afterwards ordained priest under the name of Daniel (*Gesta Reg. Fr.* 52). On the death of Dagobert III., in 715, the Neustrian Franks raised Chilperic to the throne. Ragenfred, mayor of the palace, and the Neustrian nobles waged civil war in Chilperic's name against Charles Martel and the Austrasians [**CHARLES MARTEL**]. On the defeat of the Neustrians, in 719, and the death of Clotaire IV., Charles, as mayor of the whole kingdom, recognised Chilperic as king. In the following year (720) Chilperic died and was buried at Noyon (*Gesta*, 53). [T. R. B.]

CHIMASIUS (**Χειμάσιος**), one of the contentious monks chidden by Nilus in the 5th century (*Ep.* ii. 77). [E. B. B.]

CHINEBERTUS (Hen. Hunt. *Hist. Angl.* M. H. B. 726), bishop of the Lindisfari. [**CYNEBERT**.]

CHINEGISLUS (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, vol. i. p. 45), king of the West Saxons. [**CYNEGISLS**.]

CHIONIA, martyred by fire at Thessalonica under Count Sisinnius in the reign of Diocletian;

commemorated on April 1, with her sister Agape, who shared her martyrdom. They were sisters of Irene, another martyr of the same city. (Bed. *Mart.* April 1 and 5). [C. H.]

CHLODOBERT. [**CLODOBERT.**]

CHLODOMER [**CLODOMIR.**]

CHLODOWIG. [**CLOVIS.**]

CHLODULPHUS, ST., confessor, bishop of Metz. One of the thirty saints enumerated in the ancient catalogues and martyrologies of the church of Metz (Meurissius episc. Madaurensis et hujus ecclesiae Suffraganeus in Praefatione ad Historiam episcoporum ecclesiae Metensis). This saint belonged to an illustrious family, through which the usurper Pippin traced his origin to the old kings of France. His father, St. Arnulphus, was the son of Arnoaldus, duke of Austrasia, and known as Boggisus. His great-grandfather was Auspertus, brother to St. Aigulfus, bishop of Metz, who is said to have been the son of Clothilde, the daughter of King Clovis. St. Arnulphus, after having been mayor of the palace to king Theodericus, took holy orders late in life, although he was married and had two sons. He was very soon made bishop of Metz, and his wife Doda then took the veil, and remained in the nunnery of Treves to the day of her death. He gave most of his property to the church, the rest to his sons Chlodulphus and Anchises. The latter generously gave up all his share to his father for the benefit of the poor, and was rewarded by being made, as his father had been before him, major-domus to the king, to which office his son and grandson succeeded after him, Pippinus being their descendant.

Chlodulphus, the other son, and the subject of this article, took holy orders, but was never a monk or a hermit. He succeeded his father in the bishopric of Metz. He is said to have been an excellent and renowned prelate, skilled alike in church and state. He lived in the 7th century, and is commemorated on the 8th of June (A.A. SS. June, ii. pp. 127-132). [D. R. J.]

CHLOTHARIUS or **CHLOTACHARIUS.** [**CLOTHAIRE.**]

CHONBAL, one of the five chiefs of the 365 archons, presiding over the sphere of the planet Jupiter. [**PISTIS SOPHIA**, p. 362.]

CHONNUS, CHON, identified with Caedwalla king of the Britons in the following passage of the *Annals of Tigernach* (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scriptt.* ii. 191), the marginal date being A.D. 631:—"Proelium inter Edwinum filium Aelli regem Saxonum qui supra totam Britanniam regnavit, in quo victus est a Chonno (Hoano) rege Britonum et Penda Saxono." Another MS. reading is Chon. [CAEDWALLA (1).] [C. H.]

CHORENTINUS, another spelling of Corentinus, bishop of Quimper, q. v. In Usuard (*Mart.* ad Mai. 1, *Auctaria*; Patrol. tom. 124, p. 13), he is called bishop of Aquila in Lesser Britain. This Aquila must be the Aquilonia of Gall. *Christ.* xiv. 871, by which Quimper was sometimes called in the 11th century. His day in Usuard and in Bede (*Mart. Auct.*) is May 1. [C. H.]

CHOREUTAE. [**EUCHITES.**]

CHORZAR, regarded by the **PERATAE** as

the true name of the power called Poseidon by the Greeks. (Hippol. Ref. v. 14.) [G. S.]

CHOSROES (Χοσροης), Khusrud (חושלוד) on coins,* Kesra (كسرى) in Arabic, Khusrū (خسرو) in modern Persian, Khosrov in Armenian, Kasré in Georgian, Hucrava in Zend; a name said to be applied in the Zendavesta, as well as in the *Shah Nameh*, to the great Cyrus, and which reappears in Sanskrit as Sushravas, the exact equivalent of the Greek εὐκλεής, "famous." The Hebrew חֲשִׁירֹשׁ or חֲשִׁירֹשִׁי, Achashbrosh or Achashverosh (Ahasuerus) points to identification with the Khshayarsha of the cuneiform inscriptions, the well-known Xerxes, a name that is once given by Malelas to the great Chosroes (Mal. p. 441), though there are difficulties in the way of this. Another desperate attempt to sputter out the guttural, Phthasuaras, is found in Theophanes (A.M. 6016). The name is certainly not a corruption of Kurush (Cyrus), nor can Kurush be a corruption of it, but the great king of that name may have borne this surname. (See for most of the facts Sir H. Rawlinson, in the *Asiatic Journal*, vol. x. p. 90; xi. (1849), pp. 112, 120; Benfey, *Sansk. Dict.* p. 965). It seems to be in some sense a title common to Persian kings, as descended from Cyrus. Their throne is described in the *Shah Nameh* by terms which Mohl translates *le trône des Chosroes*. It was not, however, the common royal name of any line, as Arsaces was of the Parthians, but was borne individually by several monarchs. There was a great Arsacid king of the name in the time of TRAJAN, and another who opposed the rise of the Sassanid Ardeshir and his dynasty about A.D. 230, and twice in later times we read of a Chosroes descended from this Ardeshir, but not more closely connected with the reigning line, being set on the throne of Persia in a time of anarchy, A.D. 430 and A.D. 630 [ISDEGERDES], but we are here concerned mainly with two Christian Arsacid princes in Armenia, A.D. 316-325 or 345-354, and A.D. 384-391, and with two great Sassanid monarchs, A.D. 531-579, and A.D. 591-628, who, if not themselves ever, as some say, Christians, at any rate had Christian wives, and exercised no little influence on the fortunes of the church.

For the history of the Arsacid or Parthian dynasty, which ruled the East from the beginning of the 2nd century before Christ, and of the Sassanid or revived Persian dynasty that supplanted it at the beginning of the 3rd century after Christ, see the articles ARSACES and SASSANIDAE, in the *Dictionary of Classical Biography*, or for a fuller treatment the volumes by Rawlinson on the *Sixth and Seventh Oriental Monarchies*.

For convenience, we give here the chronological and genealogical successions (1) of the later Arsacids—Chosroes I., d. A.D. 237?; Tiridates, and his sister Chosroiducht; Chosroes II., d. A.D. 354. (The exact relationship of Chosroes III. of Armenia, or at first of Persarmenia only, is uncertain.) (2) Of the later Sassanids—Isdegerdes II., d. A.D. 457; Perozes, d. A.D. 486?; Cabades I., d. A.D. 531; Chosroes I. (Nushirvan),

the Great, d. A.D. 579; Hormisdas IV., d. A.D. 591; Chosroes II. (Parviz), d. A.D. 628; Cabades II. (Siroes), d. A.D. 628; Isdegerdes III., d. A.D. 652.

As illustrations of the connexion of these Sassanidae with Christianity we may just mention two facts. (1.) The name of the chief treasurer of Cabades I., the father of Chosroes I., has been found coupled with that of Christ on a Greek inscription in North Africa. (2.) We have seen an impression, from a gem in the collection of Col. Pearce, found on the confines of North India, and referred by the Rev. C. W. King to the time of Chosroes II., bearing the usual Persian fire-altar with the legend below in Greek letters ΙΕΣΥ (Jesus).

The name, moreover, being so generic, it seems desirable to preface the separate biographies with some general observations respecting the peoples, the regions, and the period of which we are to treat; and then to enumerate authorities.

But for Canon Rawlinson's work our article could hardly have been written, but we believe our own essay, however imperfect, to contain (thanks to Professor Cowell, Mr. King, and Mr. Bensly) the first English reproduction of the historical treasures of the *Shah Nameh*, and the first modern attempt at collation of those earliest native traditions with the foreign documents contemporary with the events.

Character of the Times.—Parthians, Medes, and Elamites are named among the Jews present at the feast of Pentecost. The Jews were indeed dispersed as much to the East as to the West, and in the apostolic age, while Jerusalem was still the earthly centre of the church, it is probable that the gospel was carried as far in this direction as in that. The probability is confirmed by the absence of any certain knowledge in the West respecting the career of the twelve, and the traditions that refer the labours of several of them to Eastern regions. That the Parthian power was in the time of Christ the one counterpoise to the Roman, is recognised by several ancient authors (see Rawlinson, *Sixth Monarchy, Preface*), and by Milton (*Par. Reg.* iii. 267 ff.). We are, however, rendered blind to the early spread of Christianity in the far East by three facts, which are closely connected, and the reasons of which we are as far as possible here to investigate, namely, that it did not become the religion of the reigning dynasty, that it did not finally abolish the ancient national religion, and that it succumbed at last, more completely than in modern Turkey, to the onslaught of Islam.

The Parthians were a nomad, perhaps a Tartar race, who passed along with the other subjects of Persia beneath the sceptre of Alexander, but were the first to shake off the Greek yoke, and at length succeeded in carving out for themselves an empire between the Greek kingdoms of Syria and Bactria, when the one was weakened by the Maccabean revolt, and the other enfeebled by straining too much after conquests in North India. They were barbarians who had received some tincture both of Greek and of Persian civilisation. They allowed independence to the Greek cities in their empire, their kings delighted in the title Phil-Hellene, and the deities as well as the language of the legends on their coins are Greek. But they were not thoroughly Hellen-

* In Sassanian times L and R were represented by the same letter. The final letter was read by Longpérier as ʾ, but is now taken for a ʾ.

ised. On the other hand, Mithridates, the real founder of the empire, bears a Persian name, and restored the feudal system of Persia, and they permitted Magianism among their subjects. The Persian tradition was thus fostered and kept alive, while yet the real Persians felt that they were under a foreign yoke, and subject to an intellectually inferior race. About the beginning of the 2nd century after Christ a return from Greek towards Persian tendencies among the Parthians, seems to be indicated by the disuse of Greek on the coins of the inferior branches, nominally subject to, but really independent of, the Arsacid dynasty, and by the assumption of the name Chosroes by an Arsaces.

The Medes and Persians were Aryan races, and the Persians seem in many respects to have preserved with unusual freshness the frank simplicity of the primitive Aryan manners and worship. See the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon and Herodotus (i. 31-40). Their education comprised three points, to ride, to draw the bow, to speak the truth. The old Aryan worship seems to have been of the kind portrayed by Shakespeare in the sons of Cymbeline—

"Hail heaven!

Hail heaven!

Now for our mountain sport."

A ready tolerance for diversities of religious belief in others, and an adherence, as a point of honour, to hereditary forms, seem alike characteristic of Aryan races.

But the splendid vigour of the Persians had little real strength, and their purity was easily tarnished. Of all nations, says Herodotus, they most easily adopt foreign manners.

This may be partly due to the admixture of a Semitic with the Aryan element. Susa was in Elam, and Elam was a son of Shem. There is a large Semitic element in the Pehlvi language, spoken under the Sassanidae. Both the ancient and the revived Persian dynasties seem to have combined the adventurous spirit of the Aryans with the magnificent repose of a stately luxury like that of Solomon or of Croesus, while the Hamitic tendencies towards the development of a complex commercial and mechanical civilisation as in Egypt, Phoenicia, and Babylon, seem to have been wanting.

In religion, the comparative purity of the Zoroastrian creed seems to have been due, not so much to a firm persistence in the primitive tradition as to a reaction and reform at a certain definite epoch. The Devas, the gods of the Hindoos, and Indra among them, are the devils of the Persians. Something of Semitic vehemence and iconoclasm breaks through the usual Aryan tolerance in the Persians. It appears notably in the campaign of Cambyses. The revolt of the Sassanidae was a reaction against Parthian idolatry, a revindication of the purity of Zoroastrianism. The first rise of Zoroastrianism has been supposed nearly contemporary with the victory of Abraham over Chedorlaomer. But modern scholars, while refusing to pronounce upon its exact epoch, have no doubt that it is subsequent to the 12th century B.C. Alone of national religions, not historically traceable to Abraham, it makes some approach towards monotheism. But it stopped far short of it, as is clearly pointed out by Isaiah (xlv. 7).

The chivalry of ancient Persia relieved the world from the tyranny of Babylon, and we shall see reason to suppose that a hardly less important office was performed for Gothic Christendom by the chivalry of the Sassanidae. But to the Babylonian monarch in his vision the power that was to succeed him appeared inferior both in substance and form to his own. The Persian empire never had for centre and metropolis a single vast city of royal splendour and ancient learning. Ctesiphon could not, any more than Susa, Ecbatana or Persepolis, rival the renown of ancient Babylon, or of the Bagdad of the caliphs. The empire was the empire of a nation, not of a city. It was the freer, but also the weaker. And to the Hebrew captive seer the two did but appear as different wild beasts struggling together, and the forms under which Persia was shadowed forth to him, the bear and the ram, seem to betoken a certain clumsiness and immobility in the nature of their rule. In their religion, the belief in the co-eternity of Ahriman (Angromainyus) blighted the hopes of the good, and encouraged the machinations of men like Haman. And this was not the only belief that obscured their trust in the power of Ormuzd. His throne had rivals among his subordinates as well as in his great antagonist. MITHRA and Serosh appear originally to have corresponded to the Apollo and the Hermes of the Greeks, Hermes in his nobler capacities, but the worship of Mithra was early debased with Babylonian orgies, that induced Herodotus to confound him with the Hamitic Urania. Moreover the four elements, especially fire, were regarded as divine; and the kings of Neo-Persia were deified, as much as the Roman Caesars. In their domestic life, the institution of polygamy; in their polity, an absolute and capricious despotism of the king over the nobles, a barbarous cruelty of torture, a sacerdotal caste, a court such as results when feudalism sinks into absolutism, and a permanent barrier prohibiting the very wealthiest of the common people from attaining to distinction or obtaining a liberal education—all concur to stamp their civilisation as less capable of healthy developments. Their rule would have been stifling. But they were unable to impress their institutions on conquered races. They pulled down mightily; they failed to organise, to impregnate with their ideas, to implant their customs.

Many social observances were connected with the Persian religion, which made it impossible to force it on subject races. In particular, their reverence for all four elements forbade their either burning or burying their dead. They exposed them, as the Parsees do to this day, to be devoured by the fowls of the air. This fact has been of no small importance in nerving the resistance, and prolonging the existence of the Armenian church.

The Armenian mountaineers, who were of Aryan race, preserved a certain national, though rarely a political, independence between the two great powers of which their country was ever and again the battle-ground. Armenia was the last refuge of the Arsacids when they were driven out by the Sassanids. And when forced to flee even thence to take shelter with Rome, they retained some hold on the popular affections, till they were restored by Roman influence. Nor

was this loyal fidelity altogether shaken by the conversion of these princes to Christianity, an event which, though not at all a political move, could not be without political results. Had it not been for Persia, they would perhaps never have succeeded in carrying their subjects with them. There had long been a flourishing church at Edessa, but Osrhoene was distinct from Armenia. From Armenia came the Paulicians, and so in due succession the Albigenses of the West. [CONSTANTINUS SILVANUS; PAULICIANS.]

From their geographical position the Arsacid and Sassanid dynasties afforded not only a counterpoise to the Roman power, and a harbour for refugees, but a protection against barbarian inroads from the East. The pretext for the wars of Cavades and Chosroes was found in the refusal of the Romans to take their due share in defending the civilised world from the Turks. When the wars began, the Syrian provinces lay very much at the mercy of the Persian invader. It was partly in order to resist this great civilised Eastern power more effectually, that the seat of empire was transferred from Rome to Byzantium; and the ever-recurring distraction of this danger in the rear made it impossible either to present a firm front to the Teutonic invaders, or to recover ground from them permanently, when they were at last divided and enfeebled, and thus prevented Western Christendom from becoming irretrievably Byzantine. If Persia kept off the Turks, she fostered the inroads of the Saracens, and prepared the way for Islam (v. Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton*, pp. 333-338).

Mohl remarks how much more space is occupied in the Persian annals by wars with the East than by wars with Rome. Persia faces Rome with arrogance, but Tartary with alarm, if not with abject terror. The royal residences were on the Western frontier. The war with Rome was a regular war on a fortified frontier; the incursions of the Turks came unforeseen, menaced a far wider range of country, and woke an ancient hatred of race between Iran and Turan that is as living to-day as 3000 years ago. (*Le Livre des Rois*, vol. vi. preface.)

But it was not only by military operations that Persia influenced Europe. It did so also by doctrine and by example.

The Aryan race of Persia forms a link between the Greeks and the Hindus. It must have been through Persia, if at all, that Christian influences permeated to the Punjab, and it was through Persia, chiefly, that Buddhist influences found their way into Christendom [MANI]. Nor were more purely Persian forms of doctrine without their importance at Rome [MITHRA].

What the effect upon Persia may have been of intercourse with the nomad hordes of Central Asia, and even with China, it is more difficult to say. The ferment of religious opinions seems to present some analogy to the state of things in modern Russia, and we shall treat of the rise of a communistic sect suppressed by the great Chosroes more than 1200 years before the French Revolution. All this affected Europe. Thus we pass from the influence of their teaching to the effect of their example. (Cf. De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, i. p. 20, ed. 1867.)

As the Sassanids came into power by a revolt that was at once national and religious, their

rule was based on the *alliance* of church and state. This was quite a different principle from the *union* of the two in ancient Greece and Rome. But it gave them such strength that the Roman emperor was soon their prisoner. They set an example which it was impossible for the adherents of an effete religion to follow. But the model which they furnished was copied, perhaps unconsciously, by Constantine and Theodosius and Justinian; Julian in vain endeavoured to imitate it. Ardeshir's conference of Magi may almost be regarded as the precedent for the council of Nice. The religion which they published was the religion of a book. They fixed the limits of the Zendavesta, which then assumed its present form. But the priests had a holy office quite apart from the preservation and exposition of the holy books. They were the guardians of the sacred fire that was never to be let die. The wars of Chosroes were religious wars, a foreshadowing of Islam, the first warning drops of that storm.

Of minor points in which the influence of the Sassanidae has reached us, chiefly through Saracens and Crusaders, we may note—

1. The architecture, which they borrowed from the Arabs, perfected by the help of Byzantine, Indian and Chinese workmen, and returned, probably with interest, to the caliphs; and to which we owe such buildings as St. Mark's at Venice.—

2. The example they set of translating into their own vernacular the works of Greek philosophy, and the practical turn that they seem to have given to this, directing it to statecraft, or to medicine or engineering. It was by the Persian caliphs, the Abbassides, not the Ommiades, that this example was followed.—

3. The fact that their armaments, like the armies of mediæval Europe, consisted of a heavy-armed cavalry, and of archery on foot. The Romans borrowed their tactics, the example being first set by Alexander Severus, and taught them to the Teutons.

But besides their direct influence on ourselves, the hindrances or facilities afforded by their rule for the occupation of the vast mission fields of Asia are a subject that should not fail to interest us. We are too apt, perhaps, to congratulate ourselves on conquests which, though really new, are in one sense, but a recovery of lost ground. Where now we have a single missionary, there was of old an embattled church. [NESTORIANS.]

It is in these regions, as far as we have been able to discover, that we have the earliest instances of the sword being drawn distinctly in the cause of Christ, of the church becoming, in a worldly sense, *militant*; nor did the prediction fail of fulfilment, "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." But it is strange that we should be indebted to a heathen tradition and a Moslem poet for the touching and noble story of Nushizad, the Christian son of Chosroes. Yet there are advantages for us in this mode of transmission; the speeches attributed to the actors in this affair have a value apart from the question of their authenticity. They represent the conceptions of Christian character entertained at an early date in the East by men not Christians. We learn that one obstacle to the advance of Christianity in Persia was a national, patrician pride, and that the Gospel had power to transmute

this into a lofty self-respect, tempered with genuine humility. There was no such obstacle to the spread of the doctrine of Mahomet: he did not preach Christ crucified. Thus, almost at the cradle of Islam, we are brought face to face with the question of the effect produced on uncivilised or half-civilised races by contact with a corrupt civilisation, especially when the races are heathen, and the civilisation is nominally Christian.

The Christian chroniclers of this period force upon us the conviction that the devastations of the Eastern Church were the inevitable result of its corruptions. The very air seemed heavy with judgment. Auroras, meteoric dust-showers, burning droughts, excessive rains, intense frosts, famines, pestilences, cattle-plagues, earthquakes, may denote a period of unusual activity in the solar orb. But frivolity, avarice, vice, superstition, sectarian fury in Christians, were the occasions of the adversities of the church. Conversion to Christianity is adoption into a family, and what could be expected when the chief advantages that the family seemed to offer were superior luxuries? Christian belief requires effort; an indolent dread of Ahri-man might easily give place to the more comfortable acquiescence in the omnipotence of Allah. But Islam, thus haughty, and yet thus submissive, however it may devastate, does not threaten the demolition of society by upheaval from beneath. Creeds that arise in contact with a debased Christianity may develop yet more anarchic forces and appeal more directly to the lowest passions; like the strange communistic religion that sprang up in the days of the Sassanidae, gained a royal proselyte, and was propagated in the West. A glance at modern Russia may illustrate the importance of the history of the power which of old intervened between Europe and the hordes of Asia. As we study it, we seem to behold and hear an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, "Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpet, which are yet to sound!"

Authorities accessible for the history of this period are divisible into various classes.

A. The native Persian, and these of several kinds.

(a.) The inscriptions and the legends on coins and gems, the only contemporary native authorities. The ancient Pehlvi language and character, in which they are engraved, was first deciphered by Baron De Sacy, after the time of Gibbon, from a bilingual inscription at Roustam (*Mémoires sur la Perse*, 1793), and both the language (which is intermediate between the Zend and the Parsee), and the alphabet (which is Semitic), still present many difficulties. The coins are treated by Longpérier (*Mémoires des Sassanides*, Paris, 1844), and in sundry papers by Thomas in the *Asiatic Journal*. The coinage chiefly supplies us with means of ascertaining the separate identity of kings whom historians confuse, and with some information as to the lengths of the several reigns.

(b.) *Shah Nameh*, or the Book of Kings, an epic poem in Persian, by a Moslem poet named Abul K'azim Firdusi, in the 10th century of our era, inaccessible to Gibbon, and not used by Rawlinson, but published in a very costly form, with a French translation and prefaces, as far as the

reign of Hormuzd, who came between the two Khosrus, by the late M. Mohl, is said by that scholar to be probably based during the period that concerns us, on the royal Pehlvi chronicles, commenced by order of Chosroes the First himself. For earlier times it is nearly useless. It throws no light on the story of our Arsacid princes. The heading to each reign states the number of years it lasted, though the statement is sometimes quite at variance with the representations in the body of the poem. The inaugural speech of every king is given, and of many of the kings we are told no more. But for those of which we are told to treat it is a most valuable authority, especially for its living pictures of character.

(c.) Tabari, an Arab born in Persia in the 9th century, wrote a chronicle based on the ancient Persian records and Arabic legends, which was rendered into Persian in the 10th century by the Vizier of a Sassanide prince, and has been translated from the Persian into French by Zotenberg, Paris, 1869. It is quite unhistorical.

(d.) *Hamza of Ispahan* was another Persian Arab chronicler of the 9th century, published with a Latin version by Gottwaldt, Leipzig, 1844. He cites earlier authorities.

(e.) Of later Persian histories, the most important, perhaps, is the prose epitome by Mirkhond, a Persian Mussulman of the close of the 15th century of our era, based partly on the *Shah Nameh* and Tabari, partly on other native authorities, inaccessible to Gibbon, but published in French by De Sacy in the work above named.

(f.) The *Dabistan* is an account of all the religions of the world by a Parsee in India in the 17th century who was acquainted with many old Persian books. It was translated into English by Shea and Troyer, Paris, 1843.

B. Armenian literature has had an almost unbroken continuance of life from the period of which we write to the present day. For the two Armenian Khosrus, our authority is Moses of Chorene, whose chronicle, beginning with the earliest times, by his own confession, becomes historical first at the point where for our present purpose we most need him, the introduction of Christianity to Armenia in the beginning of the 4th century. It is continued down to his own epoch, A.D. 441, so that he fails us when we come to treat of the great Chosroes. His work was translated by Whiston, 1736, and read by Gibbon. There are no extant Armenian historians contemporary with the great Chosroes or his grandson, but Lazarus Pharbetsi has carried the story of the religious war down to A.D. 485. A portion of his history was rendered into French by M. Kabaragy Gatabed, Paris, 1843, and the whole of this and other Armenian authorities of the 5th century is given in French by Langlois, *Collection des Historiens de l'Arménie*. Modern abstracts of the Armenian authorities are *Mémoires sur l'Arménie*, by St. Martin, Paris, 1818, notes and additions by the same author to Lebeau's *Bas Empire*, and a paper by Patkanien, in Russ., of which a French version is given in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1866. The proximity of Armenia to Persia and the continuity of the Armenian national life give great value even to the later histories in that language. Seeps in the 7th century is very near our period.

C. The Byzantine empire supplies a series of

contemporary authorities, lay and clerical, Syriac or Greek.

(a.) Joshua the Stylite wrote a Syriac chronicle of Eastern affairs from A.D. 495 to A.D. 505, given in Latin by Assemani (*B. O. t. i. c.* 26), and published with a French version by M. Paulin Martin, Leipzig, 1876.

(b.) Theodorus the Reader (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxvi. 166) brings the history down to A.D. 518.

(c.) There are valuable incidental notices in John the Lydian's book on Magistracies.

(d.) Procopius, secretary to Belisarius, chronicled the wars of Justinian. He is of course somewhat the partisan.

(e.) His story is continued and sometimes corrected from the Persian annals, or supplemented with fresh incidents by Agathias the Scholastic.

(f.) John Malelas, a Syrian ecclesiastic of the time of Justinian, wrote in Greek.

(g.) Zacharias, bishop of Melitene, fl. A.D. 536 (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxxv. 1150; cf. Assem. *B. O.* ii. 55.)

(h.) JOHN, native of Amida, bishop of Ephesus, chief of the Monophysites at Constantinople, wrote in Syriac a church history of the events of his own old age under Justin, Tiberius and Maurice. It has been rendered into English by Payne Smith, Oxford, 1860 (v. Assem. *B. O.* ii. 85).

(i.) Menander wrote under Maurice (A.D. 582-602) on the Embassies from and to the Barbarians. Only fragments are extant.

(k.) Theophylact of Simocatta wrote under Heraclius the history of the reign of Maurice.

(l.) EVAGRIUS brought his Church History down from A.D. 431 to A.D. 594.^b

The later Byzantines are of use as they preserve some independent traditions, and as they attempt far more systematically than Malelas, to give us regular chronological annals. Theophanes, at the beginning of the 9th century, is the best. Our references are always to the *Bonn Corpus Historiæ Byzantinæ*.

D. (a.) Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria in the 10th century, has given in his Arabic annals, published with a Latin version at Oxford, 1655, several notices of the Persian kings, viz. Cobades I. vol. ii. pp. 127, 176; Chosroes I. pp. 179, 188; Chosroes II. pp. 200-236, 252; Cobades II. p. 232, 256; Chosroes III. p. 255. He is valuable, not only as the events affected Egypt, but as under Moslem rule he evidently met with Persian traditions, similar and contemporary with those embodied by Firdusi. At the same time he is quite ignorant of Persian.

(b.) Gregorius Bar-Hebraeus Abulpharagius, of Jewish descent, physician, bishop of Aleppo and Jacobite primate in the 13th century, wrote an Arabic *History of the Dynasties*, published with a Latin version by Pococke, Oxford, 1665. Gibbon (chs. 18, 32, 40, 42, 46) has used Moses of Chorene, the Byzantines, Eutychius, and Abulpharagius.

E. Georgia or Iberia only emerged from the mythical to the historical condition at the close of our period, two or three centuries later than Armenia. Their Georgian annals are published by Brosset, and fragments from them given by Langlois, *Numismatique Géorgienne*.

F. We have not found any Eastern martyr

acts of so late a date as our period in Assemani (*Mart. Or. et Occid.*). We must refer to Lequien (*Oriens Christianus*) for the bishops, and to Assemani (*Bibliotheca Orientalis*) for the ecclesiastical writers. His first volume contains the orthodox, his second the Monophysites, his third and fourth the Nestorians.

CHOSROES I. OF ARMENIA, was brother of the Vologeses and Artabanus, whose dissensions delighted Caracalla (Patk. p. 144, from Zenob-Glak, 4th century). He was the most formidable antagonist of Ardeshir. He persecuted the Christians, and, like Pharaoh, compelled them to labour on the public works. Many were martyred (Milman, *Hist. Christ.* ii. 319, from Chamich, *Hist. Armen.* i. 153). At last Ardeshir found an Arsacid, named Anak, to assassinate him. The whole families of both Anak and Chosroes were slain, except the youngest son of Anak, who became Gregory the apostle of Armenia, and Tiridates, the youngest son, and Chosrudacht, the daughter, of Chosroes. Ardeshir remained master of Armenia, and destroyed the idols of the Parthians (Patkan. 135, 144; Milman, *ib.* 320).

CHOSRUDACHT, or Chosroiducht, had great influence in persuading her brother to become a Christian. Her story shall be told under GREGORY the ILLUMINATOR, and TIRIDATES.

CHOSROES II. OF ARMENIA (A.D. 345-354?), son of Tiridates and of Aschenia daughter of Ascharades, "did not equal his parents in stature" (Mos. Chor. ii. 80); for they were both of colossal proportions, and he was surnamed the Little. When Tiridates had been poisoned for his attempt to force Christianity on his subjects, Chosroes sought refuge in the Roman empire. But Bacurius, one of the leaders of the rebels, entered on an unpopular Persian alliance; and therefore the other nobles joined with the patriarch Vartan, son of Gregory, in applying to Constantius to set Chosroes on the throne (*ib.* iii. 4, 5). Thus Chosroes received his crown from the grandson of his grandfather's murderer. Such was the effect of Christianity in making men of one mind in the house of Arsaces. And thus it was hatred of Persia that made the Armenians espouse the cause and accept the new creed of the Arsacids, and form the first distinctly national church. The emperor sent an officer named Antiochus, and Chosroes was enthroned. He was a puny weakling prince, whom the Romans did not venture to expose on the battlefield; and after the Greek army had retired he made peace with Persia, and paid a tribute to that power as well as to the court of Constantinople. Moses would have us believe that he was wholly given to pleasure and not to business, but still he lets it appear that his pleasures were manly sports, and that he had plenty to occupy him in which he did not acquit himself altogether amiss. St. Martin gives a different account, and makes Chosroes himself perform what Moses attributes to his generals (*Mém. sur l'Arm.* i. 307), but gives no authorities. A pestilence induced him to transfer the seat of government from Artaxata to Dovin, a healthier site on a hill near the river Eleutherus, where he planted a park (Mos. Chor. iii. 6, 8). Manazirus, the general of his southern army, which included a Cilician force, slew Bacurius, routed his Persian allies,

^b M. Paulin Martin also refers to Eustathius of Epiphania, d. A.D. 502 (Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, iv. 133).

invaded Assyria, and carried off captives from Nisibis, and among them eight deacons of Bishop James. The bishop followed to expostulate, and when expostulations failed, cursed him. The curse, if we are to believe Moses, did not fail. Manazirus died the death of Herod; his province was blighted with drought; his sovereign was wroth and released the captives; his son became a noted penitent (*ib.* 7). Sapor, whose policy it was to set the Arsacids against each other, stirred the Arsacid king of the Massagetae to invade Armenia, but the latter was routed by Bazarat, and by Vahan, a Christian satrap, who slew a gigantic champion (Mos. Chor. iii. 9; St. Martin, *l. c.*; Patkan. p. 139). Therefore Chosroes ceased remitting tribute to Persia, and sent it all to the emperor, along with a request for a Greek army. But he died before the fresh war began, after a reign of nine years. (Mos. Chor. iii. 10.)

St. Martin has not explained why he assigns this reign to the years 316–325 (*Mém.* i. 413). Moses of Chorene (iii. 8) distinctly fixes the accession of Chosroes to the 8th year of Costandus (Constantius), A.D. 345, so that his death would be in A.D. 354, and Patkanien evidently sees no reason against following him (p. 140); while Gibbon points out two clear reasons in favour of doing so (ch. 18, note 58), the agreement between his narrative and the allusions in Julian's speech upon Constantius (pp. 20, 21); and the occurrence of the name of Antiochus in an inferior office a few years before (Godofred. *Cod. Theod.* t. vi. p. 350). We may add that just before the date assigned to the petition to the emperor, Sapor was instituting a bitter, religious persecution (Patk. 154, from the life of St. Schmavon). Rawlinson has simply followed St. Martin. They have thus much in their favour that reigns, which together make up 60 years, have to be compressed into 30 otherwise.

CHOSROES III., of Armenia, was a Christian prince set over Persarmenia, when it was ceded by a treaty concluded in the name of the infant emperor Arcadius, A.D. 384, while his father Theodosius was busy in the West. The Persian king who appointed him was Sapor, and his reason was that Arsaces, the brother of Chosroes, in retiring from those regions as agreed, had carried all the satraps and almost all the population with him. For this reason Sapor appointed Chosroes, and invited the satraps back (Mos. Chor. iii. 42). All returned, except half a dozen or so of Arsaces' chief friends, and moreover four of his own satraps deserted to Chosroes. These were the knight Isaac, his brother's daughter's husband, and, as soon as they could follow, Surenas Vahanus, and Ascharades, who brought the treasures of Arsaces with them. Hence there was war between Arsaces and Chosroes. The Romans and Persians left them to fight it out. Arsaces was beaten, fled to a church, and there died of fever, A.D. 386 (*ib.* 43–46). Then the Romans appointed no successor to his throne, but made the strongest of the satraps, Gazavon, son of Spandaret, who had protected his master's flight, chief ruler, and sent a *resident* or "count" of their own to be set over him, instead of a king. This displeased Gazavon and the satraps, who, with the exception of Samuel the Mamiconian, sent in their

allegiance to Chosroes. He accepted it, promised to protect them from Greek procurators, then sent envoys to Arcadius, requesting the office of count for himself. The request was granted. Chosroes proceeded to appoint Isaac, sixth in descent from Gregory, to the hereditary episcopate vacant by the death of Aspuraces or Asburas his kinsman. Sapor thought he should have been consulted, and made it a pretext of war. Chosroes applied to Constantinople for help, but applied in vain. Sapor sent his son Ardeshir into Armenia. Chosroes yielded himself up, and his brother, Bahram Shapur, was appointed king of Armenia. In the next chapter (51) Moses' history seems to be much confused. A dead warrior bishop seems to take his way into Persia, to beg that his son-in-law may succeed him. Probably he took the precaution before his own decease. The letter of Ardeshir making the grant recognised both the murder of Chosroes I. and the cure of his son as merits of the house of Anak. Then Ardeshir died, and Bahram Kirmanshah succeeded to the Persian throne, released Chosroes from his dungeon, and kept him a prisoner at large in the fortress called Oblivion. On the death of Bahram Shapur, which happened after twenty-one years, Isaac went to the court of Isdegerd, to beg that Chosroes might be set on the throne again. Isdegerd was at that time well inclined towards the Christians, and the request was granted, but Chosroes died within the year, probably A.D. 411 (Mos. Chor. iii. 55).

Here again there are more serious chronological difficulties. If we accept the account of Moses, we must suppose the reign of Sapor I. prolonged till A.D. 384, nay 386, and even 389. But on almost all other grounds he is supposed to have died in 380. And again, the reigns that intervene between the death of Sapor and accession of Isdegerd should make up 31 years instead of 21. If Ardeshir were regent for Sapor III. the mistake would easily arise. Procopius (*Aed. Just.* iii. 1, p. 245) gives a different tale (*cf. Bell. Pers.* ii. 3); so does Gibbon (ch. 32 *fin.*).

The Roman part of Armenia remained a Roman country. Theodosius the second built Theodosiopolis near the sources of the Euphrates to strengthen it (Mos. Chor. iii. 59).

CHOSROES I., of Persia (A.D. 531–579), better known in the East as NUSHIRVAN or ANUSHIRVAN. Under this head we have also to treat of the history of his father Cabades, and of the sect of Masdek.

Birth and Name.—He died at the age of 74 (*Shah Nameh*), and therefore was born in A.D. 505. This agrees with the description of him at his accession. "Because of his goodness, his justice, his dignity, his learning, and his piety, they named him Nushirvan ('Sweet soul') for his face was young and his power was new" (*ib.* p. 157).

It does not however agree with the story of his birth related in that poem. His father Cabades was over 80 years of age when he died in A.D. 531, and must therefore have been considerably over 50 when he begat Chosroes in 505, and himself have been born not later than 450. He is indeed spoken of as an old man in A.D. 502, by Joannes Lydus (*De Magistr.* iii. 53, p. 245).

Now the story of the birth of Chosroes told

in the *Shah Nameh*, is as follows:—His grandfather Pirouz (Perozes, پرویز), in an expedition against the Heitalians or Ephthalites or White Huns, a people to the east, fell into a pitfall and perished, with his army and the princes. Cabades alone was taken alive. Balasch, youngest son of Perozes, who had been left on the throne, was too young to attempt anything, but Suferai, of Shiraz, governor of Cabul, marched against the Huns, and made them give up their prisoners. Balasch embraced his brother, but did not yield the throne (pp. 95, 121). Suferai really governed. After four years he told Balasch that he was unfit to reign, and Balasch accordingly made way for Cabades, who was then 16 years of age and transferred the court from Istakhar to Ctesiphon (pp. 121–125). Suferai was omnipotent. But in four or five years, when Cabades came of age, it was represented to him that he was only king in name. He therefore sent for Shapur, the commander-in-chief, who advised him to write an angry letter to Suferai, who was at Shiraz. Shapur marched upon the place: Suferai surrendered and was put to death (pp. 127–133). All Iran was angry, and rose and made Djamasp, younger brother of Cabades, king, and gave Cabades in charge to Rezmihir, son of the murdered Suferai, who forgave him, released him, and escaped with him to the Huns. On his way, Cabades asked the daughter of his host, the Dihkam, in marriage. He left her in her father's house. The king of the Huns upbraided Cabades for his breach of faith and disloyalty to him, and told him he was served right; but gave him an army, on the promise of the cession of a province.

For terror of the troops of China and of Rome, the people induced Djamasp, a child of ten, to submit himself to his brother. The child was freely pardoned. Then the daughter of Dihkam met Cabades and presented him with a son. This was Chosroes. Rezmihir became as omnipotent as his father Suferai had been before him.

"Things passed so," says Firdusi, "till Kesra grew and became a valiant and haughty young man; then Kobad entrusted to the sages this fresh and fruitful branch. He ordered all the affairs of Iran and Turan, and raised the crown of his power to the sky. Then he led his army into the land of Rome, and fashioned it with his hand like a ball of wax. He made it a desert of brambles, and two cities sought his protection. The name of the one was Hindia, and of the other Farikin. He taught them the Zendavesta, and gave them the true faith" (*Shah Nameh*, vi. 141). Farikin is Martyropolis.

We might try to remove the difficulty by supposing that it was not Chosroes but some other son, with whom Cabades was presented on this occasion by the lady of his amour; as shortly before the birth of Chosroes, Cabades was certainly engaged, not in ridding himself of his ministers, or fleeing for his life, but in leading his armies against Syria. We can hardly say we are confirmed in making this change in the story by the authority of Eutychius, for he calls the prince, who was born of this lady, Babudacht, and *-dacht* means daughter. But, however we might separate the birth of Chosroes from

the events above narrated, it is manifest that if Cabades was 16 at his accession and over 80 at his death, he reigned more than sixty-four years. Authorities vary between 68 years for his reign and about 40; but the testimony of Agathias, who had the Persian annals translated to him by Sergius, is decisive in favour of the shorter period. Firdusi has erred in making Balash son of Perozes, whereas he was brother, and, in saying that he abdicated when he was really removed by death, has thrown the accession of Cabades back far too early (perhaps by confusion with an earlier regency of Suferai); he has postponed the mention of the war with Rome and of the rise of Masdekism some twenty years, and so has given a false account of the submissiveness of Cabades to his ministers, and obscured the true grounds of it. The political adventures depended on the relations of the religious sects. (Agath. iv. 27, 28, 30.)

Christianity and Zoroastrianism in Armenia were in the thick of a struggle for life and death, at the very time when Chosroes' father was born. In A.D. 450, which was about the time of the birth of Cabades, Yesdigerd II. was on the throne of Persia. We are able to fix the year of his reign, for a treaty with Rome, which Lazarus assigns to his second year, is fixed by other considerations to A.D. 441. Thus we obtain an era for the comparison of Oriental and Byzantine history. In A.D. 450 we find the nobles of Armenia summoned to a great council, to consider the invitation, addressed to them by the Persian viceroy, to renounce Christianity and embrace Zoroastrianism. As the document that throws most light on the creed of Chosroes, and the state of the church in his realms, we give this proclamation here.

"Mihir-Nerseh to the great commanders and princes of great Armenia: health. Ye shall know that every man that dwelleth under heaven and followeth not the religion of the Masdeyans is blind, deaf and deceived by the fiery serpent of the devils. When heaven and earth were not yet, the great God Zervan made a prayer for 1000 years, and said: 'Perhaps a son will be born to me called Ormuzd, who will make heaven and earth.' He then conceived two children in his womb, one for praying, and the other for saying, Perhaps. When he knew that they were both in his womb, he said, 'He who shall first come forth, to him will I give the empire.' He who had been conceived in unbelief, broke his womb, and came forth. Zervan said to him, 'Who art thou?' He answered, 'Thy son Ormuzd.' 'My son is gleaming with light, and spreads a good smell,' answered Zervan, 'while thou art dark and friend of evil.' And as he wept very bitterly his father gave him the empire for 1000 years, and named him Ahriman. Then he engendered another son, whom he called Ormuzd, and he took away the empire from Ahriman and gave it to this other, saying 'To-day I address to thee my prayer, address thine to me.' Then Ormuzd created heaven and earth, but Ahriman created evil. The creatures were thus shared between them: the angels come of Ormuzd, and the devils of Ahriman: all the good things that come from the heavens and from here below proceed equally from Ormuzd; and all the evils that diffuse themselves there and here are alike from Ahriman. All the good in heaven, 'tis

* Perhaps Pocock has misrendered him; St. Martin says he calls the lady Babudacht.

Ormuzd that made it; all the evil has been produced by Ahriman. All the hates, the misfortunes that come, the disastrous wars, are the effects of the bad side, but on the other hand happy things, empire, glory, light, health of body, beauty of face, truth of word, length of life, take their being from the good principle and all that is so, is from him. But evil is mingled in all. All the people that say that God created death and that good and evil come of Him are in error; as the Christians, to wit, who say that God, angry because his servant had eaten a fig, made death, and chastised man with this punishment. Then is God capable of anger, and though He be not man, He hath something in common with man; besides that though He be God He is likened to men; also one may rightly say that he who speaketh thus is deaf, blind, and deceived by the serpent of the devils. There has come also another error which is that of the folk who say: 'God that made heaven and earth is come and hath been born of a certain woman that was called Mary, whose husband was named Joseph,' and many are the people who have been deceived by this man. The land of the Romans which follows this gross error is in the profoundest ignorance; they are entirely deprived of religion; which causes the loss of their souls. Ye also, why have ye followed their senseless errors? Embrace the religion of your master; embrace it, for we have to give account of you before God. Believe not your chiefs, whom ye call Nazarenes, for they are great hypocrites, and they teach you by their words, while by their actions they do nothing. 'To eat meat,' they say, 'is no sin,' and yet they eat it not. 'To take a wife,' they say, 'is a suitable thing,' and yet they will not even look upon a woman. According to them, he who amasseth riches doth a great sin. They praise poverty much more than riches; they brag of it, and injure the rich; they insult the name of fortune, and mock at those who are covered with glory. They love filth in their apparel, and prefer vile things to things honourable. They praise death, and despise life; they disdain to beget a man, and boast of barrenness. If you listen to them, and go near women no more, the end of the world will come soon. I will not, in this writing, combat all they say; but what they have written most detestable of all whereof we have spoken is, that God has been crucified by men, has died, has been buried, and then that He has risen and ascended to the heavens. Would it not be unworthy of you to make an answer to such detestable opinions? The devils, who are wicked, cannot be taken and tormented by men, and so it would be with the God that hath made all creatures. It is shameful for us and for you to listen to things so unworthy of belief. There are only two things for you to do; either to make an answer article by article, or else to make one and come to court that we may meet face to face amid a great session of judgment" (St. Martin, *Mémoires sur l'Arménie*, ii. 472).

The Triumph of Christianity in Armenia.—The nobles were summoned to court and compelled, by threats of torture, to apostatise; Marcian was too insecure on his throne, and too busy with the Eutychemians at home to help the patriots; the renegades, as often happens, proved the cruellest persecutors. In a year or two all

resistance was subdued, except that some preferred to take refuge in Greece (where they became valiant supporters of the throne, fore-runners of the Paulicians, or some of them ancestors of emperors), or in Khurdistan or the gorges of the Caucasus. But the resistance had done its work; the attempt to stamp out the faith in the conquered country ceased. Instead of persecution; bribes, and tempting offers on the one hand, and all manner of petty annoyance on the other, were the suaves employed to induce the Armenians to renounce their faith. These methods succeeded only too well. On the death of Yesdigerd, his sons disputed the throne. After about a year, Hormuzd succumbed, and Perozes, *i.e.* Victor, took the kingdom. In his seventh year, after twelve years' captivity, the Armenian princes were allowed to return to their lands (A.D. 464). But the hindrances in the way of Christians continued. In A.D. 475, the patriarch Gioud (Jude?) was deposed for his over-zeal, and one Christopher put in his place. And Christopher, not long after, was hampered by the free leave extended to the Nestorians—a kind of Christians who found no favour, and had no dealings, with the hostile power of Rome—to make converts where they would. Prince Vahan (A.D. 478) thought it prudent to apostatise, and even so was compelled to leave his son at court as a hostage. At length, the revolt of Vakhthank, king of Georgia, who slew a Zoroastrian and persecuting king, was the signal for renewed revolt in Armenia. Vahan retraced his course, and atoned for apostasy by desertion and treason. Once at the head of his countrymen he fought with vigour. Whether as commander or fugitive he was a thorn in the side of the Persians. Then followed the overthrow of Perozes by the Ephthalites narrated above. Shapur, from Armenia, Zarmihr (Rezmihir), from Georgia, were at once recalled. Vahan was left master of Armenia; Varghash (Balash, Blasius, Vologeses) was made king of Persia. Shapur and Zarmihr represented the necessity of pacifying Armenia. One Nikhor was appointed to the task. He entered into negotiations with Vahan. Terms of agreement were drawn up and settled, and only waited the ratification of the king. These terms were as follows:—1. Free exercise of Christianity without annoyance. 2. Destruction of all the fire-altars in Armenia. 3. No government offices to be given to perverts to Zoroastrianism. 4. Justice and rewards to be administered equitably. 5. The government of Armenia to be carried on by the king in person, not by deputies. Suddenly the help of Nikhor was summoned to put down the revolt of Zareh, son of Perozes. He invited Vahan and the Armenians to prove their loyalty and worth by assisting him. Vahan consented, and despatched a body of horse. The Armenians (says their compatriot) did wonders. Zareh was defeated and put to death. Then the demands of the loyal insurgents were accorded. Vahan was well-received at court, and was welcomed in solemn procession by the aged patriarch John, with all the clergy. Then Nikhor was superseded by Andekan, and Andekan by Vahan himself. The state religionists flocked back to the churches. Such, extracted from the report of St. Martin in his additions to Lebeau (*Bas Empire*, vii. 259–315), is the account of Lazarus P'harbetsi, c. 54–87.

Shapur and Zarmihr, who here appear as counselling Balash to grant peace to the church of Armenia, are represented (as we have seen) in the *Shah Nameh*, the one as suggesting, the other as condoning the murder of Suferai, who deposed Balash. Moreover it appears from Procopius that the Hunnic rule lasted for two years, *i.e.* he was shaken off by Balash before the close of his reign, and yet that the tribute to the Huns was paid by Cabades till he was firm on the throne, *i.e.* till he had rid himself of Suferai, whose death seems to be the grievance urged by the king of the Huns against Cabades. Suferai appears to have disliked the Christians, and favoured the Huns, in which last particular his son Rezmihir seems to have followed him.

Our Armenian authorities stop short of the reversal of the policy of Balash that followed on the accession of Cabades and lasted till Rezmihir assumed the reins of power. But we have it on the evidence of another contemporary chronicler. Joshua the Stylite (11, 12) speaks of three wars of Perozes with the Huns. In the first he was assisted by Roman gold, which he claimed according to the treaty of offensive and defensive alliance between Rome and Persia. He was at first successful and added several provinces to his empire, then was taken prisoner and was ransomed by Roman gold. He broke treaty with the Huns, and was captured a second time. The ransom was fixed at thirty mules' burden of gold; he paid down twenty, left his son TNP (Cabades) as a hostage for the remainder; redeemed him, and renewed the war. His army perished, and as for himself, none knew what became of him. These events are referred to the reign of Zeno (A.D. 474-491). Balash, his brother, succeeded, and asked aid of Zeno in vain; for he was told that the revenues that he derived from Nisibis, which should have been restored to the Romans in A.D. 483, ought to suffice him. For lack of Roman support, Balash, who had sought to build baths, was suppressed by the Magi, and Cabades was set on the throne. His embassy to Rome found Anastasius in possession of the empire. Anastasius, finding that Cabades had been endeavouring to force a peculiarly hateful form of Zoroastrianism, which permitted promiscuous concubinage, on the Armenians, rejected his demands. The Armenians took courage, demolished the fire-temples, slew the Magi, destroyed the marzban (or marquis) and armament that were sent against them. The Qadusians (their name appears to be derived from Qavadēs) and Tamurians (a race otherwise unknown) revolted. In the general confusion the subject Arabs ravaged Persia. About the time of the suppression of the Isaurian revolt (A.D. 497), an attempt to assassinate Cabades forced him to flee to the Ephthalites. Zamasphes took the kingdom. Cabades married the daughter whom his own sister had borne to the Ephthalite king. He returned with an Ephthalite army: the Qadusians and Tamurians submitted; the Arabs were attracted to his standard by hopes of war with Rome; the Armenians were brought over by promises of religious freedom. On Thursday night, August 22, A.D. 502, an aurora borealis blazed, and an earthquake overthrew Acē. On the morrow Cabades invaded the empire.

The chronology is thus made fairly clear.

Isdegerdes died in his 19th year, A.D. 457; Vakhthank revolted in the 25th year of Perozes, *i.e.* reckoning his accession from his father's death, A.D. 482. After two campaigns followed the great overthrow of the Persians, A.D. 484. The reign of Vologeses (Balash), variously reckoned at four or six years, brings us to A.D. 489 for the accession of Cabades, A.D. 499 will be his 11th, A.D. 531 his 43rd year. It is between these two years that his extant coins range (Rawlinson, p. 378). In his 11th year he was deposed, and the four years of Zamasphes bring us to A.D. 502. The flight of Cabades to the Huns very shortly preceded his declaration of war against Rome in A.D. 502. We are told (Procop. *Bell. Pers.* i. 7), that it was in order to pay his debt to them that he made the claim upon the Romans (Joan. Lyd. *Magistr.* iii. 52, 53) for their share of the expenses of the fort erected against those Huns and Eastern foes, the refusal of which was made the ground of war. In A.D. 504, we find him again recalled to withstand an Ephthalite invasion. Either the amour of Cabades and birth of Chosroes belong to this slightly later date, or the child used to misreckon his age, as though his life began when he first knew his father.

The Masdekites.—One obstacle remains in the way of our following what Hamza calls *the lesser book of lives*, and giving Cabades 43 years only, instead of following the greater and giving him 68. Cabades must have been forty at his accession. At fifty he was a formidable and determined captain; how was it that at forty he was a mere puppet?

Hamza of Ispahan supplies the answer, taking up the story where the Armenians drop it. "When Cabades was freed from his captivity, and had taken the kingdom, he did not mind the death, nor the murderers of his father; the realm went to ruin *because the king gave his thoughts to a future life*; the Persians exulted in crimes, and Zencidism abounded. The author of that superstition was Masdek, son of Bamsadan, a mage, who gathered the credulous around him and promised them a kingdom" (Hamza, p. 83).

Tabari names this Masdek in Cabades's 12th year; Firdusi not till after his restoration, even after his war with Rome and the coming of age of Chosroes. His tale runs thus. In a time of famine, Masdek, the chief treasurer, told the king a story: "A man was serpent-bitten; another had an antidote, and would not give it him." "He is worthy of death," said the king. Masdek repeated the fable and the royal sentence to the starving people, and they broke open the granaries. The king expostulated. Masdek answered: "I did but tell them what you said, softly, softly." The king was silenced.

Both Firdusi and Tabari tell of a famine in the days of Perozes. According to Tabari, Perozes was a tyrant till his seventh year; then famine came; he repented, and for seven long years, at his own cost, sustained his people, and only one person starved, a neglect for which he was very penitent. This state charity synchronises with the return of the exiles to Armenia.

Whatever the origin of Perozes's policy, Cabades followed it further. The permanent mensuration of the land, estimation of its productiveness, and reduction of the taxes to a

regular tithe, instead of an arbitrary and unlimited demand of the tax-collector, are measures attributed to Cabades and to the influence of Masdek (*Shah Nameh*, vi. 167).

But Masdekism had a darker side. Procopius tells us that Cabades used his power tyrannically, and brought in a law that Persians should have their wives in common. Therefore they rose and deposed him, and bound him and kept him in prison. He then tells how his wife (others say sister, possibly both) made the jailor enamoured of her, thus gained admission, and smuggled the king out of his confinement. (Agathias did not find this romance in the annals.) Seoses was ready to carry him off to the Huns, where he married their king's daughter, and borrowed an army, and returned and put out the eyes of his uncle Blases, who had been made king in his stead (Procop. i. 5-7, pp. 25, 31-33). Agathias corrects this confusion of Balash and Djamasp. Procopius adds that he raised Seoses to a military rank before unknown, "Adrastadarsalan," was himself quick-witted and active, and held the reins of state tightly. Seoses is none other than Zarmihir or Rezmihir.

Eutychius, who mentions famine at the close of the 5th century (pp. 131, 132), says that men were kept to their allegiance by fear of Soacherai, therefore stirred the king to get rid of him; that after his death Masdek made a convert of Cobad (Cabades), but afterwards, when the Masdekites were strong, they themselves confined that monarch and set up Ramasp, but were beaten by Bazarmihir, and Cobad restored (p. 176).

Both stories may be true. Cabades must have made himself intolerable to those who were not Masdekites, while, on the other hand, he can hardly have contented those who were; and we shall see Masdek decreeing very similar confinement for such as professed his faith and did not put it in practice.

Joshua the Stylite speaks of the detestable heresy of Zoroaster, which Cabades tried to force on the Armenians, as enjoining incest and promiscuous concubinage. He agrees with Procopius, Tabari, Mirkhond, and Agathias in representing the detestation of this doctrine by the Persians as the cause of their revolt; with Hamza in describing the doctrine as creating anarchy in Arabia. Hareth, son of Amr, son of Hodjr-Akil-morar, who is said by Hamza to have been a Zendikite, was of Kendite race, and quite distinct from the Ghassanide Hareth, son of Abu Shamir, the Christian Aretas. He drove Al Mondar, the Saracen, the old vassal of Persia, from the kingdom of Hira, but had himself no settled court (Hamza, pp. 84, 85).

It was not only in the far East that the communist Masdek found followers. Two monuments were found in 1823 in the Cyrenaic country, one bearing a Greek, the other a bilingual (Greek and Phoenician) inscription. On the first is a circle enclosing a cross, with the names of Osiris and Simon the Cyrenian, and then this legend: "Thoth, Cronos, Zoroastres, Pythagoras, Epicurus, Masdakes, John, Christ and our Cyrenaic teachers, with one voice give us charge to make nothing our own, but to support the laws, and to put down lawbreaking. For this is the spring of justice, this is to live blessedly in common."

The second bears in Phoenician letters Jehovah (or Judas) over a winged, snake-drawn car, like

that of the Demeter of the mysteries, with two lighted torches.

Then follows (still in Phoenician):—

Salvation: commonalty: spring of justice.

Salvation: justice: benefit of law.

Salvation: law: bond of salvation.

Gesenius gives a different version.

The Greek follows; the writing is *Βουστροφρόδον*, and the date below is the third year of the 88th Olympiad, B.C. 434; a lame pretence at antiquity. The legend runs: "Community of all goods and wives is the spring of divine justice, and perfect peace for the good men who are elect out of the blind crowd, whom Zarades and Pythagoras, best of hierophants, have set to live together in common"^a (St. Martin, additions to Lebeau, *Bas Empire*, vii. 338-342; Matter, *Hist. du Gnosticisme*, t. ii. pp. 288-310).

Whatever forms Masdekism took in the West, in the East it was distinctly an offshoot of Zoroastrianism. It does not seem to have made any attempt to engraft itself on Christianity. It lived on in Georgia and Persia till the time of Aurengzebe, when it was described for us in the Dabistan (Eng. transl., Paris, 1843, vol. i. 372). Masdek's book, the *Desnad*, and a translation of it into modern Persian were then extant. He does not seem at all to have put good and evil on a greater equality than other Persians. "The worship of the Lord is most meet as His kingdom is immense, and Ahriman has no power except in the elemental world; in the next place, the spirit of every one devoted to God ascends on high, whither Ahriman cannot come, but that of Ahriman's servants abideth in hell." "The works of light result from choice, but those of darkness from chance; the union of light and darkness is accidental, and the disengagement of light from darkness is also accidental; when light is severed from darkness the compound is dissolved, which means resurrection." "Almost all contentions have been caused by riches and women." "It is very unfair that one man's wife should be lovely, and another's ugly; justice and religion demand that they should exchange for a short time." "If a man's co-religionist prove unable to get wealth, or shew proofs of insanity, he is to be confined to the house, and measures adopted to provide him with food, clothing, and all requisites. Whoever assents not to these arrangements is a follower of Ahriman; they get contributions from him by compulsion." We learn from Mirkhond (p. 353), that Masdek was of Istakhar; that he deluded the king by a false miracle, pretending to make the sacred fire speak; that he wore a woollen robe; and that he forbade the slaughter of animals for food, a practice the lawfulness of which was always debated among the later Zoroastrians, so that there is no special reason to suppose Buddhist influence. Now Mirkhond is well acquainted with the history of Mani, and gives not the

^a We append the Greek: *Χριστός τε καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι Κουραναῖκοι καθηγηταὶ συμφάνως ἐντέλλωσιν* (sic St. M.) *ἡμῖν, μὴδὲν οἰκεοποιεῖσθαι, τοῖς δὲ νόμοις ἀρρήγειν* (sic St. M.; he curiously misrenders) *καὶ τὴν παρανομίαν καταπολεμεῖν. τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τῆς δικαιοσύνης πηγή, τοῦτο τὸ μακαρίως ἐν κοινῇ ζῆν. 2. Ἡ πασῶν οὐσιῶν καὶ γυναικῶν κοινότης πηγή τῆς θείας ἐστὶ δικαιοσύνης, εἰρήνῃ τε τελείᾳ τοῖς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ὅχλου ἐκλεκτοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν, οὓς Ζαραδάς τε καὶ Πυθαγόρας, τῶν ἱεροφαντῶν ἀρίστοι, κοινῇ συμβιωτέην συνίεντο.*

slightest hint of any connexion between Masdekism and Manicheanism. He represents Mani's doctrine as stamped out at once in Persia (p. 296) long before the time of Masdek. He mentions the permission of incest among the doctrines of Masdek, thus agreeing with Josua Stylites, but the *Dabistan* says nothing of this. It mentions another sect, the Akhshiyans or Materialists, who denied a future life, opposed all conventionalism, and made pleasure the chief good, and speaks of them as encouraging incest and applauding adultery, but only where the husband willingly lends his wife. The Zenda-vesta permits the marriage of a brother and sister (*Dabistan*, i. 208, 209).

Theophanes (A.M. 6016) tells us that the Manicheans had the rearing of Phthasuarsas, the third son of Cabades, whom his own daughter Sambuca had borne to him, and that they made him of their way of thinking.

The third son of Cabades (as we learn from Procopius) was Chosroes, a slightly different form of whose name some Greek has here striven in vain to represent.

We may hope, however, that Chosroes' mother was only niece, and not also daughter, of his father. That Chosroes was converted to the tenets of Masdek will be proved false. That he was trained by Masdekites is likely enough. All agree that his father, after his restoration, continued to adhere to that sect, though not to enforce it on others.

War with Rome.—When Cabades breaks in upon the Roman world, and, as John the Lydian says, "flames" (*ἐπλέγμανε*), we get some glimpse of his character, and begin to understand the influence of Masdek over him. In A.D. 502 he entered, "self-announced," into Roman Armenia, overran it, took Theodosiopolis, through the cowardice of Constantine the commandant, and besieged the impregnable Amida. James of Endjela, a hermit, one day's journey thence, was shot at by his Ephthalite archers. Their arms withered up, but at the request of Cabades, James prayed and healed them. Cabades bade him name for his reward any boon he chose. He asked that his hermitage, a wicker cage, might be a sanctuary for fugitives, and it was respected. Grossly insulted by the women on the walls of Amida, Cabades was taught by his magi to see in it a good omen. The bishop of the city was lately dead. The tower next his mine being guarded by monks, he made the close of a festival (Jan. 10, A.D. 503, according to Josua), when they were weary with services and filled with meat, the time of his assault, drew his sword and drove his men up the ladders (Procop. i. 7). He entered on an elephant, put the place to the sword, slaughtered 80,000 (Patkanién, p. 179). An old priest met him, and said, "It is not kingly to slay prisoners." "Why did you choose to fight us?" asked the king. "God meant thee to take us by thy valour, not by our choice," was the answer; and it stopped the carnage. On his return to Persia, Cabades released his captives (Proc. *ib.*). But Edessa proved divinely impregnable. On entering one of the churches he was shewn a picture of Christ, and adored it, saying He had appeared to him and commanded him to continue the siege. [CELER (2).]

One important fact is told by Eutychius (p.

131). Cabades at this time sent a great army into Egypt, and burnt with fire all that was outside the walls of Alexandria. This may help to explain how Masdekism found its way to Cyrene.

Cabades had derived benefit from the Greco-Roman baths in an illness that came upon him in this invasion. He determined to introduce them into Persia, and succeeded in doing so. Thus a feature of the civilisation of the empire, against which the church set itself, was conveyed to the East and preserved there.

The war then begun lasted with slight intermissions till after the accession of Chosroes; indeed there was no more any lasting peace between Persia and Rome. (See also Josua Stylites, and Zach. Melit. cc. 9, 10, col. 1155-1164.)

Reception of the Christians of Persia into favour.—Theophanes tells us that in A.D. 512 Cabades cut the ankles of some of the Christians in Persia, and that they walked afterwards. Theodorus (ii. 34) says that in A.D. 516 Cabades desired to take a treasure castle named Tsubdadesar, on the confines of India. But the devils kept too good a watch around. After trying every device of the magi, and then of the Jews, he called in a bishop of the Christians, who performed divine service, and partook of the holy sacrament, and approached the place and drove out the devils, and gave it over to Cabades without trouble. Cabades, struck with this sign of power, honoured the bishop with the first seat (whereas till then Manicheans and Jews had sat above him), and gave free leave to all who wished to be baptized. India here means Arabia.

Conversion of Colchis (Mingrelia), and proposed Roman adoption of Chosroes.—In A.D. 515, after the expiration of the seven years' truce made by CELER, Asia Minor was flooded with Huns, perhaps to teach the Romans from what ills Persia would protect them if they paid her.

Anastasius's successor, Justin (A.D. 518-527), shewed that he too could tamper with Huns. One Zilgibis was retained by both the powers. Cabades was politely informed of it by Justin, slew the Hun, and made peace with Rome, A.D. 522. Justin desired peace to give himself to church affairs.

Two things disturbed the treaty. (1) Tzathes, king of the Lazi, a people of Colchis, came to Constantinople to be baptized, and put himself under the protection of the Romans. He carried back a Christian wife, Valeriana. (2) Surprising to hear, and resting on only a single original testimony, but that one of unquestionable authority, the conditions of peace were to be the adoption of Chosroes by Justin. Justin was himself a barbarian, and childless. Chosroes would have shared, or filled, or more than filled, the place of Justinian. But the father's reasons for desiring this honour for his son are most curious. He had three sons, Caoses (Cambyses), the first born, who had best right; Zames (possibly the Zamasphes, who had for awhile filled his father's throne, and been disgraced for ever in consequence), and Chosroes. Zames was the popular favourite; Chosroes, his father's darling. For fear of the fratricidal factions that would follow on his death, Cabades wished to make the succession secure,—whether he hoped to content his sons by sharing the known world

among them, or to make his youngest indisputably paramount. Thus, after three centuries, the proposal of CARACALLA was echoed back. Justin and Justinian welcomed the proposal, but the pride of their subjects was too strong for them. Parchment title-deeds, it was answered, did not suit barbarians; they must win their heritage by the sword. The taunt stung Chosroes to the quick, and the failure of the negotiations was fatal to the son of Suferai (Procop. i. 11, p. 51).

The latter nobleman was accused by Mebodes (Mahboud), his fellow-plenipotentiary, of marring the negotiations by ill-timed complaints about Tzathes. This opponent of Byzantine baptisms had been the protector of native national churches. Raised to power, as we have surmised, by a combination of Zoroastrian and Masdekite malcontents, he diverged from both; and while Procopius tells us that he was accused of introducing new divinities, and, worst of all, of burying his wife undeveloped, Eutychius ascribes his fall to the instigation of the Masdekites. Unimpeachably just, he was insupportably arrogant; both sects seem to have hated him, and gratitude is too costly a luxury for sovereigns. His extraordinary office perished with him; the parties that joined against him were soon at each other's throats, and his royal betrayer bitterly regretted him.

A change of policy at once appeared. An attempt was made to force the Persian religion on the Georgians, or Iberians; they were forbidden to bury their dead. They appealed to Rome, and Probus was sent round the Black Sea to hire them Hunnish allies, but failed. They took refuge among the newly-converted Lazi, but these were unable to guard their own forts, and a Roman force could not subsist there. Iberia was subdued by the magi for another sixty years, and the Christian princes took refuge at Constantinople (Procop. i. 12, p. 58). Malelas tells us also that the Romans in Lazica fought each other, and were withdrawn, and so the Persians re-entered. Justin chose to retaliate by sending Belisarius—it was his first command—to ravage the one Christian province of Persia, Persarmenia (*ib.* p. 59). Belisarius then took command of the East; Procopius was his secretary.

The suppression of Masdekism (A.D. 528 or 529) was among the results of the death of Seoses.* Malelas (p. 444) learnt his tale from an eyewitness. In making it contemporaneous with the reappearance of Al Mondar the Saracen, as Persia's vassal in Arabia, he is confirmed by Hamza. Nor is it unnatural that the latter and many Easterns should make it subsequent to the death of Cabades; it so distinctly marked the accession of Chosroes to manhood and power. The *Shah Nameh*, as well as Malelas, speaks of the old king as yet alive. From Malelas' story, if it stood alone, we should not suspect Masdekism to be meant. As it is, it seems to point to an action and reaction between the heresies of Rome and Persia. In A.D. 527, under Justin and Justinian, he records the execution from city to city of many Manicheans; then between Sept. 528 and June 529 he says:

"At the same time the doctrine of the Manicheans reappeared in Persia, and when the king of Persia heard it he was wroth, and so were the chief magi; for the Manicheans had made them a bishop, named Indarazar. And the king of Persia called a conclave, and got possession of them all, and of the bishop of the Manicheans, and gave orders to his armed force that stood by him, and they hewed down with swords all the Manicheans and their bishop with his clergy, and they were all slain in the presence of the king and of the bishop of the Christians; and their properties were confiscated, and he gave their churches to the Christians, sending out his divine ordinances in the commonwealth administered by him, that a Manichee when found should be burnt with fire, and he burnt up all their books. Which things one Bartagarius, of the Persians, related, who when baptized changed his name to Timothy." The mention of churches and a bishop, and of the burning of their books, seems to shew that the sect was really Manichean, or semi-Christian, a development of Masdekism driven back from the West (Malel. p. 444).

Theophanes gives a different account of the king's motives. "The Manicheans said to Phthasuarsas, 'Your father is old, and the archimages will make one of your brothers king. We can persuade your father to abdicate and appoint you, that the Manichean dogma may everywhere prevail.' And he agreed to do so (*i.e.* to become a Manichee) if he should reign thereby. And when Cabades knew it he called a conclave to make his son Phthasuarsas king, and bade all the Manichees be present with their wives and children, and likewise the archimage Glonazes, and the Christian bishop Bazanes, whom Cabades loved as a most excellent physician. He bade the Manichees sever themselves; then slew them in the sight of the archimage and the Christian bishop. And when Justin heard it, he too made a great persecution of the Manichees." Michael the Syrian tells the same story, but for Phthasuarsas writes Chosroes (Patkanian).

The tale in the *Shah Nameh* is as follows. Masdek had great influence with Cabades, but Chosroes would not listen to him. Masdek seized his hand: Chosroes turned away. At last the prince said he was open to conviction. Let them have a great conference, and decide which was the true religion, Masdek's or Zoroaster's. Chosroes' argument was, "If all things are to be had in common, a child will not know its own father." This was conclusive. Masdek was asked into a garden to see the fruits of his doctrine. He saw a gibbet, was hung head downwards, and beaten to death. Some say that Masdek had asked the king's daughter in marriage (pp. 143-155). According to others, it was Chosroes' own mother that the prophet demanded, and to save her from his embraces Chosroes had to stoop to an indignity he could never forget: "I kissed thy feet, and their stench is yet in my nostrils" (Pocock, quoted by Gibbon, xlii. n. 40).

The *Kamel Al Tevarikh*, or *Universal History* (13th century), stated that Masdek and Al Mondar were one day together before Nushirvan, who said that before he mounted the throne he desired two things, to reinstate Al Mondar and to exterminate the Masdekites. "Destroy then,"

* Theophanes dates the slaughter of the Manichees A.D. 424, but a careful study of more competent authorities, or even of his own story, proves him wrong.

said Masdek, "all there are of us, if you can." Before noon, 100,000 were gibbeted (Mirkhond, p. 362).

These various accounts seem to relate to one event, to be illustrated by the occurrences that led up to it. The Christianity of Armenia was Monophysite. Nestorians, the sect most opposed to the Monophysites, had been driven to take refuge in Persia by Zeno (A.D. 485). At this time Justinian was, so to speak, purging off upon Persia the religious rancours of the Roman empire. He was expelling the Monophysites to a region where the dominant form of Christianity, the Nestorian, was yet more opposed to their own. Many Monophysite refugees, expelled by Anastasius or Justin, had been converted by the Nestorian patriarch, Silas. On the death of Silas there was a schism in the church of Persia between two rival patriarchs—the physician of Cabades, a married Nestorian, called Elisaeus, son-in-law of Silas, supported by most of the bishops, and consecrated at Ctesiphon the seat of the court; and one Narses consecrated at Seleucia (as had been the custom) by the bishop of Nisibis (Le Quien, ii. 1116). Unless the Persians reckoned the years of Alexander differently to the Greeks, the death of Silas belongs to A.D. 523, to which year Theophanes refers our conclave. The schism was only terminated after twelve or fifteen years by the death of Narses and deposition of Elisaeus. One sect of the Monophysites, that of the Incorrupticolae, was reproached with Manicheism. Before the sects diverged the name may have been applied to both. Manichee was in fact a common term of reproach. In Persian, the same term, Zendik, was applied to the Manicheans (Langlois, ii. 376) and the Masdekites. We have seen that Al Mondar had been driven from Hira by a Zendik. According to Theodore the Reader he had been baptized, and Severus, the leader of the other party of the Monophysites, the Corrupticolae, sent two bishops to bring him over to his own way of thinking. Al Mondar informed them that the archangel Michael had just died, and when they were incredulous, demanded, "How then can God be crucified?" (Theod. Lect. ii. 35.)

Justinian's persecutions had deeply affected Arabia. In Yemen, Dsu Novas (Dimnus, Dunaas), "King Curly," tenant of a throne which he had won some twenty years before, when a mere boy, by stabbing a monster of unnatural lust named Dsu Shanatir, had become a Jewish proselyte, and, in retaliation for Justinian's persecution of the Jews, attacked the Roman merchants, dug a pit, and burnt the Christians in it. Therefore the Abyssinian Christians made an alliance with Justinian, and conquered Yemen (Procop. B. P. 19, 20; Hamza, p. 106; Tabari, ii. 179; Malel, p. 433). Diomed, duke of Palestine, quarrelled with Aretas, the Monophysite sheikh of the Ghassanide Arabs. Al Mondar took occasion thence to fall upon and slay a sheikh of the Roman party. Justinian commissioned Aretas, with others, to punish Al Mondar, who took to flight, and a great prey of men, women, children, dromedaries, and cattle was carried off by the Roman party from his camp in Persian territory. Afterwards, when a Persian bishop, Simeon of Beth-Arsam, was deputed by Justinian to Al Mondar, news arrived from Yemen

CHRIST. BIOGR.

of a revolt against the Abyssinians and a persecution of the Christians of Nedjran, which Al Mondar was invited to imitate, and he warned his guest that he himself was no better than his neighbour (Zacharias, c. 18). This may illustrate the probable position of Al Mondar. Antioch had just been dismantled by earthquake, and the Saracen could promise to lead the Persians to an easy and just revenge. The ancient devotion of Cabades to Masdek had been more and more modified by respect for Christianity. Any real Manicheans or remnants of the ancient Gnostics that were expelled from the empire would gather round Masdek. But Cabades distrusted the Romeward tendencies of Christianity, and several new accessions to the church and empire (as the conversion of the Tsanni, whose land supplied a vantage ground against Persarmenia, and of Boa, a Hunnish queen, who vanquished two Hunnish kings that were fighting for Persia) must have increased his alarm. Justinian had not yet attacked the heathen, but was only endeavouring to enforce uniformity among Christians. Persian persecutors often alleged Roman example. That year (A.D. 528), while the re-occupation of Lazica and the affairs of Persarmenia kept Perozes (whom Malelas calls the elder son of Cabades) fully employed, Xerxes, his younger son (whom we may suppose to be Chosroes), had been sent into Mesopotamia, where Justin was ordering the fortification of Martyropolis, and of Mindon, near Nisibis, and there had completely routed the Romans, Belisarius alone of the generals escaping with his life. The mother of Chosroes was by this time a Christian. Two years previously she had been vexed by a devil, and had been healed by Moses, abbat of Tarmel, near Daras, who seems to have been a Catholic, and had received from him a "blessing" from the bones of St. Cyriac for an amulet, which she cherished in a secret oratory (Zacharias, c. 18; cf. Assem. B. O. t. ii. c. 10). While Justinian was engaged in chastising unnatural vice in Christian bishops, and Theodora in rescuing kidnapped girls from wholesale traffickers in their flesh and blood, it was time to suppress a doctrine that encouraged lust. In Masdek and Al Mondar two opposing principles met, and Nushirvan made his choice. (Jo. Malel. pp. 426-436, 440-444; Procop. B. P. i. 15.)

In March, A.D. 529, Al Mondar ravaged up to the suburbs of Antioch, and retired with his booty. To this time we should probably refer the statement of Michael Syrus that in the reign of Justin Cabades ravaged Syria and sacrificed 400 captive maidens to his god Covz. Human sacrifices were practised by the Arabs, but it is more probable that for "god" we should read "son," and that these virgins stocked the harem of Caoses. (Malel. p. 445; Theophan. p. 273; Patkanien, p. 179.) Negotiations of peace between the two great powers went on. Cabades's letter, preserved in Malelas, is noteworthy; as the keynote of the wars of Chosroes. He appeals to the Romans, as Christians and godly men, to spare men's souls and bodies, and give up their gold (Malelas, p. 449).

In A.D. 530 Belisarius retrieved his honour by the overthrow of the Persian army near Daras. It was commanded, according to Malelas, by the Mihran and the king's son. Perozes is by him

identified with the king's eldest son, by Procopius with the Mihran. Procopius relates that on account of this defeat Perozes was stripped of his tiara of gold and pearl. If Perozes were really the heir apparent, it is possible that the contrast of this defeat with his younger brother's victory may have been the ostensible reason for setting him aside. Procopius tells us that Cabades thought of taking the field himself, but Al Mondar suggested a new plan of campaign, a march through the deserts west of the Euphrates; and this was carried out.

On Easter eve, April 19, A.D. 531, when the Roman army was faint with fasting, as well as with their march, a battle was fought, against Belisarius' judgment, in which that general took fright, and fled in a little boat. Belisarius was recalled, but the battle was indecisive; and the reverses of the Persians on the whole were so great that Cabades had a stroke of paralysis. Mebodes hastened to obtain from him a will that gave Chosroes the crown, Sept. 13, A.D. 531.

The principles of Nushirvan's rule.—Chosroes had to secure his power by a general edict of toleration. The Manicheans, we are told, were favoured again. Toleration was a favour for them now. He then made peace with Rome, and in the same liberal spirit insisted on one stipulation. Seven philosophers had been induced, by the rumour that the Republic of Plato was realised in Persia, to seek refuge at his court from Christian persecution. One of them, Damascius, has left us much curious information about the religions of the East. The rumours that attracted them shew how great was the fame of Chosroes' government from the very first. As in the reign of our own Alfred, it was said that a purse would be safe if dropt upon the highway. But the sages did not find it so. Men had many wives, and yet were not content without stealing their neighbours' wives; many thieves were brought to justice, and many were not brought to justice at all. The king was a braggart, whose pretence to philosophy meant love of flattery; (a charge that may be illustrated by a specimen from the *Shah Nameh* of his discourse with his own sages: "What is the most praiseworthy thing in the world?" he asks, and is answered, "A king who adorns the throne.") These philosophers, though they had left him in disgust, were for ever to enjoy his protection, and to be suffered to hold their own beliefs in their own old homes. (Agath. ii. 30.)

He declared that his empire did not extend to men's thoughts. He saw that the attempt to exterminate the followers of Masdek would be endless, and contented himself with setting to work to remedy the evils which the practice of his tenets had caused. He would not consent to be the tool of any set of priests. The result was a revolt and an attempt to set his nephew Cabades, son of Zames, on the throne. The revolt was suppressed, and Procopius tells us that he put all his brothers to death. Probably he was hated by his father's sons as much as Joseph was by his; and the deed may have been an almost necessary prelude to his beneficent work; but it was a baleful precedent. Procopius, however, may very likely have exaggerated the fact.

At first Chosroes turned his attention to the East. His work in this direction must have

opened the way for Nestorian missions, much as the work of Rome in the West prepared the way for St. Paul. He was eminently a civiliser. He submitted himself to be drilled along with his soldiers. He divided his empire into four provinces. He still further reduced the already wonderfully light taxation. He chastised the Beloochees and other mountain marauders, and turned deserts into gardens (*Shah Nameh*, vi. 157-187).

The *Shah Nameh* is principally occupied with explaining the principles of his government, and relating his discourses with the sages. The "sweet soul" earned himself a grander title, the Just. He is the Eastern personification of justice, as his Vizier, Buzurjdmihr, is of wisdom. He is said to have put an end to long languishing incarcerations; to have established orphanages and industrial schools, and funds for giving dowries with poor maidens, in short to have abolished beggary. Amorous glances at another man's wife were made punishable offences. Djundi Shapur became a kind of university—a school of physic, poetry, and philosophy. He laid a poll-tax on Christians and on Jews (Tabari, ii. 226; Mirkhond, p. 372), but when told that the Christians and Jews were his enemies, he answered, "A king without tolerance cannot be great." The annals of the empire were carefully kept (Agath. iv. 30), and the *Paiman-i-Farang*, or ancient Persian code, was translated by his orders into the dialect of his own time. We may suppose the report of its provisions to represent his institutions. Male and female hospitals, attended severally by male and female doctors, were established in every city. Once a year he dined with the peasants to hear them speak their grievances freely (*Dabistan*, i. 147, 166, 168). He reasoned that imperial greatness must rest on military strength, maintained by a full treasury, replenished by regular taxation, supported by industrial prosperity, secured by justice, achieved by upright administration, carried on by honest magistrates. His art of government was comprised in twelve golden maxims:—

Govern thyself: be true: consult the wise:
Honour the wise and noble: be exact
In justice; swift to punish or release:
Protect trade: check crime: lay up stores for war
Promote thy kin: keep spies and overseers:
Take care of all thy servants and thy steeds.

The *Pancha Tantra*, or Indian book of fables, was translated into Persian; and contemporary rumour affirmed that the same was done for the whole works of Aristotle and the doctrinal dialogues of Plato, such as the *Timaeus*, *Phaedo*, *Gorgias*, and perhaps the *Parmenides*; though Agathias (ii. 28) is sceptical. But of all books he most loved the New Testament (John Eph. p. 417).

Chosroantioch: When Chosroes returned to Ctesiphon a horseman rode up; it was Al Mondar come to complain of Roman insults. Wittig the Goth, and Bassaces the Armenian, backed up the complaint (A.D. 539). Justinian was aiming at universal sway. Therefore Chosroes challenged the Caesar. The war was a religious war. The Zendavesta was brought out: the nobles rolled in the dust before it, and rent their clothes: the king was in tears, and gave large alms (*Shah Nameh*, vi. 203). Firdusi records the capture of Araishi Rum (Erzerum?), Theodosiopolis?) at this time, but Procopius is silent.

He took a great city named Shurab (Surae). He saw a lady, named Euphemia, dragged along by her left hand by a soldier, with her infant son trailing on the ground in her right, and he appealed to heaven to punish the author of such evils. He took the lady to be his wife. The captives were released on promise of 200 lb. of gold from Candidus, bishop of Sergiopolis, a fair price for 12,000 slaves; but one that Candidus found himself unable to pay. Hierapolis next had to pay a ransom; at Beroea (Aleppo) the bishop persuaded Chosroes to halve his demand; Antioch made brief resistance, her brave young men were slaughtered; two women drowned themselves for fear of Persian rape. The patriarch had fled into Cilicia. The Romans began to sue for peace [MEGAS], but murmured at Chosroes' demands. Rome could not stoop to pay tribute to Persia. Chosroes' answer was rigorous and humble enough: "You pay Saracens and Huns for doing you service; pay us likewise." Meanwhile he took all care to pay himself, and to keep his troops from marring the justice of his cause. He went down alone to bathe in the sea at Seleucia, and sacrifice to the setting sun. He took Apamea, and plundered the church of all but the fragment of the cross enshrined there. He attended the games, and insisted that the green faction should win, because Justinian favoured the blue. A complaint was laid against a soldier for outraging a woman, and in spite of the people's intercession he had the ravisher crucified. He stripped Antioch of all her treasures of art (Lydus, iii. 54, p. 257), carried all the population captive, and burnt down the whole city, except one or two churches and one lofty suburb (Proc. B. P. i. 11). He then marched on Edessa. But the promise made to ABGARUS still proved true. Chosroes was taken ill, and obliged to abandon the enterprise. He gave out that he was willing to let his captives be ransomed. The Edessenes began subscribing largely for the purpose. The harlots gave their ornaments, the husbandmen their hoards, or their heirlooms, or their donkeys, or their pet lambs. But a vista of unbounded possibilities of extortion seemed open to the Christian governor, Buz, the Thracian, and he found some excuse for breaking off the subscription. The people of Carrhae came out and offered to redeem the captives, but Chosroes would not admit them as purchasers; they were still idolatrous heathen (ib. 12). He had formed a new plan. Antioch had seemed to him a paradise. He would build a new Antioch of his own, in his own dominions, and plant his captives there. He carried out his purpose, built a city in Mesopotamia, with churches, baths, and laurel groves, and circus, and all the appurtenances of a Greek capital; and there he settled his captives, and gave them a Christian governor, and made it a place of refuge for runaway slaves who could find any one in it to recognise them as brethren. The captives were delighted save one loquacious cobbler, who grumbled that in his old home he had a mulberry tree in his court, and here he had none. The king gave orders to plant some.^f

The peace had been concluded by Megas, bishop of Aleppo (the Persians call him Mihras), before Chosroes attacked Edessa. But his exactions and hostilities in those regions were construed by the Romans into a breach of the peace. Four campaigns followed (541-544), and then a five years' truce, which the Romans broke before it was over. In A.D. 542 he claimed the promised ransom from Candidus, who replied that he had known himself to be unable to pay it, but had been disappointed in his hope that the emperor would pay it for him. He was confined, and ordered to send messengers with Chosroes' heralds to urge his flock to pay for his release. They contributed, but Chosroes was dissatisfied, and would have made his way into the town but for the secret intelligence that a Christian Saracen in his army conveyed to the inhabitants. This Arab, Ambrus, warned them not to admit the Persians, and encouraged them to stand the siege two days longer. Chosroes withdrew, and put the bishop to death; saying that a perjurer was unfit to be a priest of God (Procop. i. 240).

Nushizad.—But the Persian annalists at once go on to tell of what followed when Chosroes fell sick in Syria. He had a Christian wife of surpassing beauty, by whom he had a noble son, named Nushizad, "sweet-bairn." This young man was the darling both of his father and of all the people. "He knew the doctrine of *Ezra*, of Zerdusht, and of Messiah, but he would none of the Zendavesta; he washed his two cheeks in the water of the Messiah." All the world was astonished. Chosroes was deeply grieved. He was willing enough to tolerate diversities of faith among his subjects, but he thought that if a king did not hold the true faith there could be no blessing on the world. He confined him at Djundi-shapur with other malefactors. When Chosroes fell sick on his homeward way, the rumour reached Persia that he was dead. Nushizad believed it, got free, had himself proclaimed, released all the "madmen." His mother gave him treasures, he laid a tribute on the towns of Susiana (Ahwaz and Shuster), he wrote for help to the Caesar. Chosroes wrote a touching letter to his general Ram Berzin mourning over his son, almost as David over Absalom, bidding them offer him free pardon—"he is my flesh and blood"—but all his followers were to be hung. He encouraged his general: his son was no kin to the Caesars; and "as for the followers of the Messiah, you have but to raise your voice and they are scared, and become enemies of the cross." He quoted the saying of a sage: "Make no friend of the changeful heaven." Again he urged mercy: "One must not make his body suffer, when his tunic shall be rent; for all the women would rise in his behalf." Nushizad had Roman allies. The armies met. Ram Berzin bade his men make the air like hail in spring with their arrows. Pirouz the lion, an aged champion, addressed Nushizad, and made one last attempt to bring him back to his allegiance. "The impostor Messiah himself was put to death when he renounced the religion of God." Nushizad answered: "Think not that an army of heroes, and the son of a king, will sue for pardon. If the Messiah was put to death, the Majesty of the Lord of the world did not abandon Him; the

^f In Mirkhond this story takes the following form. The new city was the exact counterpart of the old, except that one cobbler had a mulberry tree in his court in the old one and had not in the new, a circumstance which, as the historian observes, is not a little remarkable.

Holy One returned to God, the Holy One; he preferred the splendour of heaven to this dark world. If I must die, I care not for it: 'tis a poison for which there is no antidote" (Eccl. viii. 8). The contest hung doubtful, till Nushizad fell pierced with an arrow. He sent for a bishop. He testified before the Romans his repentance for his rebellion. A son warring against a father could not be blessed. "My part in life was such, how could I be happy, or a light of the world?" He bade them tell his mother that it was not death that grieved him, but his father's displeasure. He gave instructions for his funeral. He wished for Christian burial, but without any pomp, any gazers at his corpse (which should be seen by his mother only), without diadem, Roman brocade, or throne; without camphor, musk or amber; to be wrapt in a linen cloth, and laid in the earth, like any Christian slave. The bishop told his mother: "His soul is with Messiah, though he died not on the cross." His father's intense grief seems to have saved the son's followers from vengeance, and to have preserved in the Persian annals the ungarbled tale (*Shah Nameh*, vi. 223).

But Procopius seems to have heard only the angry speeches that dropt from the sick father's lips, and fell on the ears of his Christian physician. He tells us that Anatozadus rebelled, and committed incest with his father's wives (*Bell. Goth.* iv. 10). He interprets Anatozadus, "immortal" (*dāvartī* (دَوارتِ)); relates his confinement at Belapaton, in the Vazaina land; his rebellion, even after he had heard his father was better; the expedition of Phabrizus against him; his capture, and the disfigurement of his eyelids. He dates the events about A.D. 543. In connexion with them Procopius tells the story of Tribunus, a Christian physician of Palestine, beloved by Chosroes, who when offered any boon he chose, begged for the release of any captives he might choose to name, and was given 3000 more than he had requested. That he might keep this physician was made by Chosroes a condition of peace in A.D. 545.

The hope of a Christian succession to the throne of Persia may have made the newly-converted Lazi, who were tired of the tyranny of the Roman resident, readier to retransfer their allegiance, as they did in A.D. 541. In A.D. 542 Chosroes tried to take Jerusalem, but was prevented by Belisarius (*Proc. Bell. Pers.* ii. 20, 21).

That autumn the revolted Armenians of the Roman province who had led Chosroes into the war returned to their allegiance. In A.D. 543 the Catholicus of Dovin, who claimed to be high with Chosroes, offered his services to the Romans as a peacemaker, but his brother whispered the tale of Chosroes' domestic troubles, and suggested an inroad into Persarmenia (*Proc. B. P.* ii. 21, 24, pp. 249, 260). It was important to a bishop to do the king service just then. The bishop who attended the last moments of Nushizad was probably MAR ABAS, primate of the Nestorians from A.D. 538 to A.D. 552, a converted mage and an active writer, founder of the school of Seleucia (*Ass. B. O.* iii. 76). Abulpharagius records his dispute with Chosroes, and consequent imprisonment. The king argued, "How can it be that you Nestorians alone should be right and the rest of the

Christian world wrong?" It was a great point with him that his son's creed was not that of Rome. Again he asked, "If the Virgin was not parent of a God, why did my ancestors, the magi, come so far to worship her offspring?" He charged them with falling short of other Christians, in works as well as in faith, in allowing their priests to marry. Mar Abas is said to have put a stop to the marriage of bishops. Amrus speaks of other bishops as crucified at the time when Mar Abas was imprisoned, and relates that on the revolt of Nushizad Mar Abas was again in favour, and of great use to the king in bringing the insurgents back to their allegiance (*Assem. B. O.* iii. 406, 408, 409, 81). The Jacobite primate of Armenia is called Endubius by Procopius. The Roman inroad was unsuccessful. The sickness that excited the hopes of Nushizad was the great plague of A.D. 543 (*Proc. B. P.* ii. 22, 23).

The war in A.D. 544 seems to Procopius to have assumed a new form, to be an onslaught not only on the emperor but on the God of the Christians. Chosroes and the magi bent all their energies to the attempt to falsify prophecy by a sack of Edessa, and egregiously failed (*Procop. Bell. Pers.* ii. 26). Mar Abas had studied at Edessa. Sergius of Edessa was the envoy who persuaded Chosroes to sell the Romans a five years' truce.

Armenian affairs.—A.D. 548, Mejej, native governor of Armenia, died, and was succeeded by Ten-Shapur, a Persian, who set up fire temples everywhere. 551, Moses succeeds John as Catholicus or primate of Armenia. 552, the Armenian era. Ten-Shapur, who had imprisoned the son of the archbishop for becoming a Christian catechumen, is petitioned against by Moses, and superseded by Ushnas-Vahram. Edict of toleration, except in case of proselytes (?). Crucifixion of the aforesaid convert Isidboozid. 558, Varasdat governor. 564, Surenas governor.

War in Colchis.—A.D. 548, the Lazi were discontent at the prospect of losing the slave-trade with Constantinople, on which they had depended for the necessities of life. Chosroes plans to transport them elsewhere, and establish a faithful military colony in Colchis, with a naval arsenal on the Euxine. 549, Gubazes, son of Tzathes, and his people, re-invite the Romans, who besiege Petra, which is relieved by Mermeroes. 550, Bessas and the Romans defeat Chorianes and re-invest Petra. 551, Petra falls, and is destroyed; but Mermeroes re-occupies the country. 552, Truce for five years, but war continued in Colchis. 555, Mermeroes dies. The Romans murder their ally Gubazes. 557, Truce. 562, Treaty for fifty years; the possession of Lazica and maintenance of Daras conceded by Chosroes; the toleration of Christians (except new converts) and their burial rites promised; and the charge of the Caspian gates undertaken for 30,000 pieces of gold yearly (*Menander*, pp. 359-364). One bone of contention remained. Suania, a province of Lazica, had not been conquered, but surrendered freely to Persia. Chosroes kept it, and refused to allow a plébiscoite (*ib.* p. 373).

Patriarchs.—After Mar Abas in A.D. 552, Joseph, a favourite physician of Chosroes, was made patriarch, but proved intolerant to the clergy, who obtained leave to depose him (*Assem.*

B. O. iii. 432). A.D. 559, Achudemes, after his dispute before Chosroes, was ordained by Jacobus Baradaeus, first Jacobite primate for Persia. He had previously been ordained by Christopher, primate of Armenia, to a missionary see among the Arabs. He founded two monasteries and made many converts. He was beheaded A.D. 575 for having baptized a prince of the blood royal [GEORGE] (*Assem. B. O.* ii. 414, 520; *Le Quien*, ii. 1533). A.D. 567, EZEKIEL was made primate of the Nestorians, and continued in office till just before the close of the reign of Chosroes, when, because of his hear eyes, Jesuiah was appointed his successor (*Assem. B. O.* iii. 435, 615).

Christian writers of this time in the East mentioned by Ebed Jesu (*Assem. B. O.* t. iii.) are John of Apamea, and his disciple James (p. 50), Hanan of Adiabene (p. 81), Thomas of Edessa (p. 86), Sergius of Rhesina and Paul of Nisibis (p. 87), Cyprian of Nisibis (p. 111), another Sergius (p. 171), Joseph the Huzite (p. 180), Isaac the Ninevite (p. 104), Bud the Wanderer (p. 219), Daniel of Rhesina (p. 223), Abraham Katina (p. 225), and Moses of Carche (p. 276). *Assemani* adds—Job the Monk (p. 431). The Monophysites (t. ii.) are Xenaias (p. 10), Paul of Callinicus (p. 46), Mar of Amida (p. 48), John of Tela (p. 53), John Bar Aphton (p. 54), Zacharias of Melitene (p. 55), Jacobus Baradaeus of Edessa (p. 62), Peter of Antioch (p. 69), Moses of Agbel, Simeon, John of Ephesus (p. 85), Cyriacus of Amida (p. 90). Of the orthodox, Simeon of Beth Arsam alone seems noteworthy (t. i. p. 341).

SIRA is said to have been a virgin martyred in Persia in his days.

A new era begins with A.D. 569, the Arabic era of the elephant. Abraham, a Christian slave, had made himself king of Yemen [GREGENTIUS], had taken to himself the wife of the last Homerite Dsu Djadan, and brought up their child, Saif, as his son. An accidental burning of his cathedral induced him to march against the temple of Mecca. The presence of an elephant with his troops added terror to his approach, but his army perished in a simoom, overwhelmed as though with the smoke of the bottomless pit. His sons Yaksum and Masrug succeeded him. His stepson, Saif, soon discovered his real parentage, and fled to Chosroes. That monarch is said to have been divided between reluctance to help idolaters against Christians and reluctance to leave Christian outrages on Arab women unpunished (*Tabari*, ii. 208; *Hamza*, p. 43). He armed 809 convicts and sent them to conquer Yemen. Two hundred perished by shipwreck; the remainder landed, burnt their ships, threw their victuals into the sea, and *did* conquer Yemen (A.D. 573). The reign of Saif lasted only a year, and then Chosroes sent Wahrz with 4000 men to exterminate the Abyssinian Christians from Yemen, which was thenceforward governed by a Persian Marzban. One of these had officially to report to Chosroes II. the rise of Mahometanism (*Tabari*, ii. 218). Had a Christian power been maintained in Southern Arabia Mahometanism might have been crushed at the outset; and, as *Gibbon* observes, "Abyssinia would have prevented a revolution that has changed the civil and religious face of the world."

At the same time a new power had arisen in the East, that of the Turks. A quarrel between this nation and Chosroes—some of their ambassadors had fallen victims to the climate of Persia, and the king suspected poison—induced them to send an embassy to Rome. In August, A.D. 569, Zemarchus set out on a return embassy to Tarsus. When after a year he arrived there, the Turks who were assembled to meet him burst into tears. There was an ancient tradition among them, that when an ambassador from Rome should appear in their midst they were to know that the whole world was passing away, and that thenceforth mankind would destroy one another. Zemarchus found that they believed the Romans to be the slaves of the Persians. He appealed to the trophy of Trajan in Persia as a disproof of this, and Chosroes had it demolished. The embassy returned impressed with the upright morals of the Turks (*Menander*, p. 380). Justin, who ascended the throne A.D. 565, began about the same time to set an example of persecution of the sectaries of the empire, which the magi are said to have urged Chosroes to follow. Surenas had murdered Manuel, the brother of Vartan the Mamigonian, in Armenia, and that chieftain found occasion to raise the standard of revolt. An attempt was made to raise a fire-temple at Dovin. The Armenians protested, pleaded their rights, armed for resistance, surprised Dovin, slew Surenas, massacred the magi, appealed for help to Justin. This, according to John of Ephesus (ii. 19–24), was in A.D. 569 (p. 127). Bahram Tchubin subdued Armenia, and Vartan, Gorgonis (prince of Georgia), and the Catholicus came to Constantinople in the autumn of A.D. 570 (*ib.* p. 403). In A.D. 569 Justin had begun to shew symptoms of insanity (*John Eph.* iii. 5). In the spring of A.D. 572 a Christian envoy, Sebochthes, was sent by Chosroes to Justin to claim the ten years' instalment of the promised tribute, which was then due. He pleaded that Persia was a Christian country, and that in warring against it Justin could not be blest. He was dismissed with insult (*Menander, Leg. Barb.* 20, p. 313).

In the *Shah Nameh* we are told that on the accession of a new emperor, Chosroes wrote to him in great grief, saying, "May you receive good news of the Caesar: Christ guard his soul," and offering him any help he needed, but claiming him as a vassal. The ambassador was insulted, and Chosroes swore to ruin Rome. He "made heaven giddy with his march." But to pay his troops, by advice of Buzurjdmihr, he borrowed money of his subjects; a shoemaker offered a loan of 4,000,000 drachmas. The king offered 2½ per cent. interest. The shoemaker asked only that his son should be educated as a scribe. The king would not break down the barriers of society and relax the bonds of religion by teaching the sacred language to a profane person; so rejected the loan with scorn. Aleppo (Beroea) was taken. Finally the emperor sent an embassy, acknowledging himself Chosroes' vassal, and offering ten oxhides full of gold. Chosroes demanded further 1000 pieces of Roman brocade, which were duly given (*Shah Nameh*, vi. 509 ff.). At the outset of the war Mondar, son of Aretas, gained great advantages for the Romans; and Marcian had nearly taken Nisibis. Justin laid a plot against the life of Mondar and sent to

supersede Marcan. The siege of Nisibis was abandoned. Chosroes came on like a whirlwind, and the Persians used the engines to besiege Daras. Cometes, by whom Chosroes sent his offered terms to the garrison of Daras, did not think fit to disclose them (John Eph. vi. 2-6; Simoc. iii. 10, 11). Meanwhile Adormahan ravaged up to Antioch, and took Apamea by treachery. Daras fell A.D. 574. Two thousand captive virgins were sent as a present to the king of the Turks, but found opportunity to drown themselves on the way (John Eph. vi. 7). December, A.D. 574, Tiberius was made Caesar, and a three-years' truce on the Syrian frontier followed, A.D. 575, but war continued in Armenia. Mondar was reconciled with Rome, meeting the commander, Justinian, in the church of Sergius, and made a sudden attack on Hira. Chosroes made this a ground for menacing Theodosiopolis and invading Cappadocia. But a band of Scythians plundered his camp and overthrew his sacred fire; in vain he pointed to his grey hairs and implored his troops to fight at his side; he had to flee across the Euphrates and over the Kurd mountains. He made a law that the king should no more go to battle in person. Thereupon the Romans, in the autumn of 576, overran all the northern part of his dominions and committed frightful atrocities upon the Christian inhabitants (John Eph. vi. 4, 8, 9, 10). A paltry Persian force then utterly routed the Roman army, and, on promise of an amnesty, Armenia submitted again to Chosroes. A.D. 577 was spent in negotiations. Chosroes sincerely desired peace, but the demands of Tiberius rose with every concession, and the treaty was broken off. Two Persian raids that autumn were avenged, A.D. 578, by Maurice invading Arzanene, respecting the inhabitants who were Christians, and transplanting them to Cyprus (*ib.* 11-15). He then turned southward and ravaged Mesopotamia up to the banks of the Tigris. Chosroes saw the fairest provinces of his empire, where no invader had been known to tread, ravaged under his very eyes. "He shut himself up in Ctesiphon," says Gibbon, "and sank indignant to the grave."

On his deathbed he is said to have sent for the Catholicos and received baptism at his hands. He examined his eldest son Hormisdas, and charged him to remember the poor. He left directions that his body should be embalmed and enthroned in state, and expressed a hope that his subjects would weep for him. He bade them out for his epitaph: "If we have done good it is with Him who will not bate the reward; if we have done evil it is with Him who hath the power to punish" (Patkanien, p. 184; *Shah Nameh*, p. 539; Hamza, p. 44; Evagrius, iv. 27). His death was in March, A.D. 579.

Theology of Chosroes.—To prevent misconceptions arising from our prefatory remarks we may state that in the *Paimani-Farhang*, as reported in the *Dabistan* to have been translated into the vernacular by order of Chosroes, and, as far as we can trace, in the tenets of Chosroes himself, there does not seem to be either dualism or iconoclasm. One God is the creator of all, but each sphere of the concentric orbs of paradise has its own planetary genius, worshipped under material forms (*Dabistan*, pp.

147-154). The incarnation was the great stumbling-block of the unbeliever, hence the vehement controversies of the sects on that subject. [EDESSE.] Chosroes may be likened to Julian for his attempt to measure his strength with Christ; but with this difference, that whereas to Julian Christianity was a contemptible folly, to Chosroes it was either the truth or a diabolic delusion.

CHOSROES II. of Persia (PARVIZ or Eperwiz or Ambarviz) reigned A.D. 590-628, is described in his early days under his father Hormisdas as "a young man hardly to be distinguished from the moon," and entitled himself after his accession, "king of kings, lord of lords, master of masters, prince of peace, saviour of mankind, in the sight of gods a virtuous and immortal man, in the sight of men a most manifest god, surpassingly glorious, a conqueror rising with the sun, furnishing to the night her eyes, of illustrious ancestry, a king averse to war, beneficent, hirer of the Asons (genii?), and guardian of the realm of Persia" (Theophylact. Sim. iv. 8). He was a very different kind of person from his grandfather. He may seem greater, if we look only to his Western conquests. He may seem nearer to Christianity, if we look only to his reverence for Christian saints. But a closer view will correct both conceptions.

He was employed by his father in putting down the revolt in Georgia. He entered into negotiations with the eristhaws or nobles; and by the promise of great favours and the written concession of the inheritance of their domain for their children, he induced those barons to declare themselves independent of their native sovereigns, and accept their fief each directly from the king of Persia. They paid tribute to Parviz, while the sons of Bakur, and the grandsons of Wakhthang remained entrenched in rocky fastnesses. When the Turkish invasion compelled Hormisdas to make peace with Maurice and to make Bahram Tchubin general, Parviz was recalled from Georgia. The highlanders and lowlanders of that country then came to an understanding, appealed to Maurice to give them a native sovereign, while maintaining the rights of the nobles conceded by Parviz. He agreed, and gave them one of Wakhthang's grandsons (son of Mirdat's sister), named also Gwaram or Bahram. Some of these Georgian nobles seem to have been Christians of the Chatzintzarian, or Cross-worshipping sect. An inscription by one of them has been found: "O cross of the Saviour, have pity on Stephanos, patrician of Karthli." The fire-altar surmounted by a cross appears on the coins of this Stephanos, and on those of Vrra or Gwaram, who first takes the title Agsu (Augustus) himself, instead of giving it to Hormisdas (Langlois, *Numism. Georg.* pp. 19, 23, 27, 29). In revenge for this annexation of Georgia, as soon as Bahram Tchubin had conquered the Turks, Hormisdas sent him to re-invade Colchis (A.D. 589). His defeat there induced the king to recall him with insult. Bahram is said to have proclaimed Chosroes. The king banished his son, and imprisoned Bindoes and Bostam, his brothers-in-law, Chosroes' uncles. They broke loose, threw him into a dungeon, put out his eyes, and finally murdered him. Bahram proclaimed himself king, and rejected all overtures

from Parviz. The latter, whether himself an accomplice in his father's death or not, was supported in battle and aided in flight by his father's murderers. One of them, Bindoes, tricked the pursuers and enabled him to escape. He debated between flight to the Turks and to the Romans, and chose the latter. Some say that at this juncture he laid the reins on his horse's neck and cried to Christ to guide him rightly. He was received by Probus, governor of Circesium, who reported the matter to Commentiolus, prefect of the East at Hierapolis. With some reluctance on both sides, by suasion of bishop DOMITIAN, on cession to Rome of Martyropolis and Daras, and of Armenia up to the walls of Nisibis, and the shores of lake Van, perhaps by marriage with the emperor's daughter Maria, Chosroes was received as guest and son of Maurice (Theoph. Simoc. iv. 10). Mirkhond says he spent eighteen months at the Byzantine court, but no contemporary or nearly contemporary authorities support him. Theophylact relates how the Roman guests at a banquet were entertained with the sight of the tortures and death of one of Bahram's generals (Theophylact. v. 5). The question of the identity of the princess Maria with the Christian wife of Parviz, who is so famed in Eastern song, shall be discussed elsewhere. [SHIRIN.] Chosroes was victorious, and received from Rome a robe of honour embroidered with the cross. He hesitated about wearing it, but was assured by his grand mobed that he might safely do so. But when he appeared thus clad at a banquet, the Persians murmured that he had turned Christian. To disprove it, Bindoes bade him take the knife with the iron handle and perform the Zoroastrian ceremony of silent grace before meat. The emperor's son (or more probably nephew) objected; a fray ensued, and Bindoes gave the Greek prince a blow. Maria restored peace, causing the offender to be given up and pardoned (Tabari, ii. 299). It is very evident that Chosroes was not a Christian. He himself proclaimed, that his wife Syra was a Christian, and he himself a Hellene (Erag. vi. 20).

He did, however, pay honour both to the Virgin and to the martyrs Sergius and Bacchus. Theophylact of Simocetta relates that when Probus, bishop of Chalcedon, was sent as ambassador by Maurice to Ctesiphon, Chosroes requested a sight of the portrait of the Virgin, which he knew to be in the ambassador's possession, adored it, said he had seen the original in a vision, and been promised by her the glories of Alexander the Great (Theoph. Sim. v. 15). To the intercession of Sergius he ascribed the success of his arms and the pregnancy of his wife. His letters to the martyr are preserved (Evagr. *H. E.* vi. 21; Theoph. Sim. v. 13, 14). They were inscribed on the presents he sent: "Chosroes, king of kings, to the great martyr Sergius. I have sent these gifts not for men to admire them, nor that my words should make known the greatness of thy all-worshipful name, but that the truth of the fact that has come to pass should be proclaimed, and the many mercies I have received of thee. For I hold it as a piece of good fortune that my name should be inscribed upon thy vessels. When I was at Beramas, I besought thee, O saint, that Syra (Shirin) might conceive in her womb." Sepéos tells us that Shirin built many monasteries and churches near Ctesiphon.

This alliance of Parviz with Maurice was not perhaps altogether advantageous for the church. The two sovereigns agreed to endeavour to strip Armenia of her martial population, by employing the men of that country on the Danube or against the Turk. They thus weakened what might have been a centre of resistance to the Moslems (Sepéos in Patkanien, p. 194). The story of the vengeance taken by Chosroes for the death of Maurice shall be told elsewhere. [PHOCAS, HERACLIUS.] He took Daras A.D. 605, Amida 606, Edessa 607, Aleppo 608 (?), overran Asia Minor 609, took Antioch 611, Caesarea in Cappadocia 612, Damascus 614. Jerusalem (A.D. 615) revolted against him and slew his garrison. In eighteen days he took it, filled it with 17,000 corpses, led off 35,000 slaves, and the life-giving cross, and the patriarch Zacharias to be priest of it. Modestus, abbat of St. Theodore, was made administrator of the city (Sepéos, *ib.* 200). The Jews bought up Christian captives and killed them (Theoph. A.M. 6106). A.D. 616, his generals took Alexandria, and besieged Chalcedon, which fell A.D. 617, and thenceforward he besieged Constantinople. A.D. 624, his fleet conquered Rhodes, and carried off the art treasures of the island. The daring and brilliant retaliations of Heraclius afterwards (A.D. 622-627) are boasted by the Mahometans as fulfilments of a prophecy of Mahomet.

Parviz had in his harem 3000 wives and 12,000 slave women (Hamza, p. 45). He demanded Hadiqah, daughter of Naaman, the Christian son of Al Mondar, in marriage. Naaman refused the demand, was summoned to court and trampled to death by elephants. His daughter Hadiqah retired to a convent founded by her aunt Hind, on the banks of the Euphrates, and seems there to have been unmolested. But Chosroes had thus provoked a revolt of his father's Saracen allies, and on the day of battle it is said that these Christian Arabs took to invoking the name of Mahomet, and gained a glorious victory at Dsu-Qar. The prophet, who had seen the battle in vision, wrote to Parviz: "Now shield thee from the chastisement of God, or prepare thee for a struggle with God and His apostle, for which thou hast no strength." Chosroes tore the letter. Mahomet said, "He has torn his kingdom" (Tabari, ii. 309-326).

Mahomet had also encouraged a wager that the Greeks would soon beat the Persians. Parviz fled for his life before Heraclius; but a different Nemesis slew him. He had himself come to the throne by the devoted attachment of those who strangled Hormisdas, and then, when he found men murmur, in affected indignation had put them to death. His son, Siroes, was not slow to follow the example of parricide.

On Whit-Sunday A.D. 628 the following despatch was read in the churches of Constantinople: "Rejoice in the Lord, all ye lands: for the proud fighter against God, Chosroes, hath fallen. He hath fallen and his memorial is perished from the earth, who exalted himself and spake unrighteousness in pride and contempt against our Lord Jesus Christ, the very God, and his undefiled mother, our blessed lady, parent of God, and ever-virgin Mary; the impious one hath perished with a crash. On the 24th of February last, sedition was raised against him by his firstborn son, Siroes, and all the

armies of the Persians deserted Chosroes and ran together to Siroius, and Chosroes planned to take to flight, and was taken prisoner and thrown into the new castle built by him for the keeping of his treasures. On the 25th of the same February Siroius was crowned, and on the 28th, after making Chosroes four days a prisoner bound in iron in all anguish, he destroyed the same merciless, proud blasphemer by a most bitter death, that he may know that Jesus born of Mary, crucified of the Jews, as he himself had written, against whom he did blaspheme, is God Almighty, and he gave him according to the things written to him by us. And in this life thus he perished, but he went the way of Judas . . . into the fire prepared for Satan and them that are worthy of him."

The letter of Cabat Sadasadasach, also called Siroius, to his "brother" Heraclius, is appended, and this closes the *Chronicon Paschale*.

The primates of the Nestorians were Jesuiab, d. A.D. 596; Sabarjesus, who followed Chosroes to Daras, and died there A.D. 604; Gregory, 607-610;—of the Jacobites: Kam Jesu, till A.D. 609; Samuel, from 614 to 624 (*Assem. B. O. ii. 414*).

The remaining history of Persia till the Mahometan conquest is confused, tumultuous and difficult to trace. The cross was restored to Jerusalem, whether by Purandocht, daughter of Parviz, or by the general Sharbarz. Women, infants, or usurpers held the throne, till the era of the accession of Gesdigerd or ISDEGERDES (A.D. 632), in whose reign Persia fell an easy prey (A.D. 652) to the Arabs. [E. B. B.]

CHOZI, one of the five chiefs of the 365 archons, presiding over the sphere of the planet Venus. [PISTIS SOPHIA, p. 362.] [G. S.]

CHREMAOR, the chief archon presiding over the twelfth division of the place of punishment. [PISTIS SOPHIA, p. 321.] [G. S.]

CHRESIMUS, a Christian of Augustine's time, who was so much cast down by some adverse lawsuit that it was rumoured he meditated suicide. Augustine writes to cheer him, and encloses a letter to the court that he can give or not as he likes. (The enclosure is lost.) *Aug. Ep.* 244 (83), ii. 1059. The name is variously written "Chrisimo" and "Chrissimo" in the MSS., and edited "Chrysimo" in the earlier editions. It is possible that the name has wholly disappeared, and we have only a repetition of ch(a)rissimo fratri. [E. B. B.]

CHRESTUS (1), bishop of Syracuse, was addressed by Constantine the Great A.D. 314, in a letter preserved by Eusebius (*H. E. x. 5*), wherein the emperor complained of the continuance of discord in Africa, and of the ridicule it brought on Christianity; and therefore ordered Chrestus to be present at the council of Arles by the 1st of August, and authorised him to apply for a public carriage, for himself and two presbyters and three servant lads, to Latronianus, the corrector of Sicily. Constantine speaks of "the catholic sect (*alpeus*)," and "the reverence due to the most holy sect." Chrestus subscribed first of the bishops at Arles (*Labbe, Conc. i. 1429*).

[E. B. B.]

CHRESTUS (2), bishop of Nicaea, elected in the year 325, after the expulsion of Theognius for refusing to sign the Nicene confession, at the same time that Amphion was appointed in the room of Eusebius of Nicomedia. In 328, Chrestus and Amphion had to retire on the recantation of Theognius and Eusebius (*Theod. i. 20*; *Socr. i. 14*; *Athanas. Apolog. vol. ii. p. 727*). [E. V.]

CHRISDAPHOR. [CHRISTOPHER.]

CHRISTE. [CALLISTA.]

CHRISTETA. [VINCENT of ABILA.]

CHRISTIANA, ST., Virgin, of Termonde in Flanders, is said to have been the only daughter of Migranimus, "rex Anglorum," unknown elsewhere, and probably lived in the 8th century; for she went to Dickelvenna (Ticlivinum), near Ghent, that she might tranquilly devote herself to the catholic religion, under St. Hilduardus, as it is supposed, and Hilduardus, who first introduced Christianity to Dickelvenna, died A.D. 750.

It is possible that her alleged royal birth may indicate a confusion between her and Christina, a saint of the 11th century, daughter of king Edward the Outlaw.

Her relics were translated from Dickelvenna to Termonde about the end of the 9th century, and were enshrined with those of St. Hilduardus.

St. Christina's conversion is attributed to the visit of an angel who came to her under the guise of a poor man, and baptized her in a living stream, whereupon she forsook the idolatrous worship of her country, abdicated her royal position, and devoted herself to a life of great austerity.

She is commemorated on the 26th July; also on the 7th of September, the day on which her relics were translated to Termonde (*A.A. SS. July, vi. pp. 311-314*, where reference is made to several monastic authorities). [D. R. J.]

CHRISTIANUS, ST., confessor, and 37th bishop of Auxerre. He succeeded St. Abbo. He was born at the beginning of the 9th century, and is thought by some to have been abbat of the monastery of St. Germanus of Auxerre. He held the see 13 years.

He was present at the council of Tousy, which he subscribed before Abbo, perhaps as a coadjutor or successor-designate.

The other councils which he attended were the three of Perrigny or Fétigny, and that of Soissons. It is said that he often pronounced the word Jesus, and found an unspeakable charm in the associations of this name. (*Gall. Christ. xii. 276*; *Migne, Encycl. Théolog. xl. p. 603*).

[D. R. J.]

CHRISTINA (1), a Christian woman of Athens, after the martyrdom of Peter of Lamp-sacus, arrested at Athens along with Dionysius by the same governor, and given in charge with him to two soldiers of the governor's train, whom she teaches, and they are converted. The pair of converts therefore, with Dionysius, were tortured and stoned, and Christina, since she fell upon the corpses and wept over them, was beheaded. Such is the story in the *Menology* on May 15. The Latin acts given by Ruinart do not mention Dionysius nor Christina, but seem

to speak of the latter as Dionysia; nor do they mention Athens, but speak of Troas as the place where the governor is informed that Andrew, Paul, and Nicomachus are Christians. Nicomachus is at first most eager in confessing, but under the stress of torture, when at the point of death, he cries with a loud voice, "I have never been a Christian, but I sacrifice to the gods." He was immediately taken down, and a demon seized him, and dashed him to the ground, and, biting his tongue, he expired on the spot. Then Dionysia, aged sixteen, exclaims, "Unhappy man!" and so is arrested and given over to two young men. (This incident seems to be misplaced.) They see an angel come to protect her at midnight, and they fall at her feet, and beg her pardon for the wrong they did her. The next day Onesicrates and Macedo, priests of Diana, stir a tumult, and Andrew and Paul, after being scourged, are given over to the populace to stone. The end of the story as above; the proconsul's name, Optimus; the time, that of Decius; the day, May 15, as in the Eastern legend (*Acta SS.* May, iii. 450).

CHRISTINA (2), a damsel of Tyre, confined by her father in a tower that no one should see her; she looks out upon the beauty of the sky, and is convinced of the futility of idols and throws them down. Her father punishes her in every way, plunges her in the sea, which serves for a baptism, reports her to Dio, the governor, and at last she is killed. No date given, except the day, July 24. (*Men. Basil.*) Acts of this martyr, by Alphanus of Salerno (11th century), will be found in Migne (*Patrol. Lat.* cxlvii. 1269). They may, perhaps, contain fragments of the authentic record of the trial by Urbanus of a martyr of this name, but much interpolated and confused. Urbanus is made the father of Christina; and the two chief elements of the story of St. Catherine, the philosophic ability of the martyr, and the wheel on which she suffered, are both ascribed to her. Indeed an origin is suggested for the story of the fracture of the wheel, for Christina is said also to have broken a wonderful clock in the temple of the sun. Urbanus is succeeded by Idion (=Dio), and Idion by Julianus. The last name seems to be derived from the month of the Passion. (See *Acta SS.* Jul. v. 637; Tillem. *Mém.* v. 538.)

(3) [CHARALAMPES.] See Ceillier, xiii. 493.

[E. B. B.]

CHRISTINUS, a correspondent of Augustine (*Ep.* 256 (226), ii. 1070).

[E. B. B.]

CHRISTOLOGY (*Χριστολογία*) embraces the doctrine of Christ's person, while *Soteriology* is the doctrine of Christ's work or salvation. The term was used by English divines in the 17th century (as Owen and Fleming, who named their treatises on the person of Christ *Christology*), and has recently been reintroduced from Germany. We confine ourselves here to a historical summary of the doctrine within the limits of this work, omitting the mediæval and Protestant development and modern speculations, and referring for details to the articles on Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Monophysitism, Council of Nicaea, Council of Chalcedon, &c.

I. The BIBLICAL Christology embraces (1) the

Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament; (2) the Christology of Christ in the Gospels; (3) the Christology of the Apostles, (a) of James; (b) of Peter; (c) of Paul; (d) of John (including the Apocalypse). See the respective articles in Smith's *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*.

II. The ANTE-NICENE Christology (from the death of St. John, about A.D. 100, to the council of Nicaea, 325). The ecclesiastical development of this central and fundamental dogma of our religion started from the confession of Peter (*σὺ εἶ δὲ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*), which Christ made the rock of his indestructible church, and from the idea of the incarnate Logos of John (*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*), i.e. from the faith in the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth and in the incarnation of the eternal Son of God for our salvation. It embraced three points, inseparably connected, the *divinity* of Christ, the *humanity* of Christ, and the proper relation of the two to each other in his theanthropic person. They were developed in constant conflict with heresy, which served to stimulate and unfold the knowledge of the church, and to compel it to a logical statement of its faith. The ante-Nicene church had to contend with two fundamental and antagonistic christological heresies, *Ebionism* and *Gnosticism*; the one essentially Jewish, the other essentially heathen; the one affirming the humanity of Christ to the exclusion of his divinity, the other running into the opposite error by resolving his humanity into a delusive show (*δῶκησις, φάντασμα*); both agreeing in the denial of the incarnation or the real and abiding union of the Divine and human in the person of our Lord. Besides there arose in the 2nd and 3rd centuries two forms of *Unitarianism* or *Monarchianism*, (a) first the *rationalistic* or *dynamic* Unitarianism represented by the *Alogians*, *Theodotus*, *Artemon*, and *Paul of Samosata* (see these articles), who either denied the divinity of Christ altogether or resolved it into a mere power (*δύναμις*), although they generally admitted his supernatural generation by the Holy Spirit; (b) the *Patripassian* and *Sabellian* Unitarianism, which maintained the divinity of Christ, but merged it into the essence of the Father, and so denied the independent *personality* of Christ; as did *Praxeas*, *Noëtus*, *Cullistus* (pope *Calixtus I.*), *Beryllus* of Bostra, and, in connexion with a very ingenious theory of the Trinity, *Sabellius* (see these articles).

In antagonism with these heresies the church taught the full divinity of Christ (*versus* Ebionism and rationalistic Monarchianism), his full humanity (*versus* Gnosticism and Manicheism), and his independent personality (*versus* Patripassianism and Sabellianism). The dogma was developed in close connexion with the dogma of the Trinity, which resulted with logical necessity from the deity of Christ and the deity of the Holy Ghost in connexion with the fundamental principle of Monotheism; for if Christ be strictly divine and the Holy Spirit likewise, then God, who is one in essence, must be threefold in person, Father, Son, and Spirit; and to this inherent or immanent Trinity of being corresponds an economical Trinity of revelation or self-manifestation in the works of creation, redemption, and sanctification.

The ante-Nicene Christology is not as clear and definite as that of the Nicene and post-Nicene ages; it passed through a process with many

obstructions, loose statements, uncertain conjectures and speculations; but the instinct and main current of the church was steadily towards the Nicene and Chalcedonian creed-statements, especially if we look to the worship and devotional life as well as to theological literature. Christ was the object of worship, prayer, and praise (which implies his deity) from the very beginning; as we must infer from several passages of the New Testament (John xx. 28; Acts vii. 59, 60; ix. 14, 21; 1 Cor. i. 2; Phil. ii. 10; Heb. i. 6; 1 John v. 13-15; Rev. v. 6-13), from the heathen testimony of Pliny the Younger concerning the singing of hymns to Christ as God ("carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere," *Ep.* x. 97), from the *Gloria in excelsis*, which was the daily morning hymn of the Eastern church as early as the 2nd century, from the *Tersanctus*, from the hymn of Clement of Alexandria to the divine Logos (*Paedag.* iii. 12), to the statements of Origen, *contra Cels.* viii. 67; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 28, and many other testimonies. Christ was believed to be divine and adored as divine, before he was clearly taught to be divine. Life preceded theology. Many a martyr in those days of persecution died for his faith in the divinity of our Lord, with a very imperfect knowledge of this doctrine. It is unfair to make the church responsible for the speculative crudities, the experimental and tentative statements of some ante-Nicene fathers, who believed more than they could clearly express in words. In the first efforts of the human mind to grapple with so great a mystery we must expect many mistakes and inaccuracies. The ante-Nicene rules of faith as we find them in the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, etc., are essentially agreed among themselves and with the Apostles' Creed, so called, as it appears first in the 4th century, especially at Rome and Aquileia (see Rufinus, *de Symbolo*). They confess the divine-human character of Christ as the chief object of the Christian faith, but more in the form of facts and in simple, popular style than in the form of doctrinal or logical statement. The Nicene Creed is much more explicit and dogmatic in consequence of the preceding contest with heresy, but the substance of the faith is the same in the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.

In the apostolic fathers we find only simple, practical, biblical statements and reminiscences of apostolic preaching for purposes of edification. One of them, Ignatius of Antioch, does not hesitate to call Christ God without qualification (*ad Ephes.* c. 18: $\delta \gamma\alpha\rho \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \Upsilon\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$; c. 7, $\epsilon\nu \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, comp. *ad Rom.* c. 6). Polycarp calls him "the eternal Son of God" (*ad Phil.* c. 2, 8), and associates him in his last prayer with the Father and the Spirit (*Martyr. Polyc.* c. 14). Comp. Schwane's *Dogmengeschichte der vornicänischen Zeit* (Münster, 1862), pp. 60 sqq.

The theological speculation on the person of Christ began with Justin Martyr and was carried on by Clement of Alexandria and Origen in the East; Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian in the West.

Justin Martyr (d. 166) takes up the Logos idea, which was prepared by the Old Testament personification of the Word and Wisdom of God, assumed an idealistic shape in Philo of Alexandria, and reached a realistic completion in St. John.

Following the suggestion of the double meaning of the Greek λόγος (*ratio* and *oratio*), Justin distinguishes in the Logos, i.e. the divine nature of Christ, two elements, the immanent and the transitive, the revelation of God *ad intra* and the revelation *ad extra*. He teaches the procession of the Logos from the free will (not the essence) of God by generation, without division or diminution of the divine substance. The begotten Logos he conceives as a hypostatic being, a person distinct from the Father and subordinate to him. He co-ordinates God the Son and the prophetic Spirit as objects of Christian worship ($\sigma\epsilon\beta\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\kappa\upsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$, *Apol.* i. 6). Peculiar is his doctrine of the λόγος $\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$, the Word disseminated among man, i.e. Christ before the incarnation, who scattered elements of truth and virtue among the heathen philosophers and poets, although they did not know it. (Comp. the monograph of Semisch on *Justin Martyr*, and the thorough discussion in Dorner's *History of Christology*, i. 415-435.) Clement of Alexandria (d. 220) sees in the Logos the ultimate principle of all existence, without beginning and timeless; the revealer of the Father, the sum of all intelligence and wisdom, the personal truth, the author of the world, the source of light and life, the educator of the race, who at last became man to make us partakers of his divine nature. Like some other ante-Nicene fathers (Justin M., Tertullian, and Origen), he conceived the outward appearance of Christ's humanity in the state of humiliation to have been literally "without form or comeliness" (*Isa.* liii. 2, 3), but he made a distinction between two kinds of beauty, the outward beauty of the flesh, which soon fades away, and the moral beauty of the soul, which is permanent, and shone even through the servant form of our Lord (*Paed.* iii. c. 1). Origen (d. 254) felt the whole weight of the christological problem, but obscured it by foreign speculations, and prepared the way both for the Arian heresy and the Athanasian orthodoxy, though more fully for the latter. On the one hand, he closely approaches the Nicene Homoousion by bringing the Son into union with the essence of the Father, and ascribing to him the attribute of eternity; he is properly the author of the Nicene doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son from the essence of the Father (though he usually represents the generation as an act of the will of the Father). But on the other hand, he teaches subordinationism by calling the Son simply God ($\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$), and a second God ($\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$), but not the God ($\delta\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, or $\alpha\upsilon\tau\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$). In his views on the humanity of Christ he approached the semi-Gnostic doceticism and ascribed to the glorified body of Christ ubiquity (in which he was followed by Gregory of Nyssa). His enemies charged him with teaching a double Christ (answering to the lower Jesus and the higher Soter of the Gnostics), and a merely temporary validity of the body of the Redeemer. As to the relation of the two natures in Christ, he was the first to use the term 'God-man' ($\delta\epsilon\alpha\nu\theta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma$), and to apply the favourite illustration of fire heating and penetrating the iron without altering its character.

The Western church was not so fruitful in speculation, but upon the whole sounder and more self-consistent. The key-note was struck by Irenaeus (d. 202), who, though of Eastern

origin, spent his active life in the south of France. He carries special weight as a pupil of Polycarp of Smyrna, and through him a grand pupil of St. John, the inspired master *θεόλογος*. He likewise uses the terms Logos and Son of God interchangeably, and concedes the distinction, made also by the Valentinians, between the inward and the uttered word, in reference to man, but contests the application of it to God, who is above all antitheses, absolutely simple and unchangeable, and in whom before and after, thinking and speaking, coincide. He repudiates also every speculative or *à priori* attempt to explain the derivation of the Son from the Father; this he holds to be an incomprehensible mystery. He is content to define the actual distinction between Father and Son, by saying that the former is God revealing himself, the latter God revealed; the one is the ground of revelation, the other is the actual, appearing revelation itself. Hence he calls the Father "the invisible of the Son," and the Son "the visible of the Father." He discriminates most rigidly the conceptions of generation and of creation. The Son, though begotten of the Father, is still, like him, distinguished from the created world, as increate, without beginning, and eternal. All plainly shewing, that Irenaeus is much nearer the Nicene dogma of the substantial identity of the Son with the Father than Justin Martyr and the Alexandrians. If, as he does in several passages, he still subordinates the Son to the Father, he is certainly inconsistent: and that for want of an accurate distinction between the eternal Logos and the actual Christ. Expressions like "My Father is greater than I," which apply only to the Christ of history, in the state of humiliation, he refers also, like Justin and Origen, to the eternal Logos. On the other hand, he is charged with leaning in the opposite direction towards the Sabellian and Patripassian views, but unjustly. Apart from his frequent want of precision in expression, he steers in general, with sure biblical and churchly tact, equally clear of both extremes, and asserts alike the essential unity and the eternal personal distinction of the Father and the Son. The incarnation of the Logos he ably discusses, viewing it both as a restoration and redemption from sin and death, and as the completion of the revelation of God and of the creation of man. In the latter view, as finisher, Christ is the perfect Son of Man, in whom the *likeness* of man to God (the *similitudo Dei*), regarded as moral duty, in distinction from the *image* of God (*imago Dei*), as an essential property, becomes for the first time fully real. According to this, the incarnation would be grounded in the original plan of God for the education of mankind, and independent of the fall: it would have taken place even without the fall, though in some other form. Yet Irenaeus does not expressly say this; speculation on abstract possibilities was foreign to his realistic cast of mind. He vindicates at length the true and full humanity of Christ against the docetism of the Gnostic schools. Christ must be man, like us, in body, soul, and spirit, though without sin, if he would redeem us from sin and make us perfect. He is the second Adam, the absolute, universal man, the prototype and summing up (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσις, recapitulation*) of the whole race. Connected with this is the beautiful idea of Irenaeus (repeated by Hippolytus)

that Christ made the circuit of all the stages of human life to redeem them all (*Adv. Haer. ii. 22, § 4: omnes venit per semetipsum salvare . . . infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes, et seniores, etc.*). To carry this out, he extended the life of Jesus to fifty years. He also teaches a close union of the divinity and humanity in Christ, in which the former is the active principle and the seat of personality, the latter the passive and receptive principle.

Tertullian cannot escape the charge of subordinationism. He bluntly calls the Father the whole divine substance, and the Son a part of it; illustrating their relation by the figures of the fountain and the stream, the sun and the beam. He would not have two suns, he says, but he might call Christ God, as Paul does in Rom. ii. 5. The sunbeam, too, in itself considered, may be called sun, but not the sun a beam. Sun and beam are two distinct things (species) in one essence (substantia), as God and the Word, as the Father and the Son. But we should not take figurative language too strictly, and must remember that Tertullian was specially interested to distinguish the Son from the Father in opposition to the Patripassian Praxeas. In other respects he did the church Christology material service. He propounds a threefold hypostatical existence of the Son (*filio*):—(1) The pre-existent, eternal immanence of the Son in the Father; they being as inseparable as reason and word in man, who was created in the image of God, and hence in a measure reflects his being. (2) The coming forth of the Son with the Father for the purpose of the creation. (3) The manifestation of the Son in the world by the incarnation. He advocates the entire yet sinless humanity of Christ against both the docetistic Gnostics (*Adv. Marcionem, and De carne Christi*) and the Patripassians (*Adv. Praxeas*). He accuses the former of making Christ who is all truth, a half lie, and, by the denial of his flesh, resolving all his work in the flesh into an empty show. He urges against the latter that God the Father is incapable of suffering and change. Cyprian (d. 250) marks no progress in this or any other doctrine except that of the Catholic unity and the episcopate.

Dionysius, bishop of Rome (262), came nearest the Nicene view. He maintained distinctly, in the controversy with Dionysius of Alexandria, the unity of essence and the threefold personal distinction of Father, Son, and Spirit, in opposition to Sabellianism, tritheism, and subordinationism. His view is embodied in a fragment preserved by Athanasius (*De sent. Dionysii, c. 4, and Routh, Reliqu. s. iii. 384*).

On the ante-Nicene Christology see especially Bull's *Defensio fidei Nicaenae de aeternâ divinitate Filii Dei* (first Oxf. 1685); Edw. Burton's *Testimonies of the ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ* (2nd ed. Oxf. 1829), and the first sections in the works of Baur and Dorner (see below); also P. Schaaf, *The Conflict of Trinitarianism and Unitarianism in the ante-Nicene age* (*Bibliotheca Sacra* of Andover, 1858, Oct.).

III. The NICENE Christology (from the council of Nicaea, 325, to the council of Constantinople, 381). It is the result of the struggle with Arianism and Semi-arianism (see these articles) which agitated the church,

especially the Eastern church, for more than half a century. The Arian heresy denied the strict deity of Christ (the co-equality with the Father), and taught that he is a subordinate divinity, different in essence from God (ἑτεροούσιος), pre-existing before the world, yet not eternal (ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν), himself a creature of the will of God out of nothing (κτίσμα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων), who then created this present world and became incarnate for our salvation. Semi-arianism held an untenable middle ground between the Arian *hetero-ousia* and the orthodox *homo-ousia* of the Son with the Father, and asserted the *homoi-ousia* or similarity of essence, which of course was a very elastic term, and might be contracted into an Arian, or stretched into an orthodox sense, according to the general spirit and tendency of the men who held it. In opposition to these heresies Athanasius of Alexandria ("the father of orthodoxy") and the three Cappadocian bishops, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa, maintained and defended with superior ability, vigour, and perseverance, the *homo-ousia*, i.e., the essential oneness of the Son with the Father, or his eternal divinity, as the corner-stone of the whole Christian system.

This doctrine triumphed in the first oecumenical council, convened by Constantine the Great, and after a new and longer struggle it was reasserted in the second oecumenical council. It is briefly and tersely laid down in the chief article of the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed (381), which has stood ever since like an immovable rock:—

(Πιστεύομεν) . . . εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, [Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ], ὥς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

The original Nicene Creed (325) had also an express formula of condemnation of Arianism which was subsequently omitted:—

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστόν, τρεπτόν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

(We believe) . . . in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, [God of God,] Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made.

But those who say "There was a time when He was not," and "He was not before He was born," and "He was made out of nothing," or say, "He was of a different substance or essence," or that the Son of God is "created, changeable, or mutable,"—they are anathematized by the Catholic church.

On the NICENE Christology, see besides the general works of Petavius, Baur, Dorner, etc., Möhler's monograph on *Athanasius* (1844); Newman on the *Arians of the 4th century* (1838 and 1854); Bishop Kaye on the *Council of Nicaea* (1853); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* (1855 sqq. vol. i. 219 sqq.); Voigt, *Die Lehre des Athanasius* (1861), and Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the Eastern church* (1862, lect. ii.—vii.)

IV. THE CHALCEDONIAN Christology is the fully developed Christology of the ancient

Eastern and Western Catholic church. It finds its normal expression in the Chalcedonian statement of 451, which must be ranked with the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds. It was the answer of the orthodox church to the heresies which arose after the Nicene age, and which related to the proper constitution of Christ's theanthropic person.

These heresies are chiefly three, viz., (1) *Apollinarianism*, which is a partial denial of the humanity, as Arianism is of the divinity, of Christ. Apollinaris the younger of Laodicea (d. 390), on the basis of the Platonic trichotomy, ascribed to Christ a human body (σῶμα) and animal soul (ψυχὴ ἄλογος), but not a human spirit or reason (ψυχὴ λογικὴ, νοῦς, πνεῦμα); he put the divine Logos in the place of the rational soul, and thus substituted a Θεὸς σαρκοφόρος for a real θεάνθρωπος, a mixed middle being for a divine-human person. From this error it follows either that the rational soul of man was not redeemed or that it needed no redemption.

(2) *Nestorianism* (from Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, d. in exile 440), admitted the full deity and the full humanity of Christ, but put them into a loose mechanical conjunction or affinity (συνάφεια) rather than an intimate personal union (ἐνωσις), and hence it objected to the term "mother of God" (θεοτόκος, *Deipara*), as applied to the Virgin Mary.

(3) *Eutychianism* (from Eutyches, presbyter at Constantinople, d. after 451), is the very opposite of Nestorianism, and sacrificed the distinction of the two natures in Christ to the unity of the person to such an extent as to make the incarnation an absorption of the human nature by the divine, or a deification of human nature, even of the body; hence the Eutychians thought it proper to use the phrases, God is born, God suffered, God was crucified, God died. (See the article on these several titles.)

The third and fourth oecumenical councils (Ephesus 431, and Chalcedon 451), settled the question of the precise relation of the two natures in Christ's person, as the first and second (325 and 381) had decided the doctrine of his divinity. The decree of the council of Ephesus under the lead of the violent Cyril of Alexandria was merely negative, a condemnation of the error of Nestorius, and leaned a little towards the opposite error of Eutyches. The council of Chalcedon gave a clear and full statement of the orthodox faith concerning Christ's person in opposition both to Eutychianism and Nestorianism. It has been adopted as final by the church in the East and the West, and is as follows (see Act v. in Mansi's *Concil.* tom. vii. p. 115).

Ἐπόμενοι τοῖνυν τοῖς ἀγίοις πατράσιν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογοῦντες υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκοντες, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῆ τὸν αὐτὸν, ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς^a καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον

We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul^a and body; consubstantial [co-equal] with the Father according to the Godhead, and con-

^a Against Apollinarianism.

τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὁμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου^b κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, υἱόν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐκ δύο φύσεων [ἐν δύο φύσεσιν].^c ἀσυνχύτως, ἀτρέπτως,^d ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως^e γνωρίζομενον οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἑνωσιν, σωθῆσθαι δὲ μάλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκείνης φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μερίζομενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱόν καὶ μονογενῆ, θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καθάπερ ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξέπαιδευσε καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδόξωκε σύμβολον.

The same doctrine is set forth in a more condensed form in the second part of the so-called Athanasian Creed.

Sed necessarium est ad aeternam salutem, ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat. Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei Filius, Deus [pariter] et homo est; Deus ex substantiā Patris, ante secula genitus, et homo ex substantiā matris, in seculo natus. Perfectus Deus: perfectus homo, ex animā rationali et humanā carne subsistens. Aequalis Patri secundum divinitatem: minor Patri secundum humanitatem. Qui licet Deus sit et homo; non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus. Unus autem, non conversione divinitatis in carnem; sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum. Unus omnino; non confusione substantiae; sed unitate personae. Nam sicut anima rationalis et

Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that we also believe rightly [faithfully] the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the Substance [Essence] of the Father; begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance [Essence] of his Mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect Man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead; and inferior to the Father as touching his Manhood. Who although he be God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by assumption of the Manhood

caro unus est homo: ita Deus et homo unus est Christus. Qui passus est pro nostrā salutē: descendit ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, etc.

into God. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance [Essence]: but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man: so God and Man is one Christ; who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell [Hades, spirit-world], rose again the third day from the dead, etc.

On the Chalcedonian council compare Mansi, *Acta Conc. t. vii.*; Harduin, *Conc. tom. iii.*; Gallandi, *Bibl. PP.*, tom. xi.; Liberatus, *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*; Arendt, *Papst Leo der Grosse* (1835); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii. 392, sqq.

V. THE POST-CHALCEDONIAN CHRISTOLOGY. The Chalcedonian decision did not stop the controversy and called for a supplementary statement concerning the *two wills* of Christ corresponding to the *two natures*.

Eutychianism revived in the form of *Monophysitism* (μόνη φύσις) or the doctrine that Christ had but one composite nature (μία φύσις σύνθετος or μία φύσις διττή). It makes the humanity of Christ a mere accident of the immutable divine substance. The liturgical shibboleth of the Monophysites was, "God has been crucified," which they introduced into the trisagion (ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς). Hence they are also called *Theopaschites* (θεοπασχῖται). The tedious Monophysite controversies convulsed the Eastern church for more than a hundred years, weakened its power and facilitated the conquest of Mohammedanism. The fifth oecumenical council, held at Constantinople, 553, made a partial concession to the Monophysites, but did not reconcile them. They separated, like their antipodes, the Nestorians, from the orthodox Greek church, and continue to this day under various names and organisations (the Jacobites in Syria, the Copts in Egypt, the Abyssinians, and the most important of them, the Armenians). [COPTIC CHURCH.]

Closely connected with Monophysitism was *Monothelitism* (μόνον and θέλημα) or the doctrine that Christ had but one *will*, as He had but one nature. The orthodox maintained that will is an attribute of nature rather than person, and consequently that Christ had *two wills*, a human will and a divine will, both working in harmony. The Monothelite controversy lasted from 633 to 680. The emperor Heraclius proposed a compromise formula—one divine-human energy (μία θεανδρική ἐνέργεια), but it was opposed in the West.

The sixth oecumenical council, held in Constantinople, A.D. 680 (also called the third Constantinopolitan council or the Conc. Trullanum I.), condemned the Monothelite heresy and repeated the Chalcedonian Creed with the following supplement concerning the two wills (Artic. xviii., in Mansi's *Conc.*, tom. xi. p. 637):—

Καὶ δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις ἦτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαίρετως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυνχύτως κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίαν ὡσαύτως κηρύττοντες καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεραντία, μὴ γένοιτο,

And we likewise preach *two natural wills* in him [Jesus Christ], and *two natural operations* undivided, inconvertible, inseparable, unmixed, according to the doctrine of the holy fathers; and the two natural wills [are] not contrary, far

^b Against Nestorius.

^c All Latin editions read in *duabus naturis*. But the received Greek text means essentially the same, although it may have been altered from the original, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, in the interest of Monophysitism. See *Church History*, by the writer of this article, vol. iii. pp. 745 sq.

^d ἀσυνχύτως, *inconfuse*, and ἀτρέπτως, *immutabiliter* are directed against Eutychianism.

^e ἀδιαίρετως, *indivisible*, and ἀχωρίστως, *inseparabiliter* exclude Nestorianism.

καθὼς οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἐφθναν αἰρετικοί, ἀλλ' ἐπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα, καὶ μὴ ἀντίτιπον ἢ ἀντιπαλαίον, μάλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι· εἶδει γὰρ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς θέλημα κινῆσθαι, ὑποταγῆναι δὲ τῷ θελήματι τῷ θεϊκῷ, κατὰ τὸν πάνσοφον Ἀθανάσιον.

The council then quotes from John vi. 38, Gregory Nazianzen, pope Leo I., Cyril of Alexandria. The same council condemned pope Honorius as a Monothelite heretic, a fact which figured conspicuously in the Vatican council (1870) as an argument against papal infallibility. Monothelitism continued among the Maronites on Mount Lebanon, as well as among the Monophysites, who are all Monothelites.

With the sixth oecumenical council closes the development of the ancient catholic Christology. The Adoption controversy, which arose in Spain and France toward the close of the 8th century, turned upon the question whether Christ, according to his human nature, was the Son of God by nature (*naturaliter*) or simply by adoption (*nuncupative*). It was a modification of the Nestorian error and was condemned in a synod at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 794, but it did not result in a positive addition to the creed statements.

The scholastic theology of the middle ages made no real progress in Christology (for the Anselmic theory of the atonement belongs to Soteriology), and confined itself to dialectical analysis and defence of the Chalcedonian dogma with a one-sided reference to the divine nature of Christ. The evangelical Reformation symbols, Lutheran, Anglican, and Calvinistic, strongly assert their agreement with the Greek and Latin churches on the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the person of Christ, as laid down in the oecumenical creeds. But the Christological dogma was further developed, especially in the Lutheran communion and in connection with the eucharistic controversy. The Lutheran Formula of Concord gave symbolic authority to the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* (in a threefold form, *genus idiomatum*, *g. apotelesmaticum*, *g. majestaticum*), and the ubiquity of Christ's body (as a necessary support to the real corporeal presence in the Eucharist); leaving, however, undecided the question whether the ubiquity was absolute (as Brentius and Andreae maintained), or relative and dependent on Christ's will (*multivolipraesentia*, as Chemnitz and the Saxon divines taught). The last chapter in the orthodox Lutheran Christology is the subtle controversy between the Tübingen and Giessen divines in the early part of the 17th century, concerning the *κρύψις* and *κένωσις*, i.e., whether Christ in the state of humiliation made *secret use* (*κρύψις*) of his divine attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence (even in the mother's womb, and when dying on the cross), or *renounced* the use (*κένωσις*) except in the working of miracles. Both agreed in teaching that Christ, even as man, had the *possession* (*κτῆσις*) of the divine attributes, and they differed only as to the *use* (*χρήσις*). It is plain that the Tübingen view carried the theory of the *communicatio idiomatum* to the verge of gnostic

from it! (as the impious heretics assert), but his human will follows the divine will, and is not resisting or reluctant, but rather subject to his divine and omnipotent will. For it was proper that the will of the flesh should be moved, but be subjected to the divine will, according to the wise Athanasius.

doceticism and resolved the human life of Christ on earth into a magical illusion. The Reformed churches denied the ubiquity of Christ's body, and that kind of the *communicatio idiomatum*, whereby the attributes of the divine nature are communicated to the human. They opposed the Lutheran Christology as running into Eutychianism, and held fast to the Chalcedonian dyophysitism. The Reformed divines also differed from the Lutheran on the doctrine of the two states of Christ (Phil. ii. 5-9), the state of humiliation and the state of exaltation; the former refer these states to both natures, the latter only to the human nature; the former begin the humiliation with the incarnation, the latter exclude this from the humiliation. The Lutheran theory of Brenz and Andreae moreover made the two states to co-exist during the earthly life of Christ, so that the exaltation of Christ's humanity began with the incarnation and continued in a concealed form until it became openly manifest in the ascension to the right hand of the Father, i.e., the almighty and omnipresent power of God.

VI. ANALYSIS OF THE OECUMENICAL CHRISTOLOGY. The following are the leading ideas of the Chalcedonian Christology as held by the Greek, Latin, and Evangelical Protestant churches:—

1. A true INCARNATION of the Logos, or the second person in the Godhead (*ἐνανθρώπησις θεοῦ, ἐνσάρκωσις τοῦ λόγου, incarnatio Verbi*). This incarnation is neither a conversion nor transmutation of God into man, nor a conversion of man into God, and a consequent absorption of the one, nor a confusion (*κρᾶσις, σύγχυσις*) of the two; nor, on the other hand, a mere indwelling (*ἐνίκησις, inhabitatio*) of the one in the other, nor an outward, transitory connexion (*συνάφεια, conjunctio*) of the two factors, but an actual and abiding union of the two in one personal life.

2. The precise distinction between NATURE and PERSON. Nature or substance (*οὐσία*) denotes the totality of powers and qualities which constitute a being; while person (*ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον*) is the Ego, the self-conscious, self-asserting and acting subject. The Logos assumed, not a human person (else we should have two persons, a divine and a human), but human nature which is common to us all; and hence he redeemed, not a particular man, but all men as partakers of the same nature.

3. THE GOD-MAN as the result of the incarnation. Christ is not a (Nestorian) *double* being, with two persons, nor a compound (Apollinarian or Monophysite) *middle* being, a *tertium quid*, neither divine nor human; but he is *one person both* divine and human.

4. THE DUALITY OF THE NATURES. The orthodox doctrine maintains, against Eutychianism, the distinction of natures even after the act of incarnation, without confusion or conversion (*ἀσυνχύτως, inconfuse, and ἀτρέπτως, immutabiliter*), yet, on the other hand, without division or separation (*ἀδιαίρετως, indivise, and ἀχωρίστως, inseparabiliter*), so that the divine will ever remain divine, and the human ever human, and yet the two have continually one common life and interpenetrate each other, like the persons of the Trinity.

5. THE UNITY OF THE PERSON (*ἑνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν, ἑνωσις ὑποστατική, unio hypostatica*

or *unio personalis*). The union of the divine and human nature in Christ is a permanent state resulting from the incarnation, and is a real, supernatural, personal, and inseparable union—in distinction from an essential absorption or confusion, or from a mere moral union, or from a mystical union such as holds between the believer and Christ. The two natures constitute but one personal life, and yet remain distinct. "The same who is true God," says pope Leo, "is also true man, and in this unity there is no deceit; for in it the lowliness of man and the majesty of God perfectly pervade one another. . . . Because the two natures make only one person, we read on the one hand: 'The Son of Man came down from heaven' (John iii. 13), while yet the Son of God took flesh from the Virgin; and on the other hand: 'The Son of God was crucified and buried,' while yet he suffered, not in his Godhead as co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father, but in the weakness of human nature."

6. The whole WORK of Christ is to be attributed to his person, and not to the one or the other nature exclusively. The person is the acting subject, the nature the organ or medium. It is the one divine-human person of Christ that wrought miracles by virtue of his divine nature, and that suffered through the sensorium of his human nature. The superhuman effect and infinite merit of the Redeemer's work must be ascribed to his person because of his divinity; while it is his humanity alone that made him capable of, and liable to, toil, temptation, suffering, and death, and renders him an example for our imitation.

7. The ANHYPOSTASIA, IMPERSONALITY, or, to speak more accurately, the ENHYPOSTASIA, of the human nature of Christ; for anhypostasia is a purely negative term, and presupposes a fictitious abstraction, since the human nature of Christ did not exist at all before the act of the incarnation, and could therefore be neither personal nor impersonal. The meaning of this doctrine is that Christ's human nature had no independent personality of its own, besides the divine, and that the divine nature is the root and basis of his personality.

The Chalcedonian Christology has latterly been subjected to a rigorous criticism (by Schleiermacher, Baur, Dörner, Rothe, and others), and has been charged with a defective psychology, and now with dualism, now with docetism, according as its distinction of two natures or of the personal unity has most struck the eye. But these imputations neutralise each other, like the imputations of tritheism and modalism, which may be made against the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity when either the tripersonality or the consubstantiality is taken alone. This, indeed, is the peculiar excellence of the Creed of Chalcedon, that it exhibits such tact and circumspection in uniting the colossal antithesis in Christ, and seeks to do justice alike to the distinction of the natures and to the unity of the person. In Christ all contradictions are reconciled.

The Chalcedonian Creed is far from exhausting the great mystery of godliness, "God manifest in flesh." It leaves much room for a fuller appreciation of the genuine, perfect, and sinless humanity of Christ, of the Pauline doctrine of

the *Kenosis*, or self-renunciation and self-limitation of the Divine Logos in the incarnation and during the human life of our Lord, and for the discussion of other questions connected with his relation to the Father and to the world, his person, and his work. But it indicates the essential elements of Christological truth, and the boundary-lines of Christological error. It defines the course for the sound development of this central article of the Christian faith so as to avoid both the Scylla of Nestorian dualism and the Charybdis of Eutychian monophysitism, and to save the full idea of the one divine-human personality of our Lord and Saviour. Within these limits theological speculation may safely and freely move, and bring us to clearer conceptions; but in this world, where we "know only in part (*ἐκ μέρους*)," and "see through a mirror obscurely (*δὴ ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι*)," we can never fully comprehend the great central mystery of the theanthropic life of our Lord.

Literature.—Besides the works already quoted on special topics, see Petavius, *De theologicis dogmatibus* (Paris, 1644–50), tom. iv.; and v. (*De incarnatione Verbi*). F. Chr. Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen, 1841–43, 3 vols.). Is. A. Dörner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi* (1836, 2nd enlarged ed. Stuttgart, 1845–1853, in 2 vols. English translation by Alexander and Simon, Edinb. 1861, in 5 vols.—a masterpiece, and altogether the best work on the general history of the subject). R. J. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord*, etc. to the ed. London, 1852. H. P. Liddon, *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, Lond. 1868 (Bampton Lectures for 1866). M. T. Sadler, *Emmanuel, or the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Foundation of immutable Truth*, London, 1867. Goodwin, *The Divine Humanity of Christ* (New York, 1875). In part also the numerous literature on the Life of Christ, of which we have only room to mention Lange, Andrews, Ellicott, van Oosterzee, de Pressensé, Keim, and Fr. W. Farrar (the last in 2 vols., London and New York, 1874). The writer of this article has drawn in part from the third vol. of his *History of the Christian Church*, and his article *Christology* for McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopaedia of Bibl., Theol., and Ecclesiast. Literature*, vol. ii. (New York, 1868), pp. 277–285. [P. S.]

CHRISTOLYTAE. A sect mentioned by John Damascene in his *Treatise on Heresies*. They taught that when Jesus Christ had been recalled to life from the place of the departed, He left His Body with His Soul in the earth, and that it was the Divine Nature alone which had ascended into heaven. Their name comes from this dissolution of the personality of Christ. (Joh. Damasc. *Treatise on Heresies*, num. 93, § 108; *Patrol. Graec.* xciv. p. 681; Ceillier, xii. 69.) [W. M. S.]

CHRISTOPHER, ST. (Χριστοφόρος, CHRISTOPHORUS, CHRISTOFORUS, CHRISTOFANUS, etc., CHRISTÓBAL, CHRISTOPHLE, KESTER, KITT, CHRISDAPHOR.)

(1) A martyr of universal fame. He was baptized by St. Babylas, the martyr-bishop of Antioch, and about the year 250 suffered under

Decius in Lycia.^a From early times down to the current edition of *Acta Sanctorum*, the untrustworthy character of some popular stories related of him has been declared. Usuard (A.D. 876) thus commemorated him (25th July) after St. James, according to the common Western use,^b in his *Martyrologium*. "At Samos in Licia. After he had been scourged with iron rods, and then delivered from the broiling flames by the virtue of Christ, his head was at last severed from his body, which had fallen full of arrow-wounds, and the martyr's witness was complete."

In the Greek church St. Christopher is commemorated 9th May (in company with the prophet Isaiah, who is called *ὁ θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος*, by Theodoret IV. 968), with this troparion (4th tone), in the Uniate New Anthology of Arcudius. "With the head of a dog, noble in faith, and fervent in prayer, as a soldier of Christ thou didst endure torments; at thee the powers of heaven were astonished, thee the king of idols wounded, Christopher of golden-name, wherefore solemnly entreat (*δυσώρει*) the Lord for us."

The saint's cynocephalism, however, had been repudiated long before in the Menology of Basil II. (A.D. 984). "Some marvellous and miraculous relations concerning this saint are current in some quarters; as that he was a dog-headed man-eater, until he was metamorphosed at his conversion. This is not the fact, only some supposed him such because he was a heathen wild and grim. Howbeit he lived in the reign of Decius; and being taken in battle by the Comes,^c he was not able to speak Greek: he prayed to God, and an angel was sent unto him, saying 'Play the man;' and he touched his lips, and gave him power to speak Greek. So he entered into the city and began to preach Christ. And when soldiers are sent out to take him, and his staff put forth buds, they believed Christ, and are baptized with him at Antioch by St. Babylas, at which time he received his name Christopher. Afterward, being brought before the emperor, he was first tried with divers torments, and at the last beheaded."

In a Latin poem, Gualt. Spirensis, subdeacon, gives the Western version of the same date ("983, vel paullo serius"). He devotes five books out of six, and a corresponding prose narrative, to his acts: dwelling upon his miraculous baptism by a cloud after a catechetical instruction from heaven, attested by the budding of his club. His Greek name Reprobos, Canaanitish origin, conversion of multitudes and of the harlots,

^a Later legends conspire in naming a town *Samon*, *Salmon*, or *Salomon*, in which it is just possible a vestige of the old name *Solyimi* survives. The scribe revising one of the Peterhouse MSS. of *Legenda Aurea* (longer text) treated *Salomon* as a clerical error for *Christophorus*, as the construction permits. The vulgar text combines the readings.

^b There was a monastery and basilica dedicated in his name on the bank of the Guadalquivir standing in A.D. 852 (St. Eulogius, *Mem. Sancti*, II. iv. xl.).

^c Cf. the Mozarabic hymn:—

"Declusque Imperator
Captum a Comitibus
Necti suis hunc Beatum
Nittitur militibus."

A poetical plural, unless, according to the Spanish legend, "Comitibus" be a proleptic designation for the soldier-martyrs Gelonias and Aquilinas.

Nicea or Galonica, and Aquilina, sent to tempt him in prison by the blustering tyrant Dagnus, the great iron chair, the arrows, and axe of martyrdom, and the healing of his persecutor's sight are detailed. The story of his dog's head is apologised for, but there is not the slightest allusion to the beautiful modern legend, which is ignored (though he can hardly have been ignorant of it), by Surius, as late as 1573.

The Mozarabic Missal and Breviary (saec. vii.-xvi.) represent the opinion of Toledo, where his relics once rested, in a very simple form. The hymn and the missal speak of Decius Imperator trying to secure the strong man for his army; of Christopher's mouth being miraculously opened; of his providing food for the soldiers (in later times developed into a miracle) who cast in their lot with him. His name was given him at baptism "quia Christum indutus." The missal alludes also to his being tempted (but see AQUILINA), and mentions the amelioration of his visage after baptism. The legend is found in a similar short form in the 33rd sermon of St. Peter Damian (on the festival of the saint), A.D. 1072, and in England as late as the 12th century, MS. Passionale (where, however, Dagnus, Niceta, and Aquilina, appear); but in the following century there are traces of the adoption as history of what art had devised as allegory, and what was explained allegorically by Vida, bishop of Alba, in the 16th century. An 11th century column-capital, preserved in the Campo Santo at Pisa, and a 12th century window in the south transept of Strasburg Cathedral are mentioned by Guénébault as representing St. Christopher, and very early in the 14th century Simon Memmi, of Sienna, painted, in a series of saints, a figure, holding a flowering staff, walking in, or on, water between two rocks, and bearing the Holy Child astride his neck: a head in one corner may be intended to foreshadow his decollation.

Before that time James de Voragine, bishop of Genoa, when compiling his *Legenda Aurea*, found "in quibusdam gestis," in addition to a development of the earlier history, an allegorical tale of the heathen giant Reprobos^d, in a Search after the Stronger-than-he, quitting the service of the king of Canaan, who feared the name of Satan, of Satan who feared the cross, and taking up with a hermit who taught him to serve the Strongest in the charitable work of fording wayfarers across the water, for the giant had neither the gift of fasting nor the conception of prayer. One night a child insisted on being carried over, and in mid-water Reprobos felt his strong knees failing beneath the weight of Him by whom all things were made. By-and-by he apprehends the precious yoke, and finds the burden light. At dawn he has the token of his staff budding, wanders to "Samos of Licea," Dagnus, and so on with the older legend.

It is easy now to recognize in this a sort of rebus on the saint's name. The etymological note stating that he was called Christopher because he carried Christ in four ways, "in humeris per traductionem, in corpore per macerationem, in mente per devotionem, in ore per professionem sive predicationem," not found in a

^d 'Adocimus': *alias* 'Onuphrius,' 'Onuferus,' and even the perversely ingenuous 'Oferus.'

MS. of the 123 legends written in 1299, a year after the compiler's death, occurs (as does the missal extract (*Ambrosius in Prefatione*), in later MSS. and printed editions, with the 177 legends.

From this period the cultus of the saint was yet more popular than before, not only in Spain and Italy, but in France. A colossal wooden figure, erected in Notre Dame by Antoine des Essars in 1413, and destroyed in 1785, is mentioned by Sir T. Browne; the pictures by Memling (1484) and Dürer (1521) are noteworthy. In Western art the Van Eycks' great Adoration of the Immaculate Lamb (1432) is almost alone in representing St. Christopher without our Lord on his shoulders, but the simplicity and general intention of the picture would have been marred by the more popular treatment. The Roman service books provide a proper collect at lauds only, the rest from the common of martyrs. The Parisian particularise a little more—an alternative ninth lesson, merely mentioning a church and convent of his dedication. His popularity must have been increased by the superstition which is to be found expressed, *e. g.* on the much-voiced Spencer print of (or copied from some work of art of) 1423.

"Cristofori faciem die quacunq[ue] tueris
Illa nemp[er]e die morte mala non morieris."

In many English churches painted windows and wall-paintings are preserved; a colossal pulpit in Salisbury museum. Chaucer's yeoman wore a silver medal of the saint, whose aid was commonly invoked here against storms (Hom. *On Peril of Idolatry*, iii. A.D. 1562-3). In the Sarum use he is commemorated (with Cucufas on St. James's day) by a special memorial at 1st vespers, matins, and mass, and his name in the litany on Fridays in Lent. In 1492 and later editions of the missal a supplemental mass is printed, containing a reference to the later legend.

Hone (*Every-day Book*) mentions that the flower *Actaea spicata* is dedicated to him, and called *Herb Christopher*. A synagogue of Jews at Valencia told Vincent Ferrier (A.D. 1357-1413) that they had been converted by a vision of St. Christopher on July 10, and observed that day in his honour. (Moreri.)

Christophorus (Χριστοφόρος, *Christigerulus*, not Χριστόφορος, a *Christo gestus*) probably became a baptismal name very early. It was a title for Christians with some such idea as St. Matt. xi. 29, 30; 2 Cor. iv. 10, v. 16; and with a special reference to Communion. Suicer refers to Phileas *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 10, 3; and passages in Chrysostom, comparing ὁ Θεοφόρος the name of Ignatius. We may add that in one place (*Martyrium Ign.* v. Ruinart, pp. 13, 705), that apostolic martyr is actually called Christopher instead of the commoner Deifer.

Usuardi *Martyrologium*, 25 Julii; *Menologium Graecorum* (Urbini, 1727), May 9; Gualt. Spirensis, *ap.* Bern. Pezii *Thesaurum Anecd.* II. iii. 30-122; *Passionale*, MS. Cantab. saec. xii. ex dono A. Pern; Ja. de Voragine, *Leg. Aurea*, § xcv. MS. Cantab. A.D. 1299 (textus brevior); id. textus longus, MSS. saec. xiv.-xv. typis Colon. 1483; Arcudius, *Anthologion*, Romae, 1598; *Liturgia Mozarabica* (Migne), i. 795-801, Sanctoralia, ii. 1166-1170, Breviar.; other missals, and † Breviaries; *Sarum*, cura Forbes, † MS. saec. xiv.; *Parisian*, 1777, † 1822; *Roman*, 1840, † 1830; Surius, *de Probatis SS. Historiis* CHRIST. BIOGR.

(1571), iv. 353, 354; Baronius, *Martyrol.* 25, Jul.; *Acta Sanctorum*, Julii, tom. vi. pp. 125-149; J. Pinius, *in die* xxv.; Tillemont, *Mémoir. Eccl.* iii. 350, 713 a; Browne's *Vulgar Errors*, v. xvi.; *Notes and Queries*, 4th ser. vols. ii. x.; Max Müller, *Lect. Langu.* 2nd ser. 552-554; Mrs. Jameson, *Sacr. and Legend. Art.* ii. 48-59; Migne's Dictionaries, (a) *Hagiographique* (Pétin), i. 605; (b) *Iconographique* (Guénébault, 1850); (c) *Des Légendes du Christianisme*, ser. 13, vol. xiv. cols. 290-293.

Two MS. lives need investigation. (1) Vienna, codex 276 (Lambecius II. viii.), an Italian ballad-poem. (2) Imperial Library, Paris, fol. No. 7208, dated A.D. 1209.

CHRISTOPHER (2) one of three soldiers of Diocletian's guard, who being converted, A.D. 269, by the constancy of St. George (18th April), suffered charring, scarification, imprisonment, and death. Menology of Basil, iii. 63. (19th April.)

(3) A deacon, who with Clement bishop of Ancyra and Charito, the second deacon, had his throat cut (A.D. 296), while celebrating in prison, according to the Menology of Basil II. 133 (23rd Jan.).

(4) A monk at Jerusalem who testified to the superiority of the common life over the solitary condition of a hermitage; 6th century (*Pratum Spirituale*, cv. auctore J. Moscho; *Migne*, lxxv. 170). [CHR. W.]

(5) Bishop of Arcadiopolis in Asia, at the 2nd council of Constantinople, A.D. 553 (Labbe, *Conc.* v. 582). [E. B. B.]

(6) Sabaita, martyr in Palestine under the Saracens (14th April), 8th century. Pétin, *Dict. Hagiographique* (Migne).

(7) Dean ("primicier") and counsellor of the see of Rome, who with his son Sergius, treasurer of the Roman church, procured armed assistance from Desiderius, king of Lombardy, to dislodge the anti-pope Constantine. Christopher opposed the intrusion of Philip, and procured the election of Stephen III. He attempted to induce Desiderius to restore the church property which he had plundered; whereupon the king was exasperated, and used his influence at Rome with such effect, that the eyes of Christopher and Sergius were torn out, which in three days caused the death of the former, *circ.* A.D. 775 (Dom. Remy Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacr. et eccl.* 1862, xii. 1117-18).

(8) Patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 804-837. He wrote a "synodical" letter (*Migne*, xcv.) to the emperor Theophilus the Iconoclast in favour of the cultus of images, citing the story of king Abgarus. It was signed by 1455 bishops and priests. His ascetic and allegorical treatise *de Vita Humanâ* was printed at Paris in 1608 under the name of *Theophilus Alexandr.*, and in H. Savile's *Chrysostom* in the following year (Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacr. et eccl.* xii. 362, 363; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* vol. ii. p. 23, ed. 1743).

(9) "Patricius, patriâ Mitylenaeus." A menologist. Author of an iambic *Historia Sanctorum*, beginning with September and ending with August. He is included by Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Dissert. i.) among writers of uncertain date.

[CHR. W.]

(10) Chrisdaphor I., Catholicus of Armenia, succeeded Kioud A.D. 475, was succeeded by John A.D. 480.

(11) Chrisdaphor II., Catholicus of Armenia, 2 K

succeeded Sahag A.D. 515, was succeeded by Ghe-vont A.D. 521. He was Dirarhidj in Pakrevant.

CHRISTOPHER (12) Chrisdaphor the Abrahamite, Catholicus of Armenia A.D. 625-628.

These three notices are taken from St. Martin (*Mémoires sur l'Arménie*, i. 437, 438). Compare Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1381, 1386. The dates must be regarded as doubtful. Le Quien does not notice the first of these primates.

[E. B. B.]

CHRISTOTOKOS. [NESTORIUS.]

CHRODEBERT I., archbishop of Tours. His name is otherwise Rigobert, or Zerobert. He occurs in a diploma of king Clovis the younger. Dom Bouquet (*Scriptores Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum*, Paris, 1738-65, 22 vols. fol.) considers him archbishop of Tours.

The *Chronicon Turonense* makes him the prelate who granted that privilege to St. Martin's Abbey at Tours, which was confirmed by pope Adeodatus. Adeodatus, in his letter on the subject to the bishops of Gaul, speaks of "our brother Chrotbert, prelate of the church of Tours" (St. Adeodat. Pont. Rom. *Epist. Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. p. 1141). Pope Adeodatus held the Roman see from 672 to 675.

The *Chronicon Turonense* makes Papolenus successor to Chrotbert I., and puts Chrotbert II. after Papolenus. It describes Chrotbert II. as only confirming the privilege already granted by the earlier Chrotbert.

It is impossible, without further evidence, to settle the relations of the two Chrotberts; and the editors of the 14th volume of *Gallia Christiana* prefer to follow the *Chronicon Turonense*. So also Gams (*Series Episcoporum*, p. 640).

[W. M. S.]

CHRODEBERT II., archbishop of Tours. His name is also given as Ruotbertus, Crabertus, and Erabertus. He is said to have taken his vows A.D. 662. He is distinguished for a judgment which wrote he concerning a woman who had committed adultery after she was professed, or had joined a religious order. The document which contained the judgment was seen by Sirmond in the De Thou library, but was suppressed, as it is thought, for two reasons: first, because Chrodebert, who wrote about the middle of the 7th century, says in it that they did not then acknowledge in France more than the first four general councils, viz. Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon: whence it follows that the churches of that kingdom did not acknowledge as oecumenical the fifth council, which condemned the three chapters, i.e. the council of Constantinople. The other reason was because he maintained that Mary Magdalene merited seeing the Saviour after His resurrection, before that privilege was accorded to the apostles, and even before it was accorded to the blessed Virgin. It is made to appear that Chrodebert treated the affair of the Three Chapters in the same way as the other bishops of France did, when the fifth general council had not yet been acknowledged under the pontificate of St. Gregory, nor under the episcopate of Chrodebert; that with regard to his opinion on the appearance of the Saviour to Mary Magdalene it is founded on Scripture, instead of which those who maintain that He first appeared to His Virgin Mother only so reason in order to suit their own prejudices. In

his judgment on the woman accused of adultery and what sort of punishment the canons impose on that offence, Chrodebert says that, first, he found nothing on that subject in the decrees of the first four general councils, which were alone accepted in his country, but that there was something about it in the 19th canon of the council of Orleans. He goes on to say that with regard to the particular woman whom they wished him to judge, they ought to follow the example of the Saviour in His judgment of the woman accused of a similar offence, and in His merciful treatment of all sinners who shewed signs of repentance. Chrodebert does not doubt that the woman of whom the Saviour said that *her sins were forgiven her because she loved much*, was Mary Magdalene, sister to Martha and Lazarus. At the end of his letter he returns thanks to the person to whom he addresses it for having sent him a linen robe without seam, long and wide, and proportionate to his body. Chrodebert's letter is to be found in the 54th volume of the *Latin Patrology*, among the notes of Quesnel on the epistles of St. Leo the Great. (*Gallia Christ.* xiv. p. 29; Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 762; Le Cointe, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* iii. p. 573.)

[D. R. J.]

CHRODEGANG (ST.), bishop of Metz, in the 8th century. The name is spelt by mediaeval writers with even more than usual diversities. Chrodegangus, Chrodogangus, Chrotgangus. Grodegangus, Grodogangus (Fabric. *Biblioth. Med. et Inf. Aetat.*); Ruggandus (Tritheim. *Script. Eccles.* c. 255); Rotgandus (*Epitaph. ap. Mabill.*; *Analecta Nova*, p. 377); Rodegang, Rotigang (Herzog, *Real Enkyklop.*). The ruggedness of the sound, from the abundance of dental consonants, made the word particularly difficult of pronunciation to lips more accustomed to the smoother languages of the south.

The materials of his biography are chiefly to be found in a notice of him by Paulus Diaconus, almost a contemporary, and well qualified by his position to report faithfully, and who seems to have undertaken his work about the bishops of Metz at the request of Angilramn, the immediate successor of Chrodegang in that see (cf. Paulus Warnefr. *de Gestis Langobard.* vi. c. 16. ap. *AA. SS. Mart.* vi. p. 451). This memoir of Chrodegang, the only fault of which is that it is not longer, is repeated almost word for word, but with considerable additions, in a *Vita Chrodegangi*, of which Pertz gives a minute account in a learned and exhaustive treatise, read before the Royal Academy of Science at Berlin on July 8, 1852, and published among the transactions of the Academy. (*Abhandlung über die Vita Chrodeg. Episc. Mett.* Königl. Akad. der Wissenschaft. 1852.) In his collection of ancient German records, Pertz had already pronounced this Life of Chrodegang inaccurate, especially in its dates, and generally unauthentic. (*Monum. German. Hist.* x. p. 552. Praef. Vit. S. Chrodeg.) In his address at Berlin, investigating the work more closely, he comes to the conclusion from internal evidence, that its date is A.D. 970, and its author most probably John, abbat of Gorze, near Mentz, one of Chrodegang's foundations (cf. Wattenbach, *Deutschl. Geschichtsquellen*; Rettberg assigns an earlier date, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* I. ii. 87). Ac-

according to Pertz, this Life of Chrodegang appeared first, but in part only, in the work of the Magdeburg Centuriators (viii. c. 10, p. 767); in 1730 it was republished in its complete text by Eccard (*Comment. Rer. Franco. Orient.* I. App. p. 912), from a manuscript apparently transcribed in the 12th century, and marked occasionally in the handwriting of Siegebert von Gemblours (Siegebertus Gemblacensis). It is not without interest as a specimen how legends and fables clustered, as it were inevitably, round the lives of great and good men under the hands of monastic biographers, but it adds little or nothing to our knowledge of Chrodegang. It is worth noticing that abbat John dignifies his founder and benefactor with the title of "Confessor."

Chrodegang's lot was cast in an eventful period of European history. He was not merely an eyewitness of the great changes, social, political, and religious, that were transforming Europe, but played a prominent part in them—the severance of the ties which bound Rome and Italy to the decaying empire of Byzantium, the safe emergence of the papal see from the dangers with which the hostility of the Lombardic kingdom threatened it, the various preliminaries of conquest and of legislation which paved the way for the extension and consolidation of the Frankish dominion under Pepin's great successor, and for the welding together of Christendom under the joint sovereignty of emperor and pope. In his official capacity of "referendarius" (keeper of the seal), Chrodegang (as Pertz suggests) probably accompanied Charles Martel in his victorious campaigns against the Saracens and the Frisii. His intimacy and his influence with Pepin and his sons lasted apparently throughout his life without an interruption. As one of the foremost prelates in Europe, and, at the same time, one of the Frankish king's most trusted counsellors, Chrodegang exercised an influence almost unique at that time both in church and state. He is about the first of that long series of ecclesiastics holding high temporal office at court, which terminated in Europe with the 17th century. Personally, as his career shews, and as his biographer describes him, Chrodegang was a man with much force of character, and with more than ordinary ability; a man of large munificence, of winning, gracious presence, and of ready speech; accomplished both in his native language and in the Latin, which was fast becoming the language of educated men in all parts of Europe ("decorus ac facundus in Latino et in patrio sermone," Paul. Diac. v. s.). Chrodegang thus occupies a place in the history of Christendom, of which the importance has hardly been sufficiently appreciated.

Chrodegang was born very early in the 8th century, in Brabant ("Hasbania," Paul. Diac. v. s., a district near Louvain. The word is curiously miswritten by some mediaeval chronicler "Hispania," AA. SS. not. ad Mart. VI.). He was of noble Frankish family; his parents' names in their Latinised form were Sigrannus and Landrada. The anonymous Life of Chrodegang already mentioned, followed by Fabricius (v. s.), makes Chrodegang son of a daughter of Karl Martel. But this is obviously one of the writer's exaggerations. Nothing to this effect is found in Paulus Diaconus, nor in the diplomas where the names occur together of Chrodegang and Pepin, and where Pepin is simply styled

"Chrodegangi Senior" (e. g. *Diplom. pro Fundat. Gorz. Monio*, quoted in Migne, *Bibl. Patr.* from Bréquigny, *Diplomata* II.); and the difficulties of chronology, which this supposition involves, are insuperable (Pertz, v. s.; AA. SS. v. s.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* I. ii. § 87). That Chrodegang was of noble, though not of royal blood, is attested by the foundation-deed of the monastery of Lorsch, where he is styled kinsman ("consanguineus") of the founder and foundress, the son and widow of a count in one of the Rhine districts (Rettberg, v. s.).

The story of Chrodegang having been educated in the monastery of St. Trond (St. Trudo) in the diocese of Liège (Jüttich, Leodium), rests on no foundation* (AA. SS. v. s.). Apparently, like other youths, he passed the early part of his life at court, and was subsequently promoted by Karl Martel to the office of referendarius or chancellor (Paul. Diac. v. s.; cf. *Diplom. Karol. Monastio. S. Dionysii*, ap. AA. SS. Mart. VI.). By the favour of Pepin Chrodegang became bishop of the important see of Metz, retaining his civil office, in A.D. 742 (Paul. Diac. v. s.; Fabric. v. s. gives the date A.D. 745).

In 752 Chrodegang was specially selected by Pepin and his nobles ("singulariter electus a Pippino et omni coetu Francorum," *ib.*) for a very delicate and arduous embassy. It was a critical time for pope Stephen (II. otherwise styled III.). Rome itself was menaced by the Lombards. In his distress the pope looked eagerly beyond the Alps for succour ("cunctorum vota anhelabant," *ib.*); and not in vain. From policy, or from motives of a less worldly kind, Pepin willingly responded to the call; and the bishop^b of Metz was despatched to Italy with one of Pepin's counts ("Authardius dux") to mediate, if possible, between the pope and his invaders, and, if not, to bring the pope to a safe refuge in Pepin's dominions (*ib.*). Mediation was fruitless. But Chrodegang succeeded in extricating Stephen from any dangers that were to be apprehended to his own person, and in conducting him safely, to be lodged in the monastery of St. Denys at Paris. The pope was not ungrateful to his advocate and escort. From his place of exile he sent Chrodegang the archiepiscopal "pallium" (*ib.* Paul. Diac. v. s.; cf. AA. SS. v. s., where a foundation-deed of the time of Pepin is cited, styling Chrodegang "archiepiscopus;" cf. Anastas. Biblioth. *Vit. Steph. P. III.*). Probably Chrodegang's services on this occasion were recalled some ten years later by Stephen's successor Paul I., when he conceded to Chrodegang, what was then considered a boon of priceless value, the relics of certain saints, Nabor, Gorgonius, and Nazarius, to enrich the monasteries which he had founded of Gorze, Lorsch, and St. Avold ("Hilaricum," Mabill. *Ann. O. S. B.* viii. 27). Some accounts add that Chrodegang fetched these precious treasures from Rome himself; and that an attempt was made one night by the monks of St. Maurice to rob him

* D'Achery imagines from the style of Chrodegang's *Regula Canonicorum*, and from its very close resemblance to the *Regula Sti. Benedicti*, that Chrodegang was perhaps a member of the Benedictine community. "Nomen sodalitis nostrò dedit" (Prol. *Reg. Chrod.*).

^b According to the Chronicle of Lorsch, Chrodegang was sent again to attempt negotiations with Astolph just before Pepin's invasion of Lombardy, but ineffectually (*Chron. Lauresham.* ap. AA. SS. v. s.).

of them on his way home (*Vit. Chrod.* p. 934; cf. *Hist. Transl. Sti. Gorgonii*, 10th. century, ap. Mabill. *AA. SS. Saec. III. ii.* p. 207).

Chrodegang's activity in these secular affairs by no means interfered with the vigorous discharge of more strictly ecclesiastical duties. In his own diocese he set himself to correct the laxity and worldliness of his clergy; and this was the primary cause and immediate occasion of his "rule" for the clergy, which was soon to gain a much wider acceptance (*Reg. Chrod. praef.*). He endeavoured to induce the clergy to attend their synodical meetings regularly (*Conc. Met. A.D. 753, c. 3*). As archbishop and legate he consecrated many bishops, as well as ordained many priests and deacons (*Paul. Diac. v. s.*). It was probably at Chrodegang's instigation that a council, held A.D. 755, in Pepin's palace, enacted that ascetics must live either as cloistered monks or under their several bishops "in canonical order" (*Conc. Vernens. c. 11*). He used liberally and wisely the great resources at his command; content himself with a simple and unostentatious way of living, he bestowed alms on the poor largely, and exercised, unsparingly, a truly episcopal hospitality; to churches and monasteries his munificence was princely (*ib. cf. Epitaphium Chrod. ap. Fabric. v. s.*). With the assistance of his royal master he built the choir and presbytery of the cathedral of St. Stephen in his own city, and embellished it with ornaments; he was also a liberal benefactor to the cathedral of Verdun (*ib. cf. AA. SS. v. s.*). In the immediate neighbourhood of his cathedral he founded a clergy-house (his biographer terms it a "monasterium,"^c using the word, as was sometimes done, in its largest sense), where the clergy might live together in common, and endowed it with a revenue sufficient for their wants. The great monasteries, more strictly so called, bore witness to his zeal for organisation, his lavish devotion, and his influence with the powerful and wealthy, at Gorze, at Lorsch, and at St. Avoild (*ib.*). Gorze, about 8 miles from Metz, which afterwards became famous for its schools, seems to have been endowed, in part at least, from the estates of the church already mentioned of St. Stephen at Metz, and, as a colony, to have inherited the designation of its parent church ("de rebus S^ti Stephani . . . cum consensu omnium parium nostrorum, abbatum, presbyterorum, diaconorum . . . et . . . laicorum in servitio S^ti Stephani ecclesiae ad cellam et ecclesiam S^ti Stephani in Gorze," *Diplom. pro Fundat. Gorziens. Monast. v. s.*). It is to be noticed that in the foundation deed, Pepin, one of the co-founders, appears as "major-domus" in the confirmation deed, of later date, as "rex." The monastery at Lorsch or Loresheim (at Aldenmünster), near Worms, was founded A.D. 764, by "Canero" or "Cancor," a count apparently of the Rhine ("Rhemensis," probably a misprint for "Rhenensis"), and his mother "Chillisuvinidis." By their express desire the monastery was exempted from all other jurisdiction—probably they feared, what was a not

uncommon danger, the vexatious rapacity of their bishop,—and subjected solely to the archbishop of Metz, as being their kinsman ("tanquam consanguineo," *AA. SS. v. s.*). Chrodegang appointed his brother "Gundelandus" first abbat, and transplanted thither some of his monks from Gorze (*ib.*). The monastery of St. Hilary^d in Chrodegang's own diocese, on the Saar, gave origin to the town of St. Avoild.

Chrodegang's episcopate lasted rather more than 23 years. He died A.D. 764, two years before his royal patron and friend. In the previous year he presided at the council of Attigny-sur-Aisne.^e He was interred in the monastery at Gorze, the greatest of his foundations (*Paul. Diac. v. s.*). His influence did not die with him. The attempt which he made to check the irregularities of the clergy, and to reform their morals, by imposing on them the strict discipline of the cloister, was renewed with characteristic energy, and with all the authority of his imperial sceptre, by Pepin's son (cf. Milman's *Hist. Lat. Christ. ii.* 294), himself probably in earlier manhood one of those who felt, personally, the influence of the statesman-bishop. Even so, though backed by all the weight of Karl the Great's name and position, the attempt failed, because it was an attempt to impose on the clergy generally a rigid discipline which they would not submit to, and which, had it ever become general, would have severed them too inexorably from the sympathies of their people. In the next century the attempt was renewed under the feebleness of Louis, but, as was to be anticipated, without success. By the "diet-council," as Milman terms it (*Lat. Chr. ii.* p. 316), at Aachen, in A.D. 817, the bishops and archbishops were ordered to extend the canonical discipline to all the priesthood. But, practically, the "canonici" became a class by themselves; distinct from the secular clergy on the one hand, the monks on the other; and, practically, the very evils which Chrodegang strove to correct were fostered by the very remedy which he devised. As the "canonici" increased in wealth and honours, so, like the monastic coenobites, they gained an evil pre-eminence in luxury and worldliness.

It is interesting to compare Chrodegang with the almost contemporary "Apostle of Germany." In many ways they resembled one another, and their work was in many ways identical. In Boniface the politician is more lost in the saint, but in both there is the same combination of religion with practical sagacity. As Boniface extended the limits at once of the Christian church and of the Frankish kingdom among the heathen beyond the Rhine, so Chrodegang was compacting and amalgamating church and state at home. As the great missionary, wherever his enterprises led him, went as the missionary of Rome as well as the missionary of the gospel, so Chrodegang, in his more peaceful sphere of work, legislated in the same spirit of deference, if not of submission, to Rome, introducing Roman rites and ceremonies, the observance of the Ember seasons, and the Roman

^c "Aedificavit monasterium S. Petri Apostoli in parochia S^ti Stephani in pago Mosellensi et ditavit" . . . "Clerum adunavit—instant coenobii intra claustrorum septa conversari fecit—annonas vitaeq. subsidia sufficienter praebuit" (*Paul. Diac. v. s.*).

^d More properly of St. Paul, and, subsequently, of St. Nabor (*Mab. Ann. O. S. B. viii.* 27).

^e Labbe dates this council A.D. 765 (*Conc. Attiniac.*). This makes Chrodegang's death a year later.

manner of singing in church, as part of the discipline which he was enforcing. "Romanā cantilenā imbuti. Morem ac ordinem Romanæ, ecclesiæ servare præcepit." (Paul. Diac. v. s. Cf. H. Wharton *Auctarium ad Usserium de Scripturis et sacris Vernaculis*, p. 358.) Both were essentially Teutonic in character, and in aspirations; both found it necessary to subordinate the Teutonic element to the Latin; both found that, if they wished to organise permanently, they must avail themselves, in those days of license and turbulence, of the centralising authority of Rome.

The missionary and the legislator seem never to have been brought into actual contact; no record of it is preserved. An anonymous writer at Mainz in the 10th century (*AA. SS. Jun. V. Supplem. ad Vit. Bonifac.* ii. p. 475 c), represents Boniface as protesting against pope Stephen making Chrodegang bishop (archbishop) of Metz; and Rettberg argues (*Kircheng. Deutschl.* i. § 73, p. 413), not only that such a protest would be quite in accordance with all that we know of Boniface, but that the idea of any such opposition to Rome would hardly occur to the imagination of a monk in the 10th century. There is however no reference to anything of the kind in the letters of Boniface and Stephen. It would be interesting to know in what relation such men as Boniface and Chrodegang stood to each other personally.

Chrodegang's famous rule for the canonical clergy, "*Regula Canoniorum*," is extant in two forms. The longer rule, consisting of 86 chapters (*D'Achery, Spicileg.* i. 565) appears to be an anonymous copy of the original rule in 34 chapters, which was evidently intended by Chrodegang primarily, though not, perhaps, exclusively, for his own clergy. This longer form omits carefully the special references to Metz, and inserts ("non satis commode," Labbe, *Oss. in Reg.*) various precepts, taken chiefly from the canons of the council of Aachen (*Conc. Aquisgr.* A.D. 816), of more general application (cf. Sigeo. Gemblac. *de Scr. Eccl.* c. 73, ap. Fabric. *Bibl. Ecc.*).

Neither the thing itself, which Chrodegang had in view, nor his name for it, were altogether new. (Cf. Muratori *de Canonici ap. Antiq. Ital. Med. Aevi*, v. p. 183; Thomassin, *de Benef.* I. iii. 8.) The idea of the clergy living together in common under the eye of their bishop dates back to the time of the great Augustine and Eusebius of Vercelli, and never became utterly extinct in the church. The name "Canonic," which Chrodegang preferred to "*Coenobitæ*," probably as more palatable to his clergy, was one of the most ancient designations of the clergy, either because they lived under special rules, or because their names were enrolled in the ecclesiastical registers. In a similar sense, or, less probably, from the custom of reading aloud a chapter of Holy Scripture or of some other religious book on such occasions, the word "*capitulum*" was used before Chrodegang's time for a clerical convocation.

Chrodegang's aim was to revive the primitive discipline among the clergy. The result of his endeavours was that the canonical clergy in their chapter house became distinct from the ordinary clergy in their several parishes. He adopted for

great founder of Western monachism, even in many of its details. The same canonical hours for divine service are enjoined, and the word "*claustrum*" is retained for the clergy-house. Some changes were unavoidable. "*Canonicus*" is substituted for "*monachus*," the bishop stands in the place of the abbat, the archdeacon of the prior. Otherwise there is a strong resemblance at first sight between the two rules. But there are two fundamental differences. The canonici were bound neither by the vow of poverty, nor, in its monastic strictness, by the vow of implicit, unquestioning obedience. Thus Chrodegang's rule contained itself the elements at the same time of future disintegration, and of the deterioration and demoralisation which are the bane of all wealthy corporations. His rule was formally enacted almost word for word, with sundry additions and without acknowledgment, by the council of Aachen already mentioned. ("*Ad mores clericorum reformatos*," v. s.) But even so, though backed by all the weight of public and deliberate recognition by the emperor and the nation, it failed to attain the end which its originators intended.

Chrodegang's Rule, properly so-called, consists of thirty-four chapters, and was apparently intended by him for the clergy of his cathedral (cc. 4, 5), and of another church in Metz (c. 24). In the preface Chrodegang censures the laxity of his clergy. His successor, Angilramm, in a postscript to the rule (c. 20), allows a richer diet. The longer rule, which, though bearing the name of Chrodegang and retaining his preface, is of rather later date, contains eighty-six chapters, and by the adaptation of its requirements to other places than Metz (c. 8) seems framed for the clergy generally. It contains (c. 7) a citation from the council of Aachen, A.D. 816 (*Conc. Aquisgr.* c. 121), on diet, another (c. 48) from the same council (c. 135), on the education of boys, and another (c. 48), from a council of Toledo A.D. 633 (*Conc. Tolet.* iv. c. 23), on the discipline requisite for the younger clergy.

Chrodegang, as has been said, followed the *Benedictine Rule*. It is interesting to notice the points of difference. The officials of the monastery remain, but in some cases with new titles and new duties. The abbat, as we have seen, is replaced by the bishop, and the prior by the archdeacon; the doorkeeper is sometimes called "*portarius*," sometimes by his old designation "*ostiarius*." The seven canonical hours for divine service remain. After "*compline*" silence and abstinence are enjoined (c. 4), as by Benedict (*Bened. Reg.* c. 42); it is added, that no "*canonicus*," outside the gates after that hour without the bishop's leave, is to be admitted. In the dormitory the beds for the younger "*canonici*" are to be arranged each between two beds of seniors, unless by a special order from the bishop (c. 3). Chrodegang omits the old Benedictine enactment (*Bened. Reg.* c. 22), that the monks should sleep in their habits and girded, but without knives; and another about the night light burning in the dormitory (*Bened. Reg.* c. 22), appears only in the later form of Chrodegang's Rule (c. 49). Vigils are ordered to be sung soon after midnight (c. 5); in Benedict's Rule the time is at 2 A.M. (*Bened. Reg.* c. 8). The "*canonici*," like the monks, are to be punctual to the moment at the sound of the bell,

if within the precincts (C. 6. Bened. *Reg.* c. 50). Manual labour for winter and summer is prescribed by Chrodegang (c. 9), but less exactly than by Benedict (Bened. *Reg.* cc. 48, 57). Chrodegang defines winter as lasting from Nov. 1 to Easter. There is a similar gradation of punishments in both rules, the diet is less ascetic, but is defined more minutely (cc. 20, 22. Bened. *Reg.* cc. 39, 40, 41). Benedict gave a general permission for wine to be taken moderately (Bened. *Reg.* c. 40). Chrodegang fixes the quantity, allowing more to "canonici" of higher rank (c. 23). Thus a priest or deacon is allowed three glasses at dinner, two at supper; a sub-deacon two at each meal, those of lower degree two glasses at the one meal, one glass at the other (c. 23). But these too nice distinctions were abolished in the later rule (c. 7. *Cono. Aquisgr.* A.D. 816, c. 135). Benedict, to encourage a generous hospitality in his monks, sanctioned and enjoined the invitation of laymen to the refectory (Bened. *Reg.* c. 53). Chrodegang, legislating not for monks in seclusion, but for clergy dwelling in populous places, forbids it, except by special order of the bishop or arch-deacon (c. 3). He takes care, besides, to order the lay guests not to bring their weapons with them into the hall. They are not to be admitted into any other part of the buildings, but are to be "bowed out" after dinner. There is no "hospitale" or "hospitium" as in the monastery. More particular directions are given for the care of the sick (c. 28. Bened. *Reg.* c. 36). In the eyes of Benedict all the brethren were on a footing of equality in hall and choir, except, of course, the abbat, prior or provost, and dean. The rest were ranged according to seniority, unless any were thought by the abbat worthy of special distinction. Chrodegang seats his "canonici" according to rank at seven tables, the first for the bishop, archdeacon, and guests, the next for priests, and the next in a descending scale. The clergy of the city not dwelling within the cloisters, "clerici canonici qui extra claustra commanent," are to dine in hall on festivals at a separate table, after having performed their own masses (c. 21). Chrodegang requires them also, with the intention evidently of bringing them as far as possible under his canonical discipline, to be present on festivals at nocturns and matins, that is at the early service in the collegiate chapel. All the clergy, whether "canonici" in the stricter sense or not, he orders to confess to their bishop, twice in the year at least, once in the beginning of Lent, and again between August and November (c. 14). All the officials belonging to the several churches in the city or neighbourhood, whether or not residing together as "canonici," are to meet together at the cathedral, twice every month for a roll-call and the distribution of a dole, twice yearly for confession. The bishop is to be present, or, in his absence, the "presbyter-custos" corresponding to the English dean in our day of the cathedral (cf. Ducauge, *Gloss. Lat.* s. vv. *Matricularii*, *Primicerus*).

Throughout Chrodegang's system there is a recognition of rank on its own merits. Within the monastery all were "brethren." Priest and layman, the noblest and the lowest in origin, the wealthiest and the poorest, the accomplished student and the rudest boor, all, as soon as they

became monks, were by the very act equals except so far as the monastic discipline placed some in authority, and made others subordinate to them. But Chrodegang allows the distinctions of the outer world to intrude within his walls. He excuses the higher clergy from their turns in the weekly routine of tasks; the lower orders of the ministry are to wear the cast-off clothes of their superiors, and are to be content with one suit a year ("sarciles" or "consiles") instead of two (c. 29); they are to take lower places in chapel and hall. Add to this the absence of the implicit obedience vowed by the monk to his abbat. No wonder if lax and secular habits of life soon undermined the fabric which Chrodegang had erected so carefully.

Chrodegang seems to have granted reluctantly what was a still wider departure from Benedict's rule, and a still more fatal blow to the monastic discipline among his clergy, the right to retain property. It was a concession, in his eyes, to the degeneracy of his clergy from primitive and apostolic simplicity. Benedict made the skill and industry of the individual entirely subservient to the common good, by requiring every monk to hand over his earnings to the common fund (Bened. *Reg.* c. 57). Chrodegang allowed a "canonicus" to keep for himself the fees and offerings which he received, unless they were expressly given for the community (c. 32). The real property of a "canonicus" was to pass after his death to the church that he belonged to; his personal property to his church and to the poor. But in both he was allowed a life-interest. Only he was exhorted to use this life-income for the advantage of his community, and, if possible, to defray all his own expenses from it, so as not to be burdensome to the general fund. Even offenders were not to be mulcted of their possessions. It is easy to see how the wealth and luxuriousness of the great caputular bodies were an inevitable outgrowth of a rule that was originally intended to revive a stricter and more frugal way of living among the clergy. Chrodegang is not the only great reformer, whose labours have been followed by a reaction proportioned to the greatness of the end in view.

See Paulus Diaconus (al. Paulus Warnefridi) *Fragmentum de Episcopis Metensis Ecclesiae*, ap. Duchesne (A.) *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, Parisiis, 1639, fol., and ap. Pertz (G. H.) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Hannoverae, 1826, fol.; Johann Abbatis Gorziensis [?] *Vita Chrodegangi*, ap. Eckhart (J. G.) *Commentar. de Rebus Franc. Oriental.*, Wirceburgi, 1729, fol.; Chrodegangi [?] *Privilegium pro Gorziensi Abbatia*, ap. Labbe, Hardouin, Coleti, &c.; *Concilia* [A.D. 756] ap. Harzheim *Concilia German.* [A.D. 757]; Meurisse (M.) [bishop of Metz in 17th century, bishop "in partibus" of Madaura, author of several theological treatises], *Histoire des Evêques de Metz*, Metz, 1834, fol.; Achery (L. d') *Spicilegium*, Parisiis, 1723, fol.; Bähr (J. C. F.), *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur in Carolingische Zeitalter* [Supplement.], Carlsruhe, 1836, 8vo., Rettberg (F. W.), *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, Göttingen, 1846, 8vo.; Pertz (G. H.) *de Vita Chrodegangi*, ap. *Abhandlungen der Akademie Berlin*, 1852, 1853, Berlin, 1854, 4to.; Wattenbach (W.), *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, Berlin, 1858, 8vo.; Bollandus, &c. *Acta Sanctorum* [Mart. tom. i.], Parisiis, 1863, &c. fol.; Chrode-

gangi Regula, ap. D'Achery *Spicilegium*, 1654; 1723; Lecoigne, *Annal. Eccles. Franc.* 1665; Holstein, *Codex Regul. Monast. et Canonic.* 1759; Labbe, *Concilia*, 1715; Hardouin, *Concilia*, 1728; Mansi, *Concilia*, 1728; Coleti *Concilia*, 1759. See CANONICI, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

[I. G. S.]

CHRODGARIUS. A count, sent by the Emperor Charlemagne in the retinue of his son Pippin, king of Italy, for the purpose of devastating the territory of Beneventum (circ. A.D. 801). Alcuin wrote to him on this occasion. Chrodegarius had sent him his young son and his brother to be taken care of during his absence. Alcuin describes the one as a "good little boy," the brother as "a most praiseworthy person, whose character suits him excellently, in all religion and holiness."

He exhorts him "to work his soul's salvation by alms, by justice to all, pity to the wretched, and such good counsels as should be for the safety and prosperity of the Lord Emperor and the realm of the Franks."

He warns him against the pestilential air of Beneventum, and begs him to wind up his affairs carefully, lest any injustice or neglected fault might clamour about him, should he die in so dangerous a place.

Chrodegarius is perhaps Rotharius, Rotherius or Rotgerius, described in the *Vita Sancti Austremonii*, as "a very great general, skilled in the Pythagorean tongue, and an illustrious knight, more brilliant than the seed of Agamemnon, in the court of King Pippin." Rotgerius and his countess Eufasia founded the monastery of Carroficum, in the diocese of Poitiers, as appears from the eighth poem of the third book of Theodulphus Aurelianensis, who calls him "a mighty count, a famous hero." (Alcuin I. *Epist.* 137, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. c. p. 376; Theodulf. Aurelianens. *Carm.* lib. iii. num. 8, *Patrol. Lat.* cv. p. 329.)

[W. M. S.]

CHRODIELDIS, a natural daughter of king Caribert I. and a nun of the monastery of the Holy Cross (Sainte Croix), at Poitiers. Her chief, if not her only claim to notice, is that she was the author of one of the greatest scandals of her age. Although Merovaeus, bishop of Poitiers, had taken the monastery under his protection, a violent faction arose against Leubovera, who had succeeded Agnes as abbess. That faction was led by Chrodieldis, who disliked living under command, and aspired to become abbess in the place of Leubovera. Chrodieldis incited Basine, daughter of king Chilperic, and forty other nuns to revolt and leave the monastery with her, making them swear to accuse Leubovera of several heinous offences. On leaving the monastery she exclaimed, "I am going to see my royal relations, in order to let them know what we suffer. We are not treated like the daughters of kings, but like the daughters of miserable slaves." Merovaeus in vain opposed her design. Nor would she listen to Gregory of Tours, who, at the request of king Chilperic, tried to quell the disturbance. All that he accomplished in the matter, was to induce the forty rebellious nuns to pass the winter at Tours, while Chrodieldis went alone to king Gunthramnus. That prince ordered a council of bishops to assemble to investigate the scandal (*Concil. Pictav.* ad

ann. 590, Hardouin). Meanwhile, Chrodieldis returned to Tours, and then to Poitiers, where, having assembled a troop of thieves, murderers, and other bad characters, she broke into the church of St. Hilary and the monastery of Sainte-Croix, and imprisoned the abbess. Gregory of Tours informing king Childebert and king Gunthramnus that the bishops would not assemble unless the sedition was put down by the secular arm, Mavon count of Poitiers restored peace by force. For these crimes she and her associate Basine were excommunicated at the council of Poitiers in the year 590. In the same year another council was held at Metz with reference to the same subject. While the bishops were conferring, Chrodieldis and Basine went there to try to obtain reconciliation with the church, and at the desire of king Childebert they were restored to the communion. They were then sent back to Poitiers, on condition that Basine, who had made entire submission, should re-enter the monastery; and Chrodieldis, who continued obstinate, retired to an estate accorded her by Childebert. (Greg. Turon. ix. 39; x. 15, *Patrol. Lat.* lxi.; Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 366, 905, 906; Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. v. pp. 1593, 1596.)

[D. R. J.]

CHRODINUS, a general, contemporary with Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers. He died in the year 582. Gregory of Tours commemorates him as a man "of magnificent goodness and piety, exceeding liberal in almsgiving, a feeder of the poor, a profuse benefactor of churches, a provisioner of the clergy. He often founded villas, laid out vineyards, erected houses, and brought lands under cultivation. He would then invite those bishops who were poor, make a banquet, and hand over to them the houses, the farms, and farmers, with money, furniture, utensils, servants, and serfs, saying that these were to belong to the church, that while the poor were being supported God might pardon him." Gregory had not space to repeat all the good he knew about him. He died at the age of 70. Fortunatus praises his justice, modesty, affability, and universal popularity, saying that he is famous throughout all Germany and Italy, bound by closest ties to the nations, and dear especially to the Romans.

He is thought to be Rodinus the general, of whom Aimoin speaks with equal enthusiasm; adding a story that when he had ordered his young men to open a tomb for the purpose of burying a corpse, and they had found it full of a vast treasure, he immediately distributed the whole of it to the poor. (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* vi. cap. 20, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. p. 390; Venantius Fortun. *Pictav. Miscell.* x.; *Carm.* xvi., *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. p. 312; Aimoin, *Hist. Franc.* iii. 40.)

[W. M. S.]

CHRODOGANDUS. [CHRODEGANG.]

CHROMATIUS, bishop of Aquileia, at the end of the 4th and in the first years of the 5th century, one of the most influential of the Western prelates of his day, the friend and correspondent of Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, and most of the chief ecclesiastics of the age, and a warm supporter of Chrysostom against his Oriental assailants. Chromatius was a native of Aquileia, where he resided under the roof of his widowed

mother, together with his brother Eusebius, and his unmarried sisters. Jerome, writing about A.D. 374, congratulates the mother on her saintly offspring, comparing her to Anna the wife of Phanneel, with prophetesses for her daughters, like those of Philip the Evangelist, and a "geminus Samuel" for her sons [Hieron. *Epist.* xliii. (vii.)]. On the death of Valerian, Chromatius became bishop of his native city. The date is uncertain, but it is placed by Baronius towards the end of A.D. 388. He was still a presbyter when he took part in the council held at Aquileia, against the Arians, Palladius and Secundianus, A.D. 381 (Ambrose, *Gest. Concil. Aquil.* tom. ii. pp. 834, § 45; 836, § 51; 843, § 76). Eusebius his brother also became a bishop, but his see is unknown. He died before A.D. 397, when Chromatius received a consolatory letter from Jerome (Hieron. *Epist.* iii.).

Chromatius is better known by the wholesome influence he exercised over some of the first men of the age than by any remarkable actions of his own. It was at his request that St. Ambrose expounded the prophecy of Balaam in an epistolary form, transmitting the work to him with the words "hoc munusculum sanctae tuae menti transmissi" (Ambros. *Epist.* lib. i. Ep. 50, § 16). To his frequent importunities, together with those of Heliodorus, bishop of Altino, and the liberality with which they both contributed to the expenses of the work and the salaries of the amanuenses, we owe several of Jerome's translations of the books of the Old Testament. To gratify them Jerome consented, somewhat reluctantly, to translate the book of Tobit (*Praef. in lib. Tob.*). Weakness of health prevented his doing what they desired with regard to commentaries on Hosea and other of the minor prophets, but to shew that he was not altogether unmindful of their wishes he forwarded to them translations of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles (*Praef. ad version. Proverb.*). In A.D. 392 he dedicated to Chromatius his two books of Commentaries on Habakkuk (*Prolog. ad Habacc.*) and c. A.D. 397 yielded to his urgency and undertook the translation of Chronicles (*Praef. in Paralip.*).

Chromatius was also an early friend of Rufinus, who, whilst an inmate of the monastery at Aquileia, received baptism at his hands while still a presbyter, his brother Eusebius assisting as deacon, c. A.D. 371 (Rufin. *Apolog. in Hieron.* lib. i. p. 204). When, on the publication of Rufinus's translation of Origen's work *de Principiis*,—styled by Jerome that "ship laden with blasphemies brought into the port of Rome,"—the affectionate friendship between Jerome and Rufinus was exchanged for violent animosity and fierce invective, Chromatius maintained his friendship with both parties and did his best to mitigate their irritation and make them at one again. To give healthy employment to Rufinus's active mind, Chromatius imposed on him the task of translating the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius into Latin, together with Origen's Homilies on Joshua, which when completed he dedicated to Chromatius (Rufin. *Hist.* p. 15).

In the persecution of Chrysostom, Chromatius warmly embraced the cause of the deposed bishop against his enemies. The position he held in the West is shewn by Chrysostom's uniting his name together with those of Innocent, bishop of Rome, and Venerius, bishop of Milan,

in the protest addressed to the Western church against the enormities perpetrated at Constantinople on his deposition (Pallad. c. ii. ad fin.). Chromatius sent Chrysostom a letter of brotherly sympathy by the hands of the unfortunate Western deputation (Pallad. c. iv.), and A.D. 406 received from him a letter of grateful thanks (Chrys. *Epist.* clv.). Chromatius also wrote in Chrysostom's behalf to Honorius, who forwarded his letter to his brother Arcadius as an evidence of the sentiments of the Western church (Pallad. c. iii. iv.). Chromatius died somewhere about A.D. 407, but the exact year is uncertain.

Chromatius was more a man of action than of literature. He does not appear to have written much, and of what he wrote but little has come down to us. We have under his name eighteen homilies on "the Sermon on the Mount," commencing with a *Tractatus singularis de Octo Beatitudinibus*, followed by seventeen fragments of expositions on Matthew, c. iii. vv. 15–17, and c. v. vi. These homilies are written in a plain sensible style; the diction is not lofty but well chosen. His interpretation is literal, not allegorical, and his reflections moral rather than spiritual. They are valuable for plain common-sense piety. They are printed by Galland and Migne. The correspondence between Jerome and Chromatius and Heliodorus, on the apocryphal "Infancy of Christ," and "Birth of the Virgin;" also that on a martyrology of Eusebius, are undoubtedly spurious.

(Galland. *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* tom. viii. c. 15; Migne, *Patrolog.* tom. xx. § 247 sq.; Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* tom. xi. pp. 538 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 378.) [E. V.]

CHRONAN. [CRONAN.]

CHRONICA (χρονικά), histories or epitomes of history, in which special care was taken to fix the date of each event recorded. The earliest works of the kind bore the title *Chronica*, Chronological disquisitions, or some other equivalent title in the plural number. St. Jerome however several times speaks of having translated the *Chronicon* of Eusebius (*Comm. in Dan.* cap. ix. vol. iii. p. 1113; *de Vir. Ill.* cap. 135; *Ep. 33 ad Pammach.* iv. 250), and gradually the singular number prevailed. Mediaeval Latinity introduced the form *Chronica*, -ae, which is even to be seen in the earlier printed editions of St. Jerome, though without MS. authority. Scaliger, but apparently merely on his own authority, would limit the strict use of the singular number to the appendix in which the results of the chronological discussions were summed up and exhibited in a tabular form (κατάβη).

Christians were early led into chronological computations by their study of prophecy. Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 7) mentions a discussion of the seventy weeks of Daniel by the historian Judas, who brought down his chronology to the tenth year of Severus, A.D. 203, and who then expected the immediate appearance of Antichrist. Christians also engaged in chronological discussions with a polemical object. Heathens had been fond of contrasting the antiquity of their rites with the novelty of the Christian religion; and consequently the apologists for Christianity found it important to confute them by establishing the still higher antiquity of the Jewish system, of which Christianity was the legitimate continua-

tion. This argument was dwelt on by Tatian (*Or. ad Graec.* cap. 39), Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.* iii. 21), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 21). It has been even imagined that one of the earliest of Christian chronological works bore on its title this polemical object. In the list of the works of Hippolytus inscribed on his statue we read consecutively *Chronicles* against the Greeks (*χρονικῶν πρὸς Ἕλληνας*); and though it is certainly more natural to understand this as describing the titles of two distinct works, some have taken it for the title of a single chronological work composed with a professedly controversial purpose. However this may be, we cannot mistake in detecting this purpose in the great work of Julius Africanus, who first attempted to embody in a single history the most important facts recorded either in Scripture or by secular historians, so arranged in chronological order that the synchronisms between sacred and profane history should be apparent. In this way Moses was shewn to be of vastly higher antiquity than the earliest secular historians; and the heathen gods themselves were shewn to be more recent than Judaism, the theory of Eumerus that they were but deified men being confidently adopted. Africanus also made Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks the subject of elaborate computations. This work of Africanus was the basis of the great chronological work of Eusebius, which was translated into Latin and continued by Jerome, and afterwards further continued by several writers. There seems some reason to think that the work of Africanus had been previously known in the West by direct translation (see Dodwell, *Dissert. de Rom. Pontif. Success.* vii. 98; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* ii. 399).

Controversies concerning the right time of observing Easter gave an additional stimulus to Christian chronological inquiries. It was found that the full moons, on which the time of Easter depended, returned after a certain number of years to the same days of the solar years in the same order. To exhibit this recurrence Paschal cycles were formed, which gave the date of the Easters of a series of consecutive years, distinguished by the names of their consuls or otherwise. As confidence in the accuracy of these cycles increased, they were applied to the solution of chronological problems. For example, we can obtain approximately the date of the Crucifixion from St. Luke's statement that our Lord was baptized in the fifteenth year of Tiberius; but in determining the exact year there is a double uncertainty, how many years are to be assigned to our Lord's ministry, and whether we are to count the years of Tiberius from the death of Augustus or from an earlier period. It was attempted to remove this uncertainty by the help of the Paschal cycles. Our Lord suffered on a Friday, which was also according to some the day of the Jewish Passover, according to others the day after; that is to say, the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the lunar month. The exact year of the Crucifixion is then determined by selecting from among those years between which our choice lies, that one in which the Paschal full moon fell on the right day of the week. A still more precise indication was gained when the day of the year on which our Lord suffered was supposed to be traditionally known. The problem

would then be to determine by the Paschal cycles in what year Easter Sunday fell on the 25th of March; or whatever other date we assume to be that of the Resurrection; and since two years in which Easter Sunday falls on the same day are usually separated by a considerable interval, it would seem that this method ought to give the year of the Passion without any ambiguity. The same method was also supposed capable of determining the year of the world in which our Lord was born and died. An assumption was made as to the position of the heavenly bodies at the time of the Creation, and the date of the Paschal full moon in the first year of the world being thence derived, it was supposed that the date of the full moon for every subsequent year could be obtained by the tables, of which use could be made for chronological verifications in the manner already explained.

It is needless to say anything as to the merely historical use of Chronica. The purpose of the several continuators of St. Jerome was only to bring down to their own time the history contained in the earlier Chronica. These may be most conveniently consulted in Roncalli's *Vetus-tiorum Latinorum Scriptorum Chronica*, Padua, 1787, which contains the Chronicle of St. Jerome with its several continuations.

It is not easy to draw any well-defined line of separation between chronicles and histories on the one hand and Fasti on the other. The articles immediately following contain notices of those chronicles whose authors' names are unknown. We give a list of the principal chronicles of the first eight centuries, merely adding the period embraced by the chronicle, and referring to the articles under each author's name for fuller information. Africanus (Creation-A.D. 221), Beda (Creation-A.D. 729), Cassiodorus (Creation-A.D. 519), Eusebius (Call of Abraham-A.D. 325), Hieronymus (Abraham-A.D. 378), Hippolytus (Creation-A.D. 222), Idatius Lemicanus (379-468), Isidorus Hispalensis (369-625), Joannes Abbas Biclariensis (565-593), Joannes Malalas (Creation-A.D. 565), Joshua Stylites (495-507), Judas (-A.D. 203), Marcellinus Comes (379-518-534), Marius Aventicensis (456-580), Prosper Aquitanus (Creation-A.D. 459), Sulpicius Severus (Creation-A.D. 400), Victor Tununensis (445-566). We add from Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* vii. p. 444 ed. Harles.) a list of other Greek chronicles whose works have been lost, though some of them, such as Anianus and Panodorus, were probably not so much chronicles as writers on chronology; Ancyrianus, Anianus, Brunichius, Brutius, Clemens, Diodorus, Dominus, Eustathius, Euty-chianus, Heliconius (Adam-Theodosius), Hero, Hesychius, Isidorus, Magnus, Milichius, Nestorianus (to the reign of Leo Junior, A.D. 474), Nicolaus, Panodorus, Pyrrho, Theophilus, Timotheus. [G. S.]

CHRONICON ATHANASIANUM. The Festal Epistles of Athanasius, published in Syriac by Cureton, 1848, and afterwards with a Latin translation by Mai (*Pat. Nov. Bibl.* vi.), have prefixed a chronicle of the episcopate of Athanasius (A.D. 328-373). It throws much light on the history of the period, marking the Easter of each year, together with the names of its consuls and the other modes of designating the year

both in the East and in the West. There is also a Latin Athanasian chronicle (Mai, *l. c.* p. 161; Gallandi, *Bibl.* v. 222). [G. S.]

CHRONICON CANISIANUM SEU LABBEANUM SEU POTIUS HIPPOLYTI. The chronicle intended by this description was published first by Canisius in 1602 (*Antiq. Lect.* ii. 580), then in 1657 by Labbe (*Nov. Bibl.* i. 298), and was in 1688 appended by Du Cange to his edition of the Paschal Chronicle as the fourth in his collection of illustrative documents. For an account of the MSS. from which the printed editions are derived, see an essay by Mommsen (*Ueber den Chronographen vom Jahre 354; Abhandlungen der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft*, i. 585). This chronicle is anonymous and in Latin, but internal evidence shews that it is a translation from the Greek. It is needless to quote instances of Greek words or Greek constructions, because we have a decisive proof in the fact that there is extant a second version of a large portion of it, differing altogether in language, but agreeing perfectly in sense; except in one place, where to "cities" (*civitatum*) in one version answers "wars" (*bellorum*) in the other, a difference easily explicable by a difference of reading *πόλεων*, *πολέμων* in the MSS. from which the two versions were derived. This second version has been published by Mommsen (*l. c.*); it forms part of a chronicle (see *CHRONICA HOROSII*) which incorporates much of the older work, and continues it for a hundred years further. The original work, which bears the title *Liber generationis or De Divisionibus et generationibus gentium*, begins with Adam and ends with the thirteenth year of Alexander Severus. As it mentions the whole length of the reign of Alexander, thirteen years and nine days, it must have been written in the reign of his successor Maximin, A.D. 235-238, it being usual with chroniclers to bring their work to a conclusion with the last year of the immediately preceding emperor. It can scarcely be called a chronicle in the modern sense of the word, for it does not contain any continuous history, its object being chronological rather than historical; it merely gives from the Old Testament a series of names and dates sufficient for the purposes of chronological computation, and it arrives at the following results (the years marked being years of the world): the Deluge, 2242; Peleg, 2271; Abraham, 3387; the Exodus, 3817; David, 4364; Babylonish Captivity, 4842 years 9 months. It then passes immediately to the Incarnation, to which it assigns the date 5502, and gives only two subsequent dates, the Passion, 5532, and the thirteenth year of Alexander, 5738. The calculation proceeds also in another way: it counts the interval between the Exodus and the Passion by Passovers; from the Exodus to the Passover celebrated by Joshua, 41 years; thence to that celebrated by Hezekiah, 464; thence to Josiah's Passover, 114; thence to Ezra's, 108; thence to the Conception of Christ, 563; thence to the Passion, 30. For a purpose which will presently appear, we notice that on adding we find only 1320 instead of the 1715 years previously assigned for the interval between the Exodus and the Passion. It is plain then that there must be some transcriber's error in the numbers, and equally plain that the chief error must be in the interval between Joshua and Hezekiah, which is

about 400 years less than that deduced from the dates elsewhere given in the chronicle. The work gives a genealogy of Christ; lists of prophets, priests, and kings, Jewish, Persian, and Macedonian; a list of Roman emperors; and it appears from the table of contents at the beginning that the chronicle originally contained a list of Roman bishops, which, owing to accidental mutilation, is absent from our present copies.

Du Cange suspected that this chronicle was the work of the celebrated Hippolytus, a conjecture supported by many arguments. Hippolytus wrote in Greek; his connexion with the church of Rome would account for the presence in the chronicle of a list of Roman bishops; and he lived in the reign of Alexander Severus. The list of the works of Hippolytus inscribed on his statue includes two chronological works, one, of which Eusebius makes mention, containing the explanation of his cycle, and terminating with the first year of Alexander, the other a chronicle, apparently unknown to Eusebius, and which might well be identical with the present work, continued to the last year of Alexander. Further Syncellus (p. 218) states that Hippolytus attributed to Joachim (Jehoiachin), king of Judah, a reign of three years instead of three months, a peculiarity to be found in the present chronicle. Lastly, a less decisive argument is drawn from the fact that the date 5502 given for the Incarnation in this chronicle nearly agrees with the date 5500 which was assigned to it by Hippolytus, as inferred indirectly by Du Cange (p. 15), from Cyrillus Scythopolitanus, and as directly asserted by Photius (*Bibl.* 202).

On the other hand, Bianchini undertook to prove (see Hippolytus, *Ed. Fabric.* p. 117) that Hippolytus was not the author of this chronicle, by an argument which, though slighted by Mommsen on account of a supposed connexion with a fanciful theory concerning the cycle of Hippolytus, rests on perfectly sound principles. It turns out, however, that Bianchini strangely went astray in the application of these principles, and that the argument, which as he supposed disproved the connexion of Hippolytus with this chronicle, really gives an almost demonstrative proof of it. In the cycle inscribed on the chair of Hippolytus certain years of the cycle are marked as follows: 2. Conception (*γένεσις*) of Christ; 3. Hezekiah; 4. Josiah; 15. Exodus according to Daniel; 17. Esdras, according to Daniel, and Wilderness; 22. Hezekiah according to Daniel, and Josiah; 32. Passion of Christ; 35. Joshua; 55. Joshua according to Daniel; 106. Exodus; 108. Wilderness; 111. Esdras.

Bianchini first explained that these words refer to the different passovers mentioned in the Bible, the table indicating on what day of the month and week each of these was celebrated. And he shewed that the table thus afforded the means of recovering the chronological system on which it was framed. Thus the passovers of Hezekiah and Josiah being assigned to consecutive years in the cycle, Hippolytus must have supposed these passovers to have been separated by an interval either of one year, or of one year together with some entire number of cycles, that is to say, either of 1, 113, 225, &c. years. We have no difficulty in choosing 113 as the number intended. Similarly if we can only tell within

112 years what interval Hippolytus must have supposed to have elapsed between any two of the other passovers, the cycle enables us to determine that interval exactly; and further, since we know that the first year of the cycle was the first of Alexander Severus, we can recover the whole chronological system of Hippolytus and compare it with that of the chronicle. We find thus that Hippolytus assigned to the Passion the date A.D. 29, that of the consulship of the two Gemini; and that he agreed with the chronicle in placing an interval of only thirty years between the Incarnation and the Passion. The four intervals between the passovers, Joshua, Hezekiah, Josiah, Esdras, and the Incarnation, as deduced from the table on the chair, are 864, 113, 107, 563; as given in the chronicle 464, 114, 108, 563. As has been already said, even on the evidence afforded by the chronicle itself, we can have no hesitation in correcting the 464 into 864, the difference when expressed in Roman numerals being only the change of the first C into D. We find then absolute agreement between Hippolytus and the chronicle in the two larger numbers, and a difference only of a unit in the other two. To shew how little this agreement can be due to chance (without quoting modern chronologers whose results differ widely from the above), the same intervals as given by Eusebius are 730, 114, 111, 514, by Syncellus 909, 105, 128, 502, and by a computist contemporary with Hippolytus, who followed in his steps (see CHRONICON CYPRIANICUM), 826, 103, 144, 465. We could easily explain the two differences of a unit by shewing that the author of the chronicle was in the habit, when counting intervals, of including both the extreme terms; but in truth his work will not bear minute examination. On comparing several of his items with the sums total which he gives, although we can set many matters to rights by correcting from the Septuagint the figures given in the MSS. of the chronicle, yet there remain errors for which the author and not the transcriber seems to be responsible.

It will have been observed that the table gives a second computation "according to Daniel." The four intervals are by this computation 863, 112, 107, 433. The last interval, 433 years, agrees to a unit with the 62 weeks which St. Jerome tells us, in his commentary on Daniel, that Hippolytus counted between Ezra and Christ. And it would appear that Hippolytus, finding a difference of 130 years between his prophetic and historical calculation of this interval, gave the two results in his earlier work without attempting to reconcile them. No mention is made of the calculation "according to Daniel" in the later work. Possibly Hippolytus had in the mean time become acquainted with the system of Africanus, in which the prophecy is reconciled with history by counting the weeks from the 20th of Artaxerxes instead of from the 1st of Cyrus, as Hippolytus had done.

It is in any case plain that we must refuse assent to Mommsen's opinion that Hippolytus derived his chronological system from Africanus. The main points of the system of Hippolytus are embodied in the table inscribed on the chair; but at the time of the formation of that table he could not have known the work of Africanus, which would have taught him how to solve

the difficulty as to the difference of 130 years which Hippolytus had given up as hopeless. The systems of Africanus and Hippolytus come into close but not into complete agreement as to the date of our Lord's birth and the duration of his ministry, the numbers 5502 and 30 in the system of Hippolytus answering to 5500 and 31 in the system of Africanus. But in other respects the systems have every mark of being the work of independent computers. They do not even agree as to the date of the Deluge. Hippolytus recognises the second Canaan whom Africanus rejects, and consequently a difference of over 100 years runs through a great part of their chronology.

If the chronicle under consideration has been rightly claimed for Hippolytus, it furnishes, as Bunsen pointed out, strong evidence for also connecting with Hippolytus the *Refutation of all Heresies*, first published under the name of *Origen's Philosophumena*. About a third part of the chronicle is taken up with a subject which the author declares that he had investigated with the utmost industry; "summa cum industria praevidere cupientes juxta veritatem," and which seems the part of his work to which he attached most value, namely, the division of the earth among the sons of Noah. An enumeration is made of the 72 nations of the world; for such, it had been inferred from Deut. xxxii. 8, was their entire number. In the *Refutation*, x. 30, the same subject is treated of, the author also claiming credit for the labour he had bestowed on the investigation; τὴν ἀδίστακτον γνῶσιν ἣν πόνοις κεκτήμεθα περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. He states that he had published the names of the 72 nations in other books, but here only gives the summary that 25 of them were descended from Shem, 15 from Japhet, and 32 from Ham, a result precisely agreeing with that of the chronicle. The proof of identity of authorship is very strong, as it is difficult to believe that two contemporary writers should have separately entered on this investigation and arrived at coincident results, each using language excluding the supposition that he is copying the results of another. The chronicle was made use of by Epiphanius (*Ancoratus*, 115), and its results thence passed, with some modification, into the Paschal Chronicle and other works.

It has been already mentioned that the chronicle contained a list of bishops of Rome, which is absent from our present MSS. This Mommsen has attempted to restore by the help of the catalogue extending to the episcopate of Liberius, which was published by Bucherius, and by Du Cange in his appendix to the Paschal Chronicle, No. 17. Mommsen shewed from internal evidence that this catalogue consists of two parts, the later beginning with the pontificate of Pontianus, A.D. 231, having historical notices interspersed and having the consuls at the beginning and end of each episcopate marked from trustworthy and probably from official sources; the former part founded on an earlier document which only contained the name of each bishop with the duration of his episcopate, and which the later compiler brought into uniformity with the subsequent entries by an unskilful and inaccurate addition of names of consuls and emperors. Mommsen shewed also that this later compiler was the author of the chronicle already

mentioned, founded on the work of Hippolytus, and that the names of consuls and emperors added to the catalogue tally with those in the lists of that chronicler. When then we find this chronicler omitting from its proper place the section of Hippolytus "Quis episcopus quot annis praeuit," but elsewhere giving a catalogue with the title "quis episcopus quot annis praeuit quove imperante," there is every presumption that the chronicle of Hippolytus supplied the list of bishops to which the later writer added the emperors' names. And we accept this conclusion notwithstanding the formidable objection urged by Döllinger (*Hipp. und Callist.* p. 67) that, in this catalogue only, and in one other, Cletus and Anacletus are reckoned as distinct popes, and that if Hippolytus had so reckoned them he would certainly have had many followers. The second fact which he urges, that the names of three popes are omitted, Anicetus, Eleutherus, and Zephyrinus, might possibly be explained as originating in transcribers' errors.

What has been stated as to the connection of the Bucherian catalogue with Hippolytus gives especial weight to its statement, that in the year 235 Pontianus the bishop and Hippolytus the presbyter were banished to the unhealthy island Sardinia. See HIPPOLYTUS. [G. S.]

CHRONICON CUSPINIANEUM. This chronicle having prefixed an enumeration of the kings of Rome, gives a list of consuls from C. Julius Caesar, B.C. 47 to A.D. 533. It is interspersed with historical notices rare in the earlier periods, but tolerably numerous in the later years. This chronicle is a valuable and trustworthy authority for the history of the 5th century, and especially for the succession of the emperors of the West. It has been preserved in a single MS. in the Vienna Library, and was first published by Cuspinianus, but may be most conveniently consulted in Roncalli, *Vet. Lat. Chron.* viii. and ix., and in Mommsen's essay, *Abhand. K. Sächs. Gesell.* p. 656. Roncalli's preface gives an account of the preceding editions of this chronicle (see also Mommsen, pp. 572, 585). Mommsen has shewn that the two chronicles given in Roncalli as distinct are really to be regarded as different recensions of the same original, as their verbal agreement in many places proves, and that the one may be used to supply the gaps in the other. The first recension terminates with A.D. 496; the second, which is more corrupt and less circumstantial, has also in its present form had several of its parts transposed. The compiler appears to have lived in Ravenna (see, in particular, under A.D. 488). In the second version (Roncalli, ix.) he marks several times the course of the 84 years Paschal cycle, and he shews that he made use of the chronicle of Prosper and of that which bears the title **CHRONICA HOROSII**. [G. S.]

CHRONICON CYPRIANICUM. A short treatise is appended to the works of St. Cyprian (first published in Fell's edition, 1682, pp. 938-971) which bears the titles "Expositio Bissexti" and "De Pascha computus." This is probably the "very useful chronicle" which, in his life of St. Cyprian, Paulus Diaconus asserts that that father composed. It is in the same sense a Chronicle as that of Hippolytus, which we have described as **CHRONICON CANISIANUM**. Both

works contain a system of Scripture chronology; but the Cyprianic being essentially a Paschal Chronicle, counts the years not from the Creation but from the Exodus. And both writers add a note bringing down the chronology to their own time, which in this case is the last year of Gordian, A.D. 243. It is common with chronological writers to terminate their calculations with the last year of the preceding emperor, and therefore we might conclude that this work was written some time during the reign of Philip (244-249) were it not that it concludes by calculating the Easter of the year 243, which would seem to limit its publication to the early part of that year.

The main object of the book was to provide a trustworthy method of calculating Easter, which at that time was anxiously sought for. At the end of the 2nd century western Christians were dependent on Jewish sources for information as to the right time for their Paschal celebrations. It was by freeing them from this dependence that Hippolytus earned for himself that place in their grateful recollection to which his statue still bears witness. The present treatise very well supplies the place of the lost work in which Hippolytus himself explained the principle of his cycle. It explains as follows the theory of the eight-years cycle. The lunar year of 354 days (or twelve months of $29\frac{1}{2}$ days each) is shorter than the ordinary solar year by $11\frac{1}{2}$ days; and hence each full moon of one year must come $11\frac{1}{2}$ days earlier than the corresponding full moon of the preceding. Similarly thirty-six months will come short of three solar years by $33\frac{3}{4}$ days. This being more than a month, an intercalation is made of a month of thirty days; and the full moons will still be $3\frac{3}{4}$ days earlier than those of three years preceding. But since eight times $11\frac{1}{2}$ is 90, or exactly three times 30, if in eight years an intercalation of three months be made, there will be no remainder, and the full moons will return on the same days as eight years previously. In order to exhibit the day of the week on which the full moon fell, Hippolytus joined two eight-year cycles together so as to make a cycle of 16 years. On the recurrence of such a cycle the full moons fall each one day earlier in the week than the corresponding full moon of the preceding cycle; and after seven such cycles, or 112 years, the full moons come back to the same days of the week as at first.

But this method is not astronomically accurate. In point of fact, after sixteen years the full moons do not return to the same days, but fall three days later. This Cyprianic chronicle proves that on the very first recurrence of the cycle (introduced A.D. 222) Christians were perplexed by finding it give erroneous results, and were tempted to abandon the use of it, and "to walk after the blind Jews." This would point to an earlier date than 243 as that of the chair of Hippolytus, since it is unlikely that after the cycle had been found to be erroneous it would be inscribed on the chair by persons intending to do him honour. The Cyprianic author does not mention Hippolytus by name, but his whole system is based on the cycles of Hippolytus. He never doubts that after sixteen years the full moons return to the same day, and therefore he supposes that the full moons in the cycle had from the first been marked three days wrong.

He finds one of the eight Paschal full moons in the cycle to be the 25th of March; and he assumes (if indeed he did not find it in the lost work of Hippolytus) that this was explained as follows. The text "God divided the light from the darkness" shews that the world was created at the equinox; the equinox was the 25th of March, and the moon was created at its full; therefore the first full moon was the 25th of March, and it must fall on the same day every eight years afterwards. Now the Cyprianic author observes that it was here overlooked that the moon was not created until the fourth day of the world, and therefore it was the 28th and not the 25th of March which was the full moon. And he infers that all the full moons of the cycle should be pushed on three days later, after which correction he supposes that it would always give the full moons exactly. He has no suspicion that in another sixteen years it would be three days wrong again.

He follows Hippolytus in marking on his cycle the different passovers recorded in the Bible. But his chronological system is different from that of Hippolytus, and the places in the cycle assigned to these passovers are not the same. In other respects also he differs from Hippolytus, as for instance, in holding that our Lord ate the passover with His disciples on the fourteenth and suffered on the fifteenth day of the month.

This absence of any trace of direct Hippolytine influence makes it likely that the treatise was written not in Rome but in Africa. In placing the Nativity of our Lord on the 28th of March the writer was opposed to what we have reason to believe was even then the belief of the Roman church. He was probably misled by finding on the table of Hippolytus *γένεσις Χριστοῦ*; but by this Hippolytus doubtless intended the conception of our Lord, probably then as afterwards celebrated at the passover season. A presumption of African origin arises from the fact that the writer's Scripture quotations agree verbally with those of St. Cyprian. But it is extremely unlikely that Cyprian was himself the author of the treatise. It swarms with mystical calculations of numbers, not at all in Cyprian's taste (such as finding the Greek numeral letters in the name of Adam to represent the 46 years which the temple was in building); and if the work was written so early as 243 it is doubtful whether Cyprian was then a Christian. [G. S.]

CHRONICON EDESSENUM. An anonymous Syriac chronicle, published by Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* i. 387), apparently compiled about A.D. 550; the last event recorded being the breaking out of the Persian war between Justinian and Chosroes, A.D. 540. The writer was orthodox, and expressly recognises the first four general councils, though one doubtful passage has brought him under suspicion of Pelagianism (p. 402). He uses the era of the Seleucidæ, which begins B.C. 311, and he places the birth of Christ in the 309th year of his era, or two years before the vulgar computation. He commences his chronicle with the foundation of the kingdom of Edessa, B.C. 131, but the first event recorded with any fulness is an inundation, which caused much destruction in the city, A.D. 202. He enumerates in all four destructive floods by which the city suffered. Great part of his chronicle is occupied with local occurrences, and he gives the

succession of bishops of Edessa, beginning with Conon, A.D. 313, who, however, was not the first bishop, the church claiming a succession from apostolic times. He makes no mention of the celebrated correspondence between Abgarus and our Lord, the breaking out of the heresy of Marcion, A.D. 138, being the earliest event in church history which he records. Of Roman bishops Leo the Great alone finds a place in the chronicle. [G. S.]

CHRONICA HOROSII (see also FREDEGAR). The chronicle which in the manuscript bears this title is in substance the chronicle of Hippolytus, already described under the title **CHRONICON CANISIANUM**, but with an appended note bringing the chronology to the writer's own time (ad hodiernum diem). In this the years are summed up separately from Agrippa the last king of the Jews, A.D. 71, to the consulate of Severus, 194, thence to the consulate of Emilianus, 249, thence to that of Diocletian IX., 304, and thence to that of Optatus and Paulinus, 334. It thus appears that this chronicle was written A.D. 334, and that the writer probably had before him an older list of consuls, containing 55 years on a page, the years on each page of which were separately added up. The name Horosius in our MS. seems entitled to no regard. The well-known Orosius, to whom doubtless the copyist intended to ascribe the work, flourished a century afterwards.

This chronicle, originally published, as we have said, in 334, was republished twenty years afterwards as part of an interesting and valuable collection respecting which see Mommsen, "On the chronographer of the year 354," as cited in the article on **CHRON. CANISIANUM**, and De Rossi (*Inscriptiones Christianæ*, i. LV.). This collection consists of a calendar, consular Fasti to A.D. 354, a table of Easters from 312, a list of city prefects, 254-354, notes of the places of burial and days of commemoration of Roman bishops and martyrs, a list of Roman bishops, a city chronicle mainly occupied with local occurrences at Rome, and a description of the city. Internal evidence shews that the work of 354 was but a continuation of one made some twenty years previously. For example, the list of commemoration days of Roman bishops is arranged according to the order of the days of the year, including Sylvester, Dec. 31, 335; but after this are added, out of their proper order, Marcus, Oct. 7, 336, and Julius, Apr. 14, 352, shewing that the list as it now stands is the completion of one made in the early part of 336. We have already given the reasons for thinking that the writer of 336 had before him the work of Hippolytus. The work of 354 was inscribed to a certain Valentinus, and was illustrated with pictures and with an ornamental title-page by Furius Dionysius Philocalus. De Rossi has shewn from the inscriptions that this Philocalus was a scribe of singular skill, whose hand may be traced in the inscriptions placed by pope Damasus, one of which Philocalus marks with his name, describing himself as "Damasi sui Papae cultor atque amator." [G. S.]

CHRONICON PASCHALE SIVE ALEXANDRINUM; an anonymous epitome of the history of the world from the creation to the 20th year of the reign of the emperor Heraclius,

A.D. 630. It has been preserved for us in a manuscript of the 10th century, now in the Vatican library, which has lost some leaves in the middle, and is also mutilated at the beginning and the end. The preface with which the work opens has sustained some injury, and the history does not now proceed beyond the 18th year of Heraclius, the pages containing the events of the last two years being wanting or illegible. This MS. was found in a Sicilian library in the middle of the 16th century, and thence brought to Rome. The lists of consuls which it contains were first extracted, and were made use of by Sigonius (*Comm. ad Fastos et Triumphos Romanorum*), and by Onuphrius Panvinus (*Comm. ad Fastos*), who refer to them under the name of *Fasti Siculi*, so called from the place of discovery of the manuscript. A transcript of the manuscript was made in Spain by a Greek named Darmar, and sold by him to Casaubon, who communicated large extracts from it to Joseph Scaliger. These were published by Scaliger as an appendix to his edition of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, with the title *ἐπιτομή χρόνων*, and are referred to by him as *Chronicon Casaubonianum*. Darmar's manuscript is now in the Munich library, and is described by Hardt (*Catal. Cod. MSS. Bibl. Reg. Bav.* v. 416). In comparing it with the Vatican MS., it is found to be manifestly derived from it, being defective in the same places; but since it omits some things which are easy to read in the Vatican MS., there is a possibility that it was not taken from it directly, but through the intervention of another MS. in which those places were less legible. A complete edition, taken from Darmar's MS., was published by Rader at Munich in 1615. Rader having concluded on very insufficient grounds that the work had been compiled in Alexandria, gave it the name of *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, under which it has been very commonly cited. A much more accurate edition was published in Paris, in 1689, by Du Cange, whose edition, though also founded on Darmar's MS., was corrected in several places by comparison with the Vatican MS. Du Cange, rejecting the title *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, gave it the name *Chronicon Paschale* from the Paschal computations which form so essential a part of the writer's chronological system. In 1825, Cardinal Angelo Mai (*Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 222), published from the Vatican MS. portions of the mutilated pages at the beginning and the end, which had been omitted by Darmar as illegible. Finally, in 1831, an edition founded on a thorough collation of the Vatican MS. was published at Bonn, by Dindorf, as part of the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*.

What has been said being all that is known of the external history of the work, we are left to internal evidence to determine the time and place of its composition. The fulness with which the events of the reign of Heraclius are told (changes of liturgical usage at Constantinople being carefully recorded), indicates that this part was written by a contemporary, a conclusion strengthened by a passage in which Heraclius is spoken of as "our emperor" (*τὸν ἡμῶν βασιλέα*, i. 735, ed. Bonn). Further, in recording the accession of every other emperor the total number of years of his reign is given,

but not so in the case of Heraclius, from which we naturally infer that the work was published before the conclusion of his reign. The only reason for assigning to the work a later date is that it does not appear to have been made use of by Georgius Syncellus, or to have been known to Photius; but even if we had better proof than we have that Photius did not know the book we have no right to assume that Photius, with all his learning, was acquainted with every work extant in his time. On the whole, the great probability is, that the conclusion of the chronicle was written not long after the year 630, with which the history terminates. The only question is, whether the author of this part was also the compiler of the whole work. A statement was made by Holstenius, which has been very generally accepted by subsequent writers, that the original work ended with the 17th year of Constantius, A.D. 354, and that what follows is the work of a continuator. But internal evidence constrains us to reject this statement, the only ground for which appears to be very insufficient one that a MS. collated by Holstenius broke off at this point. The events of the reign of Constantius are not related with the accuracy of a contemporary; the very last event recorded in the MS. of Holstenius, the death of Magnentius, is placed under a wrong year; and there are blunders also in the account of the elevation of Constantius himself to the dignity of Caesar. But the strongest arguments are derived from the marks of unity of design which pervade the whole work. We shall presently mention several indications that the preface was written by one who must have been later than A.D. 354, and could scarcely have been much earlier than the date we have assigned for the conclusion of the chronicle; but the principles laid down in the preface are systematically applied through the entire work. We conclude then that the whole is the work of one compiler who lived in the reign of Heraclius, but there are occasional inconsistencies which attest that his materials were taken from different sources, and it is in fact the remains of older authors incorporated in the work which give it its chief value.

What has been just said shews that it is no sufficient reason for giving the chronicle the name *Alexandrinum*, that in a few places Alexandrian affairs are related with some minuteness. The places in question may have been derived from Alexandrian sources, but the work as a whole certainly does not bear an Alexandrian character. It does not use the Egyptian months, but generally the Macedonian and Latin; it employs the divisions kalends, nones and ides; it begins the year not as in Egypt with the 1st of Thoth (= 29th of August), but usually with the 1st of January; and, contrary to Egyptian usage, it marks years by their consuls and by their places in the series of Olympiads and Indictions. Some of these indications point to Constantinople as the place of composition of the chronicle, certain usages having been transferred from Old to New Rome which were not prevalent elsewhere in the East. In that part of the work which was not borrowed from any predecessor, the account of the reign of Heraclius, the writer's point of view is unmistakably Constantinople. Different conjectures have been made as to the author's

name, of which it is sufficient to mention St. Maximus, George of Pisidia, and on the theory of Alexandrian authorship, George bishop of Alexandria. More can be said against than for any of these conjectures, and the least improbable guess is that of Henschenius (in the preface to the third March volume of the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*) that the author was one of the Studite monks of Constantinople, in whose church was buried Bonus Magister, whose acts are related with much detail in the chronicle.

The actual reason why the name Alexandrian was given to this chronicle was a misunderstanding of the preface. This, as published by Rader, began with the name of Peter of Alexandria prefixed to a quotation, and it is not plain where this quotation stops, and where the writer of the chronicle speaks in his own person. Accordingly the name of Peter of Alexandria was supposed by Rader to be prefixed as that of the author of the chronicle, and by Oudin as that of the bishop under whose sanction it was published: and this Peter was identified with a Peter who was bishop of Alexandria about 640. But all this was a mistake; it was merely by accidental mutilation that the chronicle appeared to begin with the name of Peter; and whether the passage quoted be genuine or not, the Peter intended is certainly the Peter who was martyred in the persecution of Diocletian, A.D. 311.

The preface begins with a discussion of the question, the chronological importance of which has been shewn in the article CHRONICA, On what day of the lunar month did our Saviour suffer? Did He at His last supper (according to the most natural interpretation of the narrative of the Synoptic evangelists) eat the Jewish Passover with His disciples and suffer the next day, which consequently would be the fifteenth day of the month; or did He (as one who had only St. John's Gospel would infer) suffer on the fourteenth, the day of the Passover Feast? The advocates of the former view seem to have explained St. John's statement that the Jews had not eaten the Passover on the morning of the crucifixion by attributing to the nation laxity and irregularity in the time of keeping the feast, and to have applied to this subject the complaint of the Psalmist "They always err in their heart." On the other hand the writer of the chronicle maintains that, down to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews always kept the passover on the fourteenth day of the first month; in defence of which assertion he quotes the authority of Philo, Peter of Alexandria, and Athanasius; and he quotes Hippolytus, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and Clement of Alexandria in support of his view that our Lord, being himself the true Paschal lamb, was slain on the day of the Passover Feast. In referring to St. John's Gospel a statement is made, afterwards repeated in the body of the work, that the autograph of this Gospel was preserved and worshipped at Ephesus.

It having been thus established that in the year of the Passion the fourteenth day of the month fell on a Friday, and that the 16th was the Sunday of the Resurrection, the writer proceeds to the subject of cycles. Having told that the fathers of the Nicene council made it the rule of the universal church that Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday next following the

first full moon after the vernal equinox, he goes on to relate that the same fathers (but apparently after the breaking up of the council) by divine inspiration (*θεομνηστως*) set forth the cycle of nineteen years which exhibits on what day of March or April the full moon falls. He adds that this cycle was not the invention of the Nicene fathers, but that they only ratified in writing what from the very beginning had prevailed by unwritten consent. He proceeds to say that though this cycle would suffice for the determination of Easter, certain had put five such cycles together, supposing that at the end of this new cycle of 95 years the full moons would return not only to the same days of the solar month, but also to the same days of the week, and that by setting up such cycles on tablets in churches, they had made the church a laughing-stock to heathens, Jews and heretics; that to correct this evil the cycle of 532 (28×19) years had been introduced, at the expiration of which the full moons really would return to the same day of the week and year: that several such cycles had been published, but up to that time all likely to mislead in one or other of two ways. Either in the elementary cycle of 19 years the full moons were marked on days different from those to which they had been affixed by the inspired fathers, and so the cycle would give Easters on different days from those on which the church celebrated them; or if this grosser fault were avoided, the years of the cycle were marked with wrong dates Anno Mundi, or Anno Domini, in consequence of which, though the cycle gave Easter on the right day, it led those who used it to imagine that the church was in error as to other feasts, in particular as to keeping the Nativity on the 25th of December, the Annunciation on the 25th of March, the Purification on the 2nd of February, and the birth of St. John the Baptist on the 24th of June. The author then proposes to set forth a completely new cycle of 532 years, agreeing both with Scripture and church rule, and the nature of things; he proposes to commence the solar cycle of 28 years and the lunar of 19, with the creation of the sun and moon, to give rules which will shew what places in each cycle any given year of the world holds, and so which will determine on what day of the week and year the Paschal full moon in that year will fall; as for instance, in the year of the Exodus, of our Lord's Nativity, and of His Crucifixion; and he further undertakes to shew in what year ends the first cycle of 532 years beginning with our Lord's crucifixion and when the second such cycle begins. This last sentence proves so conclusively that the preface was written later than the year 562 under which the termination of the first cycle of 532 years is marked in the chronicle, that it seems scarcely necessary to add other arguments. For instance, the cycle of 95 years referred to in the preface appears to have been first used by Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 437, and after him by Dionysius Exiguus, A.D. 525; who, however, were not guilty of the mistake attributed in the preface to the framers of this cycle, of supposing that the full moons after this interval return to the same days of the week: they were aware that in bissextile years there is a difference of a day. The preface was written after cycles of 532 years had become common,

and is therefore later than Victorius of Aquitaine, A.D. 457, even though he may not have been the first to use this cycle. None of the feasts referred to in the preface appears to have been celebrated in the East so early as A.D. 354; a homily of Chrysostom fixes to A.D. 378 the first celebration in Antioch of the Nativity on the 25th of December; the feast of the Presentation of our Lord in the Temple is said by Cedrenus to have been introduced in the reign of Justin, and by Nicephorus in that of Justinian. A further argument may be founded on the fact that in the lunar table given in the preface the January moon is called the moon of St. Basil, who died the 1st of January, 379. And lastly in the conclusion of the preface is incorporated the prologue *de Paschate anni* 380 addressed to the emperor Theodosius by Theophilus of Alexandria (Gallandii *Bibl. Pat.* vii. 614), the name of Theophilus, however, being omitted, and some alteration being made to make it express the view of the chronicler and not of Theophilus, who held that our Lord suffered on the 15th day of the month. It is then abundantly evident that the author of the preface was later than A.D. 354, and therefore was the author of the latter part of the chronicle, while in order to convince ourselves that he was also the author of the former part, we have only to look at the calculation of the day of the week, and year of the Passover of the Exodus, made in exact conformity with the rules laid down in the preface, and to the calculation by the same rules of the Passovers of our Saviour's time, which gives a date of the Incarnation different from that used by any previous writer.

The basis of the author's method of calculation is the assumption that the first year of the world was the first of each of his solar and lunar cycles, and that then by the help of these cycles could be ascertained the days of the week and year on which fell the Paschal full moon in any given year of the world. In point of fact, although at the end of 19 years the full moon returns to the same day, it does not return to the same hour of the day, and the difference when accumulated by a certain number of repetitions of the cycle, makes calculation by the cycle inapplicable to years separated by a considerable interval. He assumes also as a fixed point that the vernal equinox always falls on the 21st of March; and that on this day the sun and moon were created. From this day accordingly he counts his years of the world. Since, however, the luminaries were created on the 4th day of the week, there were three days *πρὸ τῶν φωστήρων*, for which the author always makes allowance in calculating on what day of the week any given day of a given year falls. In the first year of his lunar cycle the Paschal full moon falls on the 13th of April, from which it follows that the 21st of March was the 21st day of the preceding moon; or, if we may so express it, that on the author's system the moon was created 21 days old. The author always makes allowance for the 20 preceding days, in calculating the age of the moon on any given day; but he divides these 20 days into 13, which he calls *πρὸ τῶν φωστήρων*, and 7 which he calls *προσέληνους*. Van der Hagen (p. 46) attempts an explanation of this which he himself owns to be unsatisfactory. By the methods

here indicated the chronicler calculates the date of a number of Paschal full moons, the first being the passover of the Exodus which he computes fell on Sunday, April 13th, A.M. 3839.

It is necessary next to explain what connexion there is between chronological calculations and the times of keeping the church feasts named in the preface. These feasts are evidently all connected together, since the Purification ought to be forty days after the Nativity, and the Nativity nine months after the Annunciation, and six months after the birth of St. John the Baptist. It is the last of these which the author of the chronicle accounts for by a calculation which seems to be peculiar to himself. The whole depends on the assumption that the ministration of Zacharias at which the angel appeared to him, was during the feast of Tabernacles, which began on the 15th, and ended on the 22nd of the seventh Jewish month. The author then calculates for the year A.M. 5506, which he holds to be the proper year, the age of the moon on the 1st of September; and he finds, but not without some forcing, that it was the second day of the moon, and also the Sabbath day. The feast of Tabernacles would therefore be over on September 21st, but on account of the Sabbath, Zacharias remained in Jerusalem on the 22nd; on the 23rd he returned home, and the conception of John the Baptist took place on the 24th; and the birth on the 24th of the following June. St. Luke's phrase "in the sixth month" was interpreted to mean immediately after the completion of the sixth month; and so the birth of our Lord was made to fall six months and a day after that of St. John the Baptist or Dec. 25th A.M. 5507. Thus it will have been seen that the author counted it as a test of the accuracy of his chronology to assign such a year of the world for the conception of St. John the Baptist that the termination of the feast of Tabernacles should neither fall after the 24th of September, nor at any great interval before it. The year of the Crucifixion is determined independently. Hippolytus had assigned the 25th of March as the day of the Passion (followed by Tertull. *adv. Jud.* 8, August. *C. D.* xviii. 54): but at the time of the chronicler this was taken to be the traditional date of the Resurrection, and it is March 23rd which he assumes to be the day of the Crucifixion. It is necessary for him then to find a year of the world in which this shall be a full moon and also a Friday. These conditions he tries to prove are satisfied by the year A.M. 5540; but here too his calculations are forced, for it so happens that without a special artifice, he would not have found the full moon in any year of his cycle to fall on the 23rd of March. Anianus had previously used the same principles of calculation, but had arrived at a different result, because he held our Lord to have suffered on the 15th day of the month. It is needless to discuss the chronicler's success in reconciling the years he has assigned for our Lord's birth and death with the duration he has assigned to His ministry, namely three years and seventy-six days. His difficulties were increased by his having felt himself bound to adopt Jan. 6th as the date of the Baptism, because this falls so near the 25th of December that he could not take advantage of the ambiguity of the phrase "about thirty years of age," but was compelled

to hold that the Baptism took place immediately after the completion of the thirtieth year. The author's dates correspond to B.C. 3 for the birth and A.D. 32 for the crucifixion of our Lord. His system is discussed in Clinton's *Fasti Romani*, to which work we also refer for corrections of the author's tables of consuls, and discussions of other parts of his chronological system (see vol. i. pp. 16, 863; vol. ii. pp. 163, 169, 209, 179 et seq.). See also Ideler, *Chronologie*, vol. ii. pp. 350, 354, 462; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 449, ed. Harles. Hody, in the preface to his edition of John Malalas, discusses the origin of the passages common to the chronicle with that author, and states that he had treated of this chronicle in a separate writing which, as far as we are aware, was never published. This chronicle is the subject of a special essay by Van der Hagen (Amst. 1736), where will be found the best explanations of those points in the chronicler's method of computation which present difficulty. [G. S.]

CHRONICON RUINARTIANUM. A short Latin chronicle appended to two MSS. of Victor Vitensis, and first published by Ruinart (*Hist. Persec. Vandal.* p. 112), and afterwards by Roncalli (No. xii.). It consists chiefly of extracts from other writers, in particular from Gennadius, Idatius, Marcellinus Comes and Victor Tunnunensis, put down without much regard to chronological order. It begins with the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, and goes on to that of Justin II. 565-578. It makes mention of the dialogues of pope Gregory the Great, and was probably compiled about the end of the 6th century. [G. S.]

CHRONICON SCALIGERIANUM SIVE ALEXANDRINUM. As an appendix to his edition of the Chronicon of Eusebius, Scaliger published what he called "Extracts from the first book of the Chronica of Eusebius, Africanus and others, made by a barbarous and silly writer, most ignorant of Greek and Latin." The work thus described is in Latin, and is of undoubted antiquity, being contained in an uncial MS. preserved in the Imperial Library of Paris. A note in a later hand ascribing the work to Georgius Ambianensis or Victor Furonesius (*sic*) deserves no attention. The chronicle begins with Adam, and breaks off with the reign of Arcadius and Honorius; but a list of emperors in an earlier part (p. 80) is continued as far as Anastasius, 491-518, and since the length of his reign is not given, in the same way as those of the other emperors, it is probable that the work was published during the life of that emperor. Internal evidence points to Alexandria as the place of its composition: it constantly uses the Egyptian months; and records several Alexandrian occurrences, noting not only the consuls of the year, but also the Egyptian Augustal prefect. Hence Du Cange in the preface and notes to his edition of the Paschal chronicle, after Cuciacius (*in Cod. Justin.* p. 140) refers to this work as Chronicon Alexandrinum. Herwart (in his *Chronology*, cap. 184) urges an argument for its Egyptian origin founded on the era of Christ which the author adopts. But the passage on which he relies, in which the year of the accession of Julian, A.D. 360, is said to be also that of the completion of the eleventh period of 532 years since the creation, appears to have

CHRIST. BIOGE.

been simply extracted from Anianus (see Syn-cellus, p. 36). And the truth seems to be that the compiler had no chronological system of his own, but put down results gathered from different sources, without much regard to consistency. The Latinity of the book and its blunders in translating from the Greek are as bad as Scaliger described them, but the use made by the compiler of writings not now extant renders it worthy of being consulted. He used the chronicle of Hippolytus (from whom he took the ethnographical account of the division of the earth between the sons of Noah), Africanus, Castor and others. And he appears to have taken from apocryphal sources stories of the martyrdom of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, and of the miraculous preservation of Elizabeth and her infant, of the names of the wise men, of the maidservant who questioned Peter, &c. [G. S.]

CHRONICON VALESIANUM. This chronicle, or fragment of a chronicle, by an unknown author, embracing the period from Diocletian to Theodoric, is in Latin. It was communicated by Sirmondi to Valesius, and published by him as an appendix to his edition of Ammianus Marcellinus. Mommsen notes that the writer made use of

CHRONICON CUSPINIANEUM. [G. S.]

CHRONOPIUS (1) I., third bishop of Le Périgord. He succeeded Anianus in the first half of the 4th century. In an ancient breviary of that church occurs the following record: "Chronopius etiam, Elpidii et Benedictæ filius, a morte suscitatus, B. Frontonis discipulus, ac demum in episcopatu successor, cum numerosa familia ab eo baptizatus, multorum conversionis ad fidem causa exstitit" (*Gall. Christ.* ii. p. 1448). [D. R. J.]

CHRONOPIUS (2) II. was the seventh bishop of Le Périgord. Fortunatus mentions that both his father and grandfather had followed the custom of taking orders after a former state of matrimony. Chenu (*Archiep. et Ep. Gall.* Paris, 1621) says that it was not unusual to look for prelates in families of senatorial and episcopal rank. The phrase of Fortunatus is, "*Ordo sacerdotum cui fluxit utroque parente*," which has generally been understood to indicate his father and his paternal grandfather. The author of the second volume of *Gallia Christiana* instances the case of Simplicius, bishop of Bourges. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 1451.) Chronopius is described as having been of noble birth, modest, gentle, eloquent, the father of the poor, the prop of his country, the restorer of churches, the redeemer of citizens. He was present in 506 at the synod of Agde (Agathensis). In the year 511 he subscribed to the first synod of Orleans, and in 533 to the second. He built the basilica of St. Front and translated his relics. In his time lived Avitus, who was his first preceptor in literature and philosophy. Then he was sent by his father to Clovis, and followed the standard of that king against Alarie, king of the Visigoths. At length, warned by an angel, he returned to his country, where having built an oratory in a very thick wood, he led a holy, or to use the words of Sammarthanus, an angelic life, and died full of years, being more than eighty. It is uncertain in what year he died, but it was probably about the middle of the 6th century. (Venant. For-

tunat. *Miscell.* iv. 8, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. p. 160; *Gall. Christ.* ii. p. 1450.) [D. R. J.]

CHRONOPIUS (3). A bishop of the time of the emperor Valentinian I., mentioned in his law of July 9, A.D. 369. His see is unknown, but contrary to the laws he had appealed to a secular magistrate named Claudianus, and again to another, against the decisions of a certain council, the name of which is also unknown. Seventy bishops were at this council, and they deposed him. His fine, supposed to be 50 lbs. of silver, was this year not to be paid to the treasury, but to the poor; and this was to be done likewise in other ecclesiastical matters. (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xi. tit. 36, leg. 20, p. 307; *Ceillier*, iv. 600; vi. 356.) [W. M. S.]

CHROTBERTUS. [CHRODEBERT.]

CHROTECHILDIS, CHROTILDIS. [CLOTILDA.]

CHRYSANTHUS (1), martyred along with the virgin Daria at Rome. Thus much only is told us, from Acts then extant, by Gregory of Tours (*Glor. Mart.* i. 38, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. 764, 816). The extant Acts put the martyrdom under the emperor Numerian, but as they profess to be written by Verinus and Armenius by order of pope Stephen, it is manifest that we must substitute the name Valerian: OTAA easily became OYM and NOTM. This is the more manifest, as according to Ado, who, however, gives a tissue of prodigies, they suffered under a prefect Celerinus, whose name does not occur in the list of prefects from A.D. 254 onwards, in the calendar of Philocalus (Tillem. iv. 763). According to the same Acts his father was one Polemo, or Polemius, of Alexandria, his Christian instructor the presbyter Carpophorus; the virgin Daria was of Athens. The story, as given in the menology of Basil, is to the effect that Chrysanthus went to Rome with his father who was a senator, and was made a Christian at the hands of a certain bishop, who was hiding in a cave. When his father knew it, he shut him up in a dark prison, then compelled him to take a wife, and gave him Daria, the lady philosopher. But when Chrysanthus saw her, he treated her as a sister, and they took counsel to be virgins till death. Then she too was baptized, and they both taught the people concerning chastity and sobriety. The Gentiles, vexed at their persuading their wives to leave them and be espoused to Christ, slandered them to the prefect. The saints are given over to Claudius the tribune, and are led outside the city and tortured diversely. Then a miry ditch is dug, and they are both thrown into it, and earth is thrown over them, and they are trampled down, and thus they are perfected. (*Men. Bas.* Oct. 17.)

Gregory further informs us that a vault of wonderful work was made over their tomb, and that the crowd which assembled here on their festival were buried alive, by order of the emperor, by the obstruction of the entrance with a great mass of stones and earth. The site was forgotten when Rome became Christian. Diodorus the priest, and Marianus the deacon, are mentioned in the Acts as among the martyrs thus buried alive.

The site, according to Gregory, was discovered by revelation, and a wall was put up, severing the graves of Chrysanthus and Daria from the bodies of the later crowd of martyrs. An aper-

ture was left in this wall, that the bodies of the saints might be visible. Through this aperture the silver vessels with sacred wine, that had been deposited at their burial, could also be seen. These excited the cupidity of a subdeacon, who entered the cell by night to steal them, but could not find the way out again in the dark, and durst not emerge by day. Night after night his perplexity was repeated, till he was nearly starved, and obliged to confess his attempt. The event was recorded in an inscription by Damasus, who also had the window more carefully closed. "And there," says Gregory, "our Lord Jesus Christ is blessed to the praise of His name unto this day." This was in the cemetery of Thraso, on the left of the new Salarian way (De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*, i. 176).

The above stories suggest three occasions that might give rise to commemorations; the martyrdom of the two saints, and of the throng of worshippers, and the discovery of the bodies. But it is furthermore related in the Acts, that the above-named Claudius, the tribune, with his wife Hilaria, and children Jason and Maurus, were converted and martyred soon after. They are commemorated, with Chrysanthus and Daria and eighty-six soldiers, Aug. 12 (*Mart. Hieron.*). Hilaria was afterwards commemorated the same day as mother of Afra. The same martyrology commemorates our pair along with Saturninus and Maurus, on Nov. 29 and 30. They may perhaps be mentioned at this time from a confusion between a Saturninus connected with them and the Saturninus of Toulouse, who died Nov. 29. Peter de Natalibus has a story of Maurus, coming from Africa to worship at the tomb of the apostles and being put to death by Celerinus, Nov. 30. The *Romanum Parvum* names our pair, with Diodorus, Marrianus, and an infinite multitude, Dec. 1. Rabanus and Notker commemorate them Oct. 25, which has been the usage of the Roman church from the 7th century. The Greeks assign them to Oct. 17, as we have seen, and also, though not in the menology of Basil, to March 19 (Tillem. iv. 566; cf. also Sollier's *Usuard*, Dec. 1; Ruinart, p. 420; *Acta SS.* Oct. xi. 437).

The inscription by Damasus, to which Gregory alludes, is lost; but we have his epitaph on the tomb of Maurus at the same place (Tillem. viii. 422; *Patr.* xiii. 395, *Carm.* 21). A long poem on the martyrdom of our saints, discovered in 1845, is ascribed to him, but wrongly. The source of the error may perhaps be traced in the terms in which Gregory of Tours concludes the story of the sub-deacon narrated above. The chapter (*Glor. Mart.* i. 38) says that after a long while pope Damasus "jussit diligentius operiri fenestram, ubi et *versibus* decoravit locum. Et ibi benedicitur Dominus Noster Jesus Christus ad laudem nominis sui, usque in hodiernum diem." If Damasus was thus understood to have had *versus* inscribed, it would be natural to assign the long *Carmen* to him. It is given in the *Acta SS.* and in the *Patrologia*, lxxiv. 527. [E. B. B.]

CHRYSANTHUS (2) A bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, who succeeded Sisinnius in 407. Chrysanthus was the son of Marcan, the predecessor of Sisinnius. He had passed the greater part of a long life in various civil and military employments, having filled with great

credit the offices of *ἐπαρκός* in Italy, and Vicarius of the British Isles. Having returned to Constantinople at an advanced age, in the hope of being appointed prefect of the city, he was unexpectedly named by Sisinnius, when at the point of death, as his successor. Being disinclined to the episcopal office he retired from Constantinople to Bithynia, but was pursued and dragged from his retreat and forced to submit to ordination. He held his office seven years, till his death in 414. Socrates praises his singular modesty and prudence, as well as his liberality. He states that he was the first who distributed money out of his private means to the poor of his church, and that he refused any official remuneration beyond two of the *eulogiae*, or loaves offered by the people and blessed by the bishop. Under his government the Novatian church at Constantinople advanced in numbers and prosperity. He secured the services of Ablavius, the most celebrated orator of his day, afterwards the Novatian bishop of Nicaea, whom he induced to be ordained presbyter (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 6, 12, 17).

[E. V.]

CHRYSANTHUS (3) One of the bishops at the council of Arles in the early part of the 5th century (Tillem. xv. 407).

(4) Bishop of Spoleto, addressed by Gregory the Great (*Ep.* vii. 72, 73), and begged to give some relics of SABINUS for a church at Fermo (v. Tillem. v. 42).

[E. B. B.]

CHRYSAPIUS, an eunuch, chief minister at the court of Theodosius II., Eastern emperor. He is mentioned as gaining over his master and the empress Eudoxia to the party of Eutyches. After the death of Theodosius, A.D. 450, he was disgraced, banished to an island, and put to death at the instance of the empress Pulcheria. It is thought that through the influence of Chrysaphius, Eutyches obtained a letter from Theodosius to pope Leo the Great, exhorting him to peace. Chrysaphius and Eudoxia also supported Dioscorus in his desire that Theodosius would summon the Eutychian council of Ephesus (*Letters of Pulcheria*, Theodoret, *Letters*, 124, 125; *Concil.* iv. pp. 108, 109; Ceillier, viii. 475, x. 75, 210, 675.)

[W. M. S.]

CHRYSE (in Latin versions of the story known as AUREA), the principal figure in that account of the martyrdom of Hippolytus which found most circulation in the East. The Greek text was first published by Simeon de Magistris in 1795, but may be most conveniently consulted in Lagarde's Hippolytus (v.-xii.). It purports to relate to martyrdoms which took place during a violent persecution of the Christians by the emperor Claudius. Magistris, who defends the historical character of the narrative, would have us understand the emperor Claudius Gothicus (A.D. 268-270); but it is clear that the writer of the story intended the first Claudius, for one of the characters is made to speak of Christ's appearance on earth as an event of his own time. The substance of the story is as follows:—The prefect Censorinus, at first only in secret a Christian, makes his religion known by his kindness to the confessors under imprisonment, and is in consequence himself also imprisoned at Ostia by the Emperor's command. There he is ministered to in prison by Maximus the priest, Archelaus the deacon, and by Chryse,

a lady of the imperial family. A miracle exhibited in the prison leads to the conversion of the guards, seventeen in number, whose names are given, among which, for a reason presently to be mentioned, the names Herculeaneus and Taurinus are to be noted. They are baptized under the direction of the bishop Cyriacus, by whose prayers about the same time a young lad is raised from death to life. The emperor hearing of this miracle, and imputing it to magic, orders a fresh persecution of the Christians, in which Cyriacus, Maximus, Archelaus, Chryse, and the guards suffer martyrdom by various deaths, Chryse in particular being subjected to a great variety of tortures. Nonus, the presbyter, whose name we are told had been changed to Hippolytus (that is to say who had received the second name on his conversion), buries the body of Chryse in his own ground outside the walls of Ostia; and in consequence of his loud expressions of indignation at the cruelties exercised on the Christians himself also suffers martyrdom by being drowned in a ditch at the wall of Portus. These acts mention no other connexion between Hippolytus and Portus, nor do they speak of him as a bishop, but only as presbyter. However much of the story may be pure invention, the writer of the acts derived some of his names from historical sources, for in the "Depositio martyrum," contained in the chronicle of the year 354 (CHRONICON CANISIANUM), are given under Sept. 5 the names "Aconti in Porto et Nonni et Herculani et Taurini." The Greek version of the story just described is clearly the original from which are derived all the extant Latin versions which assume a great variety of forms. One departs but little from the Greek form. In another (Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept., ii. 520), Censorinus is the chief figure, the emperor Gallus (A.D. 252) is made the persecutor, and no mention is made of Hippolytus. In another Cyriacus is the chief figure. In another later form (*Acta Sanctorum*, Aug., iv. 757), Hippolytus is made bishop of Portus, and the emperor Alexander is made the persecutor. In some forms of the story the Nonus-Hippolytus of the original is confounded with Nonnus, bishop of Edessa, who lived at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, and was celebrated as the converter of St. Pelagia (see the story as told by Peter Damiani in Fabricius's Hippolytus, p. xi.) The most complete discussion of all these stories is to be found in Döllinger, *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, chap. 2. [HIPPOLYTUS.] [G. S.]

CHRYSEROS, a sophist and apologist of paganism in the 5th century, rebuked by St. Nilus (*Ep.* ii. 42; Ceillier, viii. 217). [E. B. B.]

CHRYSIPPUS, one of four brothers, Cappadocians by birth, of whom the other two were named Cosmas and Gabriel, recorded by Cyril of Scythopolis. Having resolved on embracing a religious life, they left their native country and betook themselves to Jerusalem, that they might profit by the instructions of the celebrated abbat Euthymius. In 455 Chrysippus was made the superior of the monastery of Laura, and subsequently of the church of the Resurrection, by the patriarch Juvenal. He was raised to the presbyterate, and on the elevation of his brother Cosmas, who had held the office, to the see of Scythopolis, was appointed "guardian of the

Holy Cross," which he held for ten years, till his death. Chrysippus was a copious author, and according to Cyril, who praises him as *θαιμαστός συγγραφεύς*, "left many works worthy of all acceptance," very few of which are known to exist. A "laudatio Joannis Baptistae," delivered on the occasion of his festival, is printed in a Latin translation by Combefis (*Biblioth. Concionat.* vii. 108). This homily is couched in the inflated style of the panegyrist, overloaded with metaphors and similes, with an ostentatious display of classical and mythological learning. Herod at his banquet is compared to Polyphemus, and the Baptist in his solitude is contrasted with Timon. Fabricius mentions a *Homilia in Deiparam*, printed in the *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.*, Paris, 1624, vol. ii. p. 424, and a *Laudatio Theodori Martyris*, which appears to be lost. Photius (*cod.* 171) records his having read in a writing of Chrysippus a statement relating to the baptism of Gamaliel and Nicodemus by the apostles Peter and John, and the martyrdom of the latter, which Chrysippus had derived from a fellow-presbyter, Lucian, to whom it had been revealed in a dream, together with the localities in which their bodies, and that of St. Stephen were to be found. This is a very early example of the convenient dreams indicating the position of valuable relics which we meet with so frequently in the middle ages, by which the failing fortunes of a religious house were revived, or the rival attractions of another establishment emulated. (Cyrill. *Scythop. Vit. S. Euthym.* Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 444; Combefis, *Bibl. Concionat.* i. 8.) [COSMAS.] [E. V.]

CHRYSOGONUS (1), martyr in the persecution of Diocletian, whose name was inserted in the canon of the mass from a very early period, so that we may be sure that he was a very important person, though little is now known of him. In his case, from the very little that we are told, we are better able than in almost any other to trace the several stages of the persecution of Diocletian. In the *Menology* he is commemorated along with Anastasia, Dec. 22. He was of great Rome, "a man that feared God," "teacher of the Christians;" "and when persecution was set on foot he was arrested and cast into prison." Anastasia was of rich and noble parents, and learnt to believe in Christ from her mother, but was taught the Scriptures by Chrysogonus. She received a husband named Publius, rich, but a heathen, whence also she hated him, and would not come into contact with him, but pitied the poor and visited those in prison. Wherefore she was cast into prison (probably a private custody) by her husband; but when he died she came out. She had written to Chrysanthus in his prison "to pray for her, that, if her husband would become a Christian, he might be preserved alive, but if he would not be persuaded, he might die and not spend her wealth with idolaters, but that she might empty it upon the saints and upon the poor, which thing came to pass. Then the holy lady obtained liberty of action and gave all she had to the poor, and put on poor apparel, and went about and ministered to the saints in the prisons; when also Diocletian, staying at Nice, wrote to Rome that all the Christians should die, and that Chrysogonus should be brought bound to Nice, and when he was brought he beheaded him." For Nice we should probably read

Nicomedia. In these acts it is easy to trace the effects of the first and second of Diocletian's edicts. Chrysogonus evidently was not one of the traitors, who were so numerous at Rome, under the first edict, Feb. A.D. 303. Hence, when by the second edict, not long after, all the clergy were committed to jail, he exercised great influence from his prison on the faithful, who were still for the most part unscathed and at large. The question is to what we are to refer the statement about the decree that all Christians should be killed, and that Chrysogonus should be brought to Bithynia. His passion is assigned to the 22nd of December. By the third edict, on the great anniversary festival of the 21st, it was made the necessary preliminary to the inclusion of the captive clergy in the general release of prisoners, that they should consent to sacrifice; if they would not, torture was to be employed to induce them. But this only applied to the clergy. There were no general orders for the arrest of all Christians. The rescript of Trajan was still in force. But the great festival of the emperor's 20th anniversary must have brought to light many a recusant. The suggestion of torture in combination with the outlawry of Christians before decreed, was really equivalent to condemning them to slow deaths. They might not be executed, but if they died under torture it was strictly legal. When, in the spring of A.D. 304, the fourth edict appears, it sets forth no new penalties; it merely interprets the previous decrees in all the grim pregnancy of their meaning: "certis poenis intereat."

It may well be that the constancy of men like Chrysogonus, under their tortures, was among the things that drove Diocletian mad; and that he left word at his hurried departure from Rome (Dec. 22, A.D. 303), "Send him after me." The martyrdom is assigned by several Western authorities to Aquileia or the neighbouring Aquæ Gradatae in Friulia. The day to which it is almost universally assigned in the West from the Calendar of Carthage onwards, is Nov. 24. As for the one horror that seems to be new in the persecution of A.D. 304, the condemnation of virgins to the brothel, we may perhaps infer that the inclusion of the female with the male ministers of the church in the order for imprisonment was provoked by the conspicuous activity of women like Anastasia. Those who were so unabashed in visiting men in prison, should be visited by men in prison themselves. Her story is closely entwined with that of Irene, whom she is said to have visited whether in body or in a dream. "She buried those that were martyred, and encouraged many to martyrdom. So she was tortured by different rulers and cast into the sea and given over to fire; and when she came out of the fire she was beheaded with the women that were with her." The last account does not mean that they tried in vain to drown or burn her, and found her proof against all but the headsman's axe; but that she was cast into the hold of a ship to be taken to a place of trial or of exile, there subjected to the horrible fiery tortures that were then so common, till at last her living ashes were laid to rest by the severance of her head from her body. Miracles of fortitude were easily transformed to vulgar prodigies of invulnerability. Her commemoration in the West is on Dec. 25, and in some of the Hieronymian

martyrologies her passion is assigned to Sirmium, which was probably the scene of Diocletian's illness. But Usuard tells that she was transported to the little isle Palmaruola (about lat. 41°, long. 31°) in the Tyrrhene sea.

The Paris Breviary tells us that "the body of Chrysogonus was thrown into the sea. Shortly afterwards the presbyter Zoilus found it and buried it in his own house. There is an ancient parish of St. Chrysogonus at Rome, mentioned in the acts of the council under Symmachus, and in the epistles of Gregory the Great. Gregory III. adorned it. His name was celebrated throughout Illyria." His body is said by Alban Butler to be now at Venice. [E. B. B.]

CHRYSOGONUS (2), monk, of Aquileia, to whom St. Jerome writes (Letter 9, ed. Vall.) from the desert, asking him to write to him. [W. H. F.]

CHRYSOILIUS, ST. (ST. CHRYSEUIL), bishop and martyr, celebrated at Comines in Flanders as the apostle of that neighbourhood. He suffered under Diocletian. By De Saussay he is said to have been bishop of Tornacum (Tournay) (*Martyrolog. Gallic.* p. 98, Paris, 1637). The authorities for his life are the martyrologists of Belgium and Flanders. He is said by the MSS. at Comines to have been a native of Armenia, and is stated, but without any substantial authority, to have been of royal blood (nam *Armeniae Rex Reginaque eidem B. Chrysolio parentes carnales dicuntur veraciter exstitisse* (*AA. SS. Boll.* ex MSS. Cominien. and Rubeavallis). In the same MSS. he is said to have been made archbishop while still living in Armenia, and to have been equally distinguished for his learning and the holiness of his life. But Molanus doubts whether he was ever a bishop. By order of Diocletian, Armenia was visited with a cruel persecution of Christians, many of whom were put to death. Chrysolius then fled to Rome, where he was received with much honour by pope Marcellus. As a token of his esteem, the pope presented him with the *Canola* of St. Peter, but it is not clear what is meant here by "*Canola*," whether some relic of St. Peter, or merely a vestment consecrated by the pope. He was accompanied on his journey from Rome to Gaul by St. Dionysius of Paris, St. Quintinus of Amiens, St. Piatius of Tournay, St. Lucianus of Beauvais, and others, most of whom, like himself, won the martyr's crown. Chrysolius went to Verlenghem, where he converted many to the Christian faith.

The fame of his pious works caused him to be arrested by the imperial authorities, and he was publicly scourged and scalped. The legend states the miracle, which the monkish annalists deemed commonly appropriate, that the martyr carried his scalp and brain in his hands. His death is placed in A.D. 302. His relics were translated to Bruges to the basilica of St. Donatian, but some of them were also taken to Tournay, Lens, and other places.

Chrysolius is commemorated on the 7th of February (*AA. SS. Boll.* Feb. ii. pp. 9-13; De Saussay, *Martyrol. Gall.* p. 98; Tillemont, iv. 458). [D. R. J.]

CHRYSOLOGUS, PETRUS, archbishop of Ravenna, A.D. 433-454, who like Chrysostom obtained the name by which he is usually known from the golden brilliancy of his oratory. The

title was given to the subject of this notice by the Greeks residing at the court of Valentinianus and his mother, Galla Placidia, at Ravenna. He is said to have been born at Forum Cornelii (Imola), according to Agnellus, in the episcopate of Cornelius, by whom he was brought up and instructed (*Serm.* 165). In due time Cornelius ordained the young Peter deacon, and made him *oeconomus* of the church. The ordinary account of Peter's elevation to the see of Ravenna, which is repeated by successive biographers with ever increasing definiteness of statement, does too much violence to the facts of history to be worthy of credit. The improbabilities of the story are exposed by the learned and candid Tillemont, and it is stigmatised by Dupin as "a groundless tale related by no credible author." It is however given so circumstantially by Agnellus in his *Liber Pontificalis* (a work of which Wattenbach speaks highly in his *Geschichtsquellen*, as evidently derived from early and trustworthy sources), that it may contain some distorted elements of truth, and therefore cannot be omitted altogether. Agnellus's account is that on the death of John, bishop of Ravenna, A.D. 433, the whole people came together (according to the usual custom), with their presbyters, one of whom they chose as bishop and sent him to Rome to be consecrated by Sixtus III. Among the bishops who accompanied the newly elected to Rome was Cornelius of Imola, attended by his deacon Peter. The consecration of the bishop-elect was stayed by a vision. The apostles Peter and Paul appeared to Sixtus in a dream, bringing a young man between them, whom they commanded him to consecrate instead of the Ravenese nominee. A second vision was required to overcome the pope's indisposition to set aside the choice of the diocese. On the repetition of the command in sterner terms he yielded, and recognising in the deacon Peter the person who had been indicated by the apostles, in spite of the displeasure of the clergy and laity of Ravenna at having a young stranger set over them, he consecrated him bishop. The improbabilities of this story are patent. It assumes that the church of Ravenna was subject to that of Rome, when, if not already possessing metropolitan rank, which Tillemont thinks was probably the case, it was one of the suffragan sees of Milan, and it was to the metropolitan of that city, and not of Rome, that the confirmation and consecration of the bishop-elect belonged: and even if Ravenna had been subordinate to the papal see, it ascribes to the bishop of Rome the uncanonical power of cancelling a legitimate election, without any proved disqualification, and of appointing a bishop by his sole authority. Besides, as Tillemont has shewn, there is some reason to believe that Chrysologus was bishop of Ravenna before the date of Sixtus's accession in 432. His biographers load the episcopate of Chrysologus with panegyrics which add but little to our knowledge of him. We may gather from his sermons that he presided over his diocese with vigorous authority, taking special pains to extirpate the pagan customs still kept up among the half-leavened heathen of Ravenna (*Serm.* 155); regulating the lenten fast (*Serm.* 166); and correcting the habit of catechumens deferring their baptism (*Serm.* 10, 59). During the early progress of the Eutychian con-

troversy, A.D. 449, a letter was addressed to Chrysologus, in common with the occupants of all the principal sees of the West, by Eutyches himself, remonstrating against his condemnation by Flavian of Constantinople, and seeking to stir up all the Western bishops against him. Chrysologus's reply, which is extant among the acts of the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 35, cf. the notes of Binnius, *ib.* 992), expresses the sorrow with which he has received Eutyches's letter, and exhorts him to submit to the decision of the see of Peter, as declared in the Encyclic of Leo, since "the blessed Peter lives and presides in his own cathedra, and gives the true faith to all who seek for it." That Chrysologus died either this or the following year is plain from the 37th letter of Leo, addressed to his successor.

In the 176 sermons still extant we look in vain for any traces of the golden eloquence to which he owed his surname. They are very short, written in brief simple sentences; his meaning is always clear, and his language natural; but there is nothing in any of them calculated to touch the heart, or move the affections. His fame as a preacher must have evidently depended much more on his voice and manner than on the matter of his discourses. His sermons are almost without exception on subjects taken from the gospels, usually on the parables and miracles: he begins by explaining his text in a plain common-sense way, and goes on to draw moral reflections, in which we find neither theology nor eloquence. The series commences with a course of six on the prodigal son. Many other works are ascribed to Chrysologus, including commentaries on scripture, and letters against the Arians. These have all perished by fire, partly in the siege of Imola, by Theodoric, c. A.D. 524; partly in the conflagration of the archbishop's library at Ravenna, c. A.D. 700.

(Tillemont, xv. 114 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 432; Migne, *Patrolog.* lii. pp. 9-680; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* ii. 695.) [E. V.]

CHRYSOPHORA, a correspondent of Dionysius of Corinth, "a most faithful sister" (Eus. iv. 23). The letter is not extant. [E. B. B.]

CHRYSORETES, chamberlain of the emperor Theodosius II. (reigned A.D. 408-450). He was exceedingly powerful, and opposed to the Catholic party. It is thought that he was the chamberlain who had in A.D. 433 asked for all the writings of Cyril of Alexandria. About that time Cyril wished the empress Pulcheria to introduce Lausus into the palace, and to give him the place of Chrysoretēs, in consequence of his influence and hostility. (Labbe, *Concil.* vii. 909 b; Tillemont, xi. p. 527; Ceillier, viii. 294.) [W. M. S.]

CHRYSOSTOM, JOHN. (Ἰωάννης Χρυσόστομος.) The surname "golden-mouthed," given to the great preacher of Antioch, and bishop of Constantinople, on account of the magnificent brilliancy of his eloquence (cf. Petrus Chrysologus), has entirely superseded his personal name of John, which alone is found in contemporary or closely subsequent writers. When the epithet was first applied is unknown. There is no trace of it in his lifetime, but it was in common use before the end of the fifth century.

Chrysostom, as throughout this article we shall call him, was born at Antioch towards the

middle of the fourth century. The precise date of his birth is uncertain, but it may be fixed with some probability in A.D. 347. He was of good birth. His father Secundus was an officer high in command, filling the post of "magister militum" (στρατηγός), one of the eight who commanded the imperial armies, who, according to Vegetius, were all men of distinguished rank — *illustres viros* (Veget. *de Re militari*, ii. 9). His mother, Anthusa, was also a lady of good family (Pallad. p. 40; Socr. vi. 3). Secundus died while his son was yet an infant. Anthusa was left a widow at the age of twenty, but she steadily refused all offers of marriage, and devoted herself to watching over the education of her boy, and the care of the property which was to be his (*De Sacerdot.* lib. i. c. 55). Anthusa was no common woman. She was a Christian from the bottom of her heart, and her chief object was to train her son to God's service, and to keep him unspotted by the contaminations of the luxurious and profligate city of Antioch. Anthusa's unremitting devotion to her maternal duties excited universal admiration. Her son himself informs us that when he began to attend the lectures of one of the Antiochene professors, probably Libanius, who was still a heathen, his master on learning that he was the son of a widow forty years of age, who twenty years before had lost her husband while still in the flower of her youth, and had remained unmarried, exclaimed "Good heavens! what women these Christians have" (*Epist. ad Vid. Jun.* i. c. 2, p. 340). The church owes no common debt of reverential gratitude to the memory of Anthusa, who deserves to be placed in the very first rank of Christian mothers, with Monica the mother of St. Augustine, Nonna the mother of St. Gregory Nazianzen, and Osburh the mother of king Alfred. Chrysostom had a sister born before himself, but as there is no further reference to her she probably died in early childhood (Pallad. p. 40).

St. Chrysostom's life may be conveniently divided into five epochs. (a) His life as a layman at Antioch till his baptism and admission as a reader, A.D. 347-370; (b) his ascetic and monastic life, A.D. 370-381; (c) his career as deacon, presbyter and preacher at Antioch, A.D. 381-398; (d) his episcopate at Constantinople, A.D. 398-404; (e) exile, A.D. 404-407.

(a) *Life as a layman at Antioch.*—The intellectual power manifested by Chrysostom at a very early age marked him out as fitted for one of the learned professions. The bar was chosen, and at the age of eighteen or thereabout he began to attend the lectures of the celebrated sophist Libanius, the intimate friend and correspondent of the emperor Julian, and tutor of Basil the Great, who after his various sojourns as a professor at Athens and Constantinople and other chief cities of the Eastern world had come to end his days in his native city of Antioch. The genius and ability of the pupil excited the greatest admiration in his master. A panegyric on Constantine and his sons, composed by him as a literary effort, received his highest commendations (Isid. Pelusiot. lib. ii. *Ep.* 42). Sozomen records that when on his deathbed, about A.D. 395, being asked by his friends which of his pupils he thought worthiest to succeed him, Libanius replied, "John; if the Christians had not stolen

him from us" (Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 2). The name of another of his teachers, Andragathius, who instructed him in philosophy, of whom nothing further is known, is preserved to us by Socrates and Sozomen. On the completion of his education Chrysostom commenced practice as an advocate. His gift of eloquence speedily displayed itself. His speeches were listened to with delight, and were highly praised by Libanius, no mean judge of rhetoric. A brilliant career was opening before the young man, leading to all that men most covet, wealth, fame, high place. But a change, gradual but mighty, came over his spirit, and like another young student of the neighbouring province of Cilicia, "the things that were gain to him he counted loss for Christ." Like Timothy at the knees of Eunice, "from a child" Chrysostom had learnt from his devout mother the things that were "able to make him wise unto salvation," and his soul revolted at the contrast between the purity of the gospel standard, and the baseness of the aims and viciousness of the practices prevalent in the profession he had chosen. To accept a fee for making the worse appear the better cause seemed to his generous and guileless soul to be bribed to lie—to take Satan's wages—to sin against his own soul. His disinclination to the life of a lawyer was much increased by the influence of the example of his intimate friend, Basil, the companion of his studies, and the sharer of all his thoughts and plans. The two friends had agreed to follow the same profession; but when Basil decided on adopting a monastic life, and to follow, in Chrysostom's words, "the true philosophy," Chrysostom was unable at once to resolve to renounce the world, to the attractions of which his ardent nature was by no means insensible, and of which he was in some danger of becoming a slave. In his own words he was "a never-failing attendant at the law courts, and was passionately enamoured of the theatre" (*De Sacerdot.* lib. i. c. 14, p. 363). Basil's adoption of an ascetic life at first caused an interruption of the intercourse of the two friends. But life was intolerable separated from his second self. He renewed his intimacy with Basil, by whose influence the desire to lead a religious life was rekindled. The pleasures and pursuits of the world became distasteful to him, and he soon conceived the resolution of abandoning it altogether, quitting his mother and his home, and finding some sacred retreat where he and his friend could devote themselves to strict asceticism (*ibid.* c. 4). This decisive change—Chrysostom's conversion we should now call it—was greatly promoted by the acquaintance he formed at this period with the mild and holy Meletius, the orthodox and legitimate bishop of Antioch, who had recently returned to his see after one of his many banishments for the faith. Meletius quickly observed the intellectual promise of the young lawyer, and enamoured of the beauty of his disposition, he sought frequent opportunities of intercourse, and in a prophetic spirit declared the greatness of his future career (*Pallad.* p. 40). Up to this time Chrysostom, though the child of Christian parents, according to a not unfrequent practice at this epoch, had remained unbaptized. The time for public profession of his faith was now come, and after a period of probation of three years, Meletius

baptized him, and ordained him to the office of reader. This was in A.D. 369 or 370, when Chrysostom was about twenty-three years old (*Pallad.* p. 41).

(b) *Ascetic and Monastic Life.*—The baptism of Chrysostom restored the balance which he tells us had been so seriously disturbed by Basil's higher religious attainments (*De Sacerdot.* lib. i. c. 3, p. 363). He became in the truest sense "a new man." From the hour of his baptism, says Palladius, "he neither swore, nor defamed any one, nor spoke falsely, nor cursed, nor even tolerated facetious jokes" (*Pallad.* p. 184). His desire to flee from the world, with his beloved Basil, was established, and was only frustrated by the passionate entreaties of his weeping mother that her only child, for whom she had given up all, would not desert her. The whole scene, to which we can only allude here, is narrated by Chrysostom with great dramatic power in a passage of exquisite simplicity and tenderness (*De Sacerdot.* lib. i. c. 5, pp. 363–365). The affectionate nature of Chrysostom was not one that could resist a mother's tears. In spite of Basil's continued urgency, he yielded so far as to consent to remain at home. But in all other respects his resolution was unchanged. If out of filial regard he abstained from deserting his home for a monastery, he would make a monastery of his home. He practised the most rigid asceticism. He ate little and seldom, and of the plainest food. He slept on the bare ground, and rose frequently for prayer. He rarely left the house, and lest he should fall back into his habit of slander, he kept almost unbroken silence. It is not surprising that his former associates should have called him morose and unsocial (*De Sacerdot.* lib. vi. c. 12, p. 431).

Upon some of these associates, however, his influence began to tell. Two of his fellow pupils under Libanius, Maximus, afterwards bishop of Seleucia [MAXIMUS], and Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia [THEODORUS OF MOPSUESTIA], adopted the ascetic life under the superintendence of Diodorus [DIDORUS OF TARSUS] and Carterius [CARTERIUS], who presided over a monastery in or near Antioch. From Diodorus Chrysostom learnt the clear common-sense mode of interpreting Holy Scripture (repudiating the allegorising principle), of which he and Theodore became such distinguished representatives. The inability of his friend Theodore to part definitively with the world, and stifle natural instincts, was the occasion of the composition of Chrysostom's earliest extant treatises. Theodore was warmly attached to a girl named Hermione, and his love for her led him to leave the ascetic brotherhood and return to his secular life. Chrysostom's heart was deeply stirred at this desertion. He regarded it as a sin to be repented of and forsaken if Theodore would not forfeit his salvation. He therefore addressed two letters to his friend full of impassioned eloquence, earnestly calling him to penitence and amendment. His fervid remonstrances were successful. Theodore gave up his engagement, and finally abandoned the world (*ad Theodorum lapsum*, Epist. i. ii.; Soz. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 3).

We now come to a passage in Chrysostom's life which we cannot hesitate to condemn as utterly at variance with the principles of truth and honour. While saying this we must bear in

mind that the moral standpoint of the Fathers was on this point different from our own. It was generally held that the culpability of an act of deception depended upon its purpose, and that if this was good the deception was laudable. Chrysostom himself says, "there is a good deceit such as many have been deceived by, which one ought not even to call a deceit at all," instancing that of Jacob, "which was not a deceit, but an economy" (*Homil. vi. in Coloss. c. ii. v. 8*). On this principle, which every healthy conscience now repudiates, Chrysostom proceeded to plan and execute a deliberate fraud to entrap his friend Basil into consecration to the episcopate. The facts were these. Several sees were vacant in Syria which it was desirable to fill without delay. A body of prelates met at Antioch for this purpose. Among those suitable for the episcopate, the young friends Chrysostom and Basil were pointed out, though they were not yet even deacons. Chrysostom's awful sense of the weight and responsibility of the priestly office, which breathes in every line of his treatise *De Sacerdotio*, and of his own unfitness, made him tremble at the idea of ordination. Basil, on the contrary, he considered to be as well qualified as he was unfit, and he was as fully resolved that the church should not lose the services of his friend as he was to avoid ordination himself. While, therefore, he pretended acquiescence in his friend's proposition that they should act in concert, and either both accept or both decline the office sought to be thrust upon them, he secretly resolved to adopt his own line of action, and avoid the dreaded honour by concealment. When the time of consecration arrived, and Basil was seized and carried before the bishops, and like St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, and St. Martin of Tours, and many others, forced to allow the ordaining hands to be laid upon his reluctant head, Chrysostom was nowhere to be found. To his friend's inquiries the answer was returned that he had already submitted to be consecrated, and that therefore there was no reason for his refusing to comply. When too late Basil discovered the cheat that had been put upon him, and upbraided Chrysostom with his breach of their friendly compact, his complaints were received with bursts of laughter and loud expressions of thankfulness at the success of his plot (*De Sacerdot. lib. i. c. 3, p. 365*). [BASILIUS, p. 297.]

Soon after this singular and characteristic passage, A.D. 374, Chrysostom encountered a more formidable peril, his escape from which he ever regarded as a remarkable proof of God's providential care. An imperial decree against the practisers of magical arts was being executed at Antioch with the greatest severity. Even the possession of a magical book, or one ignorantly supposed to be such, might lead to torture, banishment, or death. It happened that Chrysostom, walking with a friend by the side of the Orontes, fished out of the river some leaves of a volume which its owner had flung into the stream. A playful contest for the prize ensued, which changed into horror on its proving to be a book of magic. The terror they felt on discovering its nature was heightened by observing a soldier approaching. What to do with the fatal leaves they knew not. To keep them or to throw them away seemed equally dangerous. At last they

flung them back into the water. The soldier's suspicions had not been aroused, and Chrysostom and his companion were allowed to pass on unchallenged (*Homil. in Act. Apostol. 38*, in fine, vol. ix. p. 326).

Shortly after this romantic event, about A.D. 374, Chrysostom carried into effect his resolution of devoting himself to an ascetic life, and he left his home for a monastic community on one of the mountain ranges to the south of Antioch. As there is no reference in any of his writings to any opposition on the part of his mother, it is not improbable that her death had left him free to follow his bent. Falling in with an old Syrian monk, who practised the strictest asceticism, he made him his model in the severity of his self-discipline (Pallad. p. 41). His writings give us a graphic picture of the difficulty with which a young man accustomed to the easy life of a luxurious city inured himself to the hardships of such a lot (*ad Demetr. de Compunct. lib. i. c. 6, vol. i. p. 162*). After four years spent in unrelenting austerities, not being able entirely to extirpate the instincts of human nature, he left the society of his kind, and, making his home in a cavern in the mountain side, practised still more rigid self-discipline, in exposing himself to the extreme cold of those altitudes, and limiting himself to the smallest portion of food and sleep on which life could subsist (Pallad. p. 41). At the end of two years his health so completely gave way that he was forced to abandon the monastic career, and forsaking "the life of angels" for that of men, return with shattered constitution to his home in Antioch. To the austerities of these six years may doubtless be attributed that debilitated frame, weakness of digestion, and irritability of temperament, to which not only his constantly recurring physical sufferings, but many of his chief difficulties and calamities are not remotely traceable.

(c) *Career as a Preacher and Presbyter at Antioch.*—It is needless to say that Chrysostom did not return to Antioch to be idle. He was ordained deacon by Meletius A.D. 381, shortly before the latter left to preside over the Oecumenical Council of Constantinople (Pallad. p. 42). Meletius died during the session of the council, and it was left to his successor Flavian to raise Chrysostom to the presbyterate in the early part of A.D. 386 (Pallad. *ibid.*). During his five years' diaconate he had gained great popularity by his aptness to teach, and the elevating influence of his intercourse and conversation had made itself widely felt at Antioch. He also pursued his career as an author. While deacon he composed the treatise *De Virginitate* (vol. i. pp. 328–411); the *Epistola ad Viduam Juniorem* (*ib.* pp. 413–427), addressed to the young widow of Therasius (c. 381); together with its sequel *de non iterando Conjugio* (*ib.* pp. 427–439); and the orations *de Martyre Babyla* (vol. ii. pp. 634–689). After his ordination he preached his first sermon in the presence of the bishop, and a vast crowd gathered by the general report of his eloquence. The sermon, like most first sermons, is a somewhat formal and laboured discourse, encumbered by rhetorical ornament, and characterised by more of self-depreciation, and extravagant laudation of Flavian and Meletius than would please now (*Sermo, cum Presbyt. fuit Ordinatus, de se ac de Episcopo, deque populi mul-*

titudine, *ibid.* pp. 534-542). The succeeding ten years, embracing Chrysostom's life as a presbyter at Antioch, were chiefly devoted to the cultivation of the gift of pulpit eloquence on which his celebrity mainly rests. It was during this period that "the great clerk and godly preacher," as our First Homily terms him, delivered the greater part of the discourses extant, which however must be but a very small portion of those actually preached. Their number must have been enormous, for he preached regularly twice a week, on Saturday and Sunday, besides Lent and saints' days. We learn from his homilies on Genesis that he sometimes occupied the pulpit five days in succession (Tillemont, tom. xi. p. 34).

Flavian was so well satisfied with his sermons that he at once opened the cathedral pulpit to him, and appointed him one of the most frequent preachers there. Whenever he preached the church was densely thronged, the hearers testifying their delight in loud and noisy applause. This conduct was highly offensive to Chrysostom, who often rebuked their unseemly behaviour. Pickpockets found so favourable a field in these crowded congregations, rapt in admiration of the eloquent preacher, that Chrysostom had occasion to recommend his auditors to leave their purses behind them (*Adv. Arian. de Incomprehen. Dei Natura*, Homil. iii. c. 7, p. 471; Homil. iv. § 6, p. 480).

The most remarkable series of homilies delivered by him, containing his grandest oratorical flights, and which evinced most strikingly his power over the minds and passions of men, are those known as the *Homilies on the Statues*, delivered in March and April, A.D. 387, while the fate of Antioch was hanging in awful suspense on the will of the justly offended emperor Theodosius. The demand of a large subsidy to provide for the payment of a liberal donative to the army had exasperated the citizens. The ominous silence with which the proclamation of the edict was received, Feb. 26, broken only by the wailings of the women, was soon succeeded by mutinous cries, and all the symptoms of a popular outbreak. The passions of the mob were stimulated by those designing wretches, never absent from public disturbances, who have nothing to lose, and may gain from the relaxation of the bonds of order. The influence of Flavian might have calmed the tumult, but he was from home. The rabble, swelling in numbers and fury as it rushed through the city, proceeded to acts of open violence. The public baths were ransacked; the praetorium was attacked and the mob with difficulty repulsed, the governor saving himself by flight through a back door, and finally the hall of judgment was stormed. This was the scene of their crowning act of insurrection. The portraits of the emperors, which decorated the walls of the court, were pelted with stones and filth, and torn to shreds, the Augusti themselves were loaded with curses, and the statues of Theodosius and his deceased wife, the excellent Flaccilla, were torn from their pedestals, and ignominiously dragged through the streets. Further outrages were only stopt by the appearance of a band of archers despatched by the prefect. The mutiny quelled, calm reflection set before them the probable consequences of this recent fury. Panic fear, as is usual, succeeded the popular madness. The fierce outbursts of unrestrained

passion, to which the emperor was subject, were well known. The insult to his beloved empress would be certain to be keenly resented, and terribly avenged. It was only too probable that an edict would be issued for the destruction of Antioch or for the massacre of its inhabitants, foreshadowing that of Thessalonica, which three years later struck horror into the Christian world. Their only hope lay in the intercession of Flavian, who, regardless of his age and the serious illness of his sister, had instantly started for the imperial city, to lay at the emperor's feet the confession of his people and to supplicate for pardon. This is not the place to record the subsequent proceedings at Antioch,—the arrival of the imperial commissioners, the daily arrests of guilty or suspected parties, the examinations by torture, the terror of the citizens, their preparations for flight, or the intervention of the monks, who, pouring down from the mountain solitudes, boldly demanded the acquittal of the city—our attention is concentrated on Chrysostom, who, day by day, during this terrible period of suspense, lasting for three weeks, devoted his noblest gifts as a sacred orator to allay the fears and revive the hopes of the panic-stricken citizens, and with holy skill sought to awaken repentance, and enforce amendment of life among the fickle and dissolute crowds who were hanging on his impassioned words. The forum was deserted; the theatres and circuses were empty; but the church was always thronged. It is noted as an unusual circumstance that people even came to hear after dinner. Never did a great emergency find a man better qualified to take advantage of it for the highest purposes (*Homil. ad Pop. Antioch.* iv. c. 1, vol. ii. p. 57). The issue of the affair, with its many picturesque attendant circumstances, belongs to the history of the period. We have only to record how this master of human hearts, who had consoled the inhabitants under the prospect of the degradation of their city and the closing of their baths and circus, and had strengthened them amid the fluctuations of hope and fear, with equal wisdom taught them how to moderate their joy, when, just before Easter, Flavian returned bringing the glad tidings that the emperor's wrath was appeased and their crime pardoned, as well as how to make this unhopèd-for deliverance from imminent destruction the occasion of lasting spiritual benefit. The homily delivered by Chrysostom on Easter day (the 21st of the series), in which he describes the interview of Flavian with Theodosius, the prelate's moving appeal for clemency and forbearance, and its immediate effect on the impressionable mind of the emperor in the granting of a complete amnesty and urging Flavian's instant return to relieve the Antiochenes from their terrible suspense, affords a worthy close to this most remarkable historical passage, illustrating vividly Chrysostom's power as a sacred orator. One happy result of this crisis was the conversion of a large number of the still heathen population to Christianity. Chrysostom speaks, in one of his homilies, of the labour imposed on him after Flavian's return, of accurately grounding in the faith those who, in consequence of the calamity, "had deserted from the side of Gentile error" (*Homil. de Anna*. I. c. 1, vol. iv. p. 812).

These events occurred in the spring of A.D. 387. For ten years longer Chrysostom continued

his labour as a preacher and teacher at Antioch, during which time he composed the greater part of his commentaries on Holy Scripture. To this period may be assigned his commentaries on Genesis and the Psalms, on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, the Acts, the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. Those on Timothy i., ii., Titus, and on the other Epistles of St. Paul, are considered by Tillemont to have been certainly delivered at Constantinople (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* tom. xi. pp. 92-97, 370-376).

(d) *Episcopate of Constantinople.*—The close of the year A.D. 397 saw the termination of Chrysostom's residence at Antioch. In September of that year the bishop of Constantinople, the amiable and indolent Nectarius, died. The place he left vacant was one of the most dignified and influential in the church. Public expectation was excited as to his successor. The nomination to the see rested virtually with the prime minister of the day, the eunuch Eutropius, the contemptible favourite of the feeble Arcadius, who had inherited a power he was utterly incapable of wielding on the death of his father, Theodosius, the last Roman emperor worthy of the name, A.D. 395 (EUTROPIUS). Eutropius, passing by the numerous candidates for the episcopal seat, who were urging their claims with indecent importunity, determined to elevate one who had no thought of being a candidate at all, the great preacher John of Antioch, of whose eloquence he had had personal experience, during a recent visit to Antioch on state business. His name was received with delight by the electing prelates, and he was at once unanimously accepted. The only difficulty lay with Chrysostom himself, and the people of Antioch. The double danger of a decided "nolo episcopari" on Chrysostom's part, and of a public commotion, when the Antiochenes heard of the intention of robbing them of their favourite preacher, was overcome by stratagem. Asterius, the "Comes Orientis," in accordance with secret instructions received from Eutropius, induced Chrysostom to accompany him to a martyrs' chapel outside the city walls. There he was apprehended by the officers of the government, and conveyed to Pagrae, the first post station on the road to Constantinople. His remonstrances were unheeded; his inquiries met with obstinate silence. Placed in a public chariot, and hurried on under a military escort from stage to stage, the 800 miles traversed with the utmost despatch, the future bishop reached his imperial see a closely guarded prisoner. However unwelcome the dignity thrust upon him was, Chrysostom, knowing that resistance was useless, felt it more dignified to submit without further struggle. He was consecrated Feb. 26, A.D. 398. Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria, was the consecrating prelate. The duty was very unwelcome, for he had left no stone unturned to secure the nomination of Isidore, a presbyter of Alexandria, who had been his confidant in some not very creditable transactions. Nothing but the menace of Eutropius, that if he refused to consecrate Chrysostom he would bring him to trial on charges the proofs of which he held in his hand, overcame his resolution. Theophilus yielded, nursing his revenge for a more convenient season. Chrysostom was consecrated Feb. 26, A.D. 398, in the presence of a vast multitude, assembled

not only to witness the ceremony, but also to listen to the inaugural sermon of one of whose eloquence they had heard so much. This "sermo entronchisticus" is lost (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 2; Sozom. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 2; Pallad. p. 42).

Constantinople was not long in discerning the difference between the character of the new bishop and his predecessor. To one trained in habits of the strictest asceticism, accustomed to few and frugal meals, averse to pomp and display of every kind, shunning society, and devoted to the duties of his sacred calling, nothing could be more distasteful than the luxury and magnificence of Nectarius and his predecessors. He at once disfurnished the episcopal residence, and disposed of the costly plate and rich equipment for the benefit of the poor and the hospitals of the city (Pallad. pp. 46, 47). Instead of giving grand banquets to the laity, or dining at their tables, he ate the simplest fare in his solitary chamber (Pallad. pp. 101-102). Unless duty compelled, he studiously avoided the court and association with the great, and even ordinary conversation he unequivocally shewed to be a tax on his time and attention, which he would escape if he could (*ibid.* pp. 103, 120-123). Such behaviour could hardly fail to be misunderstood and misrepresented. To the populace, accustomed to the splendour of former bishops, Chrysostom's simplicity appeared unworthy of his lofty station, while he was openly charged with parsimony, moroseness, and pride (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 4, Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 9).

Nor was the contrast with his predecessor more acceptable to the generality of his clergy. The moral tone of the clerical order in Constantinople was far from elevated; their standard of duty was low and perfunctory; worldliness, avarice, flattery of the great, prevailed; and even graver faults were common. A thorough reform was needed. Chrysostom, with uncompromising zeal, attempted to bring back his clergy to simplicity of life, and to rouse them to activity in their calling. He deposed some on charges of homicide and adultery, and repelled others from the Eucharist. He set his face resolutely against the perilous custom of receiving "spiritual sisters" (*συνελαομαι*), which was frequently the source of the grossest immoralities. To obviate the attractions of the Arians who at night and at early dawn gathered large crowds by their antiphonal hymns under porticoes and in the open air, as well as for the benefit of those who were unable to attend the church in the day, he revived the old custom of nocturnal services with responsive chanting, to the indignation of those clergy to whom their own ease was dearer than the spiritual improvement of their flocks (Pallad. p. 47; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 8; *Homil. in Acta*, 26, c. 3, p. 212). The disciplinary measures instituted were rendered more unpopular by the want of a conciliatory manner, coupled with irritability of temper, and no small obstinacy in dealing with his clergy (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 3, 21; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 3). He was too much swayed also by his archdeacon, Serapion, a proud, violent man, who is reported to have exclaimed at an assembly of the clergy, "You will never be able, bishop, to master these mutinous priests unless you drive them before you with a single rod" (Pallad. 18, 19; Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 4; Sozom. lib. viii. c. 9).

But while his relations with his clergy were becoming increasingly embittered, he stood high in favour with the people, who flocked to his sermons, and drank in with greedy ears his vehement denunciations of the follies and vices of the clergy and the aristocracy (Socr. *u. s. c.* 4, 5). He was no less popular with Arcadius and his lovely but imperious empress, the Frankish general's daughter, Eudoxia, who was beginning to supplant the author of her elevation, the eunuch Eutropius, and to make her feeble partner bow to her more powerful will. For a time the bishop and the empress, who afterwards waged so uncompromising an hostility, vied with one another in expressions of mutual admiration and esteem. An occasion for the public manifestation of this common feeling was offered towards the latter part of A.D. 398, not long after Chrysostom had taken possession of his see, by the remarkable ceremony of the nocturnal translation of the relics of some anonymous martyrs from the great church to the martyrdom of St. Thomas, on the seashore at Drypa, about nine miles from the city, which the empress had instituted in a fit of religious excitement. So lengthened was the procession, including persons of all classes and of both sexes, and so brilliant the torches, that Chrysostom compares it to a river of fire. The empress herself in her royal diadem and purple, attended by nobles and ladies of distinction, walked by the side of the bishop, in the rear of the chest enclosing the sacred bones. It was dawn before the church was reached and Chrysostom began his sermon. It was full of extravagant laudations of Eudoxia and of ecstatic expressions of joy, which afterwards formed a ground of accusation against him. (*Homil. dicta postquam reliquiae, &c.* vol. xii. pp. 468-473.) The next day the emperor with his court visited the shrine, and, laying aside his diadem, revered the holy martyrs. After the departure of Arcadius Chrysostom delivered a second enthusiastic homily in praise of his piety and humility (*Homil. dicta praesente Imperatore, ibid.* pp. 474-480).

At the same period the largeness of Chrysostom's heart and the sincerity of his Christian love was manifested by his care for the spiritual state of the Goths, who were becoming numerous at Constantinople. Some were Catholics, but the majority were Arians. He had portions of the Bible translated into their vernacular, which were read by a Gothic presbyter to his countrymen assembled in the church of St. Paul, and this presbyter afterwards addressed them in their own tongue (*Homil.* 8, vol. xii. pp. 512-526). Chrysostom himself not unfrequently preached to the Goths by an interpreter. He ordained native readers, deacons, and presbyters, and despatched missionaries to the Gothic tribes who still remained in their original seats on the banks of the Danube, and consecrated a bishop from among themselves named Unilas (Theodoret, *H. E.* lib. v. c. 30; *Epist.* xiv. c. cvii.). Having learnt that the nomad Scythian tribes on the banks of the Danube were desirous of being instructed in the faith he at once despatched missionaries to them, and corresponded with Leontius, bishop of Ancyra, with regard to the selection of able men from his diocese for this work (Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 31). In his zeal for the suppression of pagan

idolatry he obtained an imperial edict, A.D. 399, for the destruction of the temples in Phoenicia, which was carried into effect at the cost of some of the Christian ladies of Constantinople, who also supplied funds for missionary exertions in that country (Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 29). These efforts for the propagation of the faith were very dear to Chrysostom's heart, and even during his exile he continued by letter to superintend and direct them (*Epist.* 53, 54, 123, 123). He endeavoured to crush false doctrine wherever it was making head. Having learnt that the Marcionite heresy was infecting the diocese of Cyrus he wrote to the then bishop, desiring him to expel it, and offering to help him in putting in force the imperial edicts for that purpose. He thus evidenced, in the words of Theodoret, that, like St. Paul, he bore in his heart "the care of all the churches" (*ibid.* c. 31).

The fall of the contemptible Eutropius succeeded at no distant interval the elevation of his episcopal nominee, A.D. 399. He had hoped to have had a subservient bishop, ready to lend him his important aid whenever he might demand it. Chrysostom's uncompromising honesty speedily shewed him his mistake. Not only did Chrysostom refuse to countenance his nefarious designs, but he denounced from the pulpit with unsparing fidelity the vices with which his life was stained. The implacable enmity thus excited might have proved perilous for Chrysostom had not his insolent treatment of the empress Eudoxia aroused a foe even more fatal to himself. Passing over here the various stages of the favourite's downfall (EUTROPIUS), it is enough to say that the unhappy man, hurled in a moment from the pinnacle of his greatness, was compelled to appeal to the law of sanctuary which he himself had abrogated, and took refuge in the church. To the clamorous demands of the soldiers and the raging populace that their victim should be given up to them, Chrysostom opposed a courageous refusal. The indignation of Eutropius's pursuers was turned to the bishop, who was marched off like a prisoner between two rows of spearmen to the palace to lay the matter before the emperor. He had little difficulty in working on the feelings of the impressionable Arcadius, from whom he obtained the promise that Eutropius' sentence should be commuted to banishment. The next day was Sunday, and Chrysostom delivered a magnificent harangue on the instability of fortune, pointing the application by the spectacle displayed through the curtains of the bema of the fallen minister crouching before the holy table to which he clung with a convulsive grasp. Chrysostom's eloquence had succeeded for that time in saving the life of Eutropius. But whether deceived by treachery, or hoping to find a safer retreat, in a few days he left the church, was seized and conveyed to Cyprus as a place of exile, whence he was in a few days brought back and beheaded at Chalcedon. (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 5; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 7; Philost. *H. E.* lib. xi. c. 6; Zosimus, lib. v. c. 18; Chrys. *Homil. in Eutrop.* vol. iii. pp. 454-460; *De Capto Eutrop.* *ibid.* pp. 460-482.)

In his dealings with the commander of the Gothic troops, Gainas, the eloquence of Chrysostom gained another triumph. Elated at his success in ruining Eutropius, and presuming on the strength of his army, which a nod from him

would have turned loose like a pack of hungry wolves to pillage Constantinople, early in A.D. 400 Gainas, the haughty Goth, demanded the surrender of three of the leading ministers, Aurelianus the consul, Saturninus, and Count John, the empress's chief favourite. To relieve the emperor of his embarrassment, they surrendered themselves to Gainas. Their lives were in extreme danger. Chrysostom lost no time in resorting to Gainas' camp, and pleading the cause of the hostages, as well as in endeavouring to persuade the Goth to lessen his extravagant demands to be made consul and commander-in-chief, which would have placed the emperor at his mercy. But however anxious to conciliate Gainas, on one point he was resolute. No misbeliever should worship within the walls of the imperial city. Haughtily as Gainas had urged his claim for one of the churches of Constantinople for Arian worship, and reasonable as in many respects the plea was, Chrysostom's conjoined eloquence and spiritual authority overpowered him, and he desisted for a time at least in pressing his demand (Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 4; Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 6; Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 32, 33; Chrys. *Homil. cum Saturninus et Aurel. &c.* vol. iii. pp. 482-487). The sequel of these events belongs rather to general history. The emperor, as a last resort, declared Gainas a public enemy; the inhabitants of the city, awakened at last to the danger of a general pillage, rose against the Goths; a general massacre ensued, and Gainas himself was forced to seek safety in flight (Zosim. lib. v. c. 18-22).

At this epoch the power and popularity of Chrysostom may be said to have reached its culminating point. We have now to trace its swift and complete decline. The author of his overthrow was the empress Eudoxia. Her short-lived religious zeal had burnt itself out, and when she found that Chrysostom was too clear-sighted to be imposed upon by the outward show of piety, and too uncompromising to connive at wrong doing even in the highest places, and that not even her rank as empress could save her and her associates from public censure, her former seeming attachment was changed into the most implacable enmity. Jealousy of his influence over Arcadius contributed its share to her growing aversion. The fall of Eutropius and Gainas had removed her two most formidable rivals in power. Chrysostom was now the only obstacle to her obtaining undisputed supremacy over her imbecile husband, and through him over the Eastern world. Means must be found to get rid of this obstacle also. Nor was the opportunity long in presenting itself. Chrysostom himself afforded it in his excess of zeal for the purity of the church, by overstepping his episcopal jurisdiction, not then so strictly defined as in modern dioceses. Properly speaking the bishop of Constantinople had no jurisdiction in Asia Minor, or indeed anywhere beyond the limits of his own city and diocese. For Constantinople, as a city whose imperial dignity was of modern creation, was not a metropolitan see, but was subject ecclesiastically to the metropolitan of Heraclea (otherwise Perinthus), who was exarch of the province of Thrace. The claims of Heraclea becoming antiquated, the prelates of Alexandria, as the first of the Eastern churches, gradually assumed metropolitan rights over Byzantium. But sub-

jection to any other see was soon felt to be inconsistent with the dignity of an imperial city, and by the third canon of the Oecumenical council held within its walls, A.D. 381, its bishop was declared second to the bishop of Rome, after him coming the metropolitans of Alexandria and Antioch. But this precedence was simply honorary, and although Nectarius had set the precedent followed by Chrysostom of exercising jurisdiction in the Thracian and Asiatic dioceses, the right might at any time be called in question, nor did it receive legal authority until the council of Chalcedon (can. 28). It was therefore as the bishop of the imperial city, in constant association with the emperor and the ruling powers of the state, as well as from his personal capacity as a man of energy and ability, able and willing to discuss and apply the remedies required by ecclesiastical abuses, that Chrysostom held his visitation of the churches of Asia Minor, which was the first step towards his overthrow. The circumstances were briefly these. At a conference of bishops held at Constantinople in the spring of A.D. 400, Eusebius of Valentinopolis accused his brother bishop, Antoninus of Ephesus, of selling ordination to bishoprics, melting down the church plate for his own benefit, and other grave offences (Pallad. p. 126). A delegation was despatched to Asia to investigate these charges. Many dishonest and vexatious delays occurred, and the accused party died before any decision could be arrived at (*ibid.* pp. 130-133). The Ephesian clergy and the bishops of the circuit entreated Chrysostom to come to their rescue, and apply his healing hand to the wounds and diseases of the church. Prompt at the call of duty, Chrysostom, though it was the depth of winter (January 401), and he was in very feeble health, crossed the Bosphorus and proceeded to Ephesus. On his arrival he exercised metropolitcal authority, deposing six bishops convicted of simony, and correcting with unsparing hand the venality and licentiousness of the clergy, which had become painfully apparent during the visitation which he undertook of the provinces (*ibid.* pp. 134-135; Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 10; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 6). The excessive severity of his disciplinary measures did not reconcile the reluctant ecclesiastics to the questionable authority from which they proceeded, nor were they indisposed when the day of retribution came to swell the roll of his accusers. Chrysostom was more than a quarter of a year away from Constantinople. The results of this protracted absence were disastrous. He had entrusted his episcopal authority to Severian, bishop of Gabala, who basely abused his trust to undermine Chrysostom's influence with the emperor and empress and the leading personages at court. Severian was an adroit flatterer, and knew well how to play upon the weaknesses of those with whom it was his interest to stand well. The cabal against Chrysostom, which was rapidly forming, was headed by the empress and her favourite ladies, of whose extravagance of attire, and attempts to enhance their personal charms, the bishop had spoken in terms of contemptuous ridicule, and among whom the wealthy and licentious widows, Marsa, Castricia, and Euphrosinia, "who used for the ruin of their souls the property their husbands had gained by extortion" (Pallad. pp. 35, 66), were conspicuous. This cabal

received an important accession by the arrival of two bishops from Palestine, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and the grey-haired Acacius of Beroea, the latter not at all displeased at the prospect of fulfilling his undignified threat, when dissatisfied with the hospitality of the episcopal palace, "I'll season his soup for him" (Pallad. 49). [ACACIUS; ANTIOCHUS.] Serapion, Chrysostom's irascible archdeacon, had kept his master informed of Severian's base proceedings, and continually urged the necessity of his speedy return. His return was the signal for the outbreak of open hostilities, which Chrysostom's vehement and unguarded language in the pulpit could not fail to exasperate. In his first sermon preached after his return, he openly denounced Severian and Antiochus as flatterers and parasites. "You have become the town-talk; your conduct is as good as a play." A few days later his language was still more perilously rash. Having chosen his text from the history of Elijah, he exclaimed, "Gather together to me those base priests that eat at Jezebel's table, that I may say to them, as Elijah of old, 'How long halt ye between two opinions? . . . If Jezebel's table be the Table of the Lord eat at it; eat at it till you vomit'" (Pallad. p. 74). This allusion was too clear to be mistaken. He had called the empress Jezebel. The insult could not be brooked by the haughty Eudoxia, and from that moment the doom of Chrysostom was sealed. But until the plot was ripe it was necessary to keep up the semblance of friendship, and even of deference, towards one with whom ecclesiastical authority rested and who could still make it felt. Some half-heard words of Severian, uttered in annoyance at Serapion's discourtesy, were distorted by the archdeacon into a blasphemous denial of Christ's Divinity. (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 10; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 10.) The charge was rashly credited by Chrysostom, who, without further inquiry, proceeded to the sentence of excommunication and banishment from Constantinople. Chrysostom was still the idol of the common people. The news spread that Severian had insulted their bishop, and Severian's life would have been in danger had he not speedily fled to Chalcedon, and put the Bosphorus between himself and the enraged mob. All the authority of the emperor and the passionate entreaties of the empress, who went so far as to place her infant son on Chrysostom's knees in the Church of the Apostles as an irresistible plea for yielding to her petition, were needed to extort Severian's forgiveness, and obtain the assurance of reconciliation from his incensed bishop. The favour of the populace was not so easily recovered. Chrysostom was compelled to intercede for him with them (*Homil. de recipiendo Severiano*, vol. iii. pp. 492-494), and the semblance of peace was restored. (Socr. *Soz. u. s.*)

The secret intrigues, though checked for the time, soon broke out afresh. The allusion to Jezebel could not be forgiven by Eudoxia. Severian was equally implacable for his wrongs. The clergy were eager to do anything to rid themselves of one, who, in the words of Palladius, "like a lamp burning before sore eyes," was intolerable from the brilliancy of his virtues. All they wanted was a powerful leader, and the organisation would be complete and ready for action.

Such a leader was presented to them in Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who had been watching for an opportunity of revenge ever since he had been unwillingly compelled to consecrate Chrysostom. A pretext for his interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of Constantinople was afforded by the kindness and hospitality shewn by Chrysostom and his faithful adherents to some unhappy Egyptian monks, known from their remarkable stature as "the Tall Brethren," whom Theophilus had treated with great injustice and cruelty, nominally on account of their adherence to Origenistic views, but really because they were privy to the avarice and other vices with which his character was stained (Isid. Pelusiot. *Epist.* i. 142). Beaten, pillaged, driven from their monastic homes in the Nitrian desert, they had taken refuge in Palestine. But the unrelenting hatred of Theophilus had pursued them there, and they were fain to embark for Constantinople and appeal to the emperor and archbishop for protection. Chrysostom received them kindly, manifested sympathy in their sufferings, and wrote in their behalf to Theophilus. The reply of the latter was an indignant remonstrance against protecting heretics, and interfering in the affairs of another diocese. With this letter he despatched emissaries to accuse the "Tall Brethren" before the emperor, and to disseminate the charge of sorcery in the city. Chrysostom had earnestly dissuaded the fugitives from appealing to the civil powers, and had warned them that if they did so he should cease to act as their protector. But the public contumely with which they were treated in the streets exasperated them, and they claimed the right of prosecuting their defamers. (Pallad. pp. 51-62; Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 7, 9; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 12, 13.) A personal appeal to Eudoxia secured for them what they desired. Theophilus was summoned to appear before a council to be held for the investigation of the whole case of the Nitrian monks, while their calumniators were called upon to substantiate their charges or to suffer punishment. Theophilus had no choice but to obey the imperial summons. But he had devised a scheme for turning the tables upon Chrysostom, and transforming the council summoned that he might give an account of his own conduct into one before which Chrysostom himself might be arraigned. The case of the "Tall Brethren," the ostensible cause of the intended council, was forgotten. The object on which Theophilus's heart was set was the condemnation and deposition of Chrysostom (Pallad. p. 64.) [DIOSCORUS.]

To pave the way for the execution of this monstrous plot Theophilus induced Epiphanius, the venerable bishop of Salamis, to visit Constantinople, with the decrees of a council recently held in Cyprus, by which the tenets of Origen which the Nitrian monks were charged with holding were condemned, for Chrysostom's signature (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 10-14; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 14). Epiphanius on his arrival petulantly declined the honours and hospitality prepared for him by Chrysostom until his expectant host had formally condemned Origen and expelled "the Tall Brethren." Chrysostom replied that he left both to the coming council, and would not prejudge the matter. The relations between the two prelates were further embittered by

the ordination of a deacon by Epiphanius in violation of the canons of the church (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 11). No better success attended Epiphanius's attempt to obtain a condemnation of Origen from the bishops then at Constantinople. An interview with the accused monks, at which he was obliged to acknowledge that he had not read a page of their writings, and had condemned them on hearsay, seems to have opened his eyes to the real character of Theophilus, and the nature of the transaction in which he had become an agent. He refused to take any further share in the designs of Theophilus, and set sail for Cyprus, dying on his voyage or soon after his return. The unchristian wishes attributed to the two bishops at their last interview may be safely regarded as the invention, or at least the exaggeration, of unfriendly historians (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 12-14; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 14, 15).

Shortly after Epiphanius's departure Theophilus arrived at Constantinople. He was accompanied by a body-guard of rough sailors from his own city of Alexandria, laden with costly presents destined for those whom it would be convenient to secure as auxiliaries. He received a vociferous welcome from the crews of the Egyptian corn ships, but the bishops and clergy of the city kept aloof. He refused all communications with Chrysostom, rejected all his offers of hospitality, and, assuming the position of an ecclesiastical superior, not of a defendant about to take his trial, openly declared that he had come to depose Chrysostom for grave offences. The three weeks between his arrival and the commencement of the synod were devoted to ingratiating himself with the influential personages of the city and the disaffected clergy, by flattery, sumptuous banquets, and splendid gifts. Arcadius, probably unaware of the plans of the secret cabal of which his empress was the leading spirit, remonstrated with Chrysostom for his delay in proceeding to Theophilus's trial, which he justified by his unwillingness to usurp a jurisdiction which was not legitimately his. (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 15; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 16; Pallad. 65, 66; Chrys. *Epist. ad Innocent.* 1.) Theophilus had no such scruples. He assumed as patriarch of Alexandria the supremacy over all Eastern bishops, and claimed the right of summoning Chrysostom as a suffragan before his tribunal. Apprehensive of the well-known popularity of Chrysostom with the lower orders he dared not venture to hold a synod in Constantinople. The place chosen was a suburb of Chalcedon, on the other side of the Bosphorus, known as "the Oak," where was a large church with contiguous buildings for the clergy and monks. Thirty-six bishops, of whom all but seven were Egyptians, Theophilus's suffragans, formed the council. The Asiatic bishops were mainly such as Chrysostom had made his enemies during his recent visitation. None was more hostile than Gerontius of Nicomedia, whom he had deposed. The presidential chair was occupied by the bishop of Heraclea, as metropolitan. To this packed council, called not to investigate but to condemn, the members of which were at the same time, "judges, accusers, and witnesses" (Phot. *cod.* 59. *ad init.*), in the middle of July, A.D. 403, Chrysostom was summoned to answer to a list of charges containing twenty-nine articles drawn

up by the Archdeacon John. Many of these were most contemptibly frivolous, others grossly exaggerated, some entirely false. The utmost research of the emissaries despatched by his enemies to Antioch had failed to discover anything on which to ground an accusation in his early career, either as layman or presbyter. The articles had been concocted by two disreputable deacons, as the price of their restoration to holy orders from which they had been deposed for gross crimes (Chrysostom (Pallad. p. 66). They had reference to the administration of his church and the alleged malversation of its funds; to his violent and tyrannical behaviour towards his clergy; to his private habits—"he had private interviews with women"—"he dined gluttonously by himself as a cyclops would eat;" to ritual irregularities—"he robed and unrobed himself on his episcopal throne, and ate a lozenge after celebration" (Pallad. p. 66), and had violated the rule as to fasting communion;—to his having ordained unworthy persons; and heretical deductions were drawn from some incautious and enthusiastic expressions in the course of his sermons. A second list of charges under eighteen heads was presented by Isaac the monk. In these among other counts the accusation of violence and inhospitality was renewed; he was charged with invading the jurisdiction of other prelates (Phot. *cod.* 59; Chrysost. *Epist.* 125, *ad Cyr.*). The most flagrant offence charged was that of uttering treasonable words against the empress, comparing her to Jezebel (Pallad. p. 74). This was construed into exciting the people to rebellion, and on this his enemies chiefly relied. The sessions of this synod lasted fourteen days. Four times was Chrysostom summoned to appear before the self-appointed tribunal. His reply was dignified and unwavering. He refused to present himself before a packed synod of his enemies, to which he was summoned by his own clergy, and he appealed to a lawfully constituted general council. But irregular as the synod was, he expressed his readiness, in the interests of peace, to appear before it, if his avowed enemies, Theophilus, Severianus, Acacius, and Antiochus, were removed from the number of the judges. As this proposal met with no response, Chrysostom summoned a counter-synod of bishops attached to his cause, forty in number, by whom a letter of remonstrance was despatched to Theophilus, which was treated with equal contempt. At its twelfth sitting a message from the court urged the synod to come to a speedy decision. To this expression of the Imperial will the synod yielded prompt obedience. They came to a unanimous vote, by which they condemned Chrysostom as contumacious, and deposed him from his bishopric. The charge of uttering treasonable words they left to be dealt with by the civil power, secretly hoping that a capital sentence would be the issue (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 15; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 17). The disappointment was severe with not a few when the imperial rescript confirming the sentence of deposition simply condemned the bishop to banishment for life. On the other hand, the indignation of the people knew no bounds, when, as the evening wore on, the sentence on their beloved bishop became generally known. A crowd collected round Chrysostom's residence, and kept watch at its doors and those of the great church, lest he

should be forcibly carried off. This voluntary guard protected their spiritual father for three days and nights. Chrysostom's power over the popular mind was never greater. A word from him would have raised an insurrection. But the sermons he addressed to the vast multitudes that filled the cathedral advocated patience and resignation to the Divine Will. He shrank, "whether from timidity or Christian peacefulness of disposition, from being the cause, even innocently, of tumult and bloodshed. He had neither the ambition, the desperate recklessness, nor, perhaps, the resolution of a demagogue" (Milman's *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 141). On the third day he took advantage of the hour of the noontide meal to slip out unperceived by a side door, and quietly surrendered himself to the imperial officers, by whom he was conducted after dark to the harbour and put on board a vessel which conveyed him to Hieron, at the mouth of the Euxine. The victory of the enemies of Chrysostom seemed complete. Theophilus entered the city in triumphal state, and wreaked his vengeance on the bishop's partisans. The people, who had crowded to the churches to pour forth their lamentations, were forcibly dislodged, not without bloodshed. Furious at the loss of their revered teacher, they thronged the approaches to the imperial palace, clamouring for his restoration, and demanding that his cause should be heard before a general council. Constantinople was almost in revolt. (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 16; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 18; Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 34; Zosim. *Hist.* lib. v. c. 23; Pallad. p. 15.) The following night the city of Constantinople was convulsed by an earthquake. The shock was felt with peculiar violence in the bedroom of Eudoxia. The empress, as superstitious as she was unprincipled, fell at Arcadius's feet, and entreated him to avert the wrath of Heaven by revoking Chrysostom's sentence. Messengers were despatched in different directions to discover the exiled prelate, bearing letters couched in terms of the most abject humiliation. The news of Chrysostom's recall spread universal jubilee. Late as it was his friends took shipping, and a whole fleet of barks put forth to meet him. The Bosphorus blazed with torches, and resounded with songs of triumph (Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 34). Chrysostom at first halted outside the city, claiming to be acquitted by a general council before resuming his see. The people suspected another plot, and loudly denounced the emperor and empress. In alarm of a serious outbreak, Arcadius sent a secretary to desire Chrysostom to enter the walls without delay. As a loyal subject he obeyed. On passing the gates he was borne aloft by the crowd, carried into the church, placed on his episcopal seat, and forced to deliver an extemporaneous address. Chrysostom's triumph was now as complete as that of his enemies had been a few days before. These enemies, however, did not give up all for lost. Theophilus, and some of the leaders of the cabal, lingered on in Constantinople, in the hope of a turn in the tide. But they were now the unpopular party, and could hardly shew themselves in the streets without being attacked and ill-treated. The person of Theophilus was no longer safe in Constantinople; while a more formidable danger was to be apprehended if the general council, which Chrysostom prevailed on

the emperor to convoke, met and proceeded to inquire into his conduct. On the plea that his diocese could no longer put up with his absence, Theophilus abruptly left the city, and sailed by night for Alexandria (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 17; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 19; Chrysost. *Epist. ad Innocent.*). The flight of Theophilus was speedily followed by the assembling of a council of about sixty bishops, which annulled the whole of the proceedings at the council of the Oak, and decreed that Chrysostom was still the legitimate bishop of Constantinople. This judicial sentence removed all Chrysostom's scruples as to the legality of his position, and he returned without further question to his episcopal duties (Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 19).

The first result of the failure of the machinations of Chrysostom's enemies was an apparently complete reconciliation between him and the empress, who seemed entirely to have forgotten her former resentment. The two vied with one another in complimentary and eulogistic expressions—on each side equally extravagant and equally insincere. But a reconciliation forced on contending parties by motives of fear and self-interest is as shortlived as it is hollow. Within two months of Chrysostom's return circumstances arose which proved the unreality of the friendship, and awakened a still more irreconcilable feud. The insatiable ambition of Eudoxia aspired to higher honours than any yet obtained. Not content with the virtual rule of the Eastern world, she aspired to semi-divine honours. A column of porphyry was erected in the lesser forum, in front of the church of St. Sophia, bearing aloft her silver statue for the adoration of the people. The dedication in Sept. A.D. 403 was accompanied by the boisterous and licentious revelry handed down from the days of heathenism. The noise of this unseemly merriment penetrated the church, and disturbed the sacred services. Chrysostom's holy indignation took fire, and with ill-timed zeal he mounted the ambo, and thundered forth a homily, embracing in its fierce invective all who had any share in these profane amusements, the prefect who ordered them, the people who joined in them, and, above all, the arrogant woman whose ambition was the cause of them. "Herodias," he is reported to have exclaimed, "is once more maddening; Herodias is once more dancing; once more Herodias demands the head of John on a charger." These words, whether actually uttered or not, were reported to Eudoxia. Can we wonder that all her former fury revived, and that she demanded of the emperor signal redress for such treasonable insolence? Compromise was no longer possible. Reconciliation was utterly hopeless. Sacerdotal and imperial authority stood confronted. One or other must yield (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 18; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 20; Theophan. p. 68; Zosimus, lib. v. c. 24).

The signal given, the enemies of Chrysostom were not slow in reappearing; flocking, like vultures, from Egypt, Syria, and Asia, ready to swoop down on their prey the moment it shewed symptoms of tottering. Acacius, Severian, Antiochus, with other members of the old cabal, hastened from their dioceses, and were soon in close conference with their former confederates, among the fashionable dames and worldly and frivolous clergy of the city. After

repeated deliberations they resolved on a line of policy. For months past Chrysostom had been wearying the emperor with his demands for a general council. Let such a council be called, care being taken to select its members discreetly, and let this fresh outburst of treasonable language be laid before it, and the result could not be doubtful. Theophilus, too wary to appear again on the scene of his defeat, directed the machinations of the plotters unseen. He at once put a new and powerful tool in their hands, in the 12th canon of the council of more than doubtful orthodoxy held at Antioch, A.D. 341, pronouncing the *ipso facto* deprivation of any bishop who, after deposition, appealed to the secular arm for restoration. The council met towards the end of A.D. 403. On the succeeding Christmas day the emperor refused to communicate, according to custom, in the cathedral, on the ground of the doubtful legality of Chrysostom's position (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 18; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 20). Such a step from one who usually shrank from any decisive action, was justly regarded as ominous of Chrysostom's condemnation. Chrysostom was supported by 42 bishops, and maintained his usual calm confidence. He continued to preach to his people, and his sermons were characterised by more than common vigour and unction (Pallad. p. 81). The difficulty of arriving at any practical solution of the question before them determined the synod to submit the decision to the emperor. An adroit demand was made in Chrysostom's favour by Elpidius, the aged bishop of Laodicea, himself a confessor for the faith, that the chief promoters of the authority of the canon of Antioch, Acacius and Antiochus, should subscribe a declaration that they were of the same faith as its original promulgators, who were mainly Arians. The emperor was amused, and at once agreed to the proposal. The two bishops caught in the trap became livid with rage (*ἐπὶ τὸ πελιδνότερον μεταβαλόντες τὴν μορφήν*, Pallad. p. 80), but were compelled to dissemble their annoyance, and promise a compliance, which their astuteness had little difficulty in evading. The synod continued its protracted session. We have no record of any formal decision, or regularly passed sentence. None indeed was necessary: Chrysostom's violation of the Antiochene canon had deposed him: he was no longer bishop of Constantinople. Meanwhile Lent was wearing away and Easter was fast approaching. It would be intolerable if the Emperor were a second time shut out from his cathedral on a chief festival of the church. Some decisive step must at once be taken. Chrysostom must be removed: if possible, quietly; if not, by force. Public peace might be endangered if the accused prelate, who was still the idol of the populace, though the upper classes had deserted him following the ebbing tide of imperial favour, were allowed to preach on the high festivals, when more than ordinary numbers filled the church. Overpowered by these representations, as well as by the assurances of Antiochus and his companions, that Chrysostom had been actually condemned and had ceased to be a bishop, Arcadius was persuaded to issue an order for his removal (Pallad. p. 81). One of the imperial officers was sent to desire the bishop to leave the church immediately.

Chrysostom returned a respectful but firm refusal. "He had received the church from God, and he would not desert it. The emperor might expel him forcibly if he pleased. His violence would be his excuse before God for leaving his post." Fearing to use force, lest he should again provoke the vengeance of heaven, Arcadius ordered him to remain a close prisoner in his episcopal palace, and not to leave it even for the church without his permission. To obey God rather than man was a fixed principle in Chrysostom's mind. It was impossible for a bishop to absent himself from his flock at the great baptismal function on Easter Even, when no fewer than 3000 catechumens were expected to present themselves. When the time arrived he calmly left his residence and proceeded to the cathedral. The imperial guards, forbidden to use force, dared not interfere. The perplexed emperor summoned Acacius and Antiochus to his presence, and reproached them with the issue of their advice. They replied that "Chrysostom being no longer a bishop, was acting illegally in administering the sacraments, and that they would take his deposition on their own heads" (Pallad. p. 82). The emperor overjoyed at having the responsibility of the bishop's condemnation removed from him, at once ordered some guards to drag Chrysostom from the cathedral as usurping functions no longer his, and reconduct him to his domestic prison. A vast crowd was assembled that night in the church of St. Sophia, to keep the vigil of the resurrection. The sacrament of baptism was being administered to the long files of catechumens, male and female, whom the deacons and deaconesses had prepared for the rite by the removal of their outer garments. Suddenly the din of arms broke the solemn stillness. A body of soldiers, sword in hand, burst in, and rushed, some to the baptisteries, some up the nave to the sacred bema and altar. The catechumens were driven from the font at the point of the sword. Many were wounded, and, as an eye-witness records, "the waters of regeneration were stained with blood" (Pallad. p. 18). The baptisteries appropriated to the females were invaded by the rude, licentious soldiers, who drove them, half-dressed, shrieking into the streets. Others of the troop forced open the holy doors, and the sanctuary was profaned by the presence of pagans, some of whom, it was whispered with horror, had dared to gaze on and even to handle the Eucharistic elements. The clergy, clad in their sacred robes, were forcibly ejected from the church, and, with the mingled troop of men, women, and children, were chased along the dark streets by the brutal soldiery. With holy courage the dispersed catechumens were reassembled by their clergy in the baths of Constantine, which, hastily blessed by the priests, became sacred baptisteries. The candidates for baptism were again approaching the laver of regeneration, when they were once more forcibly dispersed by the emissaries of Antiochus. The soldiers, rude barbarians from Thrace, executed their commission with indiscriminating ferocity. The ministering priest received a wound on the head; a blow on the arm caused the deacon to drop the cruet of sacred chrism. The women were plundered of their robes and ornaments; the clergy of their vestments, and the extemporised altar of its holy vessels. The fugitives

were maltreated and beaten, and many of them dragged off to prison. The horrors of that night remained indelibly imprinted on the minds of those who witnessed them, and were spoken of long afterwards with shuddering. Similar scenes were enacted wherever the scattered congregations endeavoured to reunite. For the greater part of the holy Easter week, Constantinople wore the aspect of a city that had been stormed. Private dwellings were invaded to discover clandestine assemblies. The partisans of Chrysostom—the Joannites, as they began to be called—were thrown into prison on the slightest suspicion, and were scourged and tortured to compel them to implicate others. The sound of the scourge, and the oaths of the soldiers, were even heard in the church (Chrysost. *Epist. ad Innocent.* ap. Pallad. pp. 17–20; Pallad. pp. 82–88).

For two months the timid Arcadius could not be prevailed upon to sign the decree for Chrysostom's banishment, and he continued to reside in his palace, which was again guarded by successive detachments of his adherents. Chrysostom's danger was a very real one. His life was twice attempted by assassins (Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 21).

(e) *Exile.*—At last, on the 5th of June, A.D. 404, Arcadius's wavering mind was persuaded to sign the edict of banishment. Chrysostom received it with calm submission, and after a final prayer in the cathedral with some of his faithful bishops, prepared to yield it prompt obedience. A stratagem was employed to guard against the danger of a popular outbreak. Having directed that his horse should be saddled and taken to the great west entrance, after a tender farewell of his beloved Olympias and her attendant deaconesses, he passed out unobserved at a small eastern and surrendered himself to the guard, who conveyed him, with two faithful bishops who refused to desert him, to a vessel which instantly started under cover of night for the Asiatic shore (Pallad. pp. 89–90). Chrysostom had scarcely left the city when the church he had just quitted took fire, and the flames, which are said to have broken out first in the episcopal throne, caught the roof, and the whole building was involved in a conflagration which spread to the senate house and other adjacent public buildings (Pallad. pp. 91–92; Soz. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 18; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 22; Zosim. lib. v. c. 24). The cause of this fire was never satisfactorily ascertained. But the suspicion that it was the work of Chrysostom's adherents, resolved in their frantic grief that the church identified with the ministrations of their beloved teacher should never be possessed by his enemies, however unjustly entertained, was the occasion of a most relentless persecution of the Joannites under the semblance of a judicial investigation. Innocent persons of every age and sex were put to the torture, in the vain hope that confession would be extorted from them inculcating leading members of their party. The presbyter Tigrisus and the young reader Eutropius expired under their torturer's hands without eliciting any confirmation of the suspicions. Others barely escaped with their lives, maimed and mutilated (Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 22–24). The tender heart of Chrysostom was wrung with the accounts that reached him of the sufferings inflicted on his friends, especially his dearly loved Olympias, on account of their devotion to him. To the charge

of incendiarism was added that of contumacious resistance to the emperor's will, in refusing to hold communion with Arsacius and Atticus, who in succession had been thrust into Chrysostom's episcopal chair [ARSACIUS; ATTICUS]. This was made a crime punishable with degradation from official rank, fine, and imprisonment. The clergy who continued faithful to Chrysostom were deposed, and banished with every circumstance of brutality. Some did not reach their place of banishment alive. The most persevering endeavours were made to stamp out the adherents of the banished prelate, not only in Constantinople but in Asia Minor and Syria—endeavours which only deepened their attachment to him, and confirmed their resolution never to yield (Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 34).

All other help failing, the persecuted part of the church of Constantinople appealed to the Western church as represented by its chief bishops. Letters were sent addressed to Innocent bishop of Rome, Venerius of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia, by Chrysostom himself, by the forty friendly bishops, and by the clergy of Constantinople (Pallad. p. 10). Theophilus and his adherents also sent counter-representations (*ib.* p. 9). Innocent was in no difficulty to see on whose side right lay. He pronounced the synod that had condemned Chrysostom irregular, and annulled his deposition, on the ground that it had been pronounced in the absence of the accused, and wrote authoritative letters to the chief parties. To Theophilus he addressed words of sharp reproof, and of fatherly sympathy to the Constantinopolitan clergy, while to Chrysostom himself he replied in terms of sympathy and encouragement (Pallad. pp. 23, 24; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 26). At the same time he used all his influence with Honorius to write a letter to his brother Arcadius, urging the convocation of a general synod. This letter was conveyed to Constantinople by a deputation of Western bishops. But Arcadius was not a free agent. The bishops were not allowed admission to his presence. The letters they bore were wrested from them, the thumb of one of the bishops being broken in the struggle. They were insulted and maltreated, and were sent home with every mark of contumely (Pallad. pp. 30–33; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 28).

The place of exile selected by Eudoxia's hatred was Cucusus, a lonely mountain village buried in the depths of a valley of the Tauric range, on the borders of Cilicia and the Lesser Armenia. The climate was most inclement, and it was exposed to perpetual inroads from the Isaurian marauders. When he arrived at the city of Nicaea Chrysostom first learnt what was to be the place of his future abode. His disappointment was severe, but remembrance was vain.

The refreshing breezes from the lake Ascanius invigorated his worn constitution, and helped him to face the long and sultry journey before him. It was the season of the year when the heat was most oppressive, and his conductors had received instructions to push on with the utmost speed, without regard to the strength or comfort of their prisoner. Whatever kind consideration could do to mitigate his sufferings was done by the officers in whose charge he was, Anatolius and Theodorus, who gladly executed for him all the duties of personal servants. On

July 5th Chrysostom left Nicaea to traverse the scorching plains of Galatia and Cappadocia under a midsummer sun. The squalid villages, which by the emperor's orders were selected for their nightly halts, furnished no food beyond black bread, which from its hardness had to be steeped in water before Chrysostom could masticate it. The water also, from the bituminous nature of the soil, was unwholesome, raising thirst instead of allaying it. He was seized with ague-fever, and was almost incapable of travelling. But the orders of his convoy were imperative, and he was forced on, till, more dead than alive, he reached the city of Caesarea. The bishop Pharetrius, an unworthy successor of the great Basil, was a concealed enemy of Chrysostom, who, though deterred by fear of his people from being present at the synod, had secretly forwarded his assent to whatever decrees it might pass against him (Pallad. p. 77). He was greatly troubled at a halt being fixed at Caesarea. His clergy were Joannites almost to a man; if he treated Chrysostom badly he would offend them; if well, he would incur the more terrible wrath of the empress. So, while sending complimentary messages expressing his eagerness to see Chrysostom, he carefully avoided an interview, and used all means to despatch him from Caesarea as quickly as possible. This was not so easy, for a severe access of his habitual ague-fever had rendered him quite unfit to travel, and compelled him to seek for medical aid (*Epist.* 12). Chrysostom's stay was not rendered more welcome to Pharetrius by the enthusiastic affection with which he was received by all ranks of the city. An incursion of the Isaurian banditti having delayed his departure other means were tried to get rid of the intrusive guest, and the house in which he was lodging was attacked by a body of fanatical monks, probably the tools of Pharetrius, threatening to burn it over his head unless he instantly quitted it. Driven out by their fury, Chrysostom, suffering from a fresh attack of fever, found refuge in the country house of a wealthy lady near, named Seleucia. But not even there was he permitted to repose. The threats of Pharetrius prevailed on Seleucia to violate the rights of hospitality, and turn Chrysostom out of doors in the middle of the night, on the pretext that the barbarians were at hand, and that he must seek safety by flight. The dangers of that terrible night, when the fugitives' torches were extinguished for fear of the Isaurians, and his mule having fallen under the weight of his litter, he was taken up for dead, and had to be dragged or rather carried along the precipitous mountain tracks, are graphically described in his letters to Olympias (*Epist.* 14). We have no details of the later stages of his journey, which were rendered somewhat more tolerable by the care of one of the physicians of Caesarea, who accompanied him (*Epist.* 12). He reached the place of his destination, Cucusus, towards the end of August. His reception here was of a nature to compensate for the fatigues of the way, and to mitigate the trials of exile. Of the many houses placed at his disposition he selected that of Dioscorus, who went to considerable expense to render it a suitable habitation for an aged invalid. Adelphius, the bishop of Cucusus, vied with Dioscorus in his attentions to Chrysostom

(*Epist.* 14, § 1). Many of his friends at Constantinople, who had estates in that district, directed their stewards to make provision for his comfort, and some of them actually came to share his exile. He found himself nearer to Antioch than at Constantinople, and he was cheered by visits from several of his old friends from his native city. He found agreeable occupation for his hours of leisure in writing and receiving letters, and in social intercourse with congenial friends. Nor did his higher energies want adequate exercise. Never even as bishop of Constantinople did he exert a wider and more powerful influence. The East was almost governed from a mountain village of Armenia. His advice was sought from all quarters. No important ecclesiastical measure was undertaken without consulting him. In the words of Gibbon "the three years spent at Cucusus were the most glorious of his life. From that solitude Chrysostom, whose active mind was invigorated by misfortunes, maintained a strict and frequent correspondence with the most distant provinces; exhorted the separate congregations of his faithful adherents to persevere in their allegiance; urged the destruction of the temples of Phoenicia, and the extirpation of heresy in the isle of Cyprus; extended his pastoral care to the missions of Persia and Scythia, and negotiated by his ambassadors with the Roman pontiff and the emperor Honorius." Though deposed from his see and deprived of all legal rights, never was his episcopal power more of a reality in Constantinople. Others might occupy the throne, but the real authority over the minds and hearts of men was his. His voluminous correspondence, which all belongs to this period, shews how close was the connexion he kept up both with the clergy and laity of his former diocese, and how unremitting his oversight of the interests of his church. Reproof and encouragement, consolation and exhortation, were administered as he saw them to be needed. The bishops and ecclesiastics, together with those of the laity who suffered from their fidelity to him, had his liveliest sympathy, and his most active endeavours for their deliverance. Nor did he overlook the necessities of those who were his immediate neighbours in his place of exile. He devoted much of the money sent him by wealthy friends to the relief of the wants of the poor around Cucusus, especially during a famine that afflicted the district, and to the redemption of those who had been carried off by the Isaurian banditti. The desolate Cucusus thus proved to the exile a home of happy usefulness (Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 27). The chief cause of suffering to Chrysostom was the variable climate and the length and severity of the winter. The sudden alternations from extreme heat to intense cold seriously affected his fever-worn frame. He had to keep the house during the winter, with a fire perpetually burning, and piles of blankets on his bed. He was confined to bed for many weeks at a time by excruciating headache, and he was more than once brought to the gates of the grave. The apprehension of the attacks of the Isaurian brigands was another constantly recurring trouble. In the winter of 405 the intelligence that these barbarians were intending a *coup de main* on Cucusus drove nearly the whole of the inhabitants from the town. Chry-

sostom joined the fugitives. The feeble old man with a few faithful companions, the presbyter Evethius, and the aged deaconess Sabiniana among the number, wandered on from place to place, often passing the night in forests or ravines, pursued by the terror of the Isaurians, until they reached the mountain fort of Arabissus, some 60 miles from Cucusus, in the castle of which place, "more a prison than a home," he spent a winter of intense suffering, harassed with the apprehension of famine and pestilence, unable to procure his usual medicines, and deprived of the comfort of his friends' letters, from the roads being blocked with snow and beset by the Isaurians, who ravaged the whole district with fire and sword (*Epist.* 15, 61, 69, 70, 127, 131). On one occasion Chrysostom himself narrowly escaped falling into the hands of the marauders, who had made a nocturnal attack, and had all but taken the town (*Epist.* 135). With the return of spring the Isaurians retired, and Chrysostom was permitted to descend to Cucusus early in 406. After Arabissus this desolate little town seemed to him a paradise. His greatest joy was in being brought nearer to his friends, and receiving their letters more regularly (*Epist.* 126, 127, 128). A third winter came, and brought its usual hardships, but by this time Chrysostom was in some measure acclimatised, and he endured the severities of the season without a recurrence of illness (*Epist.* 4, § 1; 142). His wonderful preservation from the dangers to which he had been exposed, and the manner in which his feeble health, instead of sinking under the accumulated trials of his banishment, became invigorated, awoke sanguine anticipations, and in his letters written at this time he confidently foretold his return from banishment, and his resumption of the care of his church and diocese (*Epist.* 1, § 1; 2, § 13; 4, § 4). But this was not to be. The unhappy Eudoxia had preceded the victim of her hatred to the grave to which she had destined him, but she left other not less relentless enemies behind. Stung with disappointment that the rigid climate of Cucusus had failed to do the work they intended; that Chrysostom still lived, and from his mountain banishment exercised a daily growing influence, they obtained a rescript from Arcadius transferring the exile first to Arabissus (Pallad. p. 96), and then to the small town of Pityus at the roots of Caucasus on the bleak north-eastern shores of the Euxine. This was chosen as the most ungenial and inhospitable spot in the whole empire, and therefore the most certain to rid them quickly of his hated existence, even if, as proved to be the case, the long and toilsome journey had not previously quenched the feeble spark of life. This murderous purpose was plainly evidenced by the selection of two praetorian guards of specially ferocious and brutal temper to convey Chrysostom to his new place of exile, with instructions to push forward with the most merciless haste, regardless of weather or the health of their prisoner, a hint being privately given that they might expect promotion if he died on the road (Pallad. p. 98). The journey was to be made on foot. Towns where he might enjoy any approach to comfort, and have the refreshment of a warm bath, were to be avoided. The necessary halts, as few and brief as possible, were to be made at squalid

villages, or in the unsheltered country. All letters were forbidden, the least communication with passers-by was punished with brutal blows. In spite of some approach to consideration on the part of one of his guards, the three months spent on the journey between Cucusus and Comana must have been one long slow martyrdom to the fever-stricken old man. His body was almost calcined by the sun, and, to adopt Palladius's forcible image, resembled a ripe apple ready to fall from the tree (Pallad. p. 99). On reaching Comana it was evident that Chrysostom's strength was entirely worn out. But his pitiless guard hurried him through the town "as if its streets were no more than a bridge," without a moment's halt. Five or six miles outside Comana stood a chapel with its appendent buildings, erected over the tomb of the martyred bishop, Basiliscus. Here they halted for the night. In his sleep Chrysostom saw the martyr stand by his side, bidding him "be of good cheer, for on the morrow they should be together." A similar vision, it was said, had been previously seen by the priest in charge of the chapel, bidding him "prepare a place for our brother John." In the morning Chrysostom earnestly begged for a brief respite, but in vain. He was hurried off, but scarcely had he gone three or four miles when a violent attack of fever compelled them to retrace their steps. On reaching the chapel Chrysostom was supported to the altar, and having clothed himself in the white baptismal robes he had requested might be given him, and distributed his own clothes to the bystanders, he partook of the blessed Eucharist, prayed a last prayer "for present needs," uttered his accustomed doxology "Glory be to God for all things," and having sealed it with an "Amen," yielded up his soul to his Saviour, Sept. 14, A.D. 407, in the sixtieth year of his age, and the tenth of his episcopate, three years and a quarter of which he had spent in exile. He was buried in the martyr's by the side of Basiliscus, in the presence, according to Palladius, of a large concourse of monks and nuns (Pallad. pp. 99-101). One and thirty years afterwards (Jan. 27, A.D. 438), when Theodosius II. was emperor, and Proclus, formerly a disciple of Chrysostom, was bishop of Constantinople, the body of Chrysostom was taken from its grave near Comana and translated with great pomp to his own episcopal city, and deposited hard by the altar in the church of the Holy Apostles, the place of sepulture of the imperial family and of the bishops of Constantinople, the young emperor and his sister Pulcheria assisting at the ceremony, and asking the pardon of Heaven for the grievous wrong inflicted by their parents on the sainted bishop (Soer. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 45; Theodor. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 36; Evagr. *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 31).

The personal appearance of Chrysostom, as described by contemporary writers, though dignified, was not imposing. His stature was diminutive (*σμικρὸν*); his limbs long, and so much emaciated by early austerities and habitual self-denial that he compares himself to a spider (*ἀραχνώδης*, *Epist.* 4, § 4, p. 575). His forehead was very lofty, and furrowed with wrinkles, expanding widely at the summit, his head bald "like that of Elisha," his eyes deeply set, but keen and piercing; his cheeks pallid and

withered; his chin pointed and covered with a short beard. His habits were the simplest. His personal wants were few, and easily satisfied. The excessive austerities of his youth had ruined his digestive powers, and he was unable to eat food except in the smallest quantities and of the plainest kind. Outward display in dress, equipage, or furniture was most distasteful to him. Enamoured of the cloister, the life of the bishop of the capital of the Eastern world, compelled by his position to associate with persons of the highest rank and magnificence of life, was intolerable. He avoided the society of the great, and was never seen at their tables. It is not surprising that he was considered morose and ungenial, and became excessively unpopular with the upper classes. His strength of will, his manly independence, his dauntless courage were united with an inflexibility of purpose, a want of consideration for the weaknesses of others, and an impatience at their inability to accept his high standard, which rendered him harsh and uncompromising. Intolerant of evil in himself, he had perhaps too little tolerance for it in other men. His feebleness of stomach produced an irritability of temper, which sometimes led him to violent outbursts of anger. He was accused of being arrogant and passionate. He was easily offended, and too ready to credit evil of those whom he disliked. Not mixing with the world himself, he was too dependent on the reports of those who had his confidence, which, as in the case of Serapion, was not unnaturally sometimes abused to their own purposes. But however austere and reserved to the worldly and luxurious, he was ever loving and genial to his chosen associates. In their company the natural playfulness and amiability of his disposition displayed itself, and perhaps few have ever exercised a more powerful influence over the hearts and affections of the holiest and most exalted natures. His character is well summed up in the words of Dr. Newman—"a bright, cheerful, gentle soul," his unrivalled charm "lying in his singleness of purpose, his fixed grasp of his aim, his noble earnestness; he was indeed a man to make both friends and enemies, to inspire affection and kindle resentment; but his friends loved him with a love 'stronger' than 'death,' and his enemies hated him with a hatred more burning than 'hell,' and it was well to be so hated, if he was so beloved."

Chrysostom was the author of so vast a number of works that Suidas says none but the Omniscient One could recount them all. His extant works are more voluminous than those of any other father, filling thirteen folios in the Benedictine edition. It is difficult to form any precise classification of these multifarious writings, but they may be roughly divided into—I. *Treatises*; II. *Expositions of Scripture*, chiefly in the form of Homilies, but partly continuous Commentaries; III. *Homilies*, divided into (a) doctrinal, (b) occasional, (c) panegyrical, (d) general; IV. *Letters*; V. *Liturgy*.

I. *Treatises*.—The earliest works we have from the pen of Chrysostom are his letters to his friend Theodore (*ad Theodorum lapsam*, i. ii.), who was proposing to give up the ascetic life and return to the world. These were written while Chrysostom was still resident at Antioch before

A.D. 372. To an early part of his monastic life we may assign the two books *De Com-punctione*, addressed respectively to Demetrius and Stelechius. His three books in defence of the monastic life (*adversus Oppugnatores Vitae Monasticae*, i. ii. iii.) were called forth by the decree of Valens enforcing military service and civil functions on monks, A.D. 373. His short treatise, *Comparatio Regis et Monachi*, belongs to the same period. The three books *de Providentiâ*, written to console his friend Stagirus, the subject of an hysterical seizure then identified with demoniacal possession, were probably composed after his return to Antioch, i.e. subsequently to A.D. 381. Before his ordination to the priesthood he also composed his two letters on the superior happiness of a single life (*ad Viduam juniorem*, i. ii.), and his treatise on celibacy (*de Virginitate*). His six books *de Sacerdotio*, which are justly ranked among the ablest, most instructive, and most eloquent, as they are among the earliest that ever proceeded from his pen, are placed by Socrates (*H. E.* vi. 3) in the first days of his diaconate, c. A.D. 382. The maturity of thought and sobriety of tone displayed in this work prevents our fixing it at a much earlier period. The treatises denouncing the custom for the clergy to have "spiritual sisters" residing under the same roof with them (*contra eos qui subintroductas habent; Regulares foeminae viris cohabitare non debent*), incorrectly assigned by Socrates (*H. E.* lib. vi. c. 3) to his diaconate, were written, Palladius tells us (p. 45), after he became bishop of Constantinople, c. A.D. 398. To the period of his exile belong the book *Nemo laeditur nisi a seipso*; and that *ad eos qui scandalizati sunt ob adversitates*.

II. *Expositions of Scripture*.—It is as an expositor of Scripture that Chrysostom is most deservedly celebrated. His method of dealing with the divine Word is characterised by the sound grammatical and historical principles, and the healthy common sense introduced by his tutor Diodorus, which mark the exegetical school of Antioch. He seeks to discover not what the passage before him may be made to mean, but what it was intended to mean; not what recondite lessons or truths may be forced from it by mystical or allegorical interpretations, but what it was intended to convey; not what may be introduced into it, but what may be legitimately elicited from it. While regarding Scripture in the strictest sense as the word of God, no sentence of which must be neglected, he is far from ignoring the human element in it, holding that though its writers "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," they retained their personal individuality; that their natural powers were quickened and illuminated, not superseded by divine inspiration. He regards the Scriptures as a connected whole, and avoiding the erroneous plan of treating texts as isolated *gnomes*, he seeks always to view a passage not in relation only to its direct context, but to the general teaching of Scripture. His expository works being chiefly homiletic, we must not usually look in them for any continuous or systematic exegesis of the sacred text. His primary object was a practical one—the conversion and edification of his hearers, and he frequently disappoints those who consult him for the meaning of a difficult passage, who find, instead of a carefully considered interpre-

tation, the vehement denunciation of some reigning vice or fashionable folly, or an earnest exhortation to the cultivation of some Christian grace or virtue (cf. Photius, cod. 174).

We are told by Suidas and Cassiodorus that Chrysostom wrote commentaries on the whole volume of Holy Scripture, from the beginning to the end. Many of these have unfortunately perished, especially those on the Old Testament. Among those that remain to us are the *Homilies on Genesis*, 67 in number, preached at Antioch and placed by Tillemont, but, as he confesses, on weak grounds, in A.D. 395. These follow the plan of a commentary more closely than is usual with Chrysostom; the hortatory and practical part being less fully developed than that concerned with direct interpretation. The style is plainer and less rhetorical than in his homilies generally, and they are composed with less care, the sentences being of inordinate length, and encumbered with parenthesis within parenthesis. In addition to these 67 homilies, there are eight sermons on topics from the first two chapters of Genesis, which were delivered earlier in the same year. They are shorter and slighter, but more florid and rhetorical. The ninth of these sermons, de *Mutatione Nominum*, does not belong to the series. The only other homilies on the historical books of the Old Testament are five on the narrative of *Hannah* in the first book of Samuel, and three on *David and Saul*, assigned by Tillemont to A.D. 387. Chrysostom delivered homilies on the whole book of *Psalms*, of which we have only those on Ps. iii.-xii.; xliii.-xlix.; cviii.-cl. (inclusive), collected at an early period with great critical acumen. As early as Photius the gaps indicated already existed. An ill-advised attempt has been made to supply them by piecing together materials from the works of Theodoret, Eusebius, and Athanasius. There is a homily on Ps. xli., but it only embraces the opening verses, and belongs to a different series. On the book of *Isaiah* a continuous commentary was composed by Chrysostom, which appears to have been one of his most admirable works, of this the whole has perished, with the exception of the portion ch. i.-viii. 11. There is also a series of six homilies on the opening verses of the sixth chapter, in *Oziam seu de Seraphinis*. The fourth of these belongs to a different series. To these we may add a homily on Is. xlv. 7. "Dominus Deus feci lumen et tenebras." The only extant commentary on any part of *Jeremiah* is one "on free will," Jer. x. 23. "Domine non est in homine via ejus." There is also a *Ἐκμύελα in Daniele*, which bears his name, but it is so much below Chrysostom's usual style, and has so many marks of dissimilarity, that, if it is really his, it is either an unfinished work or one compiled by inferior writers from rough notes of his homilies. His general views on prophecy are given in two sermons de *Prophetiarum obscuritate*, justly ranked by Montfaucon "inter nobilissimas." The *Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae* is an imperfect work, ending with the prophet Nahum.

Chrysostom's commentaries on the New Testament commence with 90 on *St. Matthew*, delivered at Antioch. St. Thomas Aquinas is reported to have said that he would rather possess these homilies than be the master of all Paris. There are no homilies on the gospels of *St. Mark* or *St. Luke*; but we have 88 on that

of *St. John*, also preached at Antioch. These are more doctrinal than hortatory or practical, being chiefly devoted against the errors of the Anomoeans. The 55 homilies on the *Acts* are among Chrysostom's feeblest works. The style is inelegant, the language unrefined, and the line of interpretation jejune (Photius, cod. 174). "Multa plumbea" is Savile's verdict, while that of Erasmus is harsher still, "ebrius et stertens scriberem meliora" (*Epist. lib. xxvi. p. 1052*). The secret of their inferiority is that they were written at Constantinople in the midst of the troubles arising from Gainas and the Goths, when he had no time for studied composition. But if the homilies on the *Acts* are among his feeblest, the 33 on the *Romans*, which were certainly delivered at Antioch, are among his most elaborate discourses. Nowhere does he shew more argumentative power or greater skill in developing his author's meaning. On I. *Corinthians* we have 44 homilies, and 30 on II. *Corinthians*, preached at Antioch, of which the former series "have ever been considered by devout men as among the most perfect specimens of his mind and teaching" (Keble). The commentary on the *Galatians* is continuous, not in the homiletical form. It is a somewhat hasty work, on which no great amount of time or care can have been spent. The 24 homilies on the *Ephesians* hardly reach Chrysostom's highest standard of excellence, being probably delivered at Constantinople when he wanted leisure for study. The same may be said of the 15 homilies on the *Philippians*, the 12 on the *Colossians*, the 11 on I. *Thessalonians*, and the 5 on II. *Thessalonians*, all belonging to the same epoch. Montfaucon correctly assigns the 18 homilies on I. *Timothy*, the 10 on II. *Timothy*, and the six on *Titus* to the period of his ministry at Antioch. From some marks of negligence in the three on *Philemon*, they have been considered to be extemporaneous addresses taken down by others. In the 34 on the *Hebrews* we certainly have not the benefit of Chrysostom's corrections. They were delivered at Constantinople, and were published from notes by Constantine, a presbyter, after Chrysostom's death.

III. *Homilies, (a) doctrinal*.—The chief of these is the series of 12 delivered against the Anomoean form of Arianism, in the first year of his presbyterate, at Antioch, A.D. 387. "They are," writes Stephens, "among the finest of his productions, and deserve perusal on account of their intrinsic merit no less than of the important doctrines with which they are concerned." These were succeeded at no great distance of time by eight directed against the Jews and Judaizing Christians (*contra Judaeos*). Many others of his homilies deal with doctrinal matters, but these cannot be particularised here.

(b) *Occasional*.—Not a few of Chrysostom's grandest flights of Christian oratory were called forth by the events of the stirring times in which he lived. The most remarkable is the series of 21 'On the Statues' (*Ad populum Antiochenum de Statuis*), the circumstances of which are detailed in the former part of this article. Another class includes the orations delivered at Constantinople on the fall of Eutropius, on the insurrection of Gainas, on the troubles connected with Severias, and the noble and pathetic series connected with his own deposition and exile. To these we may not improperly add the homilies

delivered on the great Church Festivals, the Nativity, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, &c.

(c) *Panegyric*.—These compositions deserve careful attention as illustrating "the passionate devotion to the memory of departed saints which was rapidly passing into actual adoration." The earliest of these probably is that delivered in commemoration of his venerated spiritual father Meletius, A.D. 386. The others are mostly devoted to the eulogy of the bishops and martyrs who had illustrated the church of Antioch by their lives and deaths, St. Ignatius, St. Eustathius, St. Babylas, St. Pelagia, St. Domnina and her two daughters, and others, and were delivered at the *martyria*, or chapels erected over their remains. With these may be associated a homily delivered on the day of the commemoration of the emperor Theodosius, and the extravagant laudations heaped on the Empress Eudoxia and Arcadius during the ardent but shortlived friendship between them at the outset of his episcopate contained in the homilies. "*Postquam reliquiae martyrum*," &c. "*Praesente imperatore*," &c.

(d) *General*.—Among these we include those belonging to Christian life generally, such as the nine of *Poenitentia*, the two *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, those of *Continentia*, de *Perfecta Caritate*, de *Consolatione Mortis*, and those on single texts of Scripture or separate parables, of which the number is considerable.

It is on his homilies, both expository and practical, that Chrysostom's fame chiefly rests, and that deservedly. Chrysostom was in truth, in the words of Dean Milman, "the model of a preacher for a great capital. Clear, rather than profound, his dogmatic is essentially moulded up with his moral teaching. . . . His doctrines flow naturally from his subject or from the passage of Scripture under discussion; his illustrations are copious and happy; his style free and fluent; while he is an unrivalled master in that rapid and forcible application of incidental occurrences which gives such life and reality to eloquence. He is at times, in the highest sense, dramatic in manner" (*Hist. of Christianity*, bk. iii. c. 9).

IV. *Letters*.—The whole of Chrysostom's extant letters belong to the period of his banishment, written partly on his road to Cucusus, during his residence there, or while taking refuge in the fortress of Arabissus. The most important of these are the 17 addressed to the deaconess Olympias, the depositary of his hopes and fears, and the sharer of all his inmost feelings. The whole number of his letters is 242, written to every variety of friends—men of rank, ladies, ecclesiastics of every grade, bishops, presbyters, deacons and deaconesses, monks and missionaries, his old friends at Antioch and Constantinople, and his more recent acquaintances at Caesarea and other halting places on his journey—and including every variety of subject; now addressing reproof, warning, encouragement, or consolation to the members of his flock at Constantinople, or their clergy; now vigorously helping forward the missionary work in Phoenicia, and soliciting funds for that and the other pious and beneficent works to which his heart was given; now thanking his correspondents for their letters or their gifts; now complaining of their silence; now urging the prosecution of the appeal made

in his behalf to Innocent and the Western bishops, and expressing his hope that through the prayers of his friends he would be speedily given to them again; and the whole poured forth with the undoubting confidence of a friend writing to friends of whom he is sure. We have in this correspondence an index to the inner life of Chrysostom such as we possess for few of the great names in history. The letters are simply inestimable in aiding us to understand and appreciate this great saint. In style, as Photius remarks, they are characterised by his usual brilliancy and clearness, together with great sweetness and persuasive power (Photius, cod. 86).

V. *Liturgical*.—In the present infancy of the science of liturgiology, it is rash to pronounce an opinion as to how much contained in the liturgies passing under the name of St. Chrysostom is really of his age. There are very many editions of the liturgy, no two of which, according to Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 305), present the same text. There are hardly any that do not offer the greatest discrepancies. It would be, of course, a fundamental error to attribute the composition of a liturgy *de novo* to Chrysostom or any of the old Catholic Fathers. When a liturgy is called by the name of any father, all that is implied is that it was in use in the church to which that father belonged, and that it may have owed some corrections and improvements to him. The liturgy known in comparatively later times by the name of Chrysostom has been from time immemorial that of the church of Constantinople. We cannot question that Chrysostom found it in use there on his appointment as bishop, and though it is possible he may have introduced some modifications of detail (although of this we have not the slightest proof), nothing would be further from his thoughts than to make any alterations in the form or structure of a ritual which had in all probability been received by the churches of Thrace and its neighbouring provinces from primitive times, and was justly regarded by them as their most sacred possession.

Editions.—The first edition of the Greek text of any part of Chrysostom's works was that of his *Homilies on St. Paul*, published at Vienna, "typis Stephani et fratrum," in 4 vols. folio, with a preface by Maximus Donatus, A.D. 1529. Fabricius speaks of the text of this edition as in some cases better than that of Savile. His 'Commentaries on the New Testament' were also published by Commelin, a printer at Heidelberg, in 4 vols. folio, A.D. 1591–1602.

The first complete edition was that brought out by Sir Henry Savile, in eight thick folios, printed at Eton, by Norton, the king's printer, in 1612. The chief value of this edition lies in the prefaces and notes, contributed by Casaubon and other scholars as well as by Savile himself.

Contemporaneously with Savile's edition one was undertaken by a French Jesuit of Bordeaux, Fronton le Duc (Fronto Ducaeus), who accompanied his Greek text with a Latin translation, made by himself, when he failed to discover a satisfactory version already existing. Suspended by his death, it was taken up and completed by the brothers Frederick and Claude Morel, and published at Paris, 1609–1633, in 12 vols. folio, and again in 1636.

The best and most complete edition of Chrysostom, as of most of the Christian Fathers, is the Benedictine, prepared by the celebrated Bernard de Montfaucon, who devoted to it more than twenty years of incessant toil, and of journeys to consult MSS. It was published at Paris, in 13 volumes folio, in 1718. The value of this magnificent edition lies more in the historical and critical prefaces, and other literary apparatus, than in the text, which is faulty. It has been reprinted at Venice in 1734 and 1755, and at Paris in 1834-1839.

The most practically useful edition is that contained in the *Patrologia* of the Abbé Migne, in 13 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1863. It is in the main a reprint of the Benedictine edition, but it has been enriched by a judicious use of the labours of the best modern commentators, especially those of the Rev. F. Field in his excellent edition of the Homilies on St. Matthew, 8vo. Cantabr. 1839, and of those on Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians, 8vo., Oxon. 1838 sq. The editions of separate portions of Chrysostom's works are nearly innumerable.

The chief early authorities for the life of Chrysostom after his own works are the "Dialogue" of his contemporary Palladius, bishop of Hellenopolis, which, however valuable for the facts it embodies, too justly deserves Gibbon's censure as "a partial and passionate vindication," and the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates (lib. vi.), Sozomen (lib. viii.), and Theodoret (lib. v.), the Lexicon of Suidas (*sub voc.* Ἰωάννης), and the letters of Isidorus of Pelusium (ii. *Epist.* 42). The biography, composed by George of Alexandria, is utterly worthless, being more of the character of an historical romance than of a memoir. Equally untrustworthy are those of Leo the emperor, and an anonymous writer, who have drawn their facts chiefly from George. Of modern works, it will suffice to name "the moderate Erasmus" (tom. iii. *Epist.* 1150), the "patient and accurate" Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* tom. ix.), and the diligent and dull Montfaucon. The brilliant sketch of Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, ch. xxxii.) must not be omitted. Coming to our own times, Neander's *Life of St. Chrysostom* is a work of much value, but more for the account of Chrysostom's opinions and words than for the actual life of Chrysostom as a man. Amadée Thierry's biographical articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* bring the circumstances of Chrysostom's fall and exile before us most graphically, though allowance has to be made for some abuse of the licence of an artist. The most satisfactory biography of Chrysostom, however, that has yet appeared, is that by the Rev. W. R. W. Stephens, London, 1872, to which the foregoing article is largely indebted. [E. V.]

CHUMBRECHUS (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 461), bishop. [CYNEBERT, bp. Winch.] [C. H.]

CHUNIALDUS, ST., presbyter, of Salzburg. Lived about the middle of the 8th century, and is commemorated on Sept. 24.

St. Rupert, the apostle of the Boii, had two disciples or chaplains, Chuniald and Gisilar, who are both commemorated on the same day, viz. Sept. 24, because on that day their relics, together with those of their master, were translated

by St. Virgilius, the eighth bishop in succession from Rupert. The church of St. Rupert (Rudbertus, Rudpertus) was dedicated by Virgilius in the year 773, and in the 26th year of the reign of Duke Thassilo (?). The bodies of Rupert and his two chaplains were translated the same year.

According to some writers Chunialdus was commemorated on Feb. 8, but, as the Bollandists think, without good reason.

David Camerarius says that he was commemorated in Scotland on Feb. 21. Henry Fitz-Simon, in his *Catalogue of the Saints of Ireland*, mentions a Gisilarius commemorated on Sept. 10; others on Sept. 12.

He is supposed by some authors to have been a Scotchman or an Irishman, but by the Bollandists to have been either a Frenchman or a German.

It is uncertain how long Chunialdus and Gisilarius survived their bishop, or in what year they died. Chunialdus is said to have been married, probably before his ordination, and to have had children, but there is no proof of this. (*AA. SS. Sept.*, vi. p. 708.) [D. R. J.]

CHUNIBERTUS, ST., the eleventh archbishop of Cologne, was, says Gelenius, descended from an illustrious line of Austrasian dukes, whose territories were situate on the river Moselle. He was for some time archdeacon of Treves, and upon the death of Remedius in 623 he was appointed to succeed him in the archbishopric of Cologne. In 625 he was one of the bishops present at the council of Rheims, over which archbishop Sonnatius presided, and Flodoardus assigns to him the eighth place and the see of Cologne. Chunibert was a famous statesman, renowned for prudence and integrity, and trusted by king Dagobert more than his mayor of the palace, Pepin. In the eleventh year of his reign Dagobert made his son Sigebert king of Austrasia, and on account of his youth placed him under the guardianship of Chunibert and duke Adalgisel. By order of the king he consecrated two monasteries, Otmars and Malmédy, although they were in different dioceses, Cologne and Tongres; over the latter of which St. Remaculus presided as abbat and bishop.

Sigebert II. having, in 633, been placed on the throne of Austrasia, Chunibert retained his position, and was principal minister of that prince. Such was his influence that Grimoald, son of Pepin, who became mayor of the palace after his father, did not feel able to maintain his position without his assistance and counsel. Even after his retirement he was recalled to become the minister of Childeric, brother of Clothaire III., and he retained that post till his death.

In the year 656 he retired from political life and devoted himself to the care of his diocese, of which he was bishop forty years. He died in 663 or 664 and was buried in the church of St. Clement, which he had built and which was afterwards called by his own name. In an ancient document in the church of St. Chunibert occurs the following sentence:—"Susatum in Westphalia Angariae metropolim D. Petro S. Chunibertus archiepiscopus acquisivit."

He is said to have accompanied Sigebert to the field of battle when he was at war with the

Saxons, and to have received Soust as his share of the booty. (Flodoardus, *Hist. Rem.* lib. ii. cap. 5, *Patrol. Lat.* cxxxv. p. 102; Fredegarius, *Chron.* cap. 58 and 75, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. pp. 642 and 653; Gregor. Turon. 636, 647, 655, 656, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi.; Aimoin, lib. iv. cap. xxxvi., *Patrol. Lat.* cxxxix. p. 792; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 626.)

[D. R. J.]

CHURCH, not the material building (on which see the *Dict. of Antiquities*), but the spiritual society known as "*ecclesia*" to the Greek and Latin fathers alike: being a derivative from the Greek verb *ἐκκαλεῖσθαι*, "to be called out," as St. Cyril says (*Cat.* xviii. 24)—"I. A body collective, because it contains a huge multitude; II. A body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense" (Hooker, *E. P.* iii. 1, 2). Under this twofold aspect, we shall be able to group whatever dogmatic statements are to be found on the church in scriptural or patristic literature. The latter, indeed, being its supernatural or celestial aspect, should be taken first: and its human aspect, being dependent on, and ancillary to this, should follow.

As to the word: it was appropriated, not coined, by the writers of the New Testament, and perhaps dictated to them, if not used, by our Lord. It cannot have been accidental, that all the books of the New Testament, though written by Jews exclusively, were, if we except the Gospel of St. Matthew, written in Greek: and this word occurs again and again in the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures (Tromm's *Concord.* s. v.) circulating so widely then as to deserve to be called the Jewish Vulgate. Further, the only gospel in which it occurs—that of St. Matthew (xvi. 18 and xviii. 17)—happens to be the only gospel originally written, not in Greek, but in the vernacular (*πατριῶ γλώττῃ*, Euseb. iv. 24). In the Acts of the Apostles, on the other hand, whose Greek is all but classical, the word is used as well in its common as in its scriptural sense (ii. 47 and xix. 39, 41). Yet familiar to the apostles as it may have been, even as Jews, yet as Jews they would have probably substituted another word for it, had they been left free to employ what Greek word they pleased. The word "*synagoga*" occurs at least as often in the LXX, and has almost the same meaning as "*ecclesia*." But in their time it was used also to designate the house of prayer in their native towns. It thus had a previous endearing association for them which was wholly wanting in "*ecclesia*." Nevertheless, the two words had just that difference between them in sense, strictly speaking, as accurately expressed the difference between the law and the gospel. The "*synagoga*," was an assembly brought together without reference to its own free choice, the "*ecclesia*," was an assembly brought together by invitation addressed to each one composing it, St. Aug. on Psalm lxxxi. (or ii.).

But both these distinctions were merged in the body mystical, to which we must now turn our thoughts, the mystical Eve, or spouse of the second Adam, whose bodily training was symbolised under the law, and whose mental under the gospel; the first a carnal, the second a spiritual dispensation.

1. St. Augustine, commenting on v. 25 of Psalm xxxvi. (or vii.), "I have been young, and now am old," says "the Lord was young in His body, which is the church, in primaevial times, and now is old. You know and can appreciate this both from belonging to it yourselves, and inasmuch as it is your belief also that Christ is our head, and we are His body. We alone, do I say, and not they also who were before us? All the just that ever were since the world began have Christ for their head. They believed that He should come, we believe that He has come. They were healed by faith in Him, even as we are. To the end that he might be head of the entire city Jerusalem, composed of all the faithful from the beginning to the end of time, the legions of angels included, thus constituting one people under one king; one province under one ruler; rejoicing in perpetual peace and safety, praising God without end, and for ever blest." And again on Psalm cxxviii. (or cxxix.) 1. "The saints were no sooner called, than the church started into being on earth. At one time it was in Abel alone, and was crushed by his evil brother Cain. At another time it was in Enoch alone, and was translated from the wicked. At another it was confined to the household of Noah, suffering at the hands of all who perished in the Deluge, till having been supported on the waters in the ark alone, it got safe to dry land. At another time it was in Abraham alone, and how much it endured from the wicked we well know. . . Afterwards it commenced life with the children of Israel, persecuted by Pharaoh and the Egyptians, under which phase its numbers increased. . . At length it arrived at our Lord, when by the preaching of the gospel it was multiplied, so that it could not be numbered." In other words, the church, in this general and ideal sense, was created on the day on which man fell, and created to repair his fall, by embracing without distinction of sex or race all to whom the free gift of God, offered conditionally to the free will of man—eternal life through Christ—should not be offered in vain; all who should come to God when He called them to Him, no matter how. It is from this point of view that the same Father says in another place, tersely:—"mundus damnatus, quicquid praeter Ecclesiam; mundus reconciliatus, Ecclesia" (*Serm.* xcvi. *De Verb. Evang.* § 8). Those who accept salvation on the terms on which it is offered them constitute the church, those who reject it constitute the world; good men and angels belong to the one, wicked men and angels to the other; the head of the first is Christ, and the head of the last, Satan. "Et videte nomina duarum istarum civitatum," continues St. Augustine, "Babylonis et Jerusalem—Babylon confusio interpretatur, Jerusalem, visio pacis. . . Unde dignosci possunt istae duae civitates; numquid possumus eas modo separate ab invicem? Permixtae sunt, et ab ipso exordio generis humani permixtae currunt usque in finem saeculi. . . Possumus tamen et aliquid afferre, quantum Dominus donat, unde distinguantur pii fideles, etiam hoc tempore, cives Jerusalem a civibus Babyloniae. Duas istas civitates faciunt duo amores. Jerusalem facit amor Dei. Babyloniam facit amor saeculi. . . (on Psalm lxiv. or lxxv. 1). Post resurrectionem vero, facto universo completoque iudicio, suos fines habebunt civitates

duae; una scilicet Christi, altera diaboli; una bonorum, altera malorum; utraque tamen et angelorum et hominum" (*Enchir.* § iii.). For any further development of this idea, we must refer in general to his great work, *De Civitate Dei*, which exhausts it; the last twelve books more particularly.

Not, however, that this idea was mere symbolism with the fathers. It was deeply practical. "Let us gaze upon the blood of Christ," says the earliest of them, "and see how precious before God is His blood, and that, shed for our salvation, it has obtained the grace of repentance for the whole world. Let us mount upwards through all generations, and let us learn that from generation to generation the Lord has bestowed a place of repentance on all such as were willing to be turned to Him" (St. Clem. *Ep.* i. 7). "For He called us when we were not; and was willing that, though dead, we should live" (*Id.* ii. 1). "Pray for all other men without ceasing," says St. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Eph.* c. 10), "for there is hope of their repenting and thus finding God." It was this hope which inspired their prayers. "The church prays everywhere," says St. Prosper, "not only for saints, and the already regenerated in Christ, but for all infidels, and enemies of the cross of Christ, for all who worship images, and for all who persecute Christ in His members; for the Jews who are blind to the light of the gospel; for heretics and schismatics estranged from the unity of faith and love. And what is it that she asks for them, but this, that abandoning their errors, they may be turned to God, that they may receive faith and love, and, freed from the darkness of ignorance, arrive at a perception of the truth. . . The Lord who is merciful and just wills that prayer should be made to Him for all men; that when we see them rescued in such numbers from such depths of woe, we may not doubt His having done what He has been prayed to do; so that, while praising Him for those who have been saved, we may hope likewise that any who have not yet been enlightened will, by a similar act of divine grace, be removed from the power of darkness, and translated to His kingdom before departing from this life" (*De Vocat.* i. 12). "The fact is," says Eusebius, "though we are confessedly new, and our name of Christians has become but recently known, our conduct, manner of life, and rules of piety, far from having been invented by us recently, were developed by the natural instincts of God-serving men from the creation of mankind downwards. . . So that should anybody reckon all those who have been commemorated for their righteousness from Abraham upwards to the first man, as really Christians, though they never bore that name, he would not be far from the truth. For, if by the term Christian we understand a man who by the knowledge and teaching of Christ excels in justice and temperance, in continence and fortitude, together with the worship of the one and only true God; in all these respects we must confess the ancients to have shewn equal diligence with ourselves." (*E. H.* i. 4). "In this way," says St. Augustine, "the saving effects of this the only true religion, through which salvation is really and truly promised, were never wanting to the deserving; and only wanting where they

would have been bestowed in vain" (*Ep. ad Deog.* cii. 9, 2, § 15). As the first bishop of Ephesus had learnt from St. Paul; "God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 3). And as the first Gentile converts had heard from St. Peter: "Of a truth I perceive, that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 34-5). And as all the apostles had themselves heard from our Lord: "I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (St. Matt. viii. 11). It is a curious circumstance, notwithstanding, that the first of these passages was always more or less of a difficulty to St. Augustine (*Enchir.* c. 103, *De Corrupt. et Grat.* c. 14, &c.), and that neither he nor any of the fathers till Venerable Bede can be quoted for anything like comment on the second, and not even Bede on the last. Yet all three passages are virtually taken into account and presupposed in this view of the church: which view must, therefore, be taken into account itself and presupposed in determining the sense attached by them to their favourite dogma "Nulla extra ecclesiam salus." In the words of St. Cyprian: "If any were able to escape who were outside the ark, he may, who is outside the church" (*De Unit. Eccl.* c. 6), or, as St. Gregory puts it; "It was said of the paschal lamb, 'In one house shall it be eaten, thou shalt not carry forth aught of the flesh abroad out of the house' (*Moral.* xxxv. 8, and *Exod.* xii. 46). Practically, they meant that none could be saved, who rejected impliedly or professedly, by a direct act of their own, God's offer of salvation through Christ in whatever way it was brought home to them: "Sciebant etenim, quia nulli esset salus, nisi in sanguine Christi" as Origen says (*On Josh. Hom.* iii. 5). Mystically, they meant that none could be saved who were not incorporate members of His mystical body called the church. Finally, to this body mystical they attributed three distinct stages or periods:—1. *Ante legem*, 2. *sub lege*, 3. *sub gratiâ* (Bede, *E. H.* v. 21), or "1. *lex naturæ*; 2. *lex Mosis*; 3. *lex Christi*," as they have since been called, each marked by characteristics of its own, adapted to its day, each intended for the moral and social advancement, as well as probation, of the generations brought into contact with it, but all three deriving whatever efficacy they possessed, retrospectively as well as prospectively, from the offering made by Christ on the cross, and in no case designed to prejudice those less favoured races in the sight of God, who through no fault of their own, have from age to age lived and died outside their influence. "That servant," said Christ (St. Luke xii. 47), "which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes;" or, as paraphrased by St. Augustine, "will be doomed for ever" (*Expos. in ch. ad Rom.* § 18), "but he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes" that is, "enough to bring him to his senses, and comport with his ultimate pardon" (*ib.*)

Such, then, was the view taken by the fathers of

the body mystical, in its general or ideal aspect. What they dwelt on most in their teaching, however, as we might expect, was the aspect in which it was presented to them daily, viz., that of the Christian church. In this sense the church was to them a veritable expansion of the humanity of their crucified and risen Lord, and themselves literally, "members of His flesh and bones," as St. Paul had said (Eph. v. 31). "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof, and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man" (Gen. ii. 21). When the eyes of the second Adam were closed on the cross in death, the second Eve, said they, was similarly taken out of His side (St. Chrys. in Eph. v. Hom. xx. § 3; St. Amb. in S. Luc. ii. 86; St. Aug. De Civ. D. xxii. 17). The water and the blood which then flowed, expressed the two sacraments on which His church lives. He had said Himself, in instituting the Eucharist, "Take, eat, this is My body," relevant to which was the general maxim expressed by St. Augustine, "Quicquid manducamus, in corpus nostrum trahimus" (in Psal. xxx. Enar. iii. § 5); His own miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, twice repeated, in feeding the multitude (St. Matt. xiv. and xv.); and His intermediate discourse thereon, which St. John records (c. vi.). According to the teaching of His apostles, baptism was not a mere ceremony for conferring church membership, but people were "baptized into Christ, put on Christ (Gal. iii. 27), and were buried with Christ" (Col. i. 12), in receiving it. Their union with Christ was thus a real union of the closest kind, answering in all strictness to that of the body with the head, the prime figure for expressing it with St. Paul (Col. ii. 19; Eph. i. 22, and iv. 13-16); and second only to which was that of the marriage tie, regarded in the light in which Adam had apostrophised it before the fall (Gen. ii. 23; Eph. v. 28-31).

The church which He was about to found was also designated "a kingdom," by our Lord Himself. We find it called by that name no less than thirty-six times in St. Matthew alone, qualified indeed by the reserve that it was "of God," and "of heaven," or "not of this world." Still it was a kingdom which, in the thrilling language of prophecy, was to be set up upon earth, and to break in pieces all other kingdoms that had preceded it; whose servants all people, nations, and languages should become, and whose nursing fathers and mothers should be kings and queens. St. John, the last of the apostles, had seen, in vision, "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband;" and had heard a great voice from heaven saying, "behold, the tabernacle of God is with men; and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God" (Rev. xxi. 2-3, comp. Art. "CHILIASTS"). It must have been hard for the fathers to decide, particularly for those who lived after the Roman empire had become Christian, how much of this was intended for the church triumphant rather than militant. And it was at least as much from what they saw around them, as from what they read in Scripture, that the fathers of the

2nd council described the church to which they belonged, in the creed in which they professed their faith, as 1. one; 2. holy; 3. catholic; 4. apostolic; the four primitive notes of the church, as they are called, and their contemporaries said of it, in appealing to its decisions: "Securus judicat orbis terrarum." When St. Augustine wrote this, his "orbis terrarum" was of course bounded by the limits of the Roman empire; but that there was any world beyond this entered into the minds of none then; and further, though even this was not half Christianised, not only was it becoming more and more Christian every day, but Christianity went hand in hand everywhere with the church. This was a fact so patent, that even heretics and schismatics could only meet it by silence, when it had been once stated. No matter where they existed, their rise could be dated, their numbers counted, their locality defined, their heterogeneity exposed, with precision too literal to be evaded. "Edant origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum," was the crucial test with which Tertullian was not afraid to meet them all (De Præsc. c. 32). "Tell me, ye Donatists," said St. Augustine, "or find out, if you cannot, how many stations there are on the route by land between Jerusalem and Illyria. Then, on our affirming that there are no fewer churches than stations, shew us, if you can, how they have disappeared through the local strife that has been waged in Africa. You merely read the epistles addressed by the apostle to the Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Thessalonians and Colossians; we not only read and regulate our faith by them, but hold living communion with those churches to whom they were addressed. . . Against these churches, members of the one church that is diffused throughout the world, and authenticated to us as they are by the Scriptures which the Holy Ghost inspired, have you the face to ask us to entertain all the calumnies that may be preferred by man? Unquestionably they preach another gospel, who say that the church has failed in all the rest of the world, except Africa, where it is upheld by Donatus and his party" (De Unit. Eccl. 12-13, and c. Cresc. ii. 37). The church is conspicuous and clear as noonday to all. Like the city set upon a hill, it cannot be hid, Christ rules in it from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. The seed of Abraham has been multiplied in it as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore, and therein all the nations of the earth have been blessed" (ib. ii. 36). Similarly, "The episcopate is one," says St. Cyprian, "whose parts severally represent the entire whole. The church is one likewise, though dispersed and ever increasing. . . Part a ray of the sun from its orb, and unity forbids this division of light. Break a branch from the tree, once broken, it can bud no more. Sever the stream from its fountain, it is no sooner severed than it dries up. . . This sacrament of unity, this bond of concord inseparably cohering is foreshadowed in the gospel, where the tunic of our Lord Jesus Christ, neither rent nor parted, was cast lots for, and possessed entire, scathless, and undivided by him into whose hands it fell. . . He cannot own Christ's garment, who rends and divides Christ's church. . . In the sacrament or

sign of His garment, He has declared the unity of His church" (*De Unit. Eccl.* c. 6, with the note in the Oxford Tr.)

One more note, that of holiness, remains. As eye-witnesses of the abominations, denied by none, with which Gentile society, religious equally with secular, was steeped, of the contrast presented by the radically different life prescribed in the gospels, and by the high standard of it realised among Christians in general, the holiness of the church was a topic on which the fathers could well afford to dwell with enthusiasm, without being the least unmindful of the qualifications attendant on it, when viewed in the concrete. There could be no reasonable doubt that post-baptismal sin was both contemplated in Scripture—witness the Lord's Prayer—and existed in fact. Those who shut their eyes to this, like Tertullian and Novatian, soon found themselves repudiated by the majority, and became sectarians. Still, even the majority could contemplate with just pride the countless numbers of men, women, and children in all ranks, who continued through life faithful in general, to the double vow of profession and renunciation made by them at the font, who hung in speechless admiration on such sermons as were preached to them by SS. Gregory, Basil, and Chrysostom, and regulated their daily conduct by such treatises as were written by Tertullian, St. Cyprian and St. Augustine on prayer, fasting, almsgiving, faith, hope, charity, martyrdom, virginity, widowhood, and marriage. That such preachers and such writers should have found hearers in such multitudes proves abundantly that this note was no dream. Well, again, might St. Cyril say (*Cat.* vi. 35), "Is it not to compare darkness with light, to talk of the loftiness of the church in the same breath with the slough of the Manichees? Here is order and knowledge; here is gravity with purity; here the mere looking on a woman for lust is a sin—here is the dignity of marriage, and the steadfastness of continence, and the aspiration of virginity to compete with angels. Here food is never taken but with giving of thanks, gratitude is poured out to the Creator of all things, and the father of Christ is worshipped." Rufinus, finally, may be cited for the practical sense put on this article, as it stood in the creed (in *Symb. Ap. ad l.*), "I have stated already that belief is not professed in the church as it is in God. What we are required to profess is, merely, that *there is one holy church*, in which one faith and one baptism is maintained, and one God the Father, one Lord Jesus Christ His Son, and one Holy Spirit, believed on. Such then is this holy church, not having spot or wrinkle." . . . and so far, standing alone. At the same time, when the question turned on individuals, St. Augustine was free to confess, that as there were tares which grew inside, so there was corn which grew outside the church: "*Sicut ergo et intus quod diaboli est arguendum est, sic et foris quod Christi est agnoscendum est. . . Aut si zizania ea sola dicenda sunt, quae usque in finem in maligno errore perdurant: et foris multa frumenta sunt, et intus multa zizania*" (*De Bapt. c. Don.* iv. 9-10). Consequently, there was as broad a distinction in the minds of the fathers between the Christian church of their own days and the ideal, as

between the church militant and the church triumphant. Not but that, so far as words are concerned, it seems forgotten by them in the fervour of the moment now and then.

2. The remaining aspect of the church—that of a body corporate—was naturally considered by them also with special reference to the Christian church, though it had been in a manner derived from the synagogue. "Go," said our Lord to His apostles, "and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them" &c. (*St. Matt.* xxviii. 19). In these words our Lord finally commissioned His apostles to set about organising a society, to which baptism should give admission, and for the consolidation of which He had charged them with other rules and ordinances some time before. Among these was the power of excluding from it on the ground of sin. From this point of view, therefore, the administration of the sacraments was committed to the apostles, as a means of determining church-membership in its outward acceptance, a consideration quite distinct from their supernatural effects upon the soul. Those whom they admitted to the sacraments were made, or were continued, members of the corporate body called the church; those from whom they withheld the sacraments were excluded from it. The apostles on their part made provision for the administration of the sacraments by others to the end of time, on terms which they must have considered themselves free to initiate, for the same purpose. First, they laid their hands upon seven, chosen by the multitude, to act for them in the more ordinary details of their ministry (*Acts* vi. 1-6). These seven had hardly been ordained, before we find one preaching, and another baptizing as well as preaching, with considerable effect. No further coadjutors seem to have been employed by the twelve, while their labours were confined to Judaea. But among the acts of the first foreign missionaries—apostles, though distinct from the twelve—we read of their "ordaining elders in every church" (*Acts* xiv. 23). Not long afterwards on their returning to Jerusalem, they were themselves "received of the apostles and elders" of the mother-church (*Acts* xv. 4). Then the "apostles and elders, gathered together" there, form a council, the first of its kind to arrive at a joint decision after much disputing; and unite in forwarding it with the concurrence of the church at home to the churches abroad (*ib.* 6, 22, and 23). When the missionaries returned to Jerusalem after their latest voyage, the rest of the apostles were gone, but St. James remained. And "all the elders were present," when he received St. Paul and his companions the day following their arrival (*ib.* xxi. 18).

In fixing himself at Jerusalem, St. James set an example that was soon followed. Hitherto the apostles had exercised a personal superintendence over all the churches founded by them from time to time. We read of St. Peter "passing through all quarters" at one time (*Acts* ix. 32); of St. Paul having "the care of all the churches day after day" upon him at another (2 *Cor.* xi. 28); of SS. Peter and John being sent to Samaria by the apostles in general "to hold a confirmation," as we should say (*Acts* viii. 15). Just before revisiting Jerusalem for the last time, St. Paul had called together "the elders of the church" at Ephesus, and

taken leave of them in a way illustrating his own previous relations to that church and theirs to him (*ib.* xx. 17 et seq.) Even then, he seems to have made an effort to maintain this connexion for some time longer by writing to them. But, sooner or later, we find him begging Timothy to continue there, as his representative (1 Tim. i. 3) for a time or longer, as God might will (*ib.* iii. 14), and to this calling he leaves us to infer his companion had been designated in the first instance "by prophecy" (*ib.* i. 18, and iv. 14)—just as he had been "separated" for his own work at Antioch in former days himself—and then obtained the requisite gift (*χαρισμα*) for it by imposition of hands, from the elders of the church, as well as from him (*ib.* iv. 14 and 2 Tim. i. 6). Till then, the elders of every church had practically been its "overseers," in his absence, and such he had formerly called them more than once (Acts xx. 28, and Phil. i. 1). As yet, indeed, there was a vagueness about all such terms, in point of fact the apostleship even being called a "diaconate" by the apostles themselves (Acts i. 25) and the apostles "presbyters" (1 Pet. v. 1, and 2 and 3 John, 1), which admitted of their being interchanged. "Quia eosdem episcopos illo tempore quos et presbyteros appellabant, propterea indifferenter de episcopis quasi de presbyteris est locutus," as St. Jerome says (on Tit. i. 5, comp. Theodoret on 1 Tim. iii. 1).

But in this correspondence with Timothy the word "overseer" is used in the singular number throughout with marked care (1 Tim. iii. 1-7), thus establishing a difference between the person so called, and the deacons (*ib.* 8-14) and presbyters or presbytery (*ib.* v. 17, and iv. 14), who are named afterwards, and in a sense that instantly became special, viz., that of bishop, and this being the office which Timothy was designed to fill, its duties are sketched at becoming length, and first of any. Titus who was despatched to Crete by St. Paul on the same mission, and about the same time, had them repeated to him in almost identical terms, save that Crete not having had half the church-extension of Ephesus as yet, he was told, in addition, "to ordain elders in every city," duly qualified, like their bishop (Tit. i. 5-9). It would have been mere tautology for the New Testament to have recorded more cases, but we cannot doubt the same course that was pursued at Ephesus and Crete, having been pursued at Thessalonica, Colosse, Philippi, Corinth, Athens, &c., by St. Paul, and by others elsewhere. Thus it was, accordingly, that most of the churches founded by the apostles were provided by them with bishops during their lifetime, though, in some cases, where they attached themselves ultimately to particular churches, as at Jerusalem and Rome, bishops only succeeded them on their decease. Anyhow the succession of bishops in all the principal sees, from apostolic times downwards, is as certain a fact as any which history records. Bingham (ii. 1. 4) comments in detail upon each case. Tertullian, as we have seen, challenges heretics on this point alone (*De Praesc.* c. 32, 36). And if St. Jerome says in more than one place (in Tit. i. 5, and *Ep. ad Evang.* cxlvi. ed. Ben. with the note), that the object of episcopacy was to correct schism; its having served that purpose to some extent, is not inconsistent with its having also served, and

been designed for, another. When every local church was officered by deacons and priests with a bishop at their head, it not only fulfilled what had been prefigured by the high-priest, priests, and levites of the synagogue, but, as St. Cyprian says, represented the whole church in miniature. The universal was thus everywhere brought home familiarly to flesh and blood in the particular. And the particular, in all that concerned the sanctuary, left nothing to be desired. Each diocese contained within it all that was necessary for the work of the church in the application of the Incarnation for the saving of souls. The maxim, which St. Ignatius is so fond of repeating (*ad Trall.* § 2; *ad Philad.* § 11), "Do nothing without the bishop," itself implied that one bishop was as good as another for that matter. It is St. Jerome who says, "Wherever he may be, bishop of Rome or Eugubium, of Constantinople or Rhegium, of Alexandria or Tanis, his priesthood is the same, and his gift all one. Rich or poor, all bishops are successors of the apostles" (*Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evang.* § 1). He distinguishes in the same letter between the offices of bishop, priest, and deacon respectively: "What," he asks, "can a bishop do which a presbyter cannot, except ordain? . . . or, what can a server of tables and widows mean by placing himself above those," bishops and priests alike, so far, "at whose prayers the consecration of the body and blood of Christ takes place?" Wherever there was a local church there was a bishop: and every bishop was the vicar of Christ, the fountain of liturgical order, the centre of ecclesiastical unity, within his diocese. All he did, however, was in the name of the whole church, and not his own: and therefore subject to her laws. He alone could ordain, and regulate the functions of the deacons and priests of his church: yet he could not authorise deacons to consecrate the eucharist, nor presbyters to hold ordinations: nor presbyters or deacons to minister anyhow in a diocese that was not his. He was nothing in another diocese, though everything in his own. Within it he alone could consecrate churches, hold ordinations, administer vows, prescribe liturgies, sanction the insertion of any fresh names of departed saints in them for commemoration, exclude offenders from communion, decide what their penance should be, and readmit them when they had performed it to his satisfaction. Nobody who was under censure in his diocese could be restored in another. He was, in a manner, wedded to his diocese, as Christ was to the whole church (Vallars. in St. Hieron. *Ep.* lxi. 5, *ad Ocean.*).

But when he transgressed, to whom was he to render account? or when two or more neighbouring bishops quarrelled or differed in opinion, who was to decide between them? or, again, how was the mind of the whole church to be declared on a given question? or, lastly, forasmuch as every bishop was a recognised centre of unity within his own diocese, was there no centre of unity recognised or required amongst the bishops themselves for binding their churches in one?

When St. Cyprian talked of the episcopate being one, he presupposed all its members being in communion with each other (*Ep.* lii. *ad Anton.*), and this fact, as long as it held good, would

establish the schism of any few here and there not included in their communion. But what guarantee was there that the episcopate would *always remain one?*

Strictly speaking, the three first questions concern discipline, and may be answered easily from the canons. Questions affecting a single diocese were settled in a diocesan council. Questions affecting either the bishop of a diocese, or more dioceses than one, were settled in a council of bishops belonging to the province within which they had arisen. Questions affecting the whole church were settled in a council of bishops from every province sufficiently numerous to represent the whole church. Now, in this last more particularly, and at all times in general, was there such an episcopal centre recognised, or its need felt?

From the times of the fathers downwards, this question has always been regarded from a twofold point of view: 1. dogmatic; and 2. disciplinary. It is the first which exclusively concerns us here. In approaching it, we shall do well to call to mind the distinction already drawn between the Christian and the ideal church which, even in Scripture, seems occasionally lost sight of; Christ in some places appearing to be represented as Head of the Christian church instead of the ideal, whereas it is of the ideal alone that He is Head in the full and strict sense; and of this, of course, the Christian church merely forms part. The fathers, then, with their gaze fixed upon the church before them, or the Christian church, and on its first bishops the apostles, saw its unity foreshadowed in the person of St. Peter, and represented in their own day by his chair—"Peter, to whom the Lord left the keys of heaven, and through him to the church," says Tertullian (*Scorp.* c. 10). Or, as St. Cyprian has expressed it more fully, "The Lord spake to Peter as follows: 'I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church,' &c.; and again, after His resurrection, 'Feed my sheep.' He builds his church on one: and though He bestowed on all the apostles equal power, and said, 'As my Father sent me, even so send I you . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit,' &c., still to manifest unity, He arranged of His own authority that its origin should commence from one" (*De Unit. Eccl.* c. 4).—"Peter, whom the Lord chose first, and on whom he built His church," as he says in another place (*Ep. lxxi. ad Quint.*), "the chair of Peter, the principal church," meaning Rome, "from which sacerdotal unity took its rise," as he says in another (*Ep. lv. ad Corn.*)—"Peter, the first of the apostles, the coryphaeus and spokesman of the church," as St. Cyril of Jerusalem says (*Catech.* xi. 3)—"whom the apostles themselves yielded precedence and made their spokesman," as St. Chrysostom (in *Matt. Hom. li. 2*)—"Christ here founds His church, and makes Peter its shepherd," says St. Cyril of Alexandria (in *Matt. xvi. 18*)—"Christ gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven to the bishops through Peter," says St. Gregory Nyssen (*Op.* p. 609, ed. Paris.)—"We should look upon Peter as a type of the one church," says St. Augustine (*Serm.* lxxvi. 1, *De Verb. Ev.*)—"It was as representing the whole church in his single person that our Lord said to him 'I will give thee the

keys of the kingdom of heaven;' for it was not one man who received those keys, but the one church" (*Serm.* cxcv. 2, *De Temp.*)—"Peter answered for the rest, or rather before the rest," says St. Ambrose, "and was therefore called the foundation; because he knew how to preserve not merely what was his own, but what was common property . . . Still, indisputably, the primacy which he bore was not of honour, but of confession; not of order, but of faith" (*De Incarn.* c. iv. §§ 32, 33). "It was for the good of unity," says St. Optatus, with equal plainness, "that St. Peter, who would have received enough had he been only pardoned his denial, was preferred to all the apostles, and alone received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to be communicated to the rest. . . . It was for the good of unity that the rest, through love, forbore to separate from his communion when he denied Christ" (*De Schism.* D. vii. 3). Lastly, the fathers of the 4th council, in their synodical letter, solemnly tell St. Leo that "it was he who interpreted the voice of Peter for all, and drew down the blessing of his faith upon all," yet pass a canon in the same breath, on discipline, which they had strong reasons for believing he would not accept.

In all these passages, unquestionably, St. Peter is considered a type of the Christian church, with special reference to that attribute on which the fathers themselves laid most stress, viz., its oneness—a conspicuous type, but no more than a type—a type in no other sense than Moses and Joshua, David and Solomon, were types of Christ: and St. John and he types, on other occasions (St. John xx. 1-9, and xxi. 15-23) of the dispensations of the law and the gospel, compared with each other—a distinction which, if recognised, certainly was not supposed to have been increased in his see. The notion that St. Paul or St. Andrew held their commission, or had their powers from St. Peter, is in direct opposition to the explanation given of his primacy by St. Ambrose, "primatum confessionis utique, non honoris: primatum fidei, non ordinis." St. Cyprian and his colleagues denied that there was any "bishop of bishops" known to them whom they were bound to obey (*Op.* p. 329, ed. Ben.). St. Gregory the Great stigmatised the bare taking of the title of universal bishop as a mark of antichrist, when it was assumed by another (*Ep.* v. 18). Finally, no bishop of Rome was ever called or considered husband of the Christian, let alone the ideal church, as every bishop often was of his particular see. Practically, the see of Rome was no doubt honoured at all times, and deferred to then constantly, by collective Christendom, as being a model of the faith that should be professed by all, and a common centre with which all should be in communion—and this the fathers with one consent depose to finding typified in the constitution of the apostolic college. But of the idea, that the sacraments pass to the church in all ages through the see of Rome, making all other bishops its vicars: indebted to it for every power they possess, accountable to it all their lives for their several acts—there is no trace, but that of disproof, anywhere to be found in patristic literature, unless where it has been interpolated. Of this, St. Cyprian *de Unit. Eccl.* c. 4 (v. Fell ad l.) is a prime specimen.

When St. Augustine pressed unity upon the

Donatists, this was his recipe for securing it: "What person," he asks, "is ignorant that holy canonical Scripture, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, has its own definite limits; and that it stands so far above the writings of all later bishops, as to preclude all doubt and debate, whether a thing is right or true, whatever it be that is manifestly contained there? But that all episcopal letters written now, or at any time subsequent to the settlement of the canon, are, should they deviate from the truth in any respect, liable to correction, whether by the reasoning of one better informed on a given subject than they are, or by other bishops of graver authority and more matured judgment, or else by councils; and that councils themselves held in the provinces, or in particular countries, have to yield to the authority of plenary councils representing the whole Christian world; and that of plenary councils, in fine, the earlier are frequently corrected by the later: should that which was closed come to be unlocked by increased experience, or that which was hid to be ascertained, without any display of pride, arrogance, or envy whatever, with saintly meekness, and catholic peace, and Christian love" (*De Bapt. c. Don. ii. 3*).

Little more need be said on the general subject. Baptism, besides washing away sin, gave admission to the Christian church. Union with Christ, effected by the operation of the Holy Ghost, ensued (1 Cor. xii. 13). Both, however, were liable to be suspended or forfeited in after life. There was a twofold engagement exacted in every case before baptism was conferred: 1. No one was baptized till he had first declared publicly that he renounced the devil and all his works; and 2. That he believed in God, and would keep His commandments. The bishops of the church further claimed the privilege, granted to the apostles, of not only remitting, but retaining sins, as their successors—in a word, of excluding from, as well as admitting into, the church. Yet heretics and schismatics, who had been cast out of the church, might baptize validly, thus giving entrance to it. Manifold questions would arise from hence. Persons pledging themselves at the font in bad faith gained admission to the church on false pretences, and remained merely nominal members of it all their lives, unless they changed. Persons pledging themselves in good faith, but false to their engagements subsequently, might forfeit their union with Christ, and still, by preserving a smooth exterior themselves, or through lax discipline on the part of the church, retain their church membership. Persons pledging themselves in good faith, and never otherwise than true to their engagements, might be deprived of their church membership unjustly; in which case they would retain their union with Christ after having been excluded from the church by His ministers. Persons baptized by heretics were not considered in communion with the church till they had been formally received. Thus union with Christ and church membership were far from being convertible terms in practice, though in theory they went together, and in practice as well as in theory might be lost together. Not one of these questions escaped, and all were keenly probed by, St. Augustine, who saw in the distinction between the church militant and the church triumphant their only

possible solution. His sermons on the two draughts of fishes—one before the passion, the other after the resurrection of our Lord—are beautiful specimens of his manner of handling it in their way (*Serm. de Temp. cclxviii.-liii.*). But it will be noticed that in the church militant he thus includes the synagogue; and by the church triumphant he means the church of all ages—the ideal church—at its completion. The parable of "the tares and the wheat" (St. Matt. xiii. 24-30), the "great house," with its vessels of wood and earth, as well as silver and gold (2 Tim. ii. 20), are constant topics with him in his controversies with the Donatists (e. g. *De Bapt. c. Don. iv. 8-14*); and with St. Cyprian in arguing against Novatian (*Ep. li. and lii. ed. Ben.*). Membership with the church militant was declared by both to be quite compatible with exclusion from the church triumphant. Grace given in this life was at all times liable to be withdrawn. Or, again, as St. Jerome says, "Ecclesias vocat, quas postea errore arguat depravatas. Ex quo noscendam dupliciter ecclesiam posse dici; et eam quae non habeat maculam aut rugam, et verè corpus Christi sit: et eam quae in Christi nomine absque plenius perfectisque virtutibus congregetur. Quomodo sapientes bifariam nuncupantur: tam hi, qui sunt plenae perfectaeque virtutis, quam illi qui incipiunt et in profectu positi sunt" (In Galat. i. 1, 2). The two first rules of the African divine, Tichonius, are to the point on this head (Migne's *Patrol. xviii. 15-22*), "De Domino et Ejus corpore:" and "De Domini corpore bipartito:" comp. St. Isid. *Etymol. viii. 1*.

After all that has been stated, it is obvious we must not expect to find anything like a precise definition in the fathers of a term whose various aspects overlap and interlace so much as the church. When, for instance, the church is called the body, or spouse, of Christ, what *must* be meant is the ideal church, as the Christian, or church militant, is neither of these strictly or completely. When Rufinus, on the other hand, explains the one holy church as being that in which one faith and one baptism is maintained, and one God the Father, one Lord Jesus Christ His Son, and one Holy Ghost believed on: this is not a full description, even of the Christian church, and of course cannot be received in a sense that would exclude the ideal. When our Lord speaks of His church as "*the* (never *a*) kingdom," He adds, in general, and always means "of God" or "heaven:" in other words, "not of this world," still less confined to one period. It would, of course, be possible to construct a definition out of the writings of the fathers that should fit the Christian church militant exclusively; but then it should be stated avowedly that it was the Christian church and not the church in general which was so defined; as when St. Isidore says: "Inchoavit ecclesia a loco, ubi venit de coelo Spiritus Sanctus, et implevit uno loco sedentes," there can be no doubt of his meaning the Christian church alone. Thus it would express their teaching, to describe the Christian church as a state or society founded by Christ and organised by His apostles on earth, to bring men to heaven; whose members, as long as they were true to their engagements, were knit together amongst themselves and joined to Christ their Head, through the sacraments of

His institution, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies and informs it.

But it is not often that they themselves speak even of the church before them in this measured way; for in their day the actual approached the ideal so much more closely than it has ever done since, that they could afford to be enthusiastic over both in the same breath, and yet keep within the literal truth. "What else," says St. Nicetas (on the creed, in Migne's *Patrol.* lii. 871), "is the church but the congregation of all the saints? For, from the beginning of the world, whether patriarchs, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or prophets, or apostles, or martyrs, or all the just men that ever were, or are, or shall be—they form one church because, being sanctified with one faith and conversation, sealed with one Spirit, they are made one body, whose Head is Christ. Nay, I must go further still: even angels, principalities and powers in heavenly places form part of this confederacy called the church. In this one church, then, believe that the communion of saints will be found by you. This is that one catholic church established in all the world, to whose communion you should firmly cleave. There are, doubtless, other counterfeit churches—but you have nothing in common with them . . . believing differently, living differently, as they do, from what Christ enjoined, and the apostles taught. . . .

Such was the dogmatic account of the church given at Aquileia to catechumens in the fifth century; and with this we may close. For the origin, nature, constitution, external growth of the Christian church, for the etymology of the word church, and for authorities on the subject in general, see Append. B to *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; Mareschal's excellent *Concordantia S. Pat. Eccl. Gr. atque Lat.*, though it goes no further than the middle of the third century, faithfully represents the opinions of the fathers on it till then; comp. Kaye's *Eccl. Hist. of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries*, and *Records of the Church*, 1-25 in vols. i. and ii. of the *Tracts for the Times*.

[E. S. Ff.]

CIAN, early Welsh saint, patron of Llangian, a chapel under Llanbedrog in Carnarvonshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 302).

[C. H.]

CIANAN (KENANUS), bishop of Duleek (Damliag); commemorated Nov. 24. From the different accounts we have of St. Cíanan of Duleek, we must infer that there were two of the same name, but at different times, whose histories were mixed up together. Ussher and Colgan consider the one, who was a contemporary of St. Ciaran, as a native of Connaught, going to Gaul, and returning to teach in Connaught and Leinster. (Ussher, *De Brit. Eccl. Prim.* Dubl. 1639, p. 1070 and Ind. Chron. A.D. 450; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 443, n. 11, and *Tr. Thaum.* 8, 182, 217; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.* Ir. i. 342.) But Cíanan of Duleek was rather a native of Kiennacta in Meath, between Dublin and Drogheda: his father was Sedna, son of Trenius or Drona, descended from Cian, son of Oilili Olum. He appears to have been a great favourite with St. Patrick, who ordained him bishop, and presented him with a copy of the Gospels, a most valuable gift at that time. The church of Duleek was also among the first that St. Patrick built in Meath, and had this special pre-eminence that it was built of stone; it is

called the first stone church in Ireland, and to this day perpetuates the name of the "Stone Building," Damliag, of which Duleek is a corruption. (On this and other Damliags, see Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 141 sq.) The *Ann. Tighearnach* give the true date of his death A.D. 490. The *Cal. Cashel* says he wrote a *Life of St. Patrick*, but it is very doubtful, though Colgan, Ussher, and Ware accept it. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 315; Ware, *Ir. Bps.* 137, Harris's ed.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 217; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, xi. 505; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 301; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 123 n.) [J. G.]

CIAR, CIER, CERA, CYRA. The Irish calendars give three dedications to saints of this name—Jan. 5, Feb. 8, Oct. 16; but the first and last probably belong to the same individual. At Jan. 5 is the feast of the birth of St. Ciar or Cera, Virgin, of Kill-Cheire, and at Oct. 16 is that of her death. She was of the race of Conaire, monarch of Ireland, and flourished at Muskerry, in the county of Cork. Her father was Dubreus or Duibhre, but she cannot be the Ciar to whom St. Brendan of Clonfert sent to have a pestilential fire extinguished, as he died towards the end of the 6th century, and she towards the end of the 7th. [BRENDAN (2) of Clonfert.] When her sanctity became known and her disciples were numerous, she went forth with several (aliquot—quinque) virgins, and received from St. Munna or Fintan (Oct. 21) the monastery of Tech-telle in Heli, or Ely O'Carrol in King's County, which he had built and then left to St. Ciar. After remaining there some time she returned to her native province, and founded the nunnery of Kil-cheire, Kilchree (now Kilcrea in the barony of Muskerry and county of Cork), which she governed till her death, A.D. 680. O'Donovan (in *Four Mast.* i. 284) places her monastery at Kilkeary, in the barony of Upper Ormond, and near to Nenagh, in the county of Tipperary, but he does this from relying on Colgan's adapting the story in the *Life of St. Brendan* to the later history of St. Ciar, and thus placing our St. Ciar's monastery in Muscraige-Thire, Tipperary, in place of in Muscraige-Mitine, Cork. If Oct. 16 is the festival of her death, she is called "of Maghascadh," and Colgan says she was buried there. (He has gathered all the traditions known regarding her in *Acta SS.* 14-16. See Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. 129 sq.; Kelly, *Cal. Ir.* SS. 51; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 7; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 62 sq.; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Soc. Ir.* 3rd ser. i. 23.) [J. G.]

CIARAN (KIERAN). Seventeen saints of this name appear in the Irish calendars, but of these only five have much more than the date and place of dedication.

(1) Son of Aedh (*Mart. Doneg.* and *Tallaght*); commemorated Jan. 5. The identity of this person seems hopelessly obscured. Colgan calls him the brother of Finntan Munnu, son of Tulchan, and says he died at Clonenagh, but evidently there is some error. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 482, n. 49; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, 67-8.)

(2) The Pious, of Belach-duin—June 14. He was of the race of Irial, son of Conall Cernach. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 171.)

Little is known of him further than that he wrote *Acts of St. Patrick*, and died A.D. 770, according to the *Four Masters*. Belach-duin was the ancient name of Disert-Chiarain, or Castlekieran, near Kells in Meath (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 374, n. * 375; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 128, c. 69, 167, c. 99, 218, col. 2; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* i. 87.)

CIARAN (3) Abbat of Rathmuighe—Oct. 8. He was abbat of Rath-maighe-Eonaigh, now the church of Rath, in the district of Tir-enna, co. Donegal; he was also abbat of Taghmon, bar. Corkaree, co. Westmeath, and died A.D. 784. He could not have been brother of St. Fintan Munnu (Oct. 21) as some say. (*Mart. Doneg.*; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 383-5.)

(4) Of Saighir, B. C.—March 5. Of this saint Colgan (*Acta SS.* 458-73) gives two Lives, the first taken from a Kilkenny Codex, and the second is "Lectiones officii ejus ex MS. Salmanticensi." In these Lives there is much that is apocryphal and irreconcilable both with history and with the lives themselves; while, in order to give an appearance of harmony, the age of St. Ciaran is extended to three centuries. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Mart. tom. i. 387-97) give a memoir of the two saints, Ciaran or Kiaran, and Carthach the Elder, who are commemorated on the same day. St. Ciaran, "the firstborn of the saints of Ireland," was descended from the chieftains of Ossory (of the posterity of Labhraidh Lorc, who is of the seed of Heremon). His father was Lugneus, and his mother Liadain, of the race of Corcalaidhe, in the south of Munster. The Lives detail his birth while the Irish were yet heathens, an apocryphal journey to Rome, and his baptism there. To be a contemporary of St. Ciaran of Clonmacnoise, St. Ruadhan of Lothra, St. Finnian of Clonard, and others who belonged to the second order of saints in Ireland, he must have flourished in the middle or second half of the 6th century, and could not have been born much before A.D. 500. Lanigan is of opinion that he became a bishop about A.D. 538, that, retiring to a lonely spot in Hele or Ely O'Carrol, he lived as a hermit, and then built the monastery of Saighir, around which a city gradually arose, the monastery giving the name of Seirkieran to the parish where it lay, in the barony of Ballybritt, King's County. He was the founder and first bishop at Ossory, and died there after A.D. 550, but the year is unknown. Some English martyrologists call him Piran, and place him at Padstow in Cornwall, where they say he died. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 63; Ussher, *De Brit. Ecol. Prim.* c. xvi.; Colgan, *ut supra*; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* i. 29 sq., ii. 7, 98; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, iii. 47; Skene, *Four Anc. Books of Wales*, i. 123; Hardy, *Descrip. Cat.* i. 102, 103; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* i. p. cccxvi.; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Soc. Ir.* 4th ser. ii. 277-79.)

(5) Macantsaoir, or son of the carpenter, and abbat of Clonmacnoise—Sept. 9. He is one of the most famous saints of Ireland, and half the monasteries of Ireland are said to have followed his rule. His father was Beoidh or Beoan, and his mother Darerca, daughter of Earcan; his birth took place in Meath, though he was descended from Rudhraighe, king of Ulster. The year of his birth is variously stated from A.D. 507 to 516. He received his baptism and early

education from St. Justus, a disciple of St. Patrick, was under St. Finnian, at Clonard, along with St. Columba, the Brendans, and other Irish saints of the second class, and lived also for some time with St. Neannidus, St. Enna of Inishmore, and St. Senan of Inishcathey, the latter becoming his Annchara or spiritual director. His first foundation was on Aingin, an island in Lough Ree, but his chief one was at Clonmacnoise or the Seven Churches, in the barony of Garrycastle, King's county, on ground given him by his friend king Diarmaid, before he came to the throne. This saint is very largely mixed up with the legendary accounts of the period. Like all the others of his age he is famous for his miracles, and also for his humility and purity. He died of the plague which raged A.D. 549, called the cron-chonail or yellow jaundice; his age was 33 years. He is one of the "Patres priores" in St. Cummin or Cummin's Paschal letter, and his Law or Rule was revered not in Ireland only, but in Scotland, where many churches were dedicated to his memory, on account probably of his friendship with St. Columba, who is said to have written a poem in his praise. In the Scotch calendars he is usually Queranus, and called "abbat in Scotland." (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 265-6, 709, and *Tr. Thaum.* 91, 132, 472; Ussher, *De Brit. Ecol. Prim.* c. xvii.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* i. 31, 468, ii. 50 sq.; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 24, 263, and *Ecol. Ant.* 298; *Four Masters*, by O'Donov. i. 180-82, n. * 391; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* i. pp. cccv-v., ii. 89, 335, iii. 120; *Mart. Doneg.*, by Todd and Reeves, 163; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 435-6; Wilson, *Preh. Ann. Scot.* 483; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Soc. Ir.* 3 ser. 133; O'Conor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 132; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 116.) [J. G.]

CIBAR (Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Sanct. Bened.* i. 252, ed. Venet. 1733, margin), recluse. [CYBAR.] [C. H.]

CIER. [CIAR.]

CILIAN (KILIAN), martyr in Franconia; commemorated July 8. Of the birth or youth of St. Cilian, the apostle and martyr of Franconia, history and tradition say nothing beyond the one fact that he belonged to Ireland. With twelve companions, of whom the two most famous were Coloman, Colman, or Colonatus, a priest, and Totnan, a deacon, he left Ireland, and established a mission at Würzburg. He is said to have gone to Rome to obtain the papal sanction, but this is disputed. Duke Gozbert received him kindly, and was converted, but St. Cilian fell a victim to the hatred of Geilana, whose marriage with Gozbert was contrary to Christian morality. He and his companions, in the absence of the duke, were cruelly murdered, A.D. 689, and their relics translated by Burchard, bishop of Würzburg, in the middle of the following century. He was probably a priest when he left Ireland, and made bishop in Germany about A.D. 687. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 328 sq.) gives the Translation of St. Kilian the martyr and his companions, from Notker, Egilward, and others. Canisius (*Lect. Antiq.* iii. 175-182, ed. Basnage) has two memoirs. The first and longer one, by an anonymous author, is given in Messingham (*Flor. Sanct. Hib.* 318 sq.), with a fragment of a Chronicon of Thadeus, abbat of the Scots at

Ratisbon, and extracts from the annotations of Serarius on the Life of St. Cilian. The shorter life is given in *Acta Benedict.* saec. 2, p. 991. (See also Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* Ir. iii. 115 sq.; Ussher, *De Brit. Ecol. Prim.* c. xvi., and Jud. Ch. A.D. 687, 689; Neander, *Gen. Ch. Hist.* v. 47; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, vii. 104; Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 73; Fordun, *Scotichr.* iii. c. 44; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 214, iv. 50, 190; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* Dubl. 1704, p. 12.) [J. G.]

CILINIA, ST., a matron, connected with Rheims. She was the mother of St. Remigius, archbishop of Rheims, and apostle of France, but very little is known of her history except the few facts which have been transmitted to us by the biographers of her son. She was of noble birth, the wife of Aemilius, the mother of two saints, Principius and Remigius, and the grandmother of a third, St. Lupus.

Remigius was born about A.D. 436, ordained bishop about 458, and died Jan. 1, about 532; it seems likely that in the year 436 Cilinia must have been of mature age, and was probably born about the year 400. Huchaldus, a monk who died about the year 950, at the age of ninety, celebrated her in verse. The verses have never been found, and it is supposed that he derived all his information from the life of Remigius.

She is commemorated on Oct. 21.

She lived and died in Laurinacum, or Lubrinacum (probably Cerniacum Le Laonnois), where Remigius buried her. Her body was translated to the church of St. Remigius, Rheims, but it is uncertain when. There it was preserved in a very magnificent shrine. She is said to have been forewarned by an angel of the conception of her son, whom she presented to the Lord in his infancy, carefully bringing him up in His service, and making her own life an example worthy of the mother of so great a saint. (*AA. SS.* Oct. ix. pp. 318-322; Fortunat. Pictav. *Vita Remegii*, i., *Patrol.* Lat. lxxxviii. p. 527; Floardus, *Hist. Ecol. Rem.* lib. i. cap. 10; *Patrol.* Lat. cxxxv. p. 43.) [D. R. J.]

(2) virgin, celebrated at Meaux. The Bollandists say that although the cultus of this saint is very ancient, her name is not found in any of the earlier martyrologies. The first authority is Usuard, the later ones are Galesinius, Du Saussay, Arturus, Castellarus, Cardinal de Noailles' *Paris Martyrology*, and some of the calendars of particular churches. In a metrical life of St. Blandinus, an anchorite of Bruges, written by Fulcoius, a subdeacon (native of Beauvais and Meaux), in the 11th century, she is said to have been a native of Meaux, or the neighbourhood:—

"Meldis, sanctorum mater foecunda virorum,
Walberti Just, sacri necnon Canoaldi,
Faronis, Farae quae Christum novit amare,
Pro quo terrenum sponsum facit haec alienum,
Meldis Celiniam, vita cum celebe diem,
Hostibus austerum Meldis tulit et Rigomerum."

Baillet says that she lived in the 5th and 6th centuries; Du Plessis, about 470; Godescard, at the end of the 5th century, but the exact date is very uncertain. It is however certain that she lived in the time of St. Genovefa, the patron saint of Paris, who died at the age of more than eighty, about 509-512. It is probable that she took the veil while Childericus,

the son of Meroveus, reigned over France, 465-481. The following is the legend, included, in 1640, in the breviary of Meaux. At an early age she was espoused, but having made up her mind to remain in a state of maidenhood she was received by St. Genovefa, who lived at Meaux. When Cilinia's lover heard of her having taken the veil, he pursued her to that town, but St. Genovefa concealed her in the church, where of her own free will she remained for a long time, living in the baptisterium.*

Cilinia sought investment from Genovefa, not from a priest or bishop. Although there was one profession of the religious life public, and another private, both were equally binding. The double rites are still in use among the Greeks—"officium parvi habitus et officium magni et angelici habitus."

A virgin, man or woman, might have professed herself or herself by simply laying on himself his own hands. This use continued in the Latin church till the end of the 11th century.

The church in which Cilinia took refuge with Genovefa from her enraged lover was probably the cathedral situate near the amphitheatre. Meaux, which is now on the right bank of the Marne, was formerly on the left.

Over the sepulchre of Cilinia arose in time a monastery, which in the 9th century contained more than sixty monks, wearing a white habit, but following the rule of St. Benedict.

In 868 a synod was held there. Cilinia is commemorated on Oct. 21 (*AA. SS.* Oct. ix. pp. 306-309; Migne, *Encyclopédie Théologique*, tom. xl.; *Gallia Christiana*, viii. p. 1675). [D. R. J.]

CILLA, CILLE (CISSA), niece of Cyssa a regulus of Wessex in the reign of Centwine (A.D. 676-685), and sister of Heane the founder or co-founder of the monastery at Abingdon. Out of her patrimonial estate she erected (about A.D. 690) a nunnery, which she named after the Holy Cross and St. Helena, at Helnestow or Helenstow, near the Thames, in Berkshire, a spot sometimes confused, as Tanner remarks, with Elnstow in Bedfordshire. Cilla presided over her foundation until her death, after which the community removed higher up the Thames to Witteham or Witham, where it remained until the wars between Offa king of Mercia and Cynewulf king of Wessex, when it dispersed. An account of Cilla is given in a Cottonian MS., which has been printed by Dugdale (*Monast. Anglie.* i. 511 sq.), and in the appendix of the *Abingdon Chronicle* mentioned below. In these editions she is called Cissa as well as Cilla. Camden (ed. Gough, i. 148),

* Genovefa had come to Meaux probably because she had property in the neighbourhood. At Meaux the nuns did not all live in community, but many of them lived in their own or their parents' houses. There were four orders of nuns:—1. Those belonging to the first or lowest order wore no religious habit. 2. Those belonging to the second order assumed the tunica, pulla, and pallium, with the veil, privately. 3. Those of the third order, at the Feast of the Epiphany, at Easter, or on festivals of the apostles, were publicly invested by the bishop amidst the solemnities of the mass; they were to live at home, however, like the first two orders. 4. Those of the fourth order were solemnly professed like the third, but spent their life in the monastery.

There was no time of probation (temporis medium) between the change of habit and profession.

quoting "an ancient MS." not otherwise specified, calls her "Cilla, sister of king Ceadwalla." (*Monast. Anglic.* i. 505, note; Tanner, *Notitia*, Berks, xi.; *Chron. Monast. de Abingd.* ed. Stevenson, *App.* ii. 268 sq.; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57.)

[C. H.]

CILLEN, CILLIAN, CILLIN, KILLINUS, KILLIANUS. This name in its various forms occurs frequently in the calendars of Ireland: whether its initials be C, K, or Q, the name is the same, and derived from Cill, a cell. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 331, n. 3) has some judicious remarks upon the etymology and form of the word, and gives a long list of saints bearing the name as they stand in the calendars.

(1) Son of Lubné—April 14. O'Clery, in his Irish Calendar, thinks that this may be the Cillén, son of Lubné, abbat of Birr, who was contemporary with St. Adamnan. But Colgan (*Acta SS.* 473, c. 4) enumerates him among the prelates of Saighir, where he was abbat, and attended the synod at Armagh, which was summoned by Flann, Febhla, and St. Adamnan. Colgan gives his date as A.D. 695 (Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 140 sq.).

(2) Cillene Droicteach—July 3. He succeeded Cillene Foda in the abbacy of Iona in A.D. 726, as fourteenth abbat, and ruled for twenty-six years. He was called Droicteach or the Bridgemaker, but for what special reason we are not informed. He was of the race of Conall Cremthann, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, and therefore belonged to the southern Hy-Neill. In the Irish *Annals* he is generally called anchoret, and in the *Martyrologies* abbat of Hy or Hy-Columcille. Of his rule there we have no special account beyond the tradition of his carrying to Ireland many relics collected by St. Adamnan. If Cillen continued anchoret, while abbat, the active duties of his abbacy may have been discharged by Fedhlimidh, who had been coadjutor to the preceding abbat. Cillen died A.D. 752. (Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 166, 192; Grub, *Ecccl. Hist. Scott.* i. 119 sq.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 185; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 301.)

(3) Cillene Foda—April 19. This was the thirteenth abbat of Iona, and he succeeded Faelcu A.D. 724. He was called Foda or Fada, the Tall, to distinguish him from his successor Cillene Droicteach, but his pedigree is unknown. His festival is on April 14 or 19. He died A.D. 726. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 382; Grub, *Ecccl. Hist. Scott.* i. 119; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 166.)

(4) Cillin, bishop of Techtalain—May 27. When St. Patrick came to the region of Ui-Meithire in Ulster he is said to have built a church at Teagh-talain and given it in charge to bishop Killenus. The festival of St. Killen is still kept at Tehallan in the barony and county of Monaghan, whether Evinus is right or not in connecting him with St. Patrick. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 150 c. 9, 184 nn. 16-18; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 266 sq.)

(5) Cillin Ua Colla, abbat of Fathain-mura—Jan. 3. He succeeded St. Kellach as abbat of Fathain-mura, Athain, Fathain, or Othain, now Fahan, near Lough Swilly, in the barony of Inishowen and co. Donegal. He died about A.D. 724. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 7; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 57.) [J. G.]

CINAC (*Annal. Camb.* ad an. 606, M. H. B. 831), bishop. [CYNOC.] [C. H.]

CINEBERT, -BERHT (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 178; Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 160, 389), bishop of Winchester. [CYNEBERT.] [C. H.]

CINEGELS (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 505, 506); **CINEGILS** (Ethelw. *ibid.*); **CINEGISLUS** (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, vol. i. 45), king of the West Saxons. [CYNEGILS.] [C. H.]

CINEHARD (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 784 M. H. B. 545), etheling. [CYNHEARD.] [C. H.]

CINEHARDUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ed. Thorpe, vol. i. 56; Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 160), bishop of Winchester. [CYNHEARD.] [C. H.]

CINEUULFUS (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 507), etheling. [CYNWULF.] [C. H.]

CINEWLF (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 267), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNWULF.] [C. H.]

CINGISLUS (*Mon. Angl.* i. 2), abbat of Glastonbury. [CENGILLUS.] [C. H.]

CINIGELS (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* M. H. B. 505, 506), king of the West Saxons. [CYNEGILS.] [C. H.]

CINNA, CINNE, CINNIA, virgin; commemorated Feb. 1. *Mart. Tallaght* calls her a priest. She was daughter of Eochaidh, prince of the Oirghiallail (Oriël), son of Crimthann, of the house of Colla Dachrioch. At the time when St. Patrick began to preach in the region of the Hy-Neill, Eochaidh was ruling at Clogher in Tyrone, and anxious that Cinna should marry Corbmae, son of Carbreus, son of Neill the Great, king of Ireland; but she persistently refused, and at last was allowed to follow out her own desire and be with St. Patrick, who gave her the veil of chastity about A.D. 480, and committed her to the care of Cethuberis [CETHUBERIS] in the monastery of Drumduchan, where she remained till death. (For the life of Cinna or Kinnia, see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 234-5, and *Tr. Thaum.* 83, c. 79, 150, c. 7; Bollandists, *Acta SS.* Feb. tom. i. 96-7; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, ii. 228-34.) Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 127, identifies her with Cinnenum and Richella, reputed sisters of St. Patrick. [J. G.]

CINNAUC (*Annal. Camb.* ad an. 606, ed. Williams), bishop. [CYNOC.] [C. H.]

CINTHILA, a king of the Goths, brother and successor of king Sisenand, who assisted at the fifth council of Toledo, the decrees of which he confirmed. Isidore of Seville calls him Cinthila, and says he reigned three years, nine months and nine days. The *Codex Regioaticanus* adds that he held many synods at Toledo with his bishops, and strengthened his kingdom in the faith; and that he died at Toledo in the time of the emperor Heraclius. The acts of the fifth and sixth councils of Toledo, held under king Cinthila, are given at length in Migne's *Patrology* in the writings ascribed to Isidore of Seville, with an account of the unsettled controversy which has raged about them. That council was held in the first year of his reign (636). Eugene, archbishop of the city and metropolitan of the province of Carthage, subscribed as president, and after him twenty-one bishops with two absent deputies. The canons which they made at the council were intended for the benefit of Cinthila and his race. The punishment of excommunication was threatened against any of the Gothic nobility who might aspire to the throne

to the prejudice of the king or his heirs. They recommend the execution of the decrees of the preceding council, which is called "great and universal;" and they ordain that it shall be in the power of the king to grant pardon (*faire grâce*) to those who shall be found guilty of faults enumerated below, provided they correct them.

The edict of king Cinthila, confirmative of all those canons, is dated on the last day of June, 636. On the 9th of January, 638, the same prince convoked the sixth council of Toledo, at which nineteen canons were made. They commence with a profession of faith, in which forty-seven bishops and five absent deputies, Silva, bishop of Narbonne, being at the head, acknowledge the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. (Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 919, 920; *Concilia*, tom. v. pp. 1735, 1740; Isidor. *Hispal.* opp. t. vii. 186, and *Collectio Canonum*, lib. l. and li., Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1113, and lxxxiv. 390, 394.)

[D. R. J.]

CINVESE (Bed. *H. E.* iii. 24, tr. Giles), queen of Mercia. [CYNWISE.] [C. H.]

CIOLSTAN, presbyter, attests a charter of Ethelheard, archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 805. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 189; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 555.) [C. H.]

CIRCUITORES, synonymous with CIRCUMCELLIONES. [DONATISTS.]

CIRCUMCELLIONES. [DONATISTS.]

CISSA (1), (CYSSA, CYSSÉ), a regulus in the reign of Cwintine king of the West Saxons (A.D. 676-685), having authority over what is now Wiltshire and the greatest part of Berkshire. He was a benefactor of Abingdon monastery, founded by his nephew Heane, and there he was buried. Cilla, the foundress of Helenstow, was his niece. Higden (*Polychron.* Gale, xv. Scriptt. 238) calls him father of king Ina and founder of the Abingdon monastery. There is an account of him in a Cotton MS. printed in the *Monast. Anglic.* (i. 511 sq., where he is called Cyssa and Cysse, the niece being Cissa), and also in the appendix of Stevenson's *Abingdon Chronicle* cited below, where he is Cyssa and Cysse, while the niece is Cilla. (*Mon. Angl.* i. 505; *Chron. Monast. de Abing.* vol. i. 39, vol. ii. 268 sq.; Tanner, *Notit. Berks.* i. ed. Nasmith; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Brit.* bk. xvii. c. 12; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 81.) [C. H.]

(2) Anchorer at Croyland in the earlier part of the 8th century. It shews how paganism still lingered in high quarters, that at this late period in the establishment of Christianity Cissa, a man of high rank and position (Ingulph), had long lived in the practice of heathen rites before he was baptized "in Britannia" (Flor. Wig.). The new convert and three others, Bettelin, Egbert, and Tatwine, the last being conductor and pilot of the party, penetrating through the marshes, arrived at the island abode of Guthlac, under whom they desired to live, for the benefit of his instruction and example. Their wish was granted, and there they resided until Guthlac died. The monastery of Croyland arose above the hermit's tomb, but Cissa and his party, by permission of abbat Kenulf, ended their days in separate cells near the simple oratory of their old master. Cissa

is the only one of the four named by Florence, who gives him the honour of being Guthlac's successor (Ingulph, *Hist.*, Gale, Scriptt. 4; Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 714; *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 90).

[C. H.]

CITTINUS. Numidian bishop addressed in *Cyp. Ep.* 70 (Syn. Carth. Bapt. Haer. 1).

[E. W. B.]

CIWA, early Welsh saint, patron of Llangiwa in Monmouthshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307).

[C. H.]

CIWIG, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Llangiwg, otherwise Llanguke, in Glamorgan-shire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307).

[C. H.]

CLAIR, SS. [CLARUS.]

CLAIRENECH, CLAREINECH. This is a word which sometimes stands by itself as a proper name, but it is more frequently used as descriptive of an individual: in the former use it occurs in the calendars at Jan. 17, as Clairenech of Druim-bidhg, and at June 6 as Clairenech of Cluaincaein; and in the latter form we have Berchan (Oct. 12) who is also called Mobhi Clairenech, or the "flat faced" [BERCHAN (4)]. (For the origin of the name see Reeves, *Adamnan*, lxxii.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 354; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 76.) [J. G.]

CLAPHIUS (or ELAPHIUS). A letter exists addressed to him about A.D. 477, from Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont in the 5th century. Sidonius promises to go to Rouergue to dedicate a church which Claphius had built; and expresses a great desire to see him some day bishop of it, when God should have appeased the persecution of the Visigoths. (*Letters of Sidonius Apoll.* book iv. § 109, *Patrol. Lat.* lviii. 520; Ceillier, x. 388.) [W. M. S.]

CLARENTIUS, ST., bishop, Vienne, lived in the early part of the 7th century (ante ann. 625), and is commemorated on his birthday, the 25th April. He presided over the church of Vienne, in the reign of Dagobert, being next in order and merit to St. Aetherius. In the catalogue of the saints he is mentioned as "St. Clarentius sub Constantino Imperatore, et Dagoberto rege." In the martyrology of Vienne he is mentioned as confessor and 31st archbishop of that diocese, in the time of Constantine the Great, and as having appointed St. Clarus abbat of the monastery of St. Marcellus, at Vienne. At that time St. Martin was pope of Rome (*AA. SS.* Apr. iii. p. 373). [D. R. J.]

CLARUS (1) Bishop of Ptolemais, attended the synod convened at Caesarea, in the year 198, by the metropolitans Theophilus and Narcissus of Jerusalem, with the view of settling the paschal controversy (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 25). [E. V.]

(2) Bishop of Mascula in Numidia, halfway between Theveste and Lambaese, a see of whose bishops several were prominent in councils of the first six centuries, and the town of the martyr Archimimus (see Morcelli), 79th Suffr. in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

(3) Apostle of Aquitaine, a martyr, or as some writers say, a bishop and martyr, who came from Africa to Rome, and was sent thence by pope Anacleto, in the 1st century, as a missionary, to Aquitaine. He preached the gospel in Limousin, Périgord, and the Albigeois. He

was martyred at Lectoure in Gascony, and buried in the same place, but his relics were subsequently translated by Carolus M. to Bordeaux. He is commemorated on the 1st of June (Migne, *Encycl. Théol.* xl. p. 610).

CLARUS (4), ST. First bishop of Alby, and martyr, flourished in the 3rd century. After being honoured with a great number of conversions he died for the faith. He is commemorated at Alby on July 1 (Migne, *Encycl. Théol.* xl. p. 610).

(5) Bishop of Nantes, apostle of Brittany. There has been much dispute about the age in which this saint lived. There can, however, be little doubt that he was the first missionary sent into Brittany, and the first bishop of Nantes. The Bretons have always maintained (and in this opinion they are supported by many early biographers of the saints) that St. Clarus was sent into Brittany by St. Linus, bishop of Rome, if not by his immediate predecessor, the apostle St. Peter himself. The various traditions respecting this saint may be briefly summarised as follows:—

1. That St. Clarus associated with the apostles, or at least with two of them, SS. Peter and Paul.

2. That he was sent into Gaul by St. Peter, when that apostle was bishop of Rome.

3. That he was sent into Gaul by St. Linus, the successor of St. Peter, that he brought with him the nail which fastened the right hand of St. Peter to the cross, and had, as his companion, Deodatus the deacon.

4. That he was sent by St. Gatianus the first bishop of Tours.

5. That he was sent by the Roman pontiff into Brittany at the same time as St. Gatianus was sent to Tours, A.D. 280.

6. That he took up his abode at Nantes, and there built the church of SS. Peter and Paul, in which he deposited the sacred nail as a relic of the great apostle.

After the death of St. Clarus his own head and pastoral ring were added as relics in the same church, and many miracles were attributed to them; but his body was translated to the church of St. Albinus, in Angers (Andegavum), in the 8th century.

Argentæus, in *Britanniae Minoris Hist.*, Sammarthani fratres, in *Gallia Christiana*, and others, give the following succession of bishops of Nantes:—

St. Clarus;

St. Ennius;

St. Similinus or Similianus.

If this catalogue be right St. Clarus could hardly have lived in the 1st century, for as St. Similianus died in the 4th century, that would leave a space of nearly 200 years between him and St. Clarus, with only St. Ennius between them, which is improbable.

He probably lived in the 3rd century, or the beginning of the 4th. He is commemorated on the 10th October (*AA. SS.* Oct. v. pp. 61–66; Migne, *Encycl. Théolog.* xl. p. 610). It is unfortunate that Gregory of Tours says nothing about him. [D. R. J.]

(6) Presbyter, of Touraine, was born at Auvergne in the middle of the 4th century, and was a disciple of St. Martin, who had been brought up in the monastery of Marmoutier, and ordained him priest. He was of a rich and noble family. He died some days after that bishop,

whose counsels and example he had always followed. Sulpicius Severus, his friend and companion in the monastery of St. Martin, greatly praises him. He is commemorated on the 8th of November.

An account of his life, his virtues, and his prudence is given by Sulpicius Severus (*De Vita B. Martini*, cap. 23; *Patrol. Lat.* xx. 173). Severus buried his body in his own private chapel (Appendix ad Paulin. Nolan. 899, *Patrol. Lat.* lxi.). Paulinus of Nola mentions him in some of his letters, and in a letter to Severus, his friend, sends two poetical epitaphs for his tomb (Paulin. Nolan. *Epist.* 171, 199, 200; *Patrol. Lat.* lxi.).

CLARUS (7), ST., of Loudun, where he is honoured as a martyr. He flourished probably in the 4th century. His day is August 8 (Migne, *Encycl. Théolog.* xl. 610).

(8) Presbyter and abbat, Vienne. In the life of this saint, as given by the Bollandists, he is said to have lived in the time of St. Cadoldus, bishop of Vienne, who was alive in 696; but St. Clarentius, the bishop by whom St. Clarus was made abbat of the monastery of St. Marcellus, lived in the early part of the 7th century (ante ann. 625); therefore St. Clarus must either have died before St. Cadoldus, or lived through the whole of the 7th century, as he must have been at least 25 before he was made abbat. At that time Vienne contained a large number of religious houses, of which the following were the chief:—

1. The Coenobia Grinianensium, founded by the bishops of the diocese, and in the largest of which were the bones of the martyr St. Ferreolus.

2. The monastery of St. Columba, containing 30 monks.

3. St. Peter's, on the south side of the city, numbering about 500 monks.

4. The monastery of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, 50 monks.

5. St. John the Baptist's, 50.

6. Monastery of St. Marcellus, 30.

7. St. Blandinus's home for poor widows, 25.

8. St. Andrew's, within the city, 100.

9. St. Andrew's (another), 100.

10. The monastery of St. Nicetius, bishop, Vienne, 40.

11. St. Martin's coenobium, 150.

12. SS. Martyrs' Clergy House, many.

13. St. Severus's Clergy House, many.

Holy from a child, St. Clarus appears to have had that name bestowed upon him because he was bright in the gifts of divine grace. His widowed mother, who lived in a village called Bellicampus, was accustomed to repair to the shrines of the martyred saints, in and around Vienne, for prayers, and on those occasions she took her child with her. One day they had to cross the Rhone to visit the bones of the martyr St. Ferreolus, and when they were returning late in the evening a storm suddenly arose in the river, and placed their ship in great danger. The sailors were in despair, and all on board were in expectation of being submerged, when the boy Clarus stretched out his hands towards the church of St. Ferreolus and prayed thus:—"God, for whose name the martyr Ferreolus died, come to our aid in this danger." Whereupon the Rhone became calm, and the ship got

safe to shore. Admiring the faith of the boy, those saved from danger returned thanks to God.

At an early age he was placed by his mother (who had taken him from his infancy to the neighbouring churches and religious houses) under the care of the monks of St. Ferreolus, while she herself entered the convent of St. Blandina. He was afterwards made abbat of the monastery of St. Marcellus by the bishop of Vienne. He died about 660 in the church of St. Blandina, where he was buried. His bones were scattered in the 16th century by the Huguenots.

He is commemorated on the 1st January (A.A. SS. Jan. i. p. 55; Migne, *Encycl. Théolog. xl.* p. 611).

The St. Clarus to whom a town is dedicated in Normandy, which became celebrated through the treaty which ceded Neustria to Rollo, and which gave its name to a Norman family, is a personage of the 9th century, a native of Rochester, who settled in Vexin, in the diocese of Rouen.

[D. R. J.]

CLAUDE, a churchman raised to the presbyterate by St. Rémi, on the recommendation of Clovis, a short time before the death of that king. He fell into a sin which, however, did not appear to St. Rémi sufficiently grave to merit deposition, so the merciful saint contented himself with reconciling the offender to the church by penitence. Three bishops of Gaul, Héraclé, bishop of Paris, Theodosius of Auxerre, and Leo of Sens, disapproved of his conduct, said that it was contrary to the holy canons, and wrote a common letter to St. Rémi, in which they complained of his leniency towards Claude. The saint, in order to justify his conduct, wrote a letter in reply, in which he said that he for whom they manifested such contempt had been ordained priest by him not from any interested motive, but at the request and on the recommendation of a great king, who deserved their respect, as he was the preacher and defender of the catholic faith in his kingdom; that in saying that that prince had induced him to raise Claude to the presbyterate contrary to the canons, they arrogated to themselves the authority of the sovereign-pontiff; as they virtually condemned the conduct of the master of the peoples, and the father of the country, and the vanquisher of nations; that with regard to the sacrilege of which Claude was accused, he had begged them to be satisfied with the fact that he had expiated his fault by penitence: that in that he had only followed the rules prescribed in the Scriptures, where we read that penitence delivered the Ninevites from the ruin with which they were threatened; that the holy Precursor warned the peoples to efface their sins by fruits meet for penitence; that St. John, in the Apocalypse, exhorted the churches of Asia to reform by penitence what evil they had done in the administration of the churches. "But," he adds, "it appears to me from your letter, that you are apprehensive lest this priest should be converted and live, although you cannot ignore what the Lord has said: *I do not wish the death of the sinner, but rather that he may be converted and live.* Is it not more expedient to follow the will of the Lord than to forsake it? He has not appointed us to domineer haughtily over the people, but to guide them with mildness, and

rather to edify the faithful than to make them feel the effects of a zeal too violent and too bitter." He complains because the three bishops wished to make him responsible for some goods which a certain Celsus had confided to Claude, and even for the very person of Celsus, who had disappeared. "You only ask of me things which are impossible," he continues, "to have an excuse to treat me with indignity; and you carry your insult even so far as to reproach me with my age, because I have been bishop fifty-three years." (Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 80, 81; Remig. Rem. *Epist.* iii., *Patrol. Lat.* lv. p. 965.) [D. R. J.]

CLAUDIA. Sister of Sulpicius Severus, who was a disciple of St. Martin, and presbyter in Aquitaine; he flourished about A.D. 420. They were of an illustrious family. Gennadius mentions a great number of letters from Sulpicius Severus to his sister, in which he exhorts her to love God and despise the world. Two of these remain. In the first, he says he has shed tears of joy at her letters, which shew that she is following the principles of God our Saviour. It contains devout exhortations against the flesh, the age, worldliness, and fear of ridicule, and encourages a missionary spirit. The second letter has been attributed to Athanasius and Jerome. It contains general direction on the virgin state. It attributes the Apocalypse to St. John the Apostle. Virgins are spoken of as the brides of Jesus Christ. (Gennadius, *de Script. Eccles.* cap. xix.; Baluze, tom. i. *Miscellan.* Paris, 1678, p. 32; Ceillier, viii. 119.) [W. M. S.]

CLAUDIANISTS, a sect of Donatists. It was one of the charges against the Donatist bishop Primianus that he murdered in the basilica those of his presbyters who objected to his admitting Claudianists to communion. The acts are quoted in the 20th section of Augustine's second Sermon on Psalm 36 (Migne, iv. 379). He alludes to the fact again, and defends by the analogy of this name the formation of the title Donatist itself (*contra Cresconium*, iv. ch. ix. § 11; *ibid.* ix. 555). We learn from Optatus (*adv. Parmenian.* lib. ii.) that Claudianus was the name of the bishop or pastor of the little Donatist congregation in Rome [MONTENSES] in his time, c. A.D. 370 (*ibid.* 805). [E. B. B.]

CLAUDIANUS (1) Martyred with Papias and Diodorus in the Decian persecution. There are three different versions of their acts. On Feb. 4, in the *Menology*, we read that "they were of Attalia in Pamphylia, that they fed different kinds of cattle in their own country, but were Christians all the same, and taught the Greeks about Christ, and converted many unto Him." It is not quite clear whether this means that they were literally herdsmen, and, in spite of their humble calling, were active in making converts, or that they were pastors of various tribes that lived side by side, and were one in their Christian faith. But the simpler meaning is almost certainly the right one. "They were accused and taken before Publius, ruler of Pamphylia, and when questioned, they confessed freely the name of Christ our true God, and taught that it is He that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that is therein, and beside Him there is no other God." These strong confessions of the deity of Christ seem to be characteristic of the Decian per-

secution. "The governor heard, and was angry, and punished them severely; but as he did not persuade them to deny Christ, he beheaded them, and they received honourable burial of the Christians, to the glory of Christ our God." On the 31st of January they are joined to Victor and others, who were pounded to death under Tertius at Corinth in the same persecution, and a Serapion is joined with them, who can hardly be the same as the Serapion mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. vi. 41, 44), though the third version of the acts, that given by Assemani (*Acta Mart. Or. et Occ.* ii. 60), after their confession at Corinth under Tertius and Decius relegates them all, Victor, Victorinus, and Nicephorus included, to Diospolis in Egypt, where they are put to death, in the same manner as is related in the second version of the acts, by Sabinus under Numerian, i.e. as usual Valerian (CHRYSAETHUS). Victor, Victorinus, and Nicephorus were pounded to death in a mortar. Claudianus had his feet and hands cut off, and was hung up to bleed to death. Diodorus was burnt; Serapion [hung head downwards] and his head cut off; young Papias thrown into the sea [with his feet and hands cut off]. The details in brackets are not given in Assemani, where yet the acts are in a later and more rhetorical form. In the Roman martyrology they are commemorated Feb. 25 (Ceillier, vol. ii. p. 464). [E. B. B.]

CLAUDIANUS (2) Presbyter of Rome among the representatives of Sylvester at Arles, A.D. 314 (*Conc.* i. 1429). [E. B. B.]

(3) A friend of Chrysostom, to whom he wrote from Cucusus remonstrating with him on his silence, and desiring him to write without delay if he wished to retain his place in his affection (Chrysost. *Epist.* 195). [E. V.]

(4) The law concerning CHRONOPIUS of the year 369 is addressed to Claudianus, P.V. As the praefectus urbis of that year was Olybrius, Gothofredus conjectures either that there is an error as to the praefect's name or that the year should be 374, when Claudius held the office, or else that we should read Claudius proconsul of Africa; for a Claudius held that office in 369. We know from other sources of a Gallic but not of an African Chronopius. (*Cod. Theod.* iv. 307.) [G. S.]

(5) (Κλαυδιανός), the reputed author of seven epigrams in the Greek Anthology, two of which, ascribed to him in the Vatican MS., are addressed to the Saviour. He is thus to be distinguished from the celebrated Latin poet of the same name, who was unquestionably a pagan (Augustin, *De Civ. Dei*, i. 5, c. 26; Orosius, l. 7, c. 35). He may be the poet whom Evagrius (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 19) mentions as flourishing in the time of Theodosius II. (A.D. 408-450). According to the scholia in the Vatican MS. he wrote poems on the history of certain cities of Asia Minor and Syria (Tarsus, Anazarbus, Berytus, Nicaea), whence it has been inferred that he was a native of that part of Asia (Jacobs, *Anth. Graec.* xiii. p. 872). [E. M. Y.]

CLAUDIANUS ECDIDIUS MAMERTUS. [MAMERTUS.]

CLAUDIUS (1), A.D. 41-54. The reign of this emperor has the special interest of being that to which we must refer the earliest distinct traces

of the *origines* of the church of Rome. In some way or other, even before his accession, the new faith may have found its way there. The "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes" (Acts ii. 10) who were at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost may have returned with the strange tidings of the things they had seen and heard. Some of the "synagogue of the Libertines" (Acts vi. 9) may have yielded to the arguments of Stephen, and brought to the imperial city the new phase of the truth which he preached. "Andronicus and Junia or Junias," who were "in Christ" before the conversion of St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 7), and were at Rome when that apostle wrote to the church there, may have been among those earlier converts. When Herod Antipas and Herodias came to court the favour of Caligula (Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 7), and gain for the former the title of king, they must have had some in their train who had known—perhaps those who had reported to him (Matt. xiv. 1, 2)—the "mighty works" of the prophet of Nazareth. The frequent visits of Herod Agrippa must have tended to make what was passing in Judaea one of the topics of the day at Rome. His presence there when Claudius came to the throne (Joseph. *Antiq.* xix. 4, 5) may reasonably be connected with the indulgence extended to the Jews by that emperor on his accession (Joseph. *Antiq.* xix. 5).

The decree mentioned in Acts xviii. 2, and by Suetonius (*Claudius*, c. 25), indicates a change of policy, and the account given by the latter historian, according to a probable explanation, tells us what caused the change, "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Romæ expulsi." He does not give the date of the expulsion, but it may be fixed with some probability between A.D. 43, when Agrippa left Rome, and A.D. 51, when St. Paul arrived at Corinth, and when the decree is mentioned as recent. The point on which the explanation turns is the significance to be given to the words "impulsore Chresto." We know from Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 3) that the word "Christianus" was commonly pronounced "Chrestianus" by those who were not members of the church, and they were ignorant of its derivation ("perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis, nam nec nominis certa est notitia apud vos"), and that this continued for a long time to be the case with the name of *Christ* we learn from Lactantius ("immutatâ literâ Chrestum solent dicere," *Ver. Sap.* iv. 7). It seems legitimate with these data to assume that the preaching of the new faith that "Jesus was the Christ" had had the same effect among the Jews at Rome as it had at Thessalonica or Corinth, some believing, others reviling, that the two parties came into actual collision, and that the name of the Christ had been banded to and fro between them in vehement assertion or loud revilings; that the prefects and the Roman population generally, ignorant of its true significance, took for granted that this was the name of some local ringleader in a seditious riot. The absence

* Dio Cassius (lx. p. 669) speaks of Claudius as not expelling the Jews, but only forbidding them to assemble. Probably this was an earlier measure of police, and was not found sufficiently effective. The expulsion of the "Mathematici" about the same time (Tacitus, *Ann.* xli. 52) implies a general alarm as to the spread of what were grouped together as Eastern superstitions.

of any statement that Aquila and Priscilla were converted by St. Paul's preaching; the apostle's declaration, in A.D. 50, that he had desired for many years to see the disciples at Rome, and that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world (Rom. i. 8, 13; xv. 23); his apparently intimate knowledge of no less than three distinct congregations there (Rom. xvi. 5, 15, 16) and of many individual disciples (some of them, probably, converts to the Christian faith with whom he had become acquainted at Corinth, and who had returned with Aquila and Priscilla) the presence among them of two, Andronicus and Junia (or Junias), who had been "in Christ" before his own conversion, and were conspicuous "among the apostles," therefore, it may be, also among the preachers of the faith; all this implies a considerable growth of the Christian community before the accession of Nero. So too the trial of Pomponia Graecina on the charge of having adopted an "externa superstitio" (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 32), though it took place under Nero, A.D. 57, rested on the fact that she had led a life "non cultu nisi lugubri, non animo nisi mesto," from an earlier date, beginning before the death of Messalina. The connexion of her husband Plautius with Britain suggests a possible link with Claudia and Pudens, and the description which the historian gives of her mode of life corresponds so closely with the impression which a Christian matron's retirement from the world would make on the society in which she had hitherto lived, that there is but small risk of error in assuming that she was one of the earliest converts from the ranks of the Roman aristocracy (comp. Lightfoot on the *Philippians*, p. 21). The name Prisca or Priscilla, belonging, as it does, to a family many of whom about this time held high official rank, suggests the hypothesis that the wife of Aquila may have belonged to the same class, and that this is the explanation of the precedence sometimes given to her name over that of her husband (Acts xviii. 18; Rom. xvi. 3; Tim. iv. 19).

It is obvious further, (1) that the expulsion of Jewish Christians, and with them of such Gentile converts as had passed previously through Judaism, would yet leave behind a certain proportion of purely Gentile Christians whom the edict would not touch. And (2) that those who returned would naturally settle, not in the Jewish trans-Tiberine quarter of the city, but as far as they could in some safer locality, and that thus the church at Rome, at or soon after the death of Claudius, would gradually become more and more free from Jewish or Judaizing influences. (On other points connected with the rise and progress of Christianity at Rome under Claudius see the papers on 'Aquila and Priscilla,' and the 'Proto-martyr Stephen,' in the writer's *Biblical Studies*.) [E. H. P.]

CLAUDIUS (2), enumerated by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51, p. 427) in a list of heretics who, like the Cerinthians and Ebionites, asserted our Lord to have been mere man. The next preceding name in the list is Cleobulus. No mention is made of this Claudius elsewhere, and, in the absence of a better explanation, the conjecture may be hazarded that Epiphanius wrote from a confused recollection, the names Claudius and Cleobulus being associated in his mind from their occurring together in the acts of the disputation

between Archelaus and Manes, which he elsewhere quotes (*Haer.* 66, p. 627), and in which they are the names of two brothers, rhetoricians by profession, who acted among the judges of the disputation. [G. S.]

CLAUDIUS (3), a monk mentioned as a companion of Epiphanius in the life by Simeon Metaphrastes (ii. 324). [G. S.]

(4) Asterius and Neon, brothers, martyred at Aegea in Cilicia, under a judge named Lysias. Their acts appear to be genuine and authentic, but the date at the conclusion is no more a part of the acts than the colophons to the epistles are a part of the New Testament. It refers them to A.D. 285, but this is incredible. The name Lysias and all the circumstances point to A.D. 303. The Latins commemorate them Aug. 23, the Greeks Oct. 29. The *Menology* says that they had gone to Mopsuestia to sue their step mother for wrongfully detaining their property, and she informed against them as Christians. But the acts are registered at Aegea, where the clerk Euthalius had been able to find no other Christians but these three brothers and two women, Domnina and Theonilla, with a little infant. (There is no discrepancy here.) All the brothers are young. Claudius, Asterius, Neon, Domnina, and Theonilla are successively subjected to the most cruel tortures, throughout which they are constant. We are not told what became of Domnina's infant. The details of the story may be read in Fleury (*Hist. Eccl.* viii. 16). [E. B. B.]

(5) Proconsul of Africa, A.D. 369, perhaps the secular magistrate to whom the bishop CHRONIUS illegally appealed against the decision of a council. (*Cod. Theod.* iv. p. 307; *Cod. xi. tit. 36*; Ceillier, iv. 600.) [W. M. S.]

(6) Bishop of Picenum, at Rimini, A.D. 359 (Mansi, iii. 301, *ex* Hieronymo, in *Dialogo adv. Luciferianos*).

(7) ST., bishop of Vienne. Lived in the 4th century, and is commemorated on June 1.

The church of Vienne has very many bishops enrolled in the catalogue of saints, and amongst the number St. Claudius, who was the thirteenth* archbishop, and ruled his church in the time of the emperor Constantine the Great. He was a man of great learning and eloquence. He was present at the council of Nicaea, where he carried off the palm from the other fathers in the debate concerning the Donatists; and by the decrees of that council he obtained the primacy of his church against Marianus, archbishop of Arles (MS. *Viennensis*).

He is also said by Chorierius to have presided in the first council of Arles, A.D. 314, some months after his consecration; to have been one of those prelates who were most zealous and constant in observing the decrees of the council of Nicaea, and to have died June 1, 324. But there is a plain anachronism in this statement, since the council of Nicaea was not held till 325, and it is also very doubtful whether Claudius took part in the council of Arles. (*AA. SS. June, i. pp. 72-73*.) [D. R. J.]

(8) A bishop who sent Augustine the books that Julian, the Pelagian, had written against him, and to whom, in A.D. 421, Augustine

* In another MS. he is called the eleventh bishop of Vienne.

dedicates and sends his answer (Aug. *Ep.* 207), formerly prefixed to the books against Julian (Tillem. xiii. 828; Ceillier, ix. 48). [E. B. B.]

CLAUDIUS (9), ST., I., 19th bishop of Besançon (Vesuntium). The lists of the old chronologists make no mention of him; but in the year 517 he subscribed to the council of Epaonum, signing himself "Episcopus ecclesiae Vesuntionensis." Sirmond thinks he was one of the bishops at the council of Lyon in 518. It is thought that this is the same bishop Claudius to whom Avitus, metropolitan of Vienne, wrote.

Pope Leo IX., enumerating in 1049 the possessions of the church of Besançon, mentions the church of Metenacum (Mainal) as the resting-place of St. Claudius. This is considered a proof by the editors of *Gallia Christiana* that this Claudius was a different person from the 29th bishop of Besançon, who became abbat of Mount Jura, and was buried in that monastery. (*Patrol. Lat.* lix. p. 271; *Aviti Epist.* 57; *Gallia Christiana*, xv. p. 11.) [W. M. S.]

(10) ST., II., 29th bishop of Besançon, successor (according to the lists) of St. Gervasius. On this saint the inventors of legends have compiled a vast farrago of improbabilities. It does not, however, seem unlikely that he sprang from a noble house, which afterwards produced the Salinensian princes; that from his earliest years he was enrolled amongst the clergy of Besançon; that after a novitiate in the abbey of Mount Jura he was elected to succeed abbat Injuriosus in the year 641 or 642, under the pontificate of Pope John IV.; that on the death of Gervase he was elected by the clergy of Besançon to be their archbishop; that after seven years he abdicated and returned to rule the abbey of Mount Jura; and that he died in A.D. 696 or 699.

St. Claudius, in his lifetime the oracle and model of the clergy of Besançon, became after his death one of the most popular saints of France. In the 9th century Rabanus Maurus mentions him in his *Martyrologium* as an intercessor. The abbey of St. Oyend in Mount Jura received his name, and became one of the most frequented points for pilgrimages. A town sprang up round it, as at Einsiedeln, which was only destroyed in 1799. His day is June 6. (*Gallia Christ.* xv. p. 17; Migne, *Encycl. Theolog.* xl.; *Patrol. Lat.* cx. p. 1149; Rabani Mauri, *Martyrolog.*) [W. M. S.]

(11) Father of St. Fulgentius. The grandfather, Gordianus, was one of the senators driven from Carthage by Genserik, king of the Goths. He retired to Italy with his family, and died soon after. Claudius and another of his sons returned to Africa in the hope of regaining their paternal inheritance. Their houses had been given to the Arian priests, but after having obtained possession of all their goods by the authority of the king, they passed into Byzacene, and established themselves at Telepte. Claudius married Maria Anna, a Christian lady; in A.D. 468 she gave birth to Fulgentius. Claudius died soon after. (*Fulgent. Vita*, cap. i.; *Patrol. Lat.* tom. lxxv. p. 118, etc.; Ceillier, xi. i.) [W. M. S.]

(12) Second bishop of Glandèves, succeeded Fraternus, and was succeeded by Basilius. He is only known from having subscribed to the

fourth council of Orleans, A.D. 541. He subscribed as "Glanatensis episcopus," through Benenatus, a priest who had been sent in his place (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 1236; Le Cointe, *Annales Eccl. Franc.* i. p. 600). [D. R. J.]

CLAUDIUS (13) A letter addressed to Claudius exists in the collection of the writings of Isidore, bishop of Seville (bp. A.D. 599-636). But as this letter was written in the times of the disputes between the Greeks and Latins on the procession of the Holy Spirit, it must have been by another writer. This letter shews that the Greeks of the time believed Athanasius to be the author of the creed which bears his name. But the uncertainty of the date deprives this evidence of value. (*Letters of Isidore*, p. 693, *Patrol. Lat.*, lxxxiii.; Ceillier, xi. 722.) [W. M. S.]

(14) I., bishop of Taurinum (Turin), advanced to the see before A.D. 774. He was followed in succession by the celebrated Claudius II. and Claudius III., both of whom are beyond our period (Ughellus, *Ital. Sac.* iv. 1023).

(15) Said to have been bishop of Auxerre (Dempster, *Menol. Scot.*, Mar. 20 and Mar. 30), but not mentioned among the bishops of that see in *Gall. Christ.* (xii. 260), nor in Gams (*Series Episc.*). No cultus is attached to his name, and the *Acta SS.* place him among the *praetermissi* of March 5 (March, i. 359). The Menology above cited calls him also founder of the university of Paris. [CLEMENS (2).]

(16) CLAUDIUS CLEMENS, CLAUDIUS CLEMENS SCOTUS. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* ad diem Mar. 20.) [CLEMENS (2).]

(17) A martyr whose relics, together with those of St. Pontianus, were translated to Rome in 1650, and again translated to Antwerp in 1656. He is commemorated on the 14th of May. (*AA. SS. Bolland.* May, iii. p. 287.) [D. R. J.]

CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS. [APOLLINARIS.]

CLEDAUC, 11th or 12th bishop of St. David's (Girald. *Cambr. Opp.* vi. ed. Dimock, p. 102; Stubbs, *Regist.* 155). [C. H.]

CLEDOG, Welsh saint. [CLYDOG.]

CLEDONIUS, a trusted friend and correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen. Having spent his early years about the court, he devoted himself to a religious life in the diocese of Nazianzus, and gave up his property to the service of the poor. He subscribed Gregory's will in 381 (Greg. Naz. ii. p. 924). He then styles himself a priest of Iconium. Perhaps he accompanied Amphilocheus thither in 374, when he became bishop of Iconium, and afterwards rejoined Gregory. Gregory addressed to Cledonius his two celebrated letters against Apollinaris, written after his retirement from the see of Constantinople in 382. The second of these was written in answer to one of Cledonius, asking him to declare his faith on the person of Christ, which he was accused of dividing. In it Gregory begs Cledonius to assure all that he held the Nicene faith inviolate. These letters were adopted as documents of the faith by the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. (Labbe, iv. 826; Tillemont, ix. 370, 504, 515-18; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 51, 52; *Carm.* 47, p. 107.) [E. V.]

CLEDREDUS, ST., one of the many Welsh saints who are arranged in the lists collectively as "the children of Brychan," the king of Brecknock, which was certainly a centre of missionary enterprise at one time, and in which numerous inscribed stones and other early Christian memorials are found (see Hubner, *Inscriptiones Britanniae Christianae*). This genealogical mode of connecting persons of the same tribe is common enough. The Welsh lists of Brychan's children, given in Rees, do not altogether correspond with the Cornish lists in the life of St. Nectan, and in the calendar of St. Michael's Mount (Leland, *Collect.* 4, 153; William of Worcester's *Itinerary*). The Irish calendars too make little or no mention even of the most celebrated of their missionaries, if their sphere of activity lay entirely out of Ireland. The parish of St. Clether is north of Altonun and east of Davidstow; St. Nun (Nonna), of Cornwall, being in one account the mother of the celebrated Welsh saint St. David. In fact the connexion with Wales is very manifest on this coast, and we can trace Welsh influence, though more faintly, all along North Devon and some way into Somersetshire; but the Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastics mostly rededicated the churches to the saints of the Roman calendar.

[C. W. B.]

CLEMENS (1), FLAVIUS, son of Sabinus, brother of the emperor Vespasian, and therefore first cousin to Domitian, whose niece Flavia Domitilla was his wife. Domitian regarded his kinsman with great favour, and placed his two sons, whom he caused to be named after himself and his brother, Vespasianus and Domitianus, under the tuition of Quintilian as the destined inheritors of the imperial throne. Flavius Clemens held the consulate in A.D. 95, and had only just resigned the office when he and his wife Domitilla were suddenly arrested and convicted on the charge of 'atheism,' by which there is no reasonable doubt that Christianity is intended. The crime on which Clemens and Domitilla were condemned was, according to Dio Cassius, that of "Judaizing," from which in the popular mind Christianity was hardly distinguishable. The religious charge was regarded by Suetonius as a most trivial one, the object of suspicion rather than of proof,—"tenuissima ex suspicione,"—but it was strengthened by a neglect of the ordinary usages of Roman social and political life, almost unavoidable by a Christian, which was regarded as "a most contemptible indolence" meriting severe animadversion. Clemens suffered death; his wife Domitilla was banished to one of the islands off the west coast of Italy. [DOMITILLA] (Sueton. *Domit.* § 15; Dio Cassius, *Hist.* lxxvii. 14; Tillemont, tom. ii. p. 124; Merivale, *Romans under the Empire*; vol. vii. c. lxii. p. 383; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 22.)

[E. V.]

(2) Bishop of Ancyra and martyr under Diocletian and Maximian Jan. 23 (*Menol. Basil.*). He is said to have been the son of a heathen father and a Christian mother, Euphrosyne, who prophesied his martyrdom. The narrative relating to him is very dubious. (Till. *Mém.* v. 62.)

[E. B. B.]

(3) (Κλήμης), a Greek historian and chronicler. He is described by Suidas (s.v.) as having written a history of the Roman kings and emperors, and also as having written to Hiero-

nymus concerning the rhetorical figures of Isocrates. Suidas cites Clemens under the words Ζάλην (on which see also the *Etymologicum Magnum*), "Ἦρας δὲ and Παλιμβολος. It is impossible to test the suspicion expressed by Ruhnken (*Praef. ad Timaei Lexicon*), that Suidas has here confounded two different Clements, a grammarian and a historian. The historian Clemens is quoted as an authority by Cedrenus (*Hist. Comp.* p. 19), by an anonymous writer in his *Demonstrationes Chronographicae*, published by Combesis, p. 32; by Hesychius in *Natalem Christi*, and by Joannes Malalas, pp. 39, 295, 298, 312, b. 155, Hody's edition. Hody places this Clement in the 8th century, his argument consisting of an attempt to shew that the Constantine son of Constantius, mentioned in one of the passages just referred to, must have been Constantine Pogonatus, who died A.D. 685. But Hody has been sufficiently refuted by Cave (*Biog. Lit.* p. 569) who shews that Malalas, who quotes Clement could not have been much later than the death of Justinian, A.D. 565; and that therefore the Constantine in question must have been Constantine the Great. There are no other data to fix the date of this Clement. We shall probably not be far wrong in placing him in the 5th century.

[G. S.]

CLEMENS. (4) When St. Boniface was enforcing submission to the papal authority in Germany, as part of the Christian law, he was keenly opposed by the Irish missionaries. Of these Clemens or Clement is one of the most prominent, and with Adelbert, a Frankish bishop, was condemned and excommunicated at a Roman synod held in the year 745 (or as others say, 748) by pope Zachary at the instigation of Boniface. He probably died in prison; his opinions and conduct have been much traduced in the exigencies of the ecclesiastical quarrels. (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 77 sq.; Bonifacius, *Opp.* ii. pass.; Mosheim, *Ecccl. Hist.* i. cent. viii. c. 5; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 326-7.)

(5) March 20.—On this day, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 696 sq.) gives a memoir of St. Clemens, whom he calls Claudius Clemens, bishop of Auxerre and founder of the university of Paris, but Lanigan, (*Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 207 sq.) in his account of St. Clemens, strips him of the "Claudius" and the two designations. He was a Hibernian Scot, who went over to Gaul about the beginning of Charlemagne's reign (A.D. 772), and was well received by that monarch. He was one of a band of learned men who resorted to France during that reign, and occupied a large space in the field of education. St. Clemens was entrusted with the education of boys of all classes, and was made responsible to the king for their progress, his school being probably in Paris, while his companion's was at Pavia. He probably outlived his patron, but little of his history remains to us except the fame of his name, which attracted scholars even from Germany to be instructed by him. Unfortunately he has been confounded with so many others, like Clemens bishop of Auxerre, who died in the beginning of the 8th century, and a Claudius who flourished in the beginning of the 9th, that it is now impossible to define with any precision what really belongs to him. The chief authority upon his life is the anonymous Monk of St. Gall, in his two books *De Gestis Caroli Mag.* in Canisius's

Antiq. Lect. tom. ii. pt. iii. 57 sq. (Fordun, *Scotichron.*, B. iii. c. 51; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 15-6; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 326-7; *Prim. Ch. Hist.* Ir. 350.) [J. G.]

CLEMENS ROMANUS. According to common tradition, one of the first, if not the first, bishop of Rome after the apostles, and certainly a leading member of that church towards the end of the 1st century. So much that is legendary has been connected with the name of Clement that it is necessary carefully to sift the authorities which speak of him.

(1.) Among the most authentic proofs of the connection of Clement with the Roman church may be placed the mention of his name in its liturgy. It is notorious that the early Christians did not think it necessary on the death of a bishop to discontinue the mention of his name in their public prayers. Consequently those who were first mentioned by name in the prayers of a church would naturally remain commemorated in its liturgy. Now the Roman canon of the mass to this day, next after the names of the apostles, recites the names of Linus, Cletus, Clements; and we shall presently see reason to think that the liturgy contained the same names in the same order so early as the 2nd century. We may then probably conclude that this commemoration dates from Clement's own time, and that Clement is one of the three members of the Roman church who were first specially mentioned in its prayers.

(2.) An independent proof that Clement held high position in the church of Rome is afforded by the *Shepherd of Hermas*, a work not later than the episcopate of Pius (A.D. 141-156), the writer of which claims to have been contemporary with Clement. He represents himself as commissioned to write for Clement the book of his *Visions* in order that Clement might send it to foreign cities, that being his function; while Hermas himself was to read the Vision at Rome with the elders who presided over the church. In other words, Clement is recognized as the organ by which the church of Rome communicated with foreign churches; but the passage does not decide whether or not Clement was superior to other presbyters in the domestic government of the church.

(3.) Next in antiquity among the notices of Clement is the general ascription to him of the *Epistle to the Church of Corinth*, commonly known as Clement's first epistle. This is written in the name of the church of Rome, and neither in the address nor in the body of the letter contains any mention of Clement's name, yet he seems to have been from the first everywhere recognised as its author. We may not unreasonably infer from the passage just cited from Hermas that the letter was even then celebrated. About A.D. 170 it is expressly mentioned by Dionysius bishop of Corinth, who, acknowledging another letter written from the church of Rome to the church of Corinth by their then bishop Soter, states that their former letter written by Clement was still read from time to time in their Sunday assemblies. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 16) speaks of this public reading of Clement's epistle as the ancient custom of very many churches, and as having continued down to his own time. In the same place (and in *H. E.* iv. 22) he reports that Hegesippus, whose historical work was written in the

episcopate next after Soter's, and who had previously visited both Rome and Corinth, gives particulars concerning the epistle of Clement, and concerning the dissensions in the Corinthian church which had given rise to it. The epistle is cited as Clement's by Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* iii. 3), several times by Clement of Alexandria, who in one place gives Clement the title of Apostle (*Strom.* i. 7, iv. 17, v. 12, vi. 8); by Origen (*de Princip.* ii. 3, in *Ezech.* 8, in *Joan.* i. 29); and in fact on this subject the testimony of antiquity is unanimous. We may infer that a letter which did not bear Clement's name, and which merely purported to come from the church of Rome, could not have been generally known as Clement's, if Clement had not been known at the time as holding the chief position in the church of Rome.

(4.) Last among the notices of Clement which we count worthy to be relied on as historical, we place the statement of Irenaeus in the place already cited, that Clement was third bishop of Rome after the apostles, his account being that the apostles Peter and Paul having founded and built up that church, committed the charge of it to Linus; that Linus was succeeded by Anacletus, and he by Clement. This order is adopted by Eusebius, by Jerome in his *Chronicle*, and by Eastern chronologers generally.

It is to be owned, however, that a different order of placing these bishops can also lay claim to high antiquity. The ancient catalogue known as the Librarian, because ending with the episcopate of Liberius, gives for the order and duration of the first Roman episcopates:—Peter 25 years, 1 month, 9 days; Linus 12 years, 4 months, 12 days; Clements 9 years, 11 months, 12 days; Cletus 6 years, 2 months, 10 days; Anacletus 12 years, 10 months, 3 days: thus Anacletus, who in the earlier list comes before Clement, is replaced by two bishops, Cletus and Anacletus, who come after him; and this account is repeated in other derived catalogues. Irenaeus himself is not consistent in his way of reckoning the Roman bishops. [See CERDO.] The order, Peter, Linus, Clements, is adopted by Augustine (*Ep.* 53 *ad Generosum*) and by Optatus of Milevis (*de Schism. Donatist.* ii. 2). Tertullian (*de Praescrip.* c. 32) states that the church of Rome held Clement to have been ordained by Peter; and Jerome (*Cat. Scr. Ecc.* 15), while adopting the order of Irenaeus, mentions that most Latins then counted Clement to have been second after Peter, and himself seems to adopt this reckoning in his commentary on Isaiah (c. 52). The *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 46) represent Linus to have been first ordained by Paul, and afterwards, on the death of Linus, Clement by Peter. Epiphanius also (*Haer.* xvii. 6) suggests that Linus and Cletus held office during the lifetime of Peter and Paul, who on their necessary absence from Rome for apostolic journeys, commended the charge of the church to others. This solution is adopted by Rufinus in the preface to his translation of the *Recognitions*. Epiphanius has an alternative solution, founded on a conjecture which he tries to support by a reference to a passage in Clement's epistle, viz., that Clement, after having been ordained by Peter, withdrew from his office and did not resume it until after the death of Linus and Cletus. A more modern

attempt to reconcile these accounts is Cave's hypothesis that Linus and after him Cletus had been appointed by Paul to preside over a Roman church of Gentile Christians, that Clement had been appointed by Peter over a church of Jewish believers, and that ultimately he was bishop over the whole united church. In still later times it has been argued that the uncertainty of order gives us a right to think that during the 1st century there was no bishop in the church of Rome, and that the names of three of the leading presbyters have been handed down by some in one order, by others in another. The authorities, however, which differ from the account of Irenaeus, seem ultimately to reduce themselves to two. Perhaps the parent of the rest is the letter of Clement to James (see CLEMENTINE LITERATURE) giving an account of Clement's ordination by Peter; for it seems to have been plainly the acceptance of this ordination as historical which inspired the desire to correct a list of bishops which placed Clement at a distance of three from Peter. The other authority is the *Chronicle* of Hippolytus, published A.D. 235 (see CHRONICON CANISIANUM and the memoir of Mommsen there cited), for it has been satisfactorily shewn that the earlier part of the Liberian catalogue is derived from the list of Roman bishops given by Hippolytus in the work just mentioned. The confusion of later writers is fully explained when we know that they were forced to combine and reconcile, as best they could, conflicting authorities, all of which must have seemed to them fully deserving of confidence: viz. (1) the list of Irenaeus, and probably of Hegesippus, giving merely a succession of Roman bishops; (2) the list of Hippolytus giving a succession in somewhat different order and also the years of the duration of the episcopates; and (3) the letter to James relating the ordination of Clement by Peter. Dismissing then later authorities, the main question is, which is more entitled to confidence, the order of Irenaeus or of Hippolytus, and we have no hesitation in answering the former. First, because it is distinctly the more ancient: secondly, because if the earlier tradition had not placed the undistinguished name Cletus before the well-known Clement, no later writer would have been under any temptation to reverse its order; thirdly, because of the testimony of the liturgy. Hippolytus being apparently the first scientific chronologer in the Roman church, his authority there naturally ranked very high, and his order of the succession of bishops seems to have been generally accepted in the West for a considerable time. Any commemoration therefore introduced into the liturgy after his time would rather have followed his order, Linus, Clemens, Cletus, or if of very late introduction would have left out the obscure name Cletus altogether, in the same way that the immediate successors of these three have been omitted. We must conclude then that the commemoration in the order, Linus, Cletus, Clemens, had been introduced before the time of Hippolytus, and was at that time so firmly established that even the contradictory result arrived at by Hippolytus had no power to alter it. If it be asked what inducement had Hippolytus to deviate from the order which he found acknowledged in his church we can readily answer, his acceptance as historically true of the ordination of Clement by Peter

as related in the epistle to James. The *Recognitions* are cited by Origen, who was contemporary with Hippolytus; and the account which their preface gives of Clement's ordination seems to have been fully believed by the Roman church. This appears from the passage in Tertullian already cited, and Tertullian's intimate acquaintance with the beliefs of the Roman church in the time of Hippolytus is shewn by his adopting in his treatise against the Jews the date which Hippolytus was led by an erroneous astronomical computation to assign to the passion of our Lord, as the table engraved on his chair still exhibits. Now Hippolytus must have found chronological difficulties in reconciling the fact of Clement's ordination by Peter with the order, Linus, Cletus, Clemens. The death of Clement and the consequent accession of Evaristus is dated by Eusebius in his *Chronicle* A.D. 95, and in his *Church History* the third year of Trajan, A.D. 100. The list of Hippolytus only giving the lengths of episcopates, and not stating where the reckoning begins, does not immediately present a chronology: but there seems reason to accept the chronology of the Liberian catalogue as in the main what Hippolytus intended. According to this list, the accession of Evaristus is A.D. 95. Now no one dates the death of Peter later than the persecution of Nero, A.D. 67. If, therefore, we count Clement to have been ordained by Peter and retain the order of Irenaeus, we must assign to Clement an episcopate of about 30 years, a length far in excess of what any tradition has ascribed to it. Hippolytus therefore, probably following the then received account of the length of Clement's episcopate, has placed it A.D. 67-76; and has filled up the space between Clement and Evaristus, first by transposing Cletus, and, as the gap seemed too large to be filled up by one episcopate, by counting as distinct the Cletus of the liturgy and the Anencletus of the earlier catalogue. It would seem that it was Hippolytus who devised the theory stated in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, that Linus held the bishopric during the lifetime of Peter: for this seems to be the interpretation of the dates assigned in the Liberian catalogue, Peter 30-55, Linus 55-67. But the whole ground of these speculations is removed if we reject the tale of Clement's ordination by Peter; if for no other reason, on account of the chronological confusion which it has caused. We retain then the order of Irenaeus, accounting that of Hippolytus as an arbitrary transposition devised to get over a chronological difficulty. The time that we are thus led to assign to the activity of Clement, viz., the end of the reign of Domitian, coincides with that which Eusebius, apparently on the authority of Hegesippus, assigns to Clement's epistle, and, as we shall presently see, with that to which we are led by an examination of the letter itself.

The result at which we have arrived casts the greatest doubt on the identification of the Roman Clement with the Clement named by Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians iv. 3. This identification is unhesitatingly made by Origen (*in Joann.* i. 29), and he is followed by a host of later writers. Irenaeus also may have had this passage in his mind when he speaks of Clement as a hearer of the apostles, though probably he was principally influenced by the work which afterwards grew into the *Recognitions*. But though it is not actually impossible

that the Clement who held a leading position in the church of Philippi during Paul's imprisonment might thirty years afterwards have presided over the church of Rome, yet the difference of time and place deprives of all likelihood an identification which has no better ground than agreement in a very common name. Lightfoot has remarked that Tacitus for instance mentions five Clements (*Ann.* i. 23, ii. 39, xv. 73; *Hist.* i. 86, iv. 68).

With far more plausibility it has been proposed to identify the author of the epistle with another Clement, whom we have good reason to think to have been at the time a distinguished member of the Roman church. We learn from Suetonius (*Domit.* 15) and from Dio Cassius, lxxvii. 14, that in the year 95, the very year fixed by some authorities for the death of the bishop Clement, the punishment of death or banishment was inflicted by Domitian on several persons who were addicted to Jewish customs, and that amongst them Flavius Clemens, a relation of his own, whose consulship had but just expired, was put to death on a charge of atheism, while his wife Domitilla, also a member of the emperor's family, was banished. The language is such as heathen writers might naturally use to describe a persecution of Christians; but Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 13) expressly claims Domitilla, whom he describes as a niece of the consul's, as a sufferer for Christ; and (*Chron.* sub anno 95) cites the heathen historian Bruttius as stating that several Christians suffered martyrdom at this time. We may then well believe the consul Clement to have been a Christian martyr; and if so, his rank must have given him during his lifetime a foremost position in the Roman church. It is natural to think that the writer of the epistle must have been either the consul, or at least a member of his family. Yet if so, the traditions of the Roman church must have been singularly defective. No writer before Rufinus speaks of the bishop Clement as a martyr; nor does any ancient writer in any way connect him with the consul. It is so common with romance writers to ascribe noble birth to their heroes, that we have no confidence in counting it as more than a chance coincidence that in the *Recognitions* Clement is represented as a relation of the emperor; not however of Domitian but of Tiberius.

A fabulous account of Clement's martyrdom, probably of no earlier origin than the ninth century, does not deserve to be repeated at length. It tells how Clement was first banished to the Crimea, how he there worked such miracles as to cause the conversion of the whole district, and was thereupon by Trajan's order cast into the sea with an anchor round his neck, an event followed by new prodigies.

We come now to speak of the only genuine work of Clement, the Epistle to the Corinthians already mentioned. The main object of the letter is the restoration of harmony to the Corinthian church which had been disturbed by dissensions. It would appear that the questions at issue concerned rather the discipline than the doctrine of the church. The bulk of the letter is taken up in enforcing the duties of meekness, humility, submission to lawful authority, and but little attempt is made at the refutation of doctrinal error. The only thing looking that

way is that some pains are taken to establish the doctrine of the resurrection; but this subject is not connected by the writer with the disputes, and so much use is made of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians that we cannot lay much stress on the fact that one of the topics of that epistle is fully treated of. The dissensions are said to have been caused by the arrogance of a few self-willed persons who had taken the lead in a revolt against the authority of the presbyters. Their pride probably rested on their possession of spiritual gifts, and some passages favour the conjecture that it may also have rested on the chastity which they practised. Though pains are taken to shew the necessity of a distinction of orders in the church, we cannot infer that this was really questioned by the revolvers; for the charge against them that they had unwarrantably deposed from the office of presbyter, certain who had filled it blamelessly, implies that the office continued to be recognised by them. But this unauthorised deposition naturally led to a schism, and it is likely enough that representations made at Rome by some of the persons ill-treated led to the letter of Clement. It is just possible that we can name one of these persons. At the end of the letter a wish is expressed that the messengers of the Roman church, Ephebus and Bito, with Fortunatus also, might be sent back speedily with tidings of restored harmony. The form of expression distinguishing Fortunatus from the Roman delegates favours the supposition that he was a Corinthian, and as Clement urges on those who had been the cause of dissension to withdraw for peace sake, assured that they would find a welcome everywhere, it is possible that Fortunatus might have so withdrawn and found a home at Rome. Another conjecture identifies him with the Fortunatus mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians.

However precarious this identification may be, internal evidence shews that the epistle is not so far from apostolic times as to make it impossible. None of the apostles is spoken of as living, but the deaths of Peter and Paul, who are described as men of their own generation, are referred to as then recent, and of the presbyters appointed by the apostles some are spoken of as still surviving. The early date thus indicated is confirmed by the absence of allusion to the topics which were the subject of controversy in the 2nd century, and by the immaturity of doctrinal development on certain points. Thus the words bishop and presbyter, are, as in the New Testament, used convertibly, and there is no trace that in the church of Corinth one presbyter had any very pronounced authority over the rest. The deposition of certain presbyters is spoken of neither as an exercise of the assumed authority of any single person, nor as an infringement on the lawful authority of any single person, but rather as on that of the whole body of presbyters. Again to the writer the Scriptures are the books of the Old Testament; these he cites most copiously and uses to enforce his arguments. He makes express mention of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians; and he twice reminds his hearers of words of our Lord. The quotations being in substantial but not in verbal agreement with our gospels leave it uncertain whether he is quoting these loosely or using other sources, but the

assumption that members of a distant church will be able to *remember* the words which he quotes, implies the existence of written records recognised by both parties. Besides these, without any formal citation he makes unmistakable use of other New Testament books, the Epistle to the Hebrews being that most largely employed, but use being also made of the Epistle to the Romans and other Pauline, including the Pastoral, epistles, the Book of the Acts, the Epistle of James, and Peter's first epistle. Still, the authority of these documents is not appealed to in support of his arguments in the same manner as that of the books of the Old Testament is urged. It may be mentioned here that Clement's epistle contains the earliest recognition of the Book of Judith. He quotes also from Old Testament apocryphal books or interpolations not now extant.

In order to fix more closely the date of the epistle, the principal fact available is, that in the opening an apology is made for that the church of Rome had not been able to give earlier attention to the Corinthian disputes, owing to the sudden and repeated calamities which had befallen it. It is generally agreed that this must refer to the persecution either under Nero or under Domitian. A date about midway between these is that to which the phenomena of the epistle would have inclined us; but having to choose between these two we have no hesitation in preferring the later. The main argument in favour of the earlier date, that the temple service is spoken of as being still offered, is satisfactorily met by the occurrence of a quite similar use of the present tense in Josephus. Indeed the passage carefully considered suggests the opposite inference; for Clement would Judaize to an extent of which there is no sign elsewhere in the epistle, if in case the temple rites were being still celebrated he were to speak of them as the appointed and acceptable way of serving God. All the other notes of time are hard to be reconciled with a date so close to the apostles as the reign of Nero.

It has been disputed whether the writer of the letter was a Jew or a Gentile, and the arguments are not absolutely decisive either way; but it seems to us more conceivable that a Hellenistic Jew resident at Rome could have acquired as much knowledge of Roman history and of heathen literature as is exhibited in the epistle, than that one not familiar from his childhood with the Old Testament Scriptures could possess so intimate an acquaintance with them as is displayed by Clement. This consideration, of course, bears on the question whether Flavius Clemens could have been the writer of the letter.

The letter of Clement quite fails to yield any support to the prominence which certain theories concerning the history of the 1st century give to disputes between a Pauline and an anti-Pauline party in the church. It would seem that such disputes had quite died out before the time when the letter was written. They appear to have had no influence on the dissensions at Corinth; and at Rome the Gentile and Jewish sections of the church seem in Clement's time to be completely fused. The obligation on Gentiles to observe the Mosaic law is neither asserted nor controverted, but seems to be nowhere a matter

of dispute. The whole Christian community is regarded as the inheritor of the promises to the Jewish people. There seems to have been in Clement's mind no idea of rivalry between Peter and Paul. He holds both in the highest honour, modelling his own theological language on that of Paul, yet writing as one whose bent was practical rather than speculative, and who had not been educated by controversy to take notice of subtle doctrinal distinctions.

The epistle had till lately been known only through a single MS., the great Alexandrian MS. brought to England in the year 1628, of which an account is given in all works on the criticism of the New Testament. One leaf, containing about the tenth part of the whole letter, has been lost. In this Greek Bible of the 5th century the two letters of Clement to the Corinthians are found enumerated among the books of the New Testament, not placed however in company with the apostolic epistles, but coming after the Apocalypse. It is natural to infer that the ecclesiastical use of Clement's letter had not quite died out at the time the MS. was copied. The epistle was first edited by Patrick Young, Oxford, 1633, and has been repeatedly published since, among the most important editions being Cotelier's in his *Apostolic Fathers*, Paris, 1672; Jacobson's; Hilgenfeld's in his *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum*; Lightfoot's, Cambridge, 1869; Tischendorf's, Leipzig, 1873; and Gebhardt and Harnack's, Leipzig, 1875. A photograph of this portion of the MS. was also published by Sir F. Madden in 1856.

Since the publication of the above-mentioned editions, an entirely new authority for the text of the epistle has been gained by the discovery in the library of the Holy Sepulchre at Fanari, in Constantinople, of a manuscript containing an unmutated text of the two epistles ascribed to Clement.^a The discovery was made known, and the new authority first used in establishing the text, in a very careful and able edition of the epistles by Bryennius, metropolitan of Serree, published in Constantinople at the end of 1875. The newly discovered MS., which is cursive and dated A.D. 1056, is contained in a small octavo volume, 7½ inches by 6, which has, besides the epistles of Clement, Chrysostom's synopsis of the Old Testament, the epistle of Barnabas, the teaching of the twelve apostles (occupying in the MS. less space by one-fourth than the second epistle of Clement) and a collection of Ignatian epistles. It gives a very good text of the Clementine letters, independent of the Alexandrian MS., but on the whole in tolerably close agreement with it, even in passages where the best critics had suspected error. Besides filling up small lacunae in the text of the older MS., it supplies the contents of the entire leaf which had been lost. This part contains a passage quoted by Basil, but not another quoted by Pseudo-Justin, confirmed in some degree by Irenaeus, which had been referred to this place (see Lightfoot, p. 166). Yet although in two places a break of connexion suggests that two

^a Still later a Syriac MS. purchased for the University of Cambridge has been found to contain a translation of the two epistles of Clement. We understand that it does not disagree in any important respect with the two other authorities.

or three words must have dropped out, except for some such trifling omission we have the letter now as complete as it was originally in the Alexandrian MS. For Harnack has found on counting the letters in the recovered portion that they amount almost exactly to the average contents of a leaf of the older MS. Lightfoot has pointed out that by a small change in the text of Ps.-Justin, his reference is satisfied by a passage in the newly discovered conclusion of the second epistle. The new portion of the first principally consists of a prayer, possibly founded on the liturgical use of the Roman church. What had been said in the beginning of the letter as to the calamities under which that church had suffered is illustrated by some of the petitions, e.g. that God would deliver them from those that hated them unjustly; that He would save those of them that were in affliction; that He would raise up those who had fallen, would feed the hungry and redeem their prisoners. In accordance with the directions of 1 Tim. ii. prayer is made for their earthly rulers, that they themselves might submit to them, recognising the honour given them by God, and not opposing His will; and that the rulers might have health, peace, and stability, and that He would direct their counsels, so that they might administer without offence, in peace and meekness, the authority that He had given them. Very noticeable in this new part of the letter is the tone of authority used by the Roman church in making an unsolicited interference with the affairs of another church. "If any disobey the words spoken by God through us, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression, and no small danger, but we shall be clear from this sin." "You will cause us joy and exultation if, obeying the things written by us through the Holy Spirit, you cut out the lawless passion of your jealousy according to the intercession which we have made for peace and concord in this letter. But we have sent faithful and discreet men who have walked from youth to old age unblamably amongst us, who shall be witnesses between us and you. This have we done that you may know that all our care has been and is that you may speedily be at peace." It remains open for controversy how far the expressions quoted indicate official superiority of the Roman church, or whether only the writer's conviction of the goodness of their cause. It may be added that the epithet applied by Irenaeus to the epistle *ἰκανωτάτη* turns out to have been suggested by a phrase in the letter itself, *ἰκανῶς ἐπεστείλαμεν*.

For a list of works on the literature of the epistle, we refer to Lightfoot, who also gives references to a succession of writers who have quoted the epistle. The chief early quotations were collected in the *Testimonia Veterum* prefixed to Young's edition, and the list has been extended by subsequent editors. Polycarp, though not formally quoting Clement's epistle, gives in several passages clear proof of his acquaintance with it. A passage in Ignatius's epistle to Polycarp c. 5, may also be set down as derived from Clement, but other parallels collected by Hilgenfeld are extremely doubtful. The epistle does not seem to have been translated into Latin, and was consequently little known in the West.

Some of the spurious works ascribed to Clement are the subject of separate articles, see APOSTOLIC CANONS, APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS, LITURGY, CLEMENTINE LITERATURE. Of the other writings ascribed to him, the first place is due to the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. This letter also formed part of the Alexandrian MS., but the conclusion of it had been lost by mutilation. We have it now complete in the edition of Bryennius above mentioned.

In the list of contents of the older MS. it is marked as Clement's second epistle, but it is not expressly described as an epistle to the Corinthians. It is so described in the later MS. It is not mentioned by any writer before Eusebius, and the language used by some of them is inconsistent with their having accepted it. Eusebius mentions it as a second letter ascribed to Clement, but not, like the former, used by the older writers, and he only speaks of one as the acknowledged epistle of Clement. The two epistles of Clement are placed among the books of the New Testament, in the 8th book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which probably belongs to the 6th century. The second epistle is first expressly cited as to the Corinthians by Severus of Antioch in the early part of the same century. Internal evidence, though adverse to the Clementine authorship, assigns to the work a date not later than the second century, and probably the first half of it. The writer is distinctly a Gentile, and contrasts himself and his readers with the Jewish nation in a manner quite unlike the genuine Clement; and his quotations are not, like Clement's, almost exclusively from the Old Testament; the gospel history is largely cited, and once under the name of Scripture. Many of the quotations however differ from our canonical gospels, and since one of them agrees with a passage referred by Clement of Alexandria to the gospel of the Egyptians, this was probably the source of other quotations also. The epistle would therefore seem to be earlier than the close of the second century, at which time our four gospels were in a position of exclusive authority. The controversies with which the writer has to deal are those of the early part of the 2nd century. In language suggested by the epistle to the Ephesians, the spiritual church is described as created before the sun and moon, as the female of whom Christ is the male, the body of which he is the soul. It seems likely that the work using this language had gained its acceptance with the church before Gnostic theories concerning the Aeon Christ and Ecclesia had brought discredit on such speculations. The doctrine of the pre-existence of the church is, as Harnack has noted, one of several points of contact between this work and the Shepherd of Hermas, making it probable that both emanate from the same age and the same circle. We therefore refer the place of composition to Rome, notwithstanding an apparent reference to the Isthmian games which favours the idea of a connexion with Corinth. But the description of the work as an epistle to the Corinthians which had never been strongly supported by external evidence, is disproved by the newly discovered conclusion, whence it clearly appears that the work is, as Dodwell and others had supposed, no epistle, but a homily. There seems no sufficient reason for refusing to believe that the work was really,

as it is professedly, composed with a view to its being publicly read in church, and therefore that the writer's position in the church was one which would secure that the use which he intended would be made of his work. But the writer does not claim for himself any position of superiority, and the foremost place in ruling and teaching the church is attributed by him to the body of presbyters. The writer nowhere claims to be Clement, and, from what has already been said, he must have been at least a generation later. But it is not strange either that an anonymous, but undoubtedly early document of the Roman church should come to be ascribed to the universally acknowledged author of the earliest document of that church; or that when both had come to be received as Clement's, the second should come to be regarded as, like the first, an epistle to the Corinthians.

The two epistles on Virginity.—These are extant only in Syriac, and are only preserved in a single MS. This was one purchased at Aleppo about A.D. 1750, for Wetstein, for the purposes of his Greek Testament. He had commissioned a copy of the Philoxenian version to be bought, and this MS. proved to be only a copy of the well-known Peshito. But the disappointment was compensated by the unexpected discovery of these letters, till then absolutely unknown in the West. After the epistle to the Hebrews, the last in the Peshito canon, the scribe adds a doxology, and a note with personal details by which we are enabled to date the MS. A.D. 1470, and then proceeds "We subjoin to the epistles of Paul those epistles of the apostles, which are not found in all the copies," on which follow 2 Peter, 2, 3 John and Jude, from the Philoxenian version, and then, without any break, these letters, with the titles: "The first epistle of the blessed Clement, the disciple of Peter the apostle," and "The second epistle of the same Clement." The MS. is now preserved in the library of the Seminary of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam. The letters were published as an appendix to his Greek Testament, by Wetstein, who also defended their authenticity. The last editor is Beelen, Louvain, 1856. The letters, though now only extant in Syriac, are proved to be a translation from the Greek by the Graecisms which they contain, and by the existence of a fragment containing what would seem to be a different Syriac translation of one passage in these epistles. This fragment is contained in a MS. bearing the date A.D. 562. The earliest writer who quotes these letters is Epiphanius. In a passage, which until the discovery of the Syriac letters had been felt as perplexing, he describes Clement as "in the encyclical letters which he wrote, and which are read in the holy churches," having taught virginity, and praised Elias and David and Samson, and all the prophets. The letters to the Corinthians cannot be described as encyclical; and the topics specified are not treated of in them, while they are dwelt on in the Syriac letters. St. Jerome, though in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers he follows Eusebius in mentioning only the two letters to the Corinthians as ascribed to Clement, yet must be understood as referring to the letters on virginity in his treatise against Jovinian where he speaks of Clement as composing almost his entire discourse concerning the purity of virginity. He may have become

acquainted with these letters during his residence in Palestine.

The presumption against the genuineness of these letters, arising from the absence of notice of them by Eusebius and every other writer anterior to Epiphanius, and from the limited circulation which they appear ever to have attained in the church, is absolutely confirmed by internal evidence. The style and the whole colouring of the letters are utterly unlike those of the genuine epistle; and the writer is evidently one whose whole thoughts and language have been moulded by long and early acquaintance with the New Testament, in the same manner as those of the real Clement are by his acquaintance with the Old. The Gospel of St. John is more than once cited, but not any apocryphal New Testament book. The great object of the second letter, is to insist that men who have taken vows of chastity should not give cause for scandal by conversing privately with women, or accepting hospitable attentions from them, but it scarcely appears that the abuses against which the writer contends proceeded so far as those against which Cyprian remonstrated. Competent judges have assigned these epistles to the middle of the 2nd century, but their arguments hardly suffice to exclude a somewhat later date.

The Epistles to James our Lord's brother.—In the article CLEMENTINE LITERATURE is given an account of the letter to James by Clement, which relates how Peter, in immediate anticipation of death, ordained Clement as his successor, and gave him charge concerning his ministry. After the translation of this letter by Rufinus, some Latin writer added a second, giving instruction concerning the administration of the Eucharist and other matters of church discipline. These two letters had considerable currency in the West. In the forged decretals both these letters were much enlarged, and three new letters purporting to be Clement's were added.

It is worthy of remark how James, who in the original Clementines is the head of the church, is made in the later epistle to receive instruction and commands from Peter's successor Clement. There must have been yet other letters ascribed to Clement in the East if there be no error in the MS. of Leontius (Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* vii. 84), who cites a passage not elsewhere extant as from the *ninth* letter of Clement. Discourses concerning Providence and the righteous judgment of God are cited by Anastasius of Antioch; and a writer of the 13th century (*Spicilegium Acherianum*, viii. 382) reports having seen in a Saracen MS. a book of Revelations of Peter, compiled by Clement. [G. S.]

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA [TITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS]. It will be convenient to notice in succession: i. *The personal Details of Clement's Life*; ii. *His Works*; and iii. *His Position and Influence in the Development of Christian Doctrine and Thought*.

i. *The Life of Clement.*—The full name of Clement, Titus Flavius Clemens, is given by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 13) and Photius (*Cod.* 111) in the title of the *Stromateis* (Τίτου Φλαυίου Κλήμεντος [Photius adds πρεσβυτέρου Ἀλεξανδρείας] τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν γνωστικῶν ὑπομνημάτων στρωματείς). The remarkable coincidence of the name with that of Titus

Flavius Clemens, nephew of Vespasian and consul in 95 [CLEMENS FLAVIUS], cannot have been accidental, but no direct evidence enables us to determine what was Clement's connexion with the imperial Flavian family. Perhaps he was descended from a freedman of the consul; and at any rate his wide and varied learning indicates that he had received a liberal education, and so far suggests that his parents occupied a good social position.

The place of Clement's birth is not certainly known. Epiphanius, the earliest authority on the question, observes casually that two opinions were held in his time, "some saying that he was an Alexandrian, others that he was an Athenian" (*ὅν φασὶ τινες Ἀλεξανδρέα ἑτεροὶ δὲ Ἀθηναῖον*, *Haer.* xxxii. 6). There are obvious reasons why he should be called an Alexandrine, since Alexandria was without doubt the principal scene of his labours; but there was no apparent reason for connecting him with Athens by mere conjecture. The statement that he was an Athenian must therefore have rested upon some direct tradition that he was born or educated there. That this was the case follows also by a natural deduction from the description which he gives of his Christian training. In recounting his wanderings he makes Greece the starting-point and Alexandria the goal of his search (*Strom.* 1, § 11, p. 322); and in the 2nd century Athens was still the centre of the literary and spiritual life of Greece.

We may then with reasonable probability conclude that Clement was an Athenian by training if not by origin, and the fact that he was at the head of the catechetical school of Alexandria towards the close of the century fixes the date of his birth about A.D. 150–160. Nothing is recorded of his parentage; but his own language seems to imply that he embraced Christianity by a personal act, as in some sense a convert (*Paed.* i. § 1, p. 97, *τὰς παλαιὰς ἀπομνήμονι δόξας*; comp. *Paed.* ii. § 62, p. 206, *δάκρυά ἔσμεν . . . οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότες*), and this is directly affirmed by Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* ii. 2 f.), though it is doubtful whether he speaks from independent knowledge or simply gives an inference from Clement's words. Such a conversion would not be irreconcilable with the belief that Clement, like Augustine, was of Christian parentage at least on one side; but whether Clement's parents were Christians or heathens it is evident that heathenism attracted him for a time; and though he soon overcame its attractions, his inquisitive spirit did not at once find rest in Christianity. He enumerates six illustrious teachers under whom he studied the "true tradition of the blessed doctrine of the holy apostles." His first teacher in Greece was an Ionian (Athenagoras?); others he heard in Magna Graecia; others in the East; and at last he found in Egypt the true master for whom he had before sought in vain (*Strom.* i. § 11, p. 322). There can be no doubt that this master was Pantaenus, to whom he is said to have expressed his obligations in his *Hypotyposes* (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 13; v. 11). Pantaenus was at the time the chief of the catechetical school, and though the accounts of Eusebius and Jerome (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 10; Hieron. *de Vir.* iii. 36, 38) are irreconcilable in their details and chronology, it cannot be questioned that on the death or retirement of

Pantaenus, Clement succeeded to his office, and it is not unlikely that he had acted as his colleague before. The period during which Clement presided over the catechetical school (c. A.D. 190–203) seems to have been the season of his greatest literary activity. He was now a presbyter of the church (*Paed.* i. § 37, p. 120) and he had the glory of reckoning Origen among his scholars. On the outbreak of the persecution under Severus (A.D. 202, 203) in which Leonidas the father of Origen perished, Clement retired from Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3) never, as it seems, to return. Nothing is directly stated as to the place of his withdrawal. There are some indications that he made a visit to Syria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11, *ὃν ἴσται*); and at a later date we find him in the company of an old pupil, Alexander, afterwards bishop of Jerusalem, and at that time a bishop of Cappadocia, who was in prison for the faith. If therefore Clement had before withdrawn from danger, it was through wisdom and not through fear. Alexander regarded his presence as due to "a special providence" (comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14), and charged him, in most honourable terms, with a letter of congratulation to the church of Antioch on the appointment of Asclepiades to the bishopric of that city, A.D. 311 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11). This is the last mention of Clement which has been preserved. The time and the place of his death are alike unknown. Popular opinion reckoned him among the saints of the church; and he was commemorated in the early Western martyrologies on Dec. 4. His name, however, was omitted in the martyrology issued by Clement VIII. after the corrections of Baronius; and Benedict XIV. elaborately defended the omission, which called forth some protests, in a letter to John V. king of Portugal, dated 1748. In this letter Benedict argued that the teaching of Clement was at least open to suspicion, and that private usage would not entitle him to a place in the calendar. (Benedicti XIV. *Opera*, vi. pp. 119 ff. ed. 1842, where the evidence is given in detail; comp. Cognat, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, pp. 451 ff.)

ii. *The Works of Clement.*—Eusebius, whom Jerome follows closely with some mistakes (*De Vir.* iii. 38) has given a list of the works of Clement (*H. E.* vi. 13): (1) *Στρωματεῖς*, libb. viii.; (2) *Ῥητορικαὶ*, libb. viii.; (3) *Πρὸς Ἑλληνας λόγος προτρεπτικός* (*adversus Gentes*, Jerome); (4) *Παιδαγωγός*, libb. iii.; (5) *Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*; (6) *Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα*; (7) *Διαλέξεις περὶ νηστείας*; (8) *Περὶ καταλαλίας*; (9) *Προτρεπτικός εἰς ὑπομνήν ἡ πρὸς τοὺς νεωστὶ βεβαπτισμένους* (omitted by Jerome); (10) *Κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός ἡ πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους* (*De Canonibus Ecclesiasticis et adversum eos qui Judaeorum sequuntur errorem*, Jerome).

Photius (*Bibl. Codd.* 109–111) mentions that he read the first five works on the list, and knew by report 6, 7, 8 (*περὶ κακολογίας*); 10, (*περὶ κανόνων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν*); from the variations in the titles and the omission of 9, it is evident that he derived his knowledge of these simply from the secondary Greek version of Jerome's list.

With the exception of 2, the first five works are still preserved almost entire. Of 2 considerable fragments remain; and of 6, 8, 10 a few fragments have been preserved in express quotations.

Quotations are also found from a treatise *περὶ πρῶτολης*, and from another, *περὶ ψυχῆς*, to which Clement himself refers (*Strom.* iii. 13, p. 516; v. 88, p. 699). Elsewhere Clement speaks of his intention to write *On First Principles* (*περὶ ἀρχῶν*, *Strom.* iii. 13, p. 516; *id.* 21, p. 520; comp. *iv.* 2, p. 564); *On Prophecy* (*Strom.* v. 88, p. 699; *id.* iv. 93, p. 605); *Against Heresies* (*Strom.* iv. 92, p. 604); *On the Resurrection* (*Paed.* i. 6, p. 125); *On Marriage* (*Paed.* iii. 8, p. 278).

But it may be questioned whether the references may not be partly to sections of his greater works, and partly to designs which he never carried out (comp. *Strom.* iv. 1-3, pp. 563 f.). No doubt has ever been raised as to the genuineness of the *Address*, the *Tutor*, and the *Miscellanies*. Internal evidence shews that they are all the work of one writer (comp. Reinkens, *de Clemente*, cap. ii. § 4), and they have been quoted as Clement's by a continuous succession of fathers even from the time of Origen (*Comm. in Joh.* ii. 3, p. 52 B; *Strom.*; anonymous). These three principal extant works form a connected series. The first is an exhortation to the heathen to embrace Christianity, based on an exposition of the comparative character of heathenism and Christianity: the second offers a system of training for the new convert, with a view to the regulation of his conduct as a Christian: the third is an introduction to Christian philosophy. The series was further continued in the lost *Outlines* (*δποτυπώσεις*), in which Clement laid the foundation of his philosophic structure in an investigation of the canonical writings. The mutual relations of these writings leave no doubt that Clement proposed to himself to construct a complete system of Christian teaching, corresponding with the "whole economy of the gracious Word, Who first addresses, then trains, and then teaches" (*Paed.* i. 1), bringing to man in due succession conviction, discipline, wisdom. The first three books correspond in a remarkable degree, as has frequently been remarked (Potter, *ad Protrept.* i.), with the stages of the Neo-Platonic course, the *Purification* (*ἀποκαθάρσις*), the *Initiation* (*μύησις*), and the *Vision* (*ἐκσπρέλα*). The fourth book was probably designed to give a solid basis to the truths which were fleeting and unreal in systems of philosophy. If Clement had done no more than conceive such a plan his service to "the Gospel of the Kingdom" would not have been unfruitful. As it is, the execution of his work, if it falls short of the design, is still full of precious lessons. And when it is frankly admitted that his style is generally deficient in terseness and elegance; that his method is desultory; that his learning is undigested: we can still thankfully admire his richness of information, his breadth of reading, his largeness of sympathy, his lofty aspirations, his noble conception of the office and capacities of the Faith.

I. *The Address to the Greeks* (*Λόγος προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας*: comp. *Strom.* vii. § 22, p. 421, ἐν τῷ προτρεπτικῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ ἡμῖν λόγῳ).—The works of Clement were composed in the order in which they have been mentioned. The *Address* was written before the *Tutor*, which contains a reference to it in the first section (*ὁ λόγος δηνίκα μὲν ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν παρέκλει, προτρεπτικός ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἦν*: comp. *Strom.* vii. § 22; Pott, p. 841); and, if we can

trust the assertion of Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28), some of Clement's works were composed before the accession of Victor (A.D. 192). Putting these two facts together, we may reasonably suppose that the *Address* was written c. A.D. 190. It was addressed to *Greeks* and not to *Gentiles* generally, as Jerome understood the word (*adversus gentes*, *De Vir. Ill.* 38). This appears from the entire contents of the book, which deals almost exclusively with Greek mythology and Greek speculation. Nor is there anything unnatural in supposing that in his first work Clement, the Athenian student, wrote with a direct reference to men who had once shared his speculations and had not yet gained his resting-place.

The general aim of the *Address* is to prove the superiority of Christianity to the religions and the philosophies of heathendom, while it satisfies the cravings of humanity to which they bore witness. The gospel is, as Clement shews with consummate eloquence, the New Song more powerful than that of Orpheus or Arion, new and yet older than the creation (c. 1), pure and spiritual as contrasted with the sensuality and idolatry of the pagan rites, clear and substantial as compared with the vague hopes of poets and philosophers (2-9). In such a case, he argues, custom cannot be pleaded against the duty of conversion. Man is born for God, and is bound to obey the call of God who through the Word is waiting to make him like unto Himself. The choice is between judgment and grace, between destruction and life: can the issue then be doubtful (10-12)?

It would not be difficult to point out errors in taste, in fact, in argument throughout Clement's appeal: on the other hand it would be perhaps impossible to shew in any earlier work, passages like those in which he describes the mission of the Word, the Light of men (p. 88) and pictures the true destiny of man (pp. 92 ff.).

Manuscripts.—The *Address* is preserved in the following MSS.:

1. Cod. Paris. *Bibl. Imp.* 451. Saec. x. (914 A.D.). Collated by Dindorf, in whose edition it is marked P. This MS. contains Scholia on the work, which are printed in Klotz and Dindorf.

2. Cod. Mutin. *Bibl. Palat.* iii. D. 7. Saec. xi. Collated by Dindorf, in whose edition it is marked M. This MS. also contains Scholia; generally coincident with those in P, but with some later additions.

3. Cod. Oxon. *Coll. Novi* 139. Saec. xv. Collated for Potter, and worthy of a second and complete examination. Cited by Dindorf (from Potter) as N.

II. *The Tutor* (*ὁ Παιδαγωγός*. Comp. Hos. v. 2, quoted in *Paed.* i. 7, p. 129).—The *Tutor* was written after the *Address* (c. A.D. 190), as we have seen, and before the *Miscellanies* in which the *Tutor* is described generally (*Strom.* vi. § 1, p. 736), that is, it was written c. A.D. 190-195. The writer's design was, as he describes it, "to prepare from early years, that is from the beginning of elementary instruction (*ἐκ κατηχέσεως*), a rule of life growing with the increase of faith, and fitting the souls of those just on the verge of manhood with virtue so as to enable them to receive the higher knowledge of philosophy" (*εἰς ἐπιστήμης γνωστικῆς παραδοχὴν*, *Strom.* i. c.).

The main scope of the *Tutor* is therefore practical: the aim is action and not knowledge;

but still action as preparatory to knowledge, and resting upon conviction. It is divided into three books. The first book give a general description of the Tutor, who is the Word Himself (1-3); of the "children" whom He trains, Christian men and women alike (4-6); and of the general method which He follows, using both chastisements and love (7-12). The second and third books deal with special precepts which were designed to meet the actual difficulties of contemporary life and not to offer a theory of morals. And as it would not be easy to find elsewhere, even in the Roman satirists, an equally vivid and detailed picture of heathen manners, so this picture must be vivified before justice can be done to the rules of conduct which Clement lays down. Nay more, Clement must be compared with Tertullian, and the society of Alexandria with the society of Carthage, if we are to appreciate rightly the temper of Clement's instruction. The second book contains general directions as to eating and drinking (1 f.), furniture (3), entertainments (4-8), sleep (9), the relations of men and women (10), the use of jewellery (11 f.). The third book opens with an inquiry into the nature of true beauty (c. 1). This leads to a condemnation of extravagance in dress both in men and in women (2 ff.), of luxurious establishments (4 f.), of the misuse of wealth (6 f.). Frugality and exercise are recommended (8-10); and many minute directions are added—often curiously suggestive in the present times—as to dress and behaviour (11 f.). General instructions from Holy Scripture as to the various duties and offices of life lead up to the prayer to the Tutor—the Word—with which the work closes.

Immediately after the *Tutor* are printed in the editions of Clement two short poems, which have been attributed to his authorship. The former of these, written in an anapaestic measure, is *A Hymn of the Saviour Christ* (ὕμνος τοῦ Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ), and the other, written in trimeter iambs is addressed *To the Tutor* (εἰς τὸν Παιδαγωγόν). There is no evidence, as far as appears, to shew that the second is Clement's work. The first is said to be "Saint Clement's" (τοῦ ἁγίου Κλήμεντος) in those MSS. which contain it; but it may be a work of primitive date like the *Morning Hymn* which has been preserved in our Communion Office as the *Gloria in Excelsis*. If it were Clement's, and designed to occupy its present place, it is scarcely possible that it would have been omitted in any MS.; while, on the other hand, it makes an appropriate and natural addition if taken from some other source. The lines *To the Tutor* cannot be any thing more than an effusion of some pious scholar of a later date than Clement.

Manuscripts.—The *Tutor* is contained in the following MSS.:

1. Cod. Paris. P. (imperfect at the beginning. Lib. i. capp 1-10, without the hymn).
2. Cod. Mutin. M.
3. Cod. Flor. *Bibl. Laur.* 5-24. Saec. xi. Collated by Dindorf, in whose edition it is marked F. These MSS. (P, M, F) contain Scholia. Those in M are fullest. Of this MS. there are three secondary copies of the 16th century; B (Bodl. Saec. xvi.); R (Mus. Brit.); P (Palat.); which were used by Potter.

4. Cod. Oxon. N (Saec. xv.) contains books ii, iii., without the hymn.

5. Cod. Ven. (Marc. 652) Saec. xv.

There are several other MSS. of late date which possess no independent value. Comp. Dindorf. *Pref.* pp. x. and ff.

III. *The Miscellanies* (Στρωματεῖς).^a—The title of this work, the *Miscellanies* (στρωματεῖς, patch-work, or rather bags for holding the bedclothes, like στρωματόδεσμοι) suggests a true idea of its character. It is designedly unmethodical, a kind of meadow as Clement describes it, or rather a wooded mountain (vii. § 111), studded irregularly with various growths, and so fitted to exercise the ingenuity and labour of those who were likely to profit by it (vi. § 2, p. 736, Pott.). But in spite of the irregularity of its composition the book is inspired by one thought. It is an endeavour to claim for the gospel the power of fulfilling all the desires of men and of raising to a supreme unity all the objects of knowledge, in the soul of the true gnostic—the perfect Christian philosopher. The first book, which is mutilated at the beginning, treats in the main of the office and the origin of Greek philosophy in relation to Christianity and Judaism. Clement shews that Greek philosophy was part of the Divine education of men, subordinate to the training of the law and the prophets, but yet really from God (§§ 1-58; 91-100). In his anxiety to establish this cardinal proposition he is not content with shewing that the books of the Old Testament are older than those of the philosophers (59-65; 101-164; 180-182); but he endeavours to prove also that the philosophers borrowed from the Jew (66-90; 165 f.). After this he vindicates the character and explains the general scope of the law—"the philosophy of Moses" (167-179).

The main object of the second book is defined to lie in the more detailed exposition of the originality and superiority of the moral teaching of revelation as compared with that of Greek philosophy which was in part derived from it (§§ 1 f.; 20-24; 78-96). The argument includes an examination of the nature of faith (4-19; 25-31), resting on a godly fear and perfected by love (32-55); and of repentance (56-71). There is some discussion of the sense in which human affections are ascribed to God (72-75); and it is shewn that the conception of the ideal Christian is that of a man made like to God (97-126), in accordance with the noblest aspirations of philosophy (127-136). The book closes with a preliminary discussion of marriage.

The third book is taken up with an investigation of the true doctrine of marriage (§§ 57-60) as against those who indulged in every license on the ground that bodily actions are indifferent (1-11; 25-44); and those on the other hand who abstained from marriage from hatred of the Creator (12-24; 45-46). Various passages of Scripture which were wrongly interpreted by heretics are examined (61-101); and the two main errors are shewn to be inconsistent with Christianity (102-110).

Clement opens the fourth book with a very interesting outline of the whole plan of the comprehensive apology for Christianity on which he

^a The full title is given at the close of Books i. iii. v. τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν γνωστικῶν ὑπομημάτων στρωματεῖς.

had entered (§§ 1-3). The work evidently grew under his hands, and he implies that he could hardly expect to accomplish the complete design. After this sketch he adds fresh traits to the portrait of the true "gnostic," of whose character he had already given some outlines. Self-sacrifice, martyrdom, lies at the root of his nature (8-56; 72-77), a virtue which is within the reach of all states and of men and women alike (57-71), though even this required to be guarded against fanaticism and misunderstanding (78-96). Other virtues, as love and endurance, are touched upon (97-119); and then Clement gives a picture of a godly woman (120-131), and of the gnostic, who rises above fear and hope to that perfection which rests in the knowledge and love of God (132-174).

In the fifth book Clement, following the outline which he had laid down (iv. 1), discusses faith and hope (§§ 1-18), and then passes on to the principle of enigmatic teaching. This, he argues, was followed by heathen and Jewish masters alike (19-26); by Pythagoras (27-31); by Moses, in the ordinances of the tabernacle (32-41); by the Aegyptians (42-44); and by many others (45-56). The principle itself is, he maintains, defensible on intelligible grounds (57-60), and supported by the authority of the apostles (61-67). For in fact the knowledge of God can be gained only through serious effort and by divine help (68-89). This review of the character and sources of the highest knowledge leads Clement back to his characteristic proposition that the Greeks borrowed from the Jews the noblest truths of their own philosophy.

The sixth and seventh books are designed, as Clement states (vi. § 1) to shew the character of the Christian philosopher (the gnostic), and so to make it clear that he alone is the true worshipper of God. By way of prelude Clement repeats and enforces at the beginning of the sixth book what he had said on Greek plagiarisms (§§ 4-38) admitting at the same time that the Greeks had some true knowledge of God (39-43), and also affirming that the gospel was preached in Hades to those of them who had lived according to their light (44-53), though that was feeble when compared with the glory of the gospel (54-70). From this point he goes on to sketch the lineaments of the Christian philosopher, who attains to a perfectly passionless state (71-79) and masters for the service of the faith all forms of knowledge which include various mysteries that are open to him only (80-114). The reward of this true philosopher is proportioned to his attainments (115-148). These are practically unlimited in range, for Greek philosophy, even while it was a gift of God for the training of the nations, is only a recreation for the Christian philosopher, in comparison with the serious objects of his study (149-168).

In the seventh book, Clement regards the Christian philosopher as the one true worshipper of God (§§ 1-5), striving to become like the Son of God (5-21), even as the heathen conversely made their gods like themselves (22-27). The soul is his temple: prayers and thanksgivings, his sacrifice: truth, the law of his life (28-54). Other traits are added to the portraiture of "the gnostic" (55-88); and Clement then meets the general objection which was urged against Christianity from the conflict of rival sects (89-

92). Heresy, he replies, can be detected by two tests. It is opposed to the testimony of Scripture (93-105); and it is of recent origin (106-108).

At the close of the seventh book Clement remarks that he "shall proceed with his argument from a fresh beginning" (τῶν ἐξῆς ἀπ' ἀλλῆς ἀρχῆς ποιησόμεθα τὸν λόγον). The phrase may mean that he proposes to enter upon a new division of the *Miscellanies*, or that he will now pass to another portion of the great system of writings which he sketched out in *Strom.* iv. 1-3. In favour of the first opinion it may be urged that Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 13) and Photius (*Cod.* 109) expressly mention eight books of the *Miscellanies*; while on the other hand the words themselves, taken in connexion with vii. 1, point rather to the commencement of a new book.

The fragment which bears the title of the eighth book in the one remaining MS. is in fact a piece of a treatise on logic. It may naturally have served as an introduction to the examination of the opinions of Greek philosophers, the interpretation of Scripture, and the refutation of heresies which were the general topics of the second principal member of Clement's plan (iv. 2); but it is not easy to see how it could have formed the close of the *Miscellanies*. It is "a fresh beginning" and nothing more.

There is no evidence to shew what were the contents of the eighth book in the reckoning of Eusebius. In the time of Photius (c. A.D. 850) the present fragment was reckoned as the eighth book in some copies, and in others the tract, *On the rich man that is saved* (*Bibl.* 111). Still further confusion is indicated by the fact that passages from the *Extracts from the Prophetical Writings* are quoted from "the eighth book of the *Miscellanies*" (Bunsen, *Anal. Ante-Nic.* i. 288, f.), and also from "the eighth book of the *Outlines*" (*id.* 285); while the discussion of prophecy, it may be added, was postponed from the *Miscellanies* to some later opportunity (*Strom.* vii. 1, cf. iv. 2).

Perhaps the simplest solution of these difficulties is to suppose that at a very early date the logical introduction to the *Outlines* was separated from the remainder of the work, and added to MSS. of the *Miscellanies*. In this way the opinion would arise that there were eight books of the *Miscellanies*, and scribes supplied the place of the eighth according to their pleasure.

Manuscript.—The *Miscellanies* have been preserved in one MS. only of the 11th century: *Cod. Flor.* (*Laur.* v. 3) (L). This MS. contains *The eight books of the Stromateis* (the first leaf has been lost), with the *Exc. ex Theod.* and *Ecl. Proph.* Bandini has given a facsimile of this MS. (*Catal. MSS. Graec.* Tab. i. 1). A copy of this MS., transcribed in the 15th century, is preserved at Paris, of which copy a collation was made for Potter; but this has of course no independent value.

In the absence of other MSS., the quotations, especially those of Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.*), are of great value in correcting the text.

IV. The *Outlines* (Ἰστορίαι), as has been already indicated, seem to have grown out of the *Miscellanies*.

Several express quotations from the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th books of the *Outlines* have been preserved; but the fragments are too few and Clement's method too desultory to allow these

to furnish a certain plan of the arrangement of the work. They can, however, be brought without any violence into agreement with the summary description of Photius, and it is probable that the books i.-iii. contained the general introduction, with notes on the Old Testament ("Genesis, Exodus, and the Psalms"); books iv.-vi., notes on the Epistles of St. Paul; books vii., viii., notes on the Catholic Epistles.^b

In addition to the detached quotations, there can be no reasonable doubt that the three series of extracts, (a) *The summaries from the expositions of Theodotus and the so-called Western school*, (b) *The selections from the comments on the prophets*, and (c) *The outlines on the Catholic Epistles*, were taken from the *Outlines*. But partly from the method of compilation, partly from the manner in which they have been preserved in a single MS., these fragments, though of the deepest interest, are at present only imperfectly intelligible.

(a) *The Summaries from Theodotus* (ἐκ τῶν Θεοδοῦτου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντινίου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί) are at once the most corrupt and the most intrinsically difficult of the extracts. It appears as if the compiler set down hastily the passages which contained the interpretations of the school which he wished to collect, without regard to the context, and often in an imperfect form. Sometimes he adds the criticism of Clement (ἡμεῖς δέ, § 8; Ἔμοι δέ, § 17; δ' ἡμέτερος [λόγος], § 33); but generally the Valentinian comment is given without remark (οἱ ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντινίου, §§ 2, 6, 16, 23, 25; οἱ Οὐαλεντινιανοί, §§ 21, 24, 37; ὡς φησιν ὁ Θεόδοτος, §§ 22, 26, 30; φησὶ, §§ 41, 67; φασί, §§ 33, 35; λέγουσιν, § 43). It follows necessarily from the character of the selection that in some cases it is uncertain whether Clement quotes a Valentinian author by way of exposition, or adopts the opinion which he quotes. The same ambiguity appears to have existed in the original work; and it is easy to see how Photius, in his rapid perusal of the treatise, may have attributed to Clement doctrines which he simply recited without approval and without examination. Thus, in the fragments which remain, occasion might be given to charge Clement with false opinions on the nature of the Son (§ 19), on the creation of Eve (§ 21) on the two Words (§§ 6, 7, 19), on Fate (§§ 75, ff.), on the Incarnation (§ 1).

There is no perceptible order or connexion in the series of extracts. The beginning and the end are equally corrupt. Some sections are quite detached, e.g. (§§ 9, 18, 21, 28, 66, &c.); others give a more or less continuous exposition of some mystery: e.g. §§ 10-16 (the nature of spiritual existences); 39-65 (the relations of wisdom, Jesus, the Christ, the demiurge; the material, the animal, the spiritual); 67-86 (birth, fate, baptism).

(b) *The prophetic selections* (ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν ἐκλογαί) are for the most part scarcely less desultory and disconnected than the *Summaries*;

^b Bunsen (*Anal. Ante-Nic.* i. pp. 163 f.) arranges the contents of the books very differently. The evidence is slight; but it does not appear from Photius that the Gospels formed the subject of special annotation, and Bunsen makes the third book *Commentarius in Evangelia*.

but they are far simpler in style and substance. They commence with some remarks on the symbolism of the elements, and mainly of water (§§ 1-8). Then follow fragmentary reflections on discipline (9-11), on knowledge, faith, creation, the new creation (12-24), fire (25 f.), on writing and preaching (27), on traits of the true gnostic (28-37). A long miscellaneous series of observations, some of them physiological, succeeds (38-50), and the collection closes with a fairly continuous exposition of Ps. xviii. (xix.).

Manuscript.—The summaries from Theodotus and the prophetic selections are at present found only in *Cod. Flor. L* (see above).

The text which is given in the editions of Clement is most corrupt. The conjectural emendations and Latin translation of J. Bernays, given by Bunsen in his edition of the fragments of "The Outlines" (*Anal. Ante-Nic.* i.), are by far the most valuable help yet given for the understanding of the text. Dindorf, in his edition, has overlooked these.

(c) The third important fragment of the *Outlines* consists of a Latin version of notes on detached verses of 1 Peter, Jude, and 1, 2 John, with several insertions, which are probably due in some cases to transpositions in the MS. (e.g. 1 John ii. 1, hae namque primitivae virtutes—audita est, Pott. p. 1009, stands properly in connexion with the line of speculation on Jude 9); and in others to a marginal illustration drawn from some other part of the work (e.g. Jude 24, cum dicit Daniel—confusus est).

Cassiodorus says (*Inst. Div. Litt.* 8) that Clement wrote some remarks on 1 Peter i, 2 John, and James, which were generally subtle, but at times rash; and that he himself translated them into Latin, with such revision as rendered their teaching more safe. It has generally been supposed, in spite of the difference of range (*James for Jude*) that these Latin notes are the version of Cassiodorus. It seems, however, more probable that the printed notes are mere glosses taken from a *Catena*, and not a substantial work.

The *Adumbrationes* were published by De la Bigne in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Par. 1575 (and in later editions); but he gives no account of the MS. or MSS. from which the text was taken, nor does it appear that any later editor has taken the pains to verify his authorities. Ph. Labbe, however, states (*De Scriptt. Eccles.* 1660, i. p. 230) that he saw an ancient parchment MS., "qui fuit olim Coenobii S. Mariae Montis Dei," which contained these *Adumbrationes*, under that title, together with Didymus' commentary on the Catholic Epistles. It may, therefore, be fairly concluded, in the absence of all other evidence, that De la Bigne found the notes of Clement in the "very ancient but somewhat illegible MS." from which he took his text of Didymus, which follows the *Adumbrationes* (*Bibl. vi.* p. 676 n.). It is much to be regretted that this MS. has not been sought for and identified by later editors, for nothing more is known of the exact title of the notes than that they bore the heading *Adumbrationes*; though from the silence of De la Bigne, it is reasonable to suppose that he found them distinctly assigned to Clement.^c

^c It is probable that a careful examination of the

V. The remaining extant work of Clement, *Who is the rich man that is saved?* (τὸ δὲ σωζόμενος πλούσιος;) is apparently a popular address based upon St. Mark x. 17-31. The teaching is simple, eloquent, and just; and the tract closes with the exquisite "story, which is no story," of St. John and the young robber, which Eusebius has made familiar by inserting it in his *History* (iii. 23).

Manuscript.—The whole tract is preserved at present only in one late and somewhat imperfect Vatican MS.; but the story of "the young robber" is found separately in several MSS., of which Dindorf has collated two.

iii. *Clement's position and influence as a Christian teacher.*—In order to understand Clement rightly, it is necessary to bear constantly in mind that he laboured in a crisis of transition. It is this very fact which gives his writings their peculiar interest in all times of change. The transition which Clement strove more or less consciously to deal with was threefold, affecting doctrine, thought, and life. Doctrine was passing from the stage of oral tradition to written definition (1). Thought was passing from the immediate circle of the Christian revelation to the whole domain of human experience (2). Life in its fulness was coming to be apprehended as the object of Christian discipline (3). A few suggestions will be offered upon the first two of these heads.

(1.) Clement repeatedly affirms that even when he sets forth the deepest mysteries, he is simply reproducing an original unwritten tradition. This had been committed by the Lord to the apostles Peter and James, and John and Paul, and handed down from father to son, till at length he set forth accurately in writing what had been before delivered in word (*Strom.* i. § 11, p. 322; *Comp.* vi. 68, p. 774; and *fragm. ap. Euseb. H. E.* ii. 1). But this tradition was, as he held it, not an independent source of doctrine, but a guide to the apprehension of doctrine. It was not co-ordinate with Scripture, but interpretative of Scripture (*Strom.* vi. 124, f.; pp. 802 f. *De Div. Sal.* § 5, p. 938). It was the help to the training of the Christian philosopher (ὁ γνωστικός), and not part of the heritage of the simple believer.

Tradition in this aspect preserved the clue to the right understanding of the hidden sense, the underlying harmonies, the manifold unity of revelation. More particularly the philosopher was able to obtain through tradition the general principles of interpreting the records of revelation and significant illustrations of their application. In this way the true "gnostic" was saved from the errors of the false "gnostic" or heretic, who interpreted Scripture without regard to "the ecclesiastical rule" (*Strom.* vi. 125, p. 803, *κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός*; δὲ ἐκκλ. κ. *id.* vi. 165, p. 826; vii. 41, p. 855; *comp.* δὲ *κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*, *id.* vi. 124, p. 802; 131, p. 806; vii. 94, p. 890; δὲ *κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, *id.* i. 96, p. 375; vii. 105, p. 897).

Latin glosses on the Catholic Epistles would bring to light important fragments of Clement's Commentary. A very hasty inspection of the two MSS. mentioned in the old *Catal. MSS. Angl.* (Bodl. 640 (2094): Land. Lat. 110), as containing glosses of Clement, did not produce anything of interest; but it is desirable that the MSS. should be examined more thoroughly.

The examples of spiritual interpretation which Clement gives in accordance with this traditional "rule," are frequently visionary and puerile (e.g. *Strom.* vi. 133 ff. pp. 807 ff.). But none the less the rule itself witnessed to a vital truth, the continuity and permanent value of the books of Holy Scripture. This truth was an essential part of the inheritance of the Catholic church; and Clement, however faulty in detail, did good service in maintaining it (*id.* vii. 96, p. 891).

As yet, however, the contents of the Christian Bible were imperfectly defined. Clement, like the other fathers who habitually used the Alexandrine Old Testament, quotes the books of the Apocrypha without distinguishing them in any way from the books of the Hebrew canon. This, however, is simply a matter of common practice; and he nowhere expresses a deliberate judgment upon the authority of the two groups of books, though he appears to regard the current Greek Bible as answering to the Hebrew Scriptures restored by Ezra (*Strom.* i. 124, p. 392; *id.* 148, p. 409).

There is the same laxity of usage in Clement with regard to the Scriptures of the New Testament. He ascribes great weight to the *Epistle of Barnabas* (*Strom.* ii. 31, p. 445; *id.* 116, p. 489); and makes frequent use of the *Preaching of Peter* (*Strom.* i. 182, p. 427, &c.); and quotes also the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (*Strom.* ii. 45, p. 453). Eusebius further adds that he wrote notes on the *Revelation of Peter*, which is in fact quoted in the *Extracts from the Prophets* (§§ 41, 48, 49).

The text of his quotations is often inaccurate and evidently given from memory (e.g. *Matt.* v. 45; vi. 26, &c. *Comp. Dict. of Bible*, New Testament, § 7). But still as the earliest Greek writer who largely and expressly quotes the books of the New Testament, for the Greek fragments of Irenaeus are of comparatively small compass, his evidence as to the primitive form of the apostolic writings is of the highest value. Not unfrequently he is one of a very small group of witnesses who have preserved an original reading (e.g. 1 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 3, 5, 35, 39, &c.). In other cases his readings, even when they are wrong, are shewn by other evidence to have been widely spread at a very early date (e.g. *Matt.* vi. 33).

It would be impossible to follow out in detail Clement's opinions on special points of doctrine. The contrast which he draws between the gnostic (the philosophic Christian) and the ordinary believer is of more general interest. This contrast underlies, as we have seen, the whole plan of his *Miscellanies*, and explains the different aspects in which doctrine, according to his view, might be regarded as an object of faith and as an object of knowledge. Faith is the foundation; knowledge the superstructure (*Strom.* vi. 26, p. 660). By knowledge faith is perfected (*id.* vii. 55, p. 864), for to know is more than to believe (*id.* vi. 109, p. 794). Faith is a summary knowledge of urgent truths: knowledge a sure demonstration of what has been received through faith, being itself reared upon faith through the teaching of the Lord (*id.* vii. 57, p. 865). Thus the gnostic grasps the complete truth of all revelation from the beginning of the world to the end, piercing to the depths of Scripture, of

which the believer tastes the surface only (*id.* vi. 78, p. 779; 131, p. 806; vii. 95, p. 891). As a consequence of this intelligent sympathy with the Divine Will, the gnostic becomes in perfect unity in himself (*μοναδικός*), and as far as possible like God (*id.* iv. 154, p. 633; vii. 13, p. 835). Definite outward observances cease to have any value for one whose whole being is brought into an abiding harmony with that which is eternal: he has no wants, no passions; he rests in the contemplation of God, which is and will be his unending blessedness (*id.* vii. 35, p. 851, 84, p. 883; vi. 71, p. 776; vii. 56, p. 865).

In this outline it is easy to see the noblest traits of later mysticism. And if some of Clement's statements go beyond subjects which lie within the powers of man, still he bears impressive testimony to two essential truths which require continual iteration, that the aim of faith through knowledge perfected by love is the present recovery of the divine likeness; and again, that formulated doctrine is not an end in itself, but a means whereby we rise through fragmentary propositions to knowledge which is immediate and one.

(2.) The character of the gnostic, the ideal Christian, the perfect philosopher, represents the link between man, in his earthly conflict, and God: it represents also the link between man and men. The gnostic fulfils through the gospel the destiny and nature of mankind, and gathers together the fruit of their varied experience. This thought of the Incarnation as the crown and consummation of the whole history of the world is perhaps that which is most characteristic of Clement's office as an interpreter of the faith. It rests upon his view of human nature, of the providential government of God, of the finality of the Christian dispensation.

Man, according to Clement, is born for the service of God. His soul (*ψυχή*) is a gift sent down to him from heaven by God (*Strom.* iv. 169, p. 640), and strains to return thither (*id.* 9, p. 567). For this end there is need of painful training (*Strom.* i. 33, p. 335; vi. 78, p. 779); and the various partial sciences are helps towards the attainment of the true destiny of existence (*Strom.* vi. 80 ff. pp. 780 ff.). The "image" of God which man receives at his birth is slowly completed in the "likeness" of God (*Strom.* ii. 131, p. 499. *Comp. Paed.* i. 98, p. 156). The inspiration of the divine breath by which he is distinguished from other creatures (*Gen.* ii. 7) is fulfilled by the gift of the Holy Spirit to the believer, which that original constitution makes possible (*Strom.* v. 87 f.; p. 698. *Comp. Strom.* iv. 150, p. 632). The image of God, Clement says elsewhere, is the Word (*Logos*), and the true image of the Word is man, that is, the reason in man (*Cohort.* 98, p. 79).

It follows necessarily from this view of humanity, as essentially related to God through the Word, that Clement acknowledged a providential purpose in the development of Gentile life. Looking at the bright side of Gentile speculation he recognized in it many divine elements. These he regarded as partly borrowed from Jewish revelation, and partly derived from reason illuminated by the Word (*Λόγος*), the final source of reason. Some truths, he says, the Greek philosophers stole and dis-

figured; some they overlaid with restless and foolish speculations; others they discovered, for they also perhaps had "a spirit of wisdom" (*Ex.* xxviii. 3) (*Strom.* i. 87, p. 369).

But whatever might be, in Clement's judgment, the source of Greek philosophy, he distinctly recognised the office which it had fulfilled for the Greeks, and still in his own time continued to fulfil, as a guide to righteousness, and a work of divine providence (*Strom.* i. 176 ff. pp. 425 ff.; 91 ff. pp. 372 ff.). It was, according to his interpretation, a preparation for justifying faith (*Strom.* i. 99, p. 377; vi. 44, p. 762; *id.* 47 ff. pp. 764 ff.), and in a true sense a dispensation, a covenant (*Strom.* vi. 42, p. 761; *id.* 67, p. 773; *id.* 159, p. 823; i. 28, p. 331).

The training of the Jews and the training of the Greeks were thus in different ways designed to fit men for the final manifestation of the Christ. They were partial in their essence, and by the imperfection of men they were made still more partial. The various schools of philosophy, Jewish and heathen, are described by Clement under a memorable image, as rending in pieces the one truth like the Bacchantes who rent the body of Pentheus, and bore about the fragments in triumph. Each one, he says, boasts that the morsel which it has had the good fortune to gain is all the truth . . . Yet by the rising of the light, he continues, all things are lightened . . . and he that again combines the divided parts and unites the exposition (*λόγος*) in a perfect whole, will, we may be assured, look upon the truth without peril (*Strom.* i. 57, p. 349).

Towards this great unity of all science and all life Clement himself strove; and by the influence of his writings he has kept alive in others the sense of the magnificent promises included in the teaching of St. Paul and St. John, which by their very grandeur are apt to escape apprehension. He affirmed, once for all, upon the threshold of the new age, that Christianity is the heir of all past time, and the interpreter of the future. Sixteen centuries have confirmed the truth of his principle, and left its application still fruitful.

The *Editio princeps* of Clement was edited by P. Victorius, *Flor.* 1550. A Latin version by G. Hervetus and C. Strozza was published shortly afterwards, *Flor.* 1551, emended *Paris*, 1590. The edition of F. Sylburg, *Heidelb.* 1592, gave a Greek text carefully corrected, and two valuable indices. This was followed by the Graeco-Latin edition of D. Heinsius, *Lugd. Bat.* (1616), which served as the basis of the edition of J. Potter, *Oxon.* 1715. Other editions and reprints which possess no peculiar value may be passed over. The small edition of the Greek text, by R. Klotz, *Lips.* 1831-34, is convenient from its size, but singularly inaccurate; and the last edition by G. Dindorf, *Oxon.* 1869, is in every way most disappointing, hastily put together, incomplete, and in almost every respect below the standard of modern scholarship, so that it simply closes the way against a satisfactory edition of Clement, which is still greatly needed. *Comp. Fabric. Bibl. Graeca* (ed. Harles) vii. 119-149.

In addition to the chief Church Histories, the following works are of importance for the study of Clement: Le Nourry, *Appar. ad Bibliothecam Patrum Lib. III.* (reprinted in Dindorf's edi-

tion); Moehler, *Patrologie*, 1840; Daehne, *Gesch.-Darstellung d. jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, 1834; Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies*, Lect. xvi.; and the histories of the Alexandrine School, by Guericke, Matter, J. Simon, Vacherot. There are several interesting summaries of Clement's teaching, besides those given in the general works of Lumper, Maréchal, and Schramm; by Bp. Kaye (*Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, Lond. 1835); Bp. Reinkens (*De Clemente Presb. Alex. homine, scriptore, philosopho, theologo liber*. Vratisl. 1851); Abbé Cognat (*Clément d'Alexandrie, sa Doctrine et sa Polémique*, Paris, 1859); Abbé Freppel (*Clément d'Alexandrie, Cours à la Sorbonne*, Paris, 1866). [B. F. W.]

CLEMENTIANUS (1). See NINUS, Cyp. Ep. 56. [E. W. B.]

(2) Said by Victor Vitensis in the beginning of his 2nd book on the Vandal persecution to have had inscribed on his thigh "Manichæus Christi discipulus." [E. B. B.]

CLEMENTINE LITERATURE. Among the spurious writings attributed to Clement of Rome, the chief is one which purported to contain a record made by Clement of discourses of the apostle Peter, together with an account of the circumstances under which Clement came to be Peter's travelling companion, and of other details of Clement's family history. This work assumed a considerable variety of forms. Important changes were made with a view to the improvement of its doctrine, the Ebionitism with which the original work had been strongly coloured having been first softened, then removed. Changes were also made with a view to the improvement of the story; and as time went on far more interest was felt in the framework of narrative in which the discourses were set, than in the discourses themselves. In the latest forms of the work, several of the discourses are omitted, and the rest greatly abridged. In early times, even when the work was rejected as heretical, it seems still to have been supposed to rest on a groundwork of fact, and several statements passed into church tradition which appear primarily to rest on the authority of this book. Afterwards, when it came to be presented in an orthodox form, it was accepted as a genuine work of Clement and a trustworthy historical authority. On the revival of learning these claims were disallowed, and the disposition then was to disregard the book as a heretical figment quite worthless to the student of church history. Later it was seen, that even though the work be regarded as no more than a historical novel composed with a controversial object towards the end of the second century, such a document must be most valuable for the light which it throws on the opinions of the school from which it emanated; and accordingly the Clementine writings play an important part in all modern discussions concerning the history of the early ages of the church.

The work has come down to us in three principal forms. 1. *The Homilies* (in the MSS. τὰ Κλημένεια) first printed by Cotelier in his edition of the *Apostolic Fathers* 1672, from one of the Colbertine MSS. in the Paris Library. This manuscript is both corrupt and defective, break-

ing off in the middle of the 19th of the 20 homilies of which the entire work consists. The complete work was first published by Dressel, 1853, from a MS. which he found in the Ottobonian Library in the Vatican. Notes on the homilies by Wieseler, which were intended to have formed part of this publication, only appeared in 1859 as an appendix to Dressel's edition of the *Eptomes*, which will be presently mentioned. The two MSS. we have mentioned are the only ones now known to exist, though it would seem that a MS. different from either was used by Turrianus (1573), who in quoting the homilies uses a division into books different from that of the existing MSS.

II. *The Recognitions* (ἀναγνώσεις, ἀναγνωρισμοί). This work in the MSS. bears a great variety of titles, the most common being *Itinerarium S. Clementis* (corresponding probably to περίοδοι Κλημέντος or περίοδοι Πέτρου). The original is lost, but the work is preserved in a translation by Rufinus, of which many MSS. are extant. Rufinus states in his preface that there were then extant two forms of the work, in many respects differing in the narrative. He adds that he had omitted certain passages common to both forms, one of which he specifies, as being, to say the least, unintelligible to him; and elsewhere he expresses his opinion that those passages had been interpolated by heretics. He claims in the remainder of the work to have aimed at giving rather a literal than an elegant translation; and there seems reason for accepting this statement, and for regarding this translation as more faithful than some other translations by Rufinus. Besides that we can test his work in the case of fragments of the original preserved by quotation, we have now also a Syriac translation of the first three books, which may be described as in the main in fair agreement with the Latin. For one of the most important variations see Lightfoot on the *Galatians*, 4th edit. p. 316. The translation of Rufinus was first published by Richardus, Basle, 1526. The most important of later editions are that by Cotelier in his *Apostolic Fathers*, Paris, 1672, and that by Gersdorf, Leipzig, 1838. A new edition, founded on a better collation of MSS., is much to be wished for. The Syriac translation, an edition of which was published by de Lagarde, 1861, is preserved in two MSS. belonging to the British Museum. The older of these claims to have been written at Edessa, A.D. 411, and exhibits errors of transcription, which shew that it was taken from a still earlier MS. It contains the first three books of the *Recognitions* and part of the first chapter of the fourth book, at the end of which is marked "the end of the first discourse of Clemens." Then follow the 10th homily with the heading "the third against the Gentiles;" the 11th homily with the heading "the fourth;" the 12th and 13th homilies, the former only as far as chapter twenty-four, with the heading "from Tripoli in Phoenicia;" and the 14th homily with the heading "book fourteen," after which is marked "the end of the discourses of Clemens." The other MS. is some four centuries later, and contains only the first three books of the *Recognitions*, the note at the end being "the ninth of Clemens who accompanied Simon Cephas is ended."

III. *The Epitome*, first published by Turnebus 1555. This is an abridgement of the first form (i.e. the *Homilies*); and contains also a continuation of the story, use being made therein of the martyrdom of Clement by Simeon Metaphrastes, and of a tale by Ephraim, bishop of Chersonesus, of a miracle performed at the tomb of Clement. The *Epitome* is given in a form more or less full in different MSS. The latest edition by Dressel, Leipsic, 1859, besides giving a fuller version of the *Epitome* previously published, contains also a second form considerably different. Besides the forms which have come down to us, there must have been at least one other, called by Uhlhorn the orthodox Clementines, which retained the discourses, but completely expurgated the heresy contained in them. This is inferred from the citations of the late Greek writers (Nicephorus Callisti, Cedrenus, and Michael Glycas); and the Clementines so amended were so entirely accepted by the later Greek church, that a Scholiast on Eusebius is quite unable to understand the charge of heresy which his author brings against these writings. In what follows we set aside the consideration of the *Epitomes* as being manifestly a late form of the work, and we confine our attention to the other two forms, viz. the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, to which, or to their writers, we shall refer under the abbreviations H. and R. Of these the *Homilies* contain all the characteristics of Ebionitism in much the harsher form; but before discussing the doctrine of the work, it will be convenient first to compare the narratives as told in either form. The following is an abstract of the *Recognitions*. The form is that of an autobiography addressed by Clement to James, bishop of Jerusalem. The work divides itself into three portions, probably of different dates. I. Clement, having stated that he had been born at Rome, and had been from early years a lover of chastity, gives a lively description of the perplexity caused him by his anxiety to solve the problems, what had been the origin, and what would be the future of the world, and whether he himself might look forward to a future life. He seeks in vain for knowledge in the schools of the philosophers, but finds nothing but disputings, contradiction, and uncertainty. At length a rumour that there had arisen in Judaea a preacher of truth possessed of miraculous power, is confirmed by the arrival of Barnabas in Rome, who declares that the Son of God was even then preaching in Judaea, and promising eternal life to his disciples. Barnabas is rudely received by the Roman rabble, and returns to his own country in haste to be present at a Jewish feast. Clement, though desirous to accompany him for further instruction, is detained by the necessity of collecting money due to him; but having despatched his business as speedily as he can, he sails shortly after for Palestine, and after a fifteen days' voyage arrives at Caesarea. There he finds Barnabas again and is introduced by him to Peter, who had arrived at Caesarea on the same day, and who was on the next to hold a discussion with Simon the Samaritan. Peter forthwith frees Clement from his perplexities, by instructing him in the doctrine of the "true prophet" who has come to enlighten man's darkness and teach him what to believe. For one who has received the

true prophet's credentials there is an end of uncertainty; faith in this prophet can never be withdrawn, nor can anything which he teaches admit of doubt or question. We are here told that Clement by Peter's orders committed his teaching on this subject to writing, and sent the book to James, to whom Peter had been commanded annually to transmit an account of his doings. We are next told that Simon postponed the appointed discussion with Peter, who uses the interval thus gained to give Clement a continuous exposition of the faith, in which God's dealings are declared from the commencement of the world to the then present time. This section includes an account of a disputation held on the temple steps between the apostles and the various sects of the Jews, viz. the priests, the Sadducees, the Samaritans, the Scribes and Pharisees, and the disciples of John. When the apostles are on the point of success the disputation is broken off by a tumult raised by an enemy, whose name is not given, but who is unmistakably Saul, who flings James down the temple steps, leaving him for dead, and disperses the assembly. The disciples fly to Jericho, and the enemy hastens to Damascus whither he supposes Peter to have fled, in order there to make havoc of the faithful. At Jericho, James hears from Zacchaeus of the mischief that is being done by Simon at Caesarea, and sends Peter thither to refute him, ordering him to report to him his doings annually, but more particularly every seven years. In the section that has been just described there are some things which do not harmonise with what has gone before. The date of the events related is given as seven years after our Lord's passion, although the previous story implies that Clement's voyage had been made in the very year that ended our Lord's ministry. Also in one place (I. 71) Peter is mentioned in the third person, though he is himself the speaker. These facts prove that the story of Clement has been added on to an older document. It has been conjectured that this document was an Ebionite work *'Αναβαθμολογία* *Ἰακώβου*, the contents of which, as described by Epiphanius (xxx. 16), well correspond with those of this section, and the title of which might be explained as referring to discourses on the temple steps. But this conjecture encounters the difficulty that the author himself indicates a different source for this part of his work.

We are next introduced to two disciples of Peter, Nicetas and Aquila, who had formerly been disciples of Simon. These give an account of the history of Simon and of his magical powers, stating in particular that Simon supposed himself to perform his wonders by the aid of the soul of a murdered boy, whose likeness was preserved in Simon's bed-chamber. Prepared with this information Peter enters into a public discussion with Simon which lasts for three days, the main subject in debate being whether the difficulty of reconciling the existence of evil with the goodness and power of the Creator, does not force us to believe in the existence of a God different from the Creator of the world. The question of the immortality of the soul is also treated of, and this brings the discussion to a dramatic close. For Peter at length offers to settle the question by proceeding to Simon's bed-chamber, and interrogating the soul of the

murdered boy, whose likeness was there preserved. On finding his secret to be known to Peter Simon humbles himself, but retracts his repentance on Peter's acknowledging that he had this knowledge, not by prophetic power, but by the information of associates of Simon. The multitude however are filled with indignation, and drive Simon away in disgrace. Simon departs informing his disciples that divine honours await him at Rome. Peter resolves to follow him among the Gentiles and expose his wickedness; and having remained three months at Caesarea for the establishment of the church, he ordains Zacchaeus as its bishop, and sets out for Tripolis, which he learns has now become the centre of Simon's operations. This brings the third book of the *Recognitions* to a close; and here we are told that Clement sent to James an account in ten books of Peter's discourses. It has been questioned whether these ten books were imagined by the author of the *Recognitions* or whether they formed a work really in existence previous to his own composition. The latter supposition is greatly to be preferred, for the author not only refers to ten books, but gives in detail the contents of each book. And it is to be noted that these contents can scarcely be described as an abstract of the contents of the three books of the *Recognitions*; for though the same topics are more or less touched on in the *Recognitions*, the order and proportion of treatment are different. One of the books is described as treating of the Apostles' disputation at the temple; and therefore it seems needless to look for the original of this part in the "Ascents of James" or elsewhere.

II. On Peter's arrival at Tripolis he finds that Simon on hearing of his coming had taken flight by night and gone to Syria. Peter then proceeds to instruct the people of the place; and his discourses, containing a polemic against heathenism, occupy the next three books of the *Recognitions*. The sixth terminates with the baptism of Clement and the ordination of a bishop, after which Peter sets out for Antioch, having spent three months at Tripolis. III. With the seventh book the story of Clement's recognition of his family begins. We shall presently discuss the manner in which an occasion is skilfully presented for Clement's relating his family history to Peter. That history is as follows:—Clement's father, named Faustinianus, was a member of the emperor's family, and was married by him to a lady of noble birth, named Mattidia. By her he had twin sons, Faustus and Faustinus, and afterwards Clement. When Clement was five years old, Mattidia told her husband that she had seen a vision warning her that unless she and her twin sons speedily left Rome and remained absent for ten years all must perish miserably. Thereupon the father sent his wife and children with suitable provision of money and attendance to Athens, in order to educate them there. But after her departure no tidings of her reached Rome, and Faustinianus having in vain sent others to inquire for her, at length left Clement under guardianship at Rome, and departed himself in search of wife and children. But he too disappeared, and Clement now aged thirty-two, had never since heard of father, mother, or brothers. The story proceeds to tell how Peter and Clement on their way to

Antioch go over to the island of Aradus to see the wonders of a celebrated temple there. While Clement and his party are admiring works of Phidias preserved in the temple, Peter converses with a beggar woman outside, and the story she tells him of her life is in such agreement with that previously told him by Clement, that Peter is able to unite mother and son. It appears that the vision which she had related had been only feigned by her in order to escape from the incestuous addresses of her husband's brother, without causing family discord by revealing his wickedness. On her voyage to Athens she had been shipwrecked, and had been cast on shore by the waves, without being able to tell what had become of her children. All now return to the main land, and on telling the story to their companions who had been left behind, a further recognition takes place: for Nicetas and Aquila recognise their own story and declare themselves to be the twin sons, who had been saved from the wreck, but had been sold into slavery by their rescuers. Mattidia is baptized. After the baptism Peter and the three brothers, having bathed in the sea, withdraw to a retired place for prayer. An old man in a workman's dress having noticed what they were doing, accosts them and undertakes to prove to them that prayer is useless, and that there is neither God nor Providence, but that all things are governed by astrological fate (genesis). A set disputation takes place, which occupies the 8th and 9th books of the *Recognitions*; the three brothers, as being well-trained in Grecian philosophy, successively argue on the side of Providence, and discuss the evidence for astrology. The discussion is closed by a dramatic surprise. When all the old man's other difficulties have been solved, he undertakes to produce a conclusive argument from his own experience. His own wife had been born under a horoscope which compelled her to commit adultery, and to end her days by water in foreign travel. And so it turned out. She had been guilty of adultery with a slave, as he had learned on his brother's testimony, and afterwards leaving Rome with her twin sons on account of a pretended vision, had perished miserably by shipwreck. Peter has now the triumph of re-uniting the family and gaining a victory in the discussion, by shewing the complete falsification of the astrological prediction. From the account given by Rufinus, it would seem that one of the forms of the *Recognitions* known to him closed here; but in the tenth book as we have it, the story is prolonged by discourses intended to bring Faustinianus to a hearty reception of Christianity. After this Simon is again brought on the stage. He has been very successful at Antioch in shewing wonders to the people and stirring up their hatred against Peter. One of Peter's emissaries, in order to drive him to flight, prevails on Cornelius the centurion, who had been then sent on public business to Caesarea, to give out that he had been commissioned to seek out and destroy Simon, in accordance with an edict of the emperor for the destruction of sorcerers at Rome and in the provinces. Tidings of this are brought to Simon by a pretended friend, who is in reality a Christian spy. Simon, in alarm, flees to Laodicea, and there meeting Faustinianus, who had come to visit their common friends,

Apion (or, as our author spells the name, Appion) and Anubion, for his further security he transforms by his magic the features of Faustinianus into his own, in order that Faustinianus may be arrested in his stead. But Peter, not being deceived by the transformation, turns it to the greater discomfiture of Simon. For he sends Faustinianus to Antioch, who pretending to be Simon, whose form he bore, makes a public confession of imposture, and testifies to the divine mission of Peter. After this, when Simon attempts again to get a hearing in Antioch, he is driven away in disgrace. Peter is received then with the greatest honour and baptizes Faustinianus, who has meanwhile recovered his own form.

We turn now to the story as told in the *Homilies*. The opening is identical with that of the *Recognitions*, except for one small variation. Clement, instead of meeting Barnabas in Rome, has been induced by an anonymous Christian teacher to sail for Palestine; but being driven by storms to Alexandria, there encounters Barnabas. It is not easy to say which form of the story is to be regarded as the original. On the one hand, the account that Clement is delayed from following Barnabas by the necessity of collecting money due to him is perfectly in place if the scene is laid at Rome, but not so if Clement is a stranger driven by stress of weather to Alexandria. The author, who elsewhere shews Alexandrian proclivities, may have been zealous to do honour to that city by connecting Barnabas with it; or, it may be, have been unwilling that Peter should be preceded by another apostle at Rome. On the other hand, the rabble which assails Barnabas, is in both versions described as a mob of *Greeks*, and the fifteen days' voyage to Palestine corresponds better with Alexandria than with Rome. The narrative proceeds as in R. as far as the end of Peter's disputation with Simon at Caesarea; but both Peter's preliminary instructions to Clement and the disputation itself are different. In H. Peter prepares Clement by teaching him his secret doctrine concerning difficulties likely to be raised by Simon, the true solution of which he could not produce before the multitude. Simon would bring forward texts which seemed to speak of a plurality of Gods, or which imputed imperfection to God, or spoke of him as changing his purpose or hardening men's hearts and so forth; or, again, which laid crimes to the charge of the just men of the law, Adam and Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Moses. In public it would be inexpedient to question the authority of these passages of Scripture, and the difficulty must be met in some other way. But the true solution is that the Scriptures have been corrupted; and all those passages which speak against God are to be rejected as spurious additions. Although this doctrine is represented as strictly esoteric, to our surprise it is reproduced in the public discussion with Simon which immediately follows. This disputation in H. is very short, the main conflict between Peter and Simon being reserved for a later stage of the story. It is here stated, however, that this disputation at Caesarea lasted three days, although only the subjects treated of on the first day are mentioned. We have now a great variation in the narrative between H. and R.

According to H., Simon vanquished in the disputation flies to Tyre, and Nicetas, Aquila, and Clement are sent forward by Peter to prepare the way for him. There they meet Apion, and a public disputation on heathen mythology is held between Clement and Apion, the debate going over many of the same topics as are treated of in the tenth book of R. On Peter's arrival at Tyre, Simon flies on to Tripolis, and thence also to Syria on Peter's continuing the pursuit. We have, as in R., discourses delivered to the heathen at Tripolis, and the story of the discovery of Clement's family is in the main told as in R., with differences in detail to be noticed presently. In H., the main disputation between Peter and Simon takes place after the recognitions, and is held at Laodicea, Clement's father (whose name according to H. is Faustus) acting as judge. The last homily contains explanations given by Peter to his company after the flight of Simon; and concludes with an account similar to that in R., of the transformation of Clement's father.

To this analysis of the contents of the two forms of the story must be added an account of the prefatory matter. Neither the Latin nor Syriac version of the *Recognitions* translates any preface; but Rufinus mentions having found in his original a letter of Clement to James, which he does not prefix to his translation, because as he says, it is of later date, and because he had translated it elsewhere. The remark about later date need not be understood to imply any doubt of the genuineness of the letter, but merely that this letter, which purports to have been written after the death of Peter, is not rightly prefixed to discourses which claim to have been written some years previously. The letter itself is preserved in the MSS. of the *Homilies*, and gives an account of Peter's ordination of Clement as his successor at Rome, and closes with instructions to Clement to send to James an abstract of Peter's discourses since Clement had become his companion. The work that follows then purports to contain an abridgement of discourses already more fully sent to James; and is given in the title: "An epitome by Clement of Peter's discourses during his sojournings" (*ἐπιτομὴν κηρυγμάτων*). The *Homilies* contain another preface in the form of a letter from Peter himself to James. In this letter no mention is made of Clement, but Peter himself sends his discourses to James, strictly forbidding their indiscriminate publication, and charging him not to communicate them to any Gentile, nor even to any of the circumcised, except after a long probation, nor to him all at once, but the later only after he had been tried and found faithful in the case of the earlier. Subjoined is an oath of secrecy to be taken by those to whom the writings shall be communicated. Though, as has been said, both these letters are now found prefixed to the *Homilies*, examination shews that the letter of Clement cannot belong to the *Homilies*; for the account which it gives of Clement's deprecation of the dignity of the episcopate, and of the charges given to him on his admission to it, are in a great measure identical with what is related in the 5th homily, in the case of the ordination of Zacchaeus at Caesarea. These are omitted from the story as told in the *Recognitions*. The inference follows that the letter of Clement is the

preface to the *Recognitions*. Then according to the conclusion we form on other grounds as to the relative priority of the two forms, we may suppose, either that R., when prefixing his account of Clement's ordination, transposed matter which the older document had contained in connexion with Zacchaeus, or else that H., when substituting for the letter of Clement a letter in the name of Peter himself, found in Clement's letter matter which seemed to him too valuable to be wasted, and which he therefore worked into the account of the first ordination related in the story, that of Zacchaeus. The letter of Clement having been assigned to R., that of Peter remains as the preface either to the *Homilies*, or it may be to the earlier form of the work before the name of Clement had been introduced into the story. On the question of relative priority may be noticed the presumption that it is more likely that a later writer would remove a preface written in the name of Clement, in order to give his work the higher authority of Peter, than that the converse change should be made; and also that the strong charges to secrecy, and to the communication of the work in successive instalments would be accounted for, if we suppose that at the time of the publication of the *Homilies* another version of Peter's discourses had been in circulation, and that the writer was anxious to offer some account why what he produced as the genuine form of the discourses should not have been earlier made known.

Respecting the relative priority of the forms H. and R. there has been great diversity of opinion among critics: Baur, Schliemann, Schwegler, and Uhlhorn give the priority to H., Hilgenfeld and Ritschl to R.; Lehmann holds R. to be the original as far as the first three books are concerned, H. in the later part of the story. Lipsius regards both as independent modifications of a common original. In such diversity of opinion it would be arrogant to speak over-confidently; but the conclusion to which we have come is, that while neither of the existing documents can claim to be the original form of the story, they are not independent; that H. is the later, and in all that relates to Clement's family history has borrowed from R. The conclusion which seems to us most probable is, that the original form of the document contained little but discourses, and that it probably was an esoteric document, in use only among the Ebionites; that the author of R. added to it the whole story of Clement's recovery of his parents, at the same time fitting the work for popular use by omitting or softening down all the harshest parts of its Ebionitism; and finally, that H., a strong Ebionite, restored some of the original discourses, retaining at the same time the little romance which no doubt had been found to add much to the popularity and attractiveness of the volume. The following are some of the arguments which prove that H. is not an original.

(1.) The story of Clement's first recognition of his family is told in exactly the same way in R. book 7, and in H. book 12. Clement, anxious to be permitted to join himself permanently as travelling companion to Peter, reminds him of words he had used at Caesarea; how he had there invited those to travel with him who could do so with piety, that is to say, without desert-

ing wife, parents, or other relations whom they could not properly leave. Clement states that he is himself one thus untrammelled by family ties, and he is thus led to tell the story of his life. These words of Peter, to which both R. and H. refer, are to be found only in R. (iii. 71), not in H. It has been stated that the ordination of Zacchaeus at Caesarea is told fully in H., and only briefly in R. In recompense R. has a long section describing the grief of the disciples at Peter's departure and the consolations which he addressed to them; all this is compressed into a line or two in H. It is matter which any one revising R. would most naturally cut out as unimportant and uninteresting; but we see that it contains words essential in the interests of the story; and we can hardly doubt that these words were introduced with a view to the use subsequently made of them. This instance not only shews, as Lehmann admits, that H. is not original in respect of the Caesarean sections, but it still more decisively refutes Lehmann's own hypothesis that it was H. who ornamented an originally simpler story with the romance of the recognitions. Either the author of that romance, as is most probable, was also the author of Peter's Caesarean speech, which has little use except as a preparation for what follows; or else finding that speech in an earlier document, he used it as a connecting link to join on his own addition. In either case he must have been fully alive to its importance from his point of view, and it is quite impossible that he could have left it out from his version of the story. It may be added, that of the two writers H. and R., H. is the one infinitely less capable of inventing a romance. Looking at the whole work as a controversial novel, it is apparent all through that H. feels most interest in the controversy, R. in the novel.

(2.) The section just referred to affords another proof of the posteriority of H. In the passage common to H. and R. Peter sends on Nicetas and Aquila to prepare the way for his coming. He apologises for parting company with them, and they express their grief at the separation, but console themselves that it is only for two days. On their departure Clement says, "I thank God that it was not I whom you sent away, as I should have died of grief." And then follows the request that Peter would accept him as his inseparable companion. This is all consistent as the story is told by R.; for these regrets are expressed on the first occasion that any of the three brothers is removed from personal attendance on Peter. But as H. tells the story, Peter had already sent on Clement, while still unbaptized, together with Nicetas and Aquila to Tyre, where they hold a disputation with Apion. There is not a word of grief or remonstrance at the separation for more than a week, and it is therefore strange that subsequently there should be so much regret at a two days' parting. It is plain that H. has interpolated the mission to Tyre; but failed to notice that he ought in consistency to have modified some of the next portion of R. which he retained. This disputation with Apion has been alleged as a proof of the priority of H.; for Apion is introduced also into R., but only as a silent character; and it is urged that the original form of the story is more likely to be that in which this well-known ad-

versary of Judaism is brought in to conduct a disputation, than that in which he is but an insignificant companion of Simon. But this argument does not affect the question of relative priority between H. and R., whatever weight it may have in inducing us to believe that R. is himself not original. Eusebius (iii. 38) mentions a long work ascribed to Clement, and then but recently composed (as he infers from not having seen it quoted by any earlier writer), containing dialogues of Peter and Apion. This description may be intended for the *Homilies*; but it is also possible that it may refer to a still earlier work. There are expressions in R. which seem to imply that the writer believed himself to be making an improvement, in substituting for Peter as a disputant against heathenism, persons whose early training had been such as to give them better knowledge of heathen mythology and philosophy.

(3.) The story of Clement's recognition of his brothers contains plain marks that H. has abridged R. According to R., Nicetas and Aquila, seeing a strange woman return with Peter and Clement, ask for an explanation. Peter then repeats at full length the story of the adventures of Clement's mother. Nicetas and Aquila listen in silence until Peter describes the shipwrecked mother searching for her children and crying, "Where are my Faustus and Faustinus?" then, when they hear their own names mentioned, they start up in amaze and say, "We suspected at the first that what you were saying might relate to us; but yet as many like things happen in different persons' lives, we kept silence; but when you came to the end and it was entirely manifest that your statements referred to us, then we confessed who we were." H. avoids what seems the needless repetition of a story which had been told already, and only states in general terms that Peter recounted Mattidia's history; but the amazed starting up of the brothers, and the words in which they express themselves, are the same as in R.; while, as the incident of the mention of their former names is omitted, it is in this version not apparent why the conclusion of Peter's speech brought conviction to their minds. It is evident that H., in trying to shorten the narrative by clearing it of what seemed to him a tiresome repetition, has missed a point in the story.

(4.) It has been already related how in R. the recognition of Clement's father crowns a disputation on astrological fate. In H. the whole story is spoiled. An old man accosts Peter, as in R., and promises to prove to him from his personal history that all things are ruled by the stars; but nothing turns on this. The recognition takes place in consequence of a chance meeting of Faustinianus with his wife, and has no relation to the subject he undertakes to discuss with Peter. And the obvious explanation is, that H. has copied the introduction from R.; but omits the disputation because he has already anticipated it, having put the argument for heathenism into the mouth of the eminent rhetorician Apion, who seemed a fitter character to conduct the disputation than the unknown Faustinianus. Further H. (xx. 15) and R. (x. 57) agree in the statement that the magical transformation of Clement's father takes place on the same day that he had been recognised by his family. This agrees with the story as told by

R.; but H. had made five days' disputation intervene between the recognition and the transformation. Thus in the account of each of the three sets of recognitions there is evidence that H. copied either from R., or from a writer who tells the story exactly as R. does; and the former hypothesis is to be preferred because there is no evidence whatever of R.'s non-originality in this part of his task.

(5.) It has been stated that in H. there are two disputations of Simon with Peter, viz., at Caesarea and at Laodicea. There is decisive proof that in this H. has varied from the original form of the story which, as R. does, laid the scene of the entire disputation at Caesarea. The indications here, however, point to a borrowing not from R. but from a common original. H. does relate a disputation at Caesarea, but evidently reserves his materials for use further on, giving but a meagre sketch of part of one day's dispute, while he conscientiously follows his authority and relates that the dispute lasted three days. Afterwards at Laodicea the same topics are produced which had been brought forward in the earlier discussion, and produced as if they were new. Simon, for instance, expresses the greatest surprise at Peter's manner of disposing of the alleged spurious passages of the Pentateuch, although exactly the same line of argument had been used by Peter on the former occasion. The phenomenon again presents itself (H. xviii. 21) of a reference to former words of Peter which are not to be found in H. itself, but are found in R. ii. 45. Lastly, in the disputation at Laodicea, the office of summoning Peter to the conflict is ascribed to Zacchaeus, in flagrant contradiction with the previous story, according to which Zacchaeus was the leading man of the church at Caesarea before Peter's arrival, and had been left behind as its bishop on Peter's departure. This alone is enough to shew that H. is copying from an original, in which the scene is laid at Caesarea. It may be added that the *Apostolic Constitutions* make mention only of a Caesarean disputation.

(6.) It has been stated that the last homily contains private expositions by Peter to his disciples, and these can clearly be proved to be an interpolation. In R., after the disputation on Genesis in which Clement's father is convinced, when the party have returned home and just as they are going to sit down to meat, news comes in of the arrival of Apion and Anubion, and Faustinianus goes off to salute them. In H. the party have retired to rest, and Peter wakes them up in the middle of the night to receive his instructions; yet in the middle of this midnight discourse we have an account, almost verbally agreeing with R., of the news of the arrival of Apion coming just as they were about to sit down to meat, and the consequent departure of Clement's father. The discourse, which is thus clearly shewn to be an interpolation, contains H.'s doctrine concerning the devil, and is in such close connexion with the preceding homily which relates how Peter in his Laodicean disputation dealt with the problem of the permission of evil in the universe, that this also must be set down as an addition made by H. to the original story. And we can see the reason why H. altered the original account of a Caesarean disputation; namely, that he wished to reserve as the climax

of his story, the solutions which he put into Peter's mouth, of the great controversy of his own day.

(7.) In the section H. ii. 19-32, which contains the information given by Nicetas and Aquila concerning Simon, there are plain marks that H. is not original. Nicetas, in repeating a conversation with Simon, speaks of himself in the third person: "Nicetas answered," instead of "I answered." In the corresponding section of R., Aquila is the speaker, and the use of the third person is correct. Yet this matter, in which H. is clearly not original, is so different from R., that we are led to the conclusion, not that H. copied from R., but that both copied from a common original. One instance in this section, however, deserves to be mentioned as an apparent case of direct copying from R. In H. ii. 22, Simon is represented as teaching that the dead shall not rise, and as rejecting Jerusalem and substituting Mount Gerizim for it; but nowhere else is there a trace of such doctrine being ascribed to Simon; and no controversy on these subjects is reported in the *Homilies*. And there is strong reason for suspecting that the explanation is that H. has here blundered in copying R. i. 57, where a Samaritan, whom there is no ground for identifying with Simon, is introduced as teaching these doctrines of the non-resurrection of the dead, and of the sanctity of Mount Gerizim.

It is needless to multiply proofs of the non-originality of H., and we turn to state some of the reasons why R. must also be regarded as the retoucher of a previously existing story. The work itself recognises former records of the things which it relates. In the preface it purports to be an account written after the death of Peter of discourses, some of which had by Peter's command been written down and sent to James during his own lifetime. R. iii. 75, contains an abstract of the contents of ten books of these previously sent reports. Again, R. v. 36, we are told of the despatch to James of a further instalment. Everything confirms the conclusion that R. is here using the credit which an existing narrative had gained, in order to obtain acceptance for his own additions to the story. It has been already shewn that there are some instances in the first division of the work where H. is clearly not original, and yet has not copied from R.; whence we infer the existence of an independent authority, at least for the earlier portion, employed by both writers. There are places where H. and R. seem to supplement one another, each supplying details omitted by the other: other places again where it would seem as if an obscure passage in the common original had been differently understood by each; and again in the discourses common to both, there are places where the version presented by H. preserves so much better the sequence of ideas and the cogency of argument that it is scarcely possible to think the form in R. the original (compare in particular H. ix. 9, 10, R. iv. 15, 16). There are places again where both seem to have abridged the common original. Thus R. mentions concerning an early conversation, that none of the women were present. There is no further mention of women in the party until quite late in the story both H. and R. incidentally

speak of Peter's wife as being in the company. It may be noted in passing that they do not represent Peter and his wife as living together as married people; but Peter always sleeps in the same room with his disciples. We may conjecture that the original contained a formal account of the women who travelled with Peter, and this is confirmed by St. Jerome who refers to a work called the circuits of Peter (*περίοδοι*) as mentioning not only Peter's wife, but his daughter, of whom nothing is said either by H. or R. The work cited by Jerome contained a statement that Peter was bald, which is not found either in H. or R. In like manner we may infer that the original contained a formal account of the appointment of 12 precursors (*πρόδρομοι*) who were to go before Peter to the different cities which he meant to visit. H. several times speaks of the precursors, assuming the office to be known to the reader, but without ever recording its appointment. R. does give an account of its appointment, but one which implies that Peter had come attended by 12 companions, of whom Clement was already one. We have already mentioned inconsistencies in this first section from which we infer, that though the original form of the story mentioned the name of Clement, the introduction containing the account of Clement's journey from Rome is a later addition.

We conclude that the work cited by Jerome is the common original of H. and R.; and a comparison of the matter common to the two shews that both worked on their materials pretty freely, modifying the original to their own uses. From what has been said concerning H. under No. 7, we infer that the original contained mention both of Clement and of Nicetas and Aquila, and it is likely that Clement was there too represented as the recorder of the discourses. The original must have contained an account of a three days' disputation with Simon held at Caesarea; it also included the polemic against heathenism contained in the Tripolis discourses, as may be inferred both from R. v. 36 and also from a comparison of the two records of these discourses. It is likely that the same work contained the disputation of Peter and Apion referred to by Eusebius, and that H. followed the original in making Apion a speaking character, although he has been involved in confusion in trying to combine this with the additional matter imported by R. We may conjecture too (see R. x. 52) that it also contained a disputation by Anubion on the subject of "Genesis." On the other hand, there is no evidence that the original contained anything concerning the recognitions by Clement of the members of his family. In this part of the story R. makes no acknowledgment of previous accounts sent to James; and he shews every sign of originality and of having carefully gone over the old story, skilfully adapting it so as to join on his own additions. It appears from H. ii. 22, 26, that in quite an early part of the history the original introduced Nicetas and Aquila as addressing their fellow-disciple Clement as "dearest brother," and this probably gave R. the hint (see R. viii. 8) of representing them as natural brothers. R. omits these expressions in the place where they are inappropriate. A question may be raised whether the document referred to

R. iii. 75, and which contained an account of the disputation with Simon, was part of the same work as that referred to v. 36, which contained the disputation against the heathen. We have marked them as probably different. It may be remarked that Peter's daily bath, which is carefully recorded in the later books, is not mentioned in the three earlier. A question may be raised whether the original did not contain an account of a meeting of Simon and Peter at Rome; and it is not impossible that such an account may have been originally designed by the author; as one or two references to Rome as well as the choice of Clement as the narrator give cause to suspect. But that in any case the design was not executed, appears both from the absence of any early reference to a Roman contest between Simon and Peter; and also from the diversity of the accounts given as to the manner of Simon's death, since we may believe that if the document we are considering had related the story, its version would have superseded all others.

Quite a different impression as to relative originality is produced when we compare the doctrine of H. and R., and when we compare their narratives. The doctrine of H. is very peculiar, and at the same time, for the most part, consistently carried through the whole work; in R. the deviations from ordinary church teaching are far less striking, yet there are passages in which the ideas of H. can be traced, and which present the appearance of an imperfect expurgation of offensive doctrine. In H., Judaism and Christianity are represented as identical, and it is taught to be enough if a man recognise the authority either of Christ or of Moses; in R. he is required to acknowledge both. On this point, however, H. is not consistent; for in several places he agrees with R. in teaching the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation. H. rejects the rite of sacrifice altogether; according to R. the rite was divinely permitted for a time until the true prophet should come, who was to replace it by baptism as a means of forgiveness of sins. With respect to the authority of the Old Testament alleged for the rite of sacrifice, and for certain erroneous doctrines, H. rejects the alleged passages as falsified; R. regards them merely as obscure, and liable to be misunderstood by one who reads them without the guidance of tradition. The inspiration of the prophets later than Moses is denied by H. and admitted by R., though quotations from their writings are alike rare in both forms. According to H., the true prophet has presented himself in various incarnations, Adam, who is regarded as being identical with Christ, being the first and Jesus the last; and the history of Adam's sin is rejected as spurious; according to R., Christ has but revealed himself to, and inspired various holy men of old. And, in general, concerning the dignity and work of our Lord, the doctrine of R., though short of orthodox teaching, is far higher than that of H. The history of the fall, as far, at least, as regards the temptation of Eve, is referred to by R. as historical; but concerning Adam there are intimations of an esoteric doctrine not fully explained. H. gives what may be called a physical theory of the injury done by demons. They are represented as having sensual desires, which, being spirits, they have not organs to

satisfy, and which they can gratify only by incorporation with human bodies. They use therefore the permission which the divine law grants them, of entering into the bodies of men who partake of forbidden food, or who, by worshipping them subject themselves to their power. And with these the union is so close, that after death when the demons descend to their natural region of fire, the souls united to them are forced to accompany them, though grievously tormented by the element in which the demon feels pleasure. The opposition between fire and light is much dwelt on; and again, the water of baptism and other ablutions is represented as having a kind of physical efficacy in quenching the demonic fire. All this doctrine concerning demons shews itself comparatively faintly in R.; yet there seem to be indications that the doctrine as expounded in H. was contained in the original on which R. worked.

It is natural to think that the earlier form is that the doctrine of which is most peculiar; the later, that in which the divergences from orthodox teaching are smoothed away. Yet it is not always true that originality implies priority; and the application of this principle has caused some of the parts of H. which can be shewn to be the most recent, to be accepted as belonging to the original. For instance, we have seen that the private conversation between Peter and his disciples in the 20th homily bears on the face of it marks of interpolation; yet the clearness and peculiarity of its doctrine has caused it to be set down as belonging to the most ancient part of the work. The same may be said of the section concerning philanthropy at the end of the 12th homily, which however is wanting in the Syriac, and may be reasonably set down as one of the most modern parts of the whole work. For it is an addition made by H. to the story of the recognitions as told by R.; and we have already shewn that in all that relates to the recognitions H. is more recent than R. We arrive at more certain results, if examining the sections we have named, and for which H. is most responsible, we try to discover his favourite thoughts and forms of expression, and so to recognise the hand of the latest reviser in other parts of the work. Space will not permit such an examination to be entered on here; but we may notice the fondness of H. for discovering a male and female element in things, and for contrasting things under the names of male and female. This shews itself strongly in the sections referred to; and the almost total absence of the idea from R. makes it unlikely that it could have had any great prominence in the original document. The idea, however, became very popular in the sect to which H. belonged; and is noticed by a writer of the 10th century as a characteristic of some Ebionites then still remaining (see Hilgenfeld *Nov. Test. extra can. recept.* iii. 156). The germ, however, of the distinction between male and female prophecy, on which H. lays so much stress, was apparently to be found in the original document, which disposed of the testimony borne by our Lord to John the Baptist by the distinction that John was indeed the greatest of the prophets born of women, but was not on the level of the Son of Man. The general result of an attempt to discriminate what belongs to H. and R. respectively, from what they found

in their common original, leads to the belief that H., far more nearly than R., represents the doctrinal aspect of the original, from which the teaching of H. differs only in the way of what may be called legitimate development.

The Clementines are unmistakably a production of that sect of Ebionites which held the book of Elchasai as sacred. For an account of the sources whence our knowledge of this book is derived, and for the connexion of the sect with Essenism, see the article ELCHASAITES. Almost all the doctrines ascribed to them are to be found in the Clementines. We have the doctrine already referred to of successive incarnations of Christ, and in particular the identification of Christ with Adam, the requirement of the obligations of the Mosaic Law, the rejection however of the rite of sacrifice, the rejection of certain passages both of the Old and New Testament, hostility to the apostle Paul, abstinence from the use of flesh (H. viii. 15, xii. 6, xv. 7), the inculcation of repeated washing, discouragement of virginity, concealment of their sacred books from all but approved persons, form of adjuration by appeal to the seven witnesses, ascription of gigantic stature to the angels (H. viii. 15) permission to dissemble the faith in time of persecution (R. i. 65, x. 55); while again the supposed derivation of the book of Elchasai from the Seres, is explained by R. viii. 48, where the Seres are described as a nation where all the observances on which the Ebionites laid stress were naturally complied with, and who were consequently exempt from the penalties of sickness and premature death, which attended their neglect. Ritschl regards the book of Elchasai as an exposition of these doctrines later than the *Homilies*; but we are disposed to look on it as earlier than the work which formed the common basis of H. and R. A recognition of this book is not improbably contained in a passage which is important in reference to the use made by H. and R. of their common original. The date which the book of Elchasai claimed for itself was the third year of Trajan. Whether it actually were so old need not here be inquired, but the fact that it was confessedly no older, might seem to put it at a disadvantage in comparison with the Pauline system which it rejected. But its adherents defended their position by their doctrine of pairs; viz., that it has been ever God's method to pair good and evil together, sending forth first the evil, then the countervailing good. Thus Cain was followed by Abel, Ishmael by Isaac, Esau by Jacob, so now, Simon Magus by Peter; and at the end of the world Antichrist will be followed by Christ. The last but one of the pairs enumerated takes, in the translation of Rufinus, a form which is scarcely intelligible: but the Syriac shews that the version given by R. did not essentially differ from that of H.; and that the contrasted pairs predicted by Peter are a false gospel sent abroad by a deceiver, and a true gospel secretly disseminated after the destruction of the holy place, for the rectification of the then existing heresies. It seems most probable that we are here to understand the doctrine of Paul and of Elchasai; and it may be noted that the fact that in this pair gospels, not persons, are contrasted, favours the conclusion that Hippolytus was mistaken in supposing Elchasai to be the name of a person. Two other

of the contrasted pairs deserve notice; in H. we have contrasted Aaron and Moses, in R. the magicians and Moses. Again in H. are contrasted John the Baptist and our Saviour, in R. the tempter and our Saviour. In both cases the version of H. seems to be the original, since in that the law of the pairs is strictly observed that an elder is followed by a better younger; and we can understand R.'s motive for alteration if he did not share that absolute horror of the rite of sacrifice which ranked Aaron on the side of evil, or that hostility to John the Baptist which shews itself elsewhere in H., as for example in ranking Simon Magus among his disciples. There are passages in R. which would give rise to the suspicion that he held the same doctrines as H., but concealed the expression of them in a book intended for the uninitiated, for though in H. the principle of an esoteric doctrine is strongly asserted, the book seems to have been written at a later period, when all attempt at concealment had been abandoned. However, the instance last considered is one of several, where R.'s suppression of the doctrinal teaching of his original seems to imply an actual rejection of it.

It remains to speak of that part of the Clementines to which attention has been most strongly directed by modern students of the early history of the church, their assault on St. Paul under the mask of Simon Magus. And in the first place it may be remarked that the school hostile to St. Paul which found expression in these Clementines, cannot be regarded as the representative or continuation of the body of adversaries with whom he had to contend in his own lifetime. Their connexion was with the Essenes, not the Pharisees; and they themselves claimed no earlier origin than a date later than the destruction of Jerusalem, an event which would seem to have induced many of the Essenes in some sort to accept Christianity. We have seen that a theory was devised to account for the lateness of the period when what professed to be the true gospel opposed to Paul's was published. It follows that whatever results can be obtained from the Clementines belong to the history of the second century, not the first. The name of Paul is mentioned neither by H. nor R. Hostility to him appears in R. in a milder form. It has been already stated that in that part of the work which has been supposed to be derived from the "Ascents of James," an enemy, clearly intended for Paul, is introduced as making an assault on James; but as this relates to the period before the apostle's conversion, the narrative is one which the most orthodox writer need not have scrupled to admit into his work. R., however, plainly following his original, ignores Paul's labours among the heathen, and makes St. Peter the apostle of the Gentiles. And in one passage common to H. and R., and therefore probably belonging to the earlier document, a warning is given that the tempter who had contended in vain with our Lord, would afterwards send apostles of deceit, and therefore the converts are cautioned against receiving any teacher who had not first compared his doctrine with that of James, and had come to them with witnesses, lest the devil should send a preacher of error to them, even as he had raised up Simon as an opponent to Peter. It need not be disputed that in this passage as

well as in that concerning the pairs, already quoted, Paul is referred to, his preaching being spoken of in the future tense as dramatic propriety required; since the action of the story is laid at a time before his conversion. And in both places Paul, if Paul be meant, is expressly distinguished from Simon. In the letter of Peter prefixed to the *Homilies*, we cannot doubt that Paul is assailed as the enemy who taught the lawless and silly doctrine that the obligations of the Mosaic law were not perpetual, and who unwarrantably represented Peter himself as concurring in teaching which he entirely repudiated. In another passage which has been alleged we have been unable to find a reference to Paul. There remains a single passage as the foundation of the Simon-Paulus theory. In the Laodicean disputation which H. makes the climax of his story, a new topic is suddenly introduced (xvii. 13-20) whether the evidence of the senses or that of supernatural vision be more trustworthy; and it is made to appear that Simon claims to have obtained by means of a vision of Jesus, knowledge of him superior to that which Peter had gained during his year of personal converse with him. In this section phrases are introduced which occur in the notice of the dispute at Antioch, between Peter and Paul, contained in the Epistle to the Galatians. It need not be doubted then that in this section of the *Homilies*, the arguments nominally directed against Simon are really intended to depreciate the claims of Paul. Since von Cölln and Baur first took notice of the concealed object of this section, speculation in Germany has run wild on the identification of Paul and Simon. The theory in the form now most approved will be found in the article on Simon Magus, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*. It has been inferred that Simon was in Jewish circles a pseudonym for Paul, and that all that is related of him is but a parody of the life of Paul. Simon as a historical character almost entirely disappears. Even the story as told in the Acts of the Apostles has been held to be but a caricature of the story of Paul's bringing up to Jerusalem the collection he had made, and hoping by this gift of money to bribe the apostles to admit him to equal dignity. In order to account why the author of the Acts should have admitted into his narrative the section concerning Simon, explanations have been given which certainly have not the advantage in simplicity over that suggested by the work itself, viz., that the author having spent seven days in Philip's house had learned from him interesting particulars of his early evangelical work, which he naturally inserted in his history. The Simon-Paulus theory has been particularly misleading in speculations as to the literary history of the tales concerning Simon. Lipsius, for instance, has set himself to consider in what way the history of Simon could be told, so as best to serve the purpose of a libel on Paul; and having thus constructed a more ingenious parody of Paul's life than any which documentary evidence shews to have been ever in circulation, he asks us to accept this as the original form of the story of Simon. It becomes necessary therefore to point out on how narrow a basis of fact these speculations rest. To R., anti-Pauline though he is, the idea of identifying Simon with Paul seems never to have occurred. All through his

book Paul is Paul, and Simon Simon. And the same may be said of the whole of the *Homilies*, except this Laodicean disputation, which as we have already seen is the part in which the latest writer has taken the greatest liberties with his original. Now before any inference can be drawn from this section as to an early identification of Simon and Paul, it must be shewn in the first place that this section belongs to the original document, and is not an addition for which only the last reviser is responsible. The object of the latter may be inferred from what he states in the form of a prediction (xvi. 21) that other heretics would arise who should assert the same blasphemies against God as Simon; which we may translate as implying that the writer has put into the mouth of Simon doctrines similar to those held by later heretics against whom he had himself to contend. In particular, this Laodicean section is strongly anti-Marcionite; and it is just possible that this section may have been elicited by Marcionite exaggeration of the claims of Paul. But we own, it seems to us far more probable that H. has here preserved a fragment of an earlier document, the full force of which it is even possible he did not himself understand. But then in the second place it is altogether unproved that in this earlier document this particular disputation was directed against Simon. The original work may well have included conflicts of Peter with other adversaries, and in another instance we have seen reason to think that H. has made a mistake in transferring to Simon words which in the earlier document referred to another. But thirdly, even if the earlier writer did put Pauline features into his picture of Simon, it no more follows that he identified Simon with Paul than that the later writer identified him with Marcion. The action of the story being laid at a date antecedent to Paul's conversion, it was a literary necessity that if Pauline pretensions were to be refuted, they must be put into the mouth of another. At the present day history is often written with a view to its bearing on the controversies of our own time; but we do not imagine that a writer doubts Julius Caesar to be a historical character, even though in speaking of him he may have Napoleon Bonaparte in his mind. Now, though the author of the Clementines has put his own words into the mouth both of Simon and Peter, it is manifest that he no more doubted of the historical character of one than of the other. For Simon, his authorities were—(1) the account given in Acts viii. which furnished the conception of Simon as possessed of magical powers; (2) in all probability the account given by Justin Martyr of honours paid to Simon at Rome; and (3) since R. refers to the *writings* of Simon, it can scarcely be doubted that the author used the work ascribed to Simon called the *Great Announcement*, some of the language quoted from which by Hippolytus, we have in the Clementines put into the mouth of Simon. And hence has resulted some little confusion, for the heresy of the "Great Announcement" appears to have been akin to the Valentinian; but what the Clementine author has added of his own is Marcionite.

A few words may be added as to the quotations from the New Testament in the Clementines. All the four gospels are quoted; for since the publication of the conclusion of the *Homilies* by

Dressel, we may dismiss as altogether desperate the attempt, which had always been unreasonable, to deny that John's gospel was employed. Epiphanius tells us that a Hebrew translation of John's gospel was in use among the Ebionites. The quotations are principally from St. Matthew, but many of the passages are cited with considerable verbal differences from our present text; and there are a few passages quoted which are not found in any of our present gospels. The deviations from the existing text are much smaller in R. than in H., and it may be asserted that R. always conforms to our present gospels in the matter which he has added of his own and not taken from his original. Since it is known that the Ebionites used an Aramaic gospel, which in the main agreed with St. Matthew, but with considerable variations, we may conclude that this was the source principally employed by the author of the original. H. seems to have used the same sources as the original; but yet two things must be borne in mind before we assert that variations in H. from our existing texts prove that he had a different text before him, one is the laxity with which he cites the Old Testament; the other, the fact that the story demands that Peter should be represented as quoting our Lord's discourses from memory and not from any written source; and that the author would naturally feel himself entitled to a certain amount of licence in quotations of such a kind.*

We have, in conclusion, to say something as to the place and time of composition of the Clementine writings. The use made of the name of Clement had caused Rome to be accepted as the place of composition by the majority of critics, but the opposite arguments urged by Uhlhorn appear conclusive, and to, at least, the original document an Eastern origin must be assigned. Hippolytus mentions the arrival in Rome of an Elchasaite teacher about A.D. 220, whose doctrines would seem to have been then quite novel at Rome, and not to have taken root there. The scene of the story is all laid in the East, and the writings shew no familiarity with the Roman church. The ranking Clement among the disciples of Peter may be even said to be opposed to the earliest traditions of the Roman church, which placed Clement third from the apostles; but it is quite intelligible that in foreign churches where the epistle of Clement was habitually publicly read in the same manner as the apostolic epistles, Clement and the apostles might come to be regarded as contemporaries. Clement might naturally be chosen as a typical representative of the Gentile converts by an Ebionite who desired by his example to enforce on the Gentile churches the duty of obedience to the church of the circumcision. For all through it is James of Jerusalem, not Peter, who is represented as the supreme ruler of the churches. The author of the original document habitually used an Aramaic version of the New Testament; and there are a few phenomena which make it seem to us not incredible that the original document itself may

have been written in the same language. On the whole, it appears that we must assign an Eastern origin to the original document; we will not venture to particularise further, though Uhlhorn's conjecture of Eastern Syria as the place of composition seems not improbable. It seems not unlikely, however, that the *Recognitions* with the prefatory letter relating the ordination of Clement as bishop of Rome, was a version of the story designed for Roman circulation. In order to fix the time of composition, the data are but scanty. The *Recognitions* are quoted by Origen (with however a different division of books from the present form) about A.D. 230. This gives a later limit to the time of publication of R. We may infer that the chronicle of Hippolytus A.D. 235 recognises the epistle of Clement to James, since it counts Peter as first bishop of Rome, and places the episcopate of Clement at a time so early as to make his ordination by Peter possible [see CLEMENS ROMANUS]. It is not unreasonable to date the epistle of Clement to James at least a quarter of a century earlier, in order to allow time for its ideas to gain such complete acceptance at Rome. Irenaeus is ignorant of the episcopate of Peter, but ranks Clement as a contemporary of the apostles. It is likely therefore that he knew the work on which the *Recognitions* were founded, but not this later version of the story. As a limit in the other direction we have the use of the name Faustus for one represented as a member of the imperial family, which points to a date later than the reign of Antoninus, whose wife, and whose daughter married to Marcus Aurelius, both bore the name of Faustina. A fact which might seem to yield more definite results is that a section (R. ix. 17-29) is identical with a passage quoted by Eusebius *Præp. Ev.* 6, 10, as from the dialogues of Bardesanes. But there are difficulties in making use of the inference that R. is later than Bardesanes, on account of uncertainty as to the date of Bardesanes himself [see BARDESANES]. Suffice it here to say that the date assigned by Eusebius in his chronicle for his activity, A.D. 173, seems to need to be put later, because an authority likely to be better informed, the chronicle of Edessa, with great particularity assigns for the date of his birth, July 11, A.D. 154. Further the dialogue cited by Eusebius and by R., has been now recovered from the Syriac and has been published in Cureton's *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855. From this it appears that the dialogue does not purport to be written by Bardesanes himself, but by a scholar of his, Philippus, who addresses him as father and is addressed by him as son. This forbids us to put the dialogue at a very early period of the life of Bardesanes. Merx (*Bardesanes von Edessa*) tries to shew that not only the section referred to but other sections in R. were no part of the original work, but were later interpolations from Bardesanes; but his arguments have quite failed to convince us. On the whole, A.D. 200 seems as near an approximation as we can make to the probable date of R. The form H. must be dated later; possibly, A.D. 218, the time when according to Hippolytus the Elchasaite Alcibiades came from Apamea to Rome. There is little to determine very closely the date of the original document. If we could lay stress on a passage which speaks of there being one Caesar (R. v. 19, H. x. 14), we should

* In one place (xix. 3) H. having quoted some sayings of our Lord, makes the slip of referring to these as "Scripture." It thus clearly appears that the author used written gospels to which he ascribed the authority of Scripture.

date it before A.D. 161, when Marcus Aurelius shared the empire with Verus. And though this argument is very far from decisive, there is nothing that actually forbids so early a date, while at the same time we could not safely name a much earlier one.

The prolegomena of the earlier editors of the Clementines are collected in Migne's *Patrologia*. The most important monographs on the subject are von Cölln's article in Ersch and Gruber, 1828; Schliemann, *die Clementinen*, Hamburg, 1844; Hilgenfeld, *die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, Jena, 1848; Uhlhorn, *die Homilien und Recognitionen des Clemens Romanus*, Göttingen, 1854; Lehmann, *die clementinische Schriften*, Götha, 1867. In these works will be found references to other sources of information. Baur has treated of the Clementines in several works: the section in *Die christliche Gnosis*, pp. 300-414, may especially be mentioned. We refer also to Ritschl, *die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, who enters more largely into the subject of the Clementines in his first edition; and Lipsius, *Quellenkritik des Epiphanius und die Quellen der Römischen Petrusgeschichte*. There is also an interesting review by Lipsius of Lehmann's work in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1869, pp. 477-482. [G. S.]

CLEOBIUS, CLEOBIANS. In a fragment of Hegesippus, preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 22), we have an enumeration of some of the earliest heretics: "Simon, whence are the Simonians, Cleobius, whence the Cleobians (Κλεοβιανοί), and Dositheus, whence the Dositheans." In most works against heresy the names of Simon and Dositheus reappear; but ecclesiastical writers rarely mention Cleobius, and they appear to have known nothing of him beyond what they deduced from the passage just cited. Thus Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.*), in the introduction to the second book, mentions Cleobius, and in that to the first, the Cleobians (Κλεοβανοί); but in both cases the context shews that he is using the passage in Eusebius. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 8) Simon and Cleobius are described as disciples to Dositheus, whom they afterwards deposed from the chief place. This seems an arbitrary extension to Cleobius of the account given in the Clementines of the relations between Simon and Dositheus. Simon, Cleobius and their followers are accused of the forgery of apocryphal books (*Ap. Const.* vi. 16). Pseudo-Chrysostom, in the 48th homily on St. Matthew (vol. vi. p. cxcix.), names Dositheus, Simon, and Cleonius among the false teachers who came in the name of Christ in fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy (Matt. xxiv. 5). Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51, p. 427) names "Cleobius or Cleobulus" in a list of heretics who counted our Lord to have been mere man. It is possible he is speaking quite at random, and has no more authority for attributing this opinion to Cleobius than to Demas and Hermogenes, who occur in the same list. But the name of a heretic, Cleobulus, only occurs elsewhere in the interpolated form of the epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians, in which he warns his readers against the children of the evil one, Theodotus and Cleobulus. The hypothesis suggests itself that Epiphanius was acquainted with this form of the epistle of Ignatius, which Zahn considers may be as early as A.D. 360; that he

identified the Cleobulus whom he found there with the Cleobius of older writers; and that he attributed to him opinions kindred to those of Theodotus. If this be so, this would be the earliest indication of the existence of the longer form of the Ignatian letters. [G. S.]

CLEOBIUS, in the legendary life of Epiphanius (ii. 320), an instructor of E. in Christianity. [G. S.]

CLEOBULUS. [CLAUDIUS (2).]

CLEOMENES, a teacher of Patripassian doctrines at Rome in the beginning of the 3rd century, under the episcopate of Zephyrinus, by whom he was tolerated in the church. Hippolytus states that Cleomenes had learned these doctrines from Epigonus, a disciple of Noetus, who had brought them to Rome (*Ref.* ix. 3, 7, 10; x. 27). Hippolytus has not expressed himself clearly, and Theodoret, who was only acquainted with the tenth book of the *Refutation*, was misled into supposing that the order of succession was Epigonus, Cleomenes, Noetus (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 3). [G. S.]

CLETUS or **ANACLETUS**, "le même que St. Clet, comme les savants en conviennent" (*L'Art de vérif. les Dates*, i. 218). Eusebius calls him Anencletus, and says that he was succeeded in the see of Rome by Clement in the twelfth year of Domitian, having sat himself there twelve years. According to this, his own consecration would have fallen in the first year of Domitian, or A.D. 81: but it is variously dated by others (comp. Gieseler, *E. H.* § 32 with note 4, Eng. tr.). Eusebius indeed nowhere says that he succeeded Linus, or was the second bishop of Rome: yet he places him between Linus, whom he calls the first bishop, and Clement, whom he calls third. Other ancient authorities make Clement the first bishop (see Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 399). Cave (*Hist. Lit.* 3 v.) was of opinion at one time, that Clement was ordained bishop by St. Peter over the Jewish section of the Roman church: and Linus by St. Paul bishop over the Gentile section, having Cletus for his successor: on whose death both sections united themselves under Clement. Pearson's dissertations on the subject, he says, altered his view. Yet it should be said that Eusebius himself attests there having been a Jewish succession at Jerusalem for some time, and names Marcus as its first Gentile bishop (*E. H.* iv. 5-6). Rohrbacher, on the strength of a list attributed to pope Liberius, places Clement after Linus, Cletus after Clement, and another pope named Anencletus after Cletus (*E. H.* iv. 450). This Gieseler calls "the modern Roman view." Clinton follows Eusebius, but omits his dates (*F. R.* ii. 535). [This question of the succession of the Roman bishops is discussed also in the article CLEMENS ROMANUS, p. 554.] Three spurious epistles have the name of Anacletus affixed to them in the Pseudo-Isidorian collection (Migne, *Patrol.* cxxx. 59 and seq.). [E. S. ff.]

CLIMACUS, JOHN. [JOHN CLIMACUS.]

CLITAUO, king of Brecknock, the son of Clitguin, about A.D. 482. This is the only spelling of the name in the *Liber Landavensis*, and the varieties Clitanc and Clintanc are probably due to a very common typographical

error. The story is, that as he had resolved upon remaining unmarried, and as he was nevertheless beloved by a noble maiden who rejected all other suitors for his sake, one of the courtiers who aspired to her hand was instigated to murder him. On the spot where the crime was perpetrated, and where Clitauca was buried, near the river Myngui, a church was afterwards erected to his memory. He was commemorated on Aug. 19 (*Liber Landavensis*, 183-188; Capg. *N. L. A. f.* 59; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Britt.* lib. x. c. 15; *Acta SS.* Aug. iii. 733; *Britannia Sancta*, 1745, ii. 88; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 318; Hardy, *Desc. Cat. i.* 58, 59; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 36). [C. H.]

CLODOALDUS (CLOUD, Sr.), presbyter, was third son of Clodomir, king of Orleans, and grandson of St. Clotilda. He was born in A.D. 522, and was scarcely three years old when his father was killed in Burgundy, A.D. 524.

Queen Clotilda then brought Clodoald to Paris, with his elder brothers Theodoald and Gunthar, to be educated suitably to their illustrious birth. But in A.D. 526 king Childebart of Paris and king Clotaire of Soissons, sons of Clotilda, and uncles of the young princes of Orleans, jealous of the love of queen Clotilda for their nephews, murdered the two eldest. King Childebart, repenting after the first murder, interceded for the life of Gunthar in vain. Clodoald, however, escaped by the help of some powerful nobles.

Later on, Clodoaldus cut his hair to shew that he renounced the throne of Orleans, and consecrated himself to God. He maintained this resolution unswervingly, although several opportunities offered themselves for claiming his kingdom.

He quitted his first retreat to place himself under the conduct of St. Severinus, who lived a monastic life near Paris. But the neighbourhood of the city and court prevented him from carrying out his wish to live unknown to the world. So he retired to Provence. His works there won him universal veneration; but he had to receive such a vast number of visits, that he found it better to return to Paris. He was received with transports of joy by the people; and they demanded that he should be elevated to the presbyterate. Accordingly in 551 Eusebius, bishop of Paris, ordained him. Clodoaldus then settled at Nogent (Novigentum), a village two leagues from Paris, where he built a church, and soon had a large number of disciples. He not merely instructed these, but preached in the neighbouring villages. He died about A.D. 560 at Nogent. His church he had placed under the cathedral of Paris, but it was soon made collegiate. (Greg. Turon. *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. 110, 125, 564, 565; Valesius, *Rerum Francic.* lib. vii.; Aimoin, *Hist. Franc.* II. cap. xii.; *Patrol. Lat.* cxxxix. p. 675; Le Coiteau, *Annales Eccles. Franc.* (Paris, 1665), vol. i. pp. 327, 348, 780; *Acta SS.* Bolland. September, vol. iii. p. 91.) [W. M. S.]

CLODOBERT was son of Chilperic I., king of the Franks, by his second queen, Fredegundis. He was born in the year 565, and died in 580, aged 15. In the month of August of that year a terrible dysentery ravaged almost the whole of France. The kings were at the

time preparing civil war, and it was thought a warning or a judgment. The symptoms were a violent fever, vomiting, agony in the loins, and heaviness of the head or neck. The disease first seized children; then king Chilperic himself became seriously ill; then his younger son Dagobert. As he was for a short time better, the elder son, Clodobert, fell ill. Queen Fredegundis, his mother, terrified, and repenting of the exactions with which king Chilperic had been distressing the people, pathetically urged her husband to burn all the property lists which had been furnished for these tyrannical purposes. Encouraged by her example, the king destroyed the papers, and sent officers to forbid further inquiries into his subjects' property. The younger son now died: with the greatest grief they carried prince Clodobert on a bed from the royal villa at Brennacum to the church of St. Médard at Soissons. Here they laid him at the shrine of the saint, and uttered prayers and vows; but at midnight, panting and exhausted, he expired. They buried him in the church of Saints Crispin and Crispinian. There was a public mourning of the whole people, and men and women followed the funeral with the tokens of grief usual at the burial of husband or wife. King Chilperic afterwards made large donations to the ecclesiastical corporations, the church fabrics and the poor.

Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, wrote two elegiac poems to console king Chilperic and his queen; and composed elegiac epitaphs for the two dead princes. He describes Clodobert as untouched by the contagion of this sorrowful world, an innocent boy, of blameless life.

The details of his sickness and death, and of the speech of queen Fredegundis to king Chilperic, are given at length by Gregory of Tours. (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* v. 243, &c.; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. p. 349; Venant. Fortun. *Miscell.* ix. 2, 3, 4, 5; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. p. 298.)

[W. M. S.]

CLODOMIR, one of the four sons of Clovis, amongst whom their father's kingdom was divided in 511. Clodomir's capital was Orleans, and his share embraced parts of western Aquitaine, the lands along the south of the Loire including Tours and probably Poitiers. On this division see Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, ii. 103-106, and *Excursus* on the various partitions of the Frankish kingdom under the Merovingians in Bonnell, *die Anfänge des Karolingischen Hauses*, Berlin, 1866, p. 199. In the Frankish war against the Burgundians in 523, Clodomir took prisoner the king Sigismund, his wife and children, and cruelly murdered them at Coulmiers, near Orleans (Greg. Tur. iii. 6). In the following year, 524, in a battle with the Burgundians at Vésérone Clodomir was killed. His three children were entrusted to the care, perhaps the regency, of his mother Clotilda. Two of them, however, were shortly afterwards put to death by their uncles Childebart and Clotaire, who divided Clodomir's kingdom between themselves. The third son, Clodoaldus, escaped, entered the church, and was the reputed founder of the monastery of St. Cloud. See the horrible story in Greg. Tur. iii. 18, and *Vita Sancti Chlodaldi*, ap. Bouquet, iii. 422.

[T. R. B.]

CLODOSINDE, or **CHLODOSVINDA**, queen of the Lombards, daughter of Clotaire I., king of the Franks, by his queen Ingundis. Clodosinde had learnt much from her grandmother, St. Clotilde, the excellent queen of king Clovis I. She married Alboin, king of the Lombards, but preserved the catholic traditions of her family in the midst of an Arian court. She made many efforts to bring over her husband to her own opinions. Nicetius bishop of Treves wrote her a long letter on this subject, in which he describes her as so wonderfully prosperous and popular as to need additional vigilance towards God. Her fame, he says, is great as that of a useful, humane, and munificent woman, anxious for the welfare of the poor, sagacious in ruling, illustrious amongst all her subjects for her excellent life. She died A.D. 570, leaving an only daughter, Albesinda, who, losing her father two years later, through the intrigues of his queen, Rosamund, with Helmichis, was carried off to Ravenna, and afterwards to the emperor Tiberius at Constantinople, by Longinus, prefect of Ravenna. (Greg. Turon. num. 142, 143, 182, *Patrol. Lat.* xxi.; Nicet. Trevir. *Epist.* i., *Patrol. Lat.* lxviii. p. 375; Paulus Diac. *de Gestis Langobard.* iii. 28, 29, 30, *Patrol. Lat.* xc. p. 498.) [W. M. S.]

CLOFFAN, early Welsh saint, patron of Llangloffan in Pembrokeshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307). [C. H.]

CLOTAIRE I. (**CHLOTHARIUS**), the youngest of the four sons of Clovis, amongst whom their father's kingdom was divided in 511. Clotaire's capital was Soissons, and his share embraced generally the Frankish territory on the right bank of the Seine, including Picardy, Vermandois, Flanders, and Brabant (Bonnell, *Anfänge d. Karol. Hauses*, 201-2). On the death of Clodomir and the murder of his sons by Clotaire [v. **CHLODOMERIS**] (cf. Löbell, *Greg. von Tours*, 20-21) the kingdom of Clodomir was divided, Clotaire obtaining Touraine and Poitou (Bonnell, *ibid.*). Clotaire acted generally in concert with Chilbert [v. **CHILDEBERTUS I.**]. In 555, on the death of Theodebald, grandson of Theodoric I., Clovis's eldest son, Clotaire, obtained his kingdom (Greg. iv. 9; Bonnell, 204). During the next two years Clotaire was engaged against the Saxons with varying fortune (Greg. iv. 14). During his absence, his son Chramnus rose against him, and was assisted by Chilbert. Chramnus was put down on Clotaire's return, and Chilbert shortly afterwards dying, Clotaire became sole king of the Franks, 558. In 560 Chramnus rose again, and Clotaire marched against him. He fled to Brittany, but was taken and burnt alive with his wife and children (Greg. iv. 20). In 561 Clotaire died at Compiègne, and was buried at Soissons (*ib.* 21). The kingdom was divided amongst his four sons, Guntram, Charibert, Sigebert, and Chilperic. [T. R. B.]

CLOTAIRE II., son of Chilperic I. and Fredegund, succeeded his father in 584, but only in Chilperic's original kingdom of Soissons [v. **CHILPERICUS I.**]. Being a minor, Clotaire was under the regency of his uncle Guntram, king of Burgundy. After Guntram's death in 593 various attempts were made to despoil Clotaire of his possessions. The first, by Chil-

bert II., was repulsed with great loss (Fredegund, 14). On the death of Chilbert in 596, Fredegund seized Paris for her son (*ib.* 17); but dying the next year, her son's kingdom became a prey to Theodoric and Theodebert, kings of Burgundy and Austrasia, doubtless prompted to the attack by Brunehilde. Clotaire lost everything but a few possessions near the mouth of the Seine (*ib.* 20); nor was his mayor, Landeric, any more successful in attempting to recover these losses four years afterwards (*ib.* 25). In 611, however, Clotaire is found united with Theodoric against Theodebert (*ib.* 37-8). Theodebert being deprived of his kingdom, Theodoric turned against Clotaire, but before the two armies met Theodoric died suddenly at Metz (*ib.* 39). Brunehilde endeavoured to set up Sigebert, Theodoric's son, in his father's place, but the Burgundian and Austrasian nobles joined Clotaire; Brunehilde was taken and barbarously put to death, together with Sigebert and one of his brothers (*ib.* 40-2). Clotaire thus became sole king of the Franks (613), and the period of internecine family wars between the Merovingian princes was at an end. The remaining fifteen years of Clotaire's reign were comparatively undisturbed (*pacem habens cum omnibus gentibus vicinis*, Fred. 42). Each subsidiary kingdom, Neustria, Austrasia, and Burgundy was put under a separate mayor of the palace, at first Landeric in Neustria, Rado in Austrasia, and Warnachar in Burgundy. On Warnachar's death in 626, the Burgundian nobles specially requested that no successor might be appointed in his place. In 622 Clotaire committed the government of Austrasia to his son Dagobert, whose chief advisers were Arnulf, bishop of Metz, and Pippin as mayor of the palace. The rule of Dagobert in Austrasia was practically independent, and on the death of Clotaire in 628, Dagobert succeeded to the throne of the united realm. The *lex Alamannorum* appears to have been promulgated during this reign (Pertz, *Leg.* iii. 1 sq.). Also a very important edict for the government of the kingdom was issued by Clotaire at an assembly in Paris in 614 (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 14 sq.). Amongst other provisions it decreed that election of bishops was to be by clergy and people (*a clero et populo*) with right of confirmation in the king, and reserving also a right of direct nomination to the king (c. 1). No bishop was to elect his own successor (c. 2). The clergy were only in special cases to be subject to the civil courts (c. 4). In disputes between the clergy and civilians, the cause was to be adjudged by a mixed tribunal (c. 5). Liberty of appeal was granted against oppressive taxation (c. 9); also liberty to relations of intestates to inherit (c. 6). In local administration natives of the locality alone were to be employed (c. 12). Finally, there was a clause that neither freeman nor slave, unless a thief caught in the act, should be condemned to death without a hearing. Compare Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, ii. 684 sq.; Fehr, *Staat und Kirche im fränkischen Reiche bis auf Carl den Grossen*, 51 sq. Also see generally Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, i. sub annis. [T. R. B.]

CLOTAIRE III., son of Clovis II., was chosen king of the Franks on his father's death in 656.

Ercinoald, mayor of the palace, died shortly after Clotaire's accession, and was replaced by Ébroin. Clotaire's mother Balthildis retained some authority as regent till the year 664, when, her son coming of age, she retired into the monastery of Chelles, founded by herself. With her retirement began the unrestrained tyranny of Ébroin [v. ÉBROIN]. In the year 660, Clotaire's brother, Childeric II., had been raised with the consent of Balthildis (*Vita S. Balthildis*, 5) to the Austrasian throne, and from that year till 670, when he died, Clovis was king only of Neustria and Burgundia. For the chronology of the *Gesta Reg. Fr.* 45, see Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, vol. i. sub an. 670, note. During the reign of Clotaire, the famous monastery of Corbie was founded by Balthildis. See Bréquigny, ed. Pardessus, ii. 114 n.

[T. R. B.]

CLOTAIRE IV. was set up as king of the Austrasian Franks by Charles Martel during his struggle with the Neustrians in 717. It is uncertain whether Clotaire was of Merovingian race or not. He died in 719. (*Gesta Reg. Fr.* 53.) [CHARLES MARTEL.]

[T. R. B.]

CLOTILDA, or CHROTECHILDIS or CHROTILDIS, daughter of Chilperic, was early left an orphan by the murder of her parents by her uncle Gundobald, the Burgundian king. Though the daughter of an Arian, she, as well as the sons of Gundobald (v. Binding, *das Burgundisch-Romanische Königreich*, 1868, p. 184), was brought up a Catholic. Of her marriage with Clovis, the Frankish king, about the year 492 or 493, around which so much legendary matter has grown, the only trustworthy authority is Gregory of Tours. This is his account: "Chlodoveus happened to be sending frequent embassies to Burgundy. On one of these occasions his envoys discovered the girl Chrotildis. As they saw that she was comely and modest, and knew that she was of royal stock, they announced the fact to Chlodoveus. Without delay he despatched an embassy to Gundobald, to demand her hand in marriage. Gundobald, afraid to refuse, delivered her over to the Franks. They received her, and quickly brought her to the king's presence. And when Chlodoveus saw her, he rejoiced greatly, and wedded her" (Greg. Tur. ii. 28). Then follows a dramatic scene. Clotilda baptized her first-born son, and took occasion to represent to Clovis the futility of the worship of the heathen gods. The child died shortly afterwards; Clovis believed the Frankish gods to be offended. Nevertheless he allowed the second child also to be baptized. It too sickened; but notwithstanding the taunts of her husband, Clotilda prayed for it, and it recovered. Nor did she cease her endeavours to convert her husband until eventually successful (on the conversion, see CLOVIS). The dramatic character and the dialogue are no doubt Gregory's own. The facts, however, seem authentic enough. Though not a contemporary himself, Gregory makes use of contemporary authority (ii. 31; see generally on his authority, Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3rd ed. 1873, i. pp. 76-83; Löbell, *Gregor von Tours*, pp. 320 ff.). These facts nevertheless speedily became encrusted with legend. This

legendary growth is summed up and already stereotyped in the *Gesta Francorum*, chap. 11-13, and the *Historia Epitomatata* of Fredegarius, ch. 18. (Both chronicles are to be found in the collections of Bouquet, vol. ii., and Duchesne, vol. i.) The latter looks on Clotilda as the avenger on Burgundy of the bloody deeds of Gundobald. The former takes more strictly the ecclesiastical point of view of Clotilda as the converter of Clovis and the Franks, and the life of Clotilda, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, follows the *Gesta*. A discussion of the growth and character of the legendary accounts of the marriage is to be found in an appendix to Fauriel, *Histoire de la Gaule Méridionale*, vol. ii.; also in Junghans, *Geschichte der Frankischen Könige Childeric und Chlodovech*, Göttingen, 1857; cp. Binding, p. 112 and note.

After Clovis's death Clotilda lived principally at Tours, paying rare visits to Paris. She had borne to her husband four sons and one daughter; the latter was married to Amalaric, the Visigothic king of Spain. After the death of her son Chlodomer she gave shelter to his children until they were craftily abstracted from her care, and two of them murdered by their uncles. She was the real or reputed foundress of several religious houses, notably of St. Mary of Andelys, near Rouen, to which girls were sent for education from England during Bede's time (*H. E.* iii. 8). The original foundation was destroyed by the Normans. Clotilda, however, remained the patron-saint of the place, and miracles were worked there in her name down to the Revolution, and have recommenced since. She died at Tours in 545, and was buried at Paris beside her husband, in the church of the Apostles, afterwards St. Geneviève's. Of "Sainte Clotilde, reine de France," many lives have been written, and panegyrics pronounced, by French divines and devotees. The only one of any value is *Sainte Clotilde et son Siècle*, by the Abbé Rouquette, Paris, 1867.

[T. R. B.]

CLOUD, ST. [CLODOALDUS.]

CLOVIS (in the chronicles CLUDOEUS, CLODOVEUS, CHLODOVECHUS, &c., modern German LUDWIG, modern French LOUIS. On the spelling v. Thiel, *Ép. Rom. Pon.* p. 624 note, and *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, vol. 20, p. 67), son of Childeric, one of the kings of the Salian Franks, was born in the year 466, and succeeded his father in 481 (Greg. Tur. ii. 43). As soon as he reached manhood (486) he attacked Syagrius, "rex Romanorum" (Greg. ii. 23), son of Aegidius, the isolated and independent representative of the Roman power in Gaul (v. Junghans, pp. 22, 23). Syagrius was defeated, and Clovis advanced his territory from the Somme to the Seine, and afterwards to the Loire (*Gesta Francorum*, 14), was recognised king by the former subjects of Syagrius (Greg. ii. 27), and transferred his capital from Tournai to Soissons. (*Vita S. Remigii*, ap. Bouquet, iii. 377 E.) Waitz (ii. 60 note) doubts this (see Junghans, p. 34, note 3). Many wars and conquests followed (Greg. ii. 27).

About the year 492 Clovis married the Burgundian princess Clotilda or Chrotechildis. [As regards the marriage, see CLOTILDA.] Clotilda was a Christian and a Catholic, and she is said to have made many attempts to convert her husband from idolatry to Christianity (Greg. ii. 29; Rückert, *Culturgeschichte*, i. pp. 316, 317; Bind-

ing, pp. 111-4, doubts the value of Clotilda's work; Bornhak, pp. 207, 208, magnifies it). What the entreaties of Clotilda could not effect the crisis of war brought about. During a battle against the Alamanni (whether at Tolbiac or elsewhere, see Bornhak, p. 209, note 2; Waitz, ii. 65, note 2) the Franks were hard pressed, and beginning to yield. Clovis raised his eyes to heaven and invoked the aid of Christ. Forthwith the tide of battle turned, and the Alamanni fled. Remigius, at the instance of Clotilda, called on Clovis to fulfil his vow. "Gladly," replied the king, "but I must first obtain the consent of my own people." His warriors signified their assent in the well-known words, "Gods that die we cast away from us; the god that dies not, whom Remigius preaches, we are prepared to follow." On Christmas day, therefore, of the same year (496), Clovis, with his sisters Albofleda, a heathen, and Lantechild, an Arian, was baptized by Remigius at Rheims. "Gently, Sicambrian, bow down thy head, worship what thou hast hitherto destroyed, destroy what thou hast hitherto worshipped," were the apt words of Remigius (Greg. ii. 30, 31; *Vita Rem. ap. Bouquet*). How important this conversion was in the eyes of the Catholic world of the day may be gathered from the letters of congratulation addressed to Clovis by Avitus, bishop of Vienne (Bouquet, iv. 49), and by pope Anastasius, who wrote not only to the king but to the bishops of Gaul as well (Thiel, *Ep. Rom. Pont.* pp. 624 and 634). Theodoric, the Ostrogothic king of Italy, was an Arian, though a tolerant one, but Euric, the Visigoth, had proclaimed himself militant and proselytising (Fauriel, ii. 28); the Burgundian and Vandal princes were also Arian. The majority of the population of Gaul was Catholic, and Clovis was the only Catholic prince. (On the relation of these Arian princes to their Catholic subjects, see Binding, pp. 125 ff.) Whatever may have been his motives, and every variety has been attributed to him, from direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost (Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. p. 274, 5) to the coldest political calculation (Binding, pp. 111-114), Clovis must have been aware that by his conversion to the Catholic faith he would make the majority of his own subjects firm in their allegiance, and the Roman subjects of the Arian princes in the south ill-affected towards their rulers. (An instance of such disaffection may be found in Greg. ii. 36.) Nor can he have been ignorant of the political importance of the aid which he would get from the Catholic priesthood throughout Gaul. From this point, therefore, dates an increase of influence among the Roman population, the foundations were laid of a Roman nobility of office and intellect capable of superseding the old Teutonic nobility of race (Bornhak, pp. 219-221). Thus, whilst from one point of view this was the "first step towards the world-historical union of Teutonic civilisation with the Roman church" (Richter, p. 36 note 6), on the other hand, a reaction of Roman civilisation against its Teutonic conquerors now set in and modern Latin France became possible. As regards the immediate consequences of the conversion, a body of Frankish warriors not yet converted joined Rachnacher (*Vita Rem. ap. Bouquet*, iii. p. 377 C.D.). Whether this was also a desertion of Clovis is doubtful (v. Junghans, p. 59). The conversion

of the nation was not completed till long afterwards (see Waitz, ii. 85, note 1; and Rettberg, pp. 285-287). All questions connected with the conversion of Clovis are fully treated by Rückert, *Culturgeschichte des Deutschen Volkes in der Zeit des Uebergangs aus dem Heidenthum in das Christenthum*, Leipsic, 1853-54.

The next war of Clovis was with Burgundy, A.D. 500. Gundobald, the uncle of Clotilda and murderer of her parents, was defeated at Dijon. Clovis annexed part of the Burgundian dominion, and gave the rest to Godegisel, another brother. Shortly afterwards Gundobald returned, expelled Godegisel, and apparently became reconciled to Clovis, for in 507 the Burgundians helped Clovis in his expedition against the Visigoths. (This alliance is not mentioned by Gregory, but see Binding, p. 194 note 659; and Richter, p. 41 note e.) Between 505 and 507 Clovis is said to have been afflicted with tedious illness (*Vita Severini*, Bouquet, iii. 392 B.), immediately on recovery from which he issued his famous declaration of war against the Visigoths: "Verily it grieves my soul that these Arians should hold a part of Gaul; with God's help let us go and conquer them, and reduce their territory into our hands" (Greg. ii. 37). From Paris Clovis marched through Orleans to Tours, gave strict orders for the protection of the Catholic church and all belonging to it (*Epist. ap. Bouquet*, iv. 54), met and defeated the Visigoths at Voullon or Vouglé near Poitiers, slaying Alaric the king with his own hand (Richter, p. 40 notes and ref.). The winter of 507-8 Clovis spent at Bordeaux, carried off the Visigothic treasure from Toulouse, and reduced Angoulême and the surrounding territory before his return to Paris, which city henceforward he made the capital of his kingdom (Greg. ii. 38). That the religious element was very powerful in this war (Rückert, i. 324) is evident from the letter of Clovis to the bishops (Bouquet, *l. c.*), from the vain attempts which Alaric had made to confirm the allegiance of his Catholic and Roman subjects (Richter, p. 39 note 2), and from what Cassiodorus (Var. iii. *Ep. 1-4*) tells us of the negotiations before the war. It seems that Theodoric the Ostrogoth had proposed an alliance amongst all the Arian German kings for the maintenance of peace; and when the Franks began to pursue their victories in a fresh campaign and laid siege to Arles, Theodoric interfered, sent an army under Ibbas, which defeated the Franks and relieved Arles, and eventually agreed to a peace, by which Provence was annexed by the Ostrogothic power, Septimania adhered to the Visigothic kingdom of Spain, and Clovis's conquest of Aquitaine was acknowledged (v. Binding, p. 212 and note 731). We do not know whether Clovis joined personally in this Rhone campaign. No mention of it is made by Gregory. It was at Tours, on his return from Bordeaux in 508, that Clovis received a letter from the emperor Anastasius, "conferring upon him the consular dignity, from which time he was habitually called consul and Augustus" ("Ab Anastasio Imperatore codicillos de consulatu accepit, et in basilicâ beati Martini tunicâ blateâ indutus est et chlamyde, imponens vertice diadema, . . . et ab eâ die tanquam consul et (al. 'aut') Augustus est vocitatus," Greg. ii. 38). Much discussion has taken place as to the exact meaning of this passage. The

name of Clovis does not appear in the consular Fasti, but in the prologue to the *Lex Salaria* he is entitled "proconsul" (Sybel, *Jahrb. d. Alt. in Rheinl.* iv. p. 86). Again the chlamys and the diadem are the insignia of the patriciate. Hence it has been assumed by many that what was conferred on Clovis was the proconsulate and the patriciate (Valesius, i. 299; Richter, pp. 40, 41; Junghans, pp. 126-128). On the contrary, Waitz (ii. 59-61) and others (e.g. Pétigny, ii. 533; and Bornhak, pp. 234-35), adhering to the exact words of Gregory, maintain that it was the title of consul that was actually conferred on Clovis. The significance of the event itself is plain. Anastasius saw the value to the empire of the Frankish power as a counterpoise to the Ostrogothic. Clovis willingly accepted any title of honour by which he obtained a quasi-legal title in the eyes of his Roman subjects (cp. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, vol. i. note 3 on chap. i.).

The well-known story of the vase of Soissons (Greg. ii. 27) not only shews how ill Clovis brooked the liberty and equality of the other Frankish chiefs, but reveals the most unfavourable side of his character, his deceitfulness. "Dolus," however, if on the right side, is seldom an attribute of blame with the mediaeval chroniclers. The most discreditable deeds of this character attributed to Clovis are the machinations by which he subjected the other Frankish chiefs originally his equals, and brought about the unification of the Frankish empire. Thus he suggested the murder of his father to Siegebert, king of the Ripuarian Franks, and when the deed was done, himself took possession of the kingdom (Greg. ii. 40). So king Chararich is first imprisoned, and then put to death (ib. 41; cp. c. 27 *etiam ferri*, of Syagrius). King Rachnarch of Cambrai and his two brothers shared a similar fate (ib. 42).

In the early part of 511 Clovis summoned a council of 32 bishops to Orleans (see *Decrees ap. Sirmondi, Conc. Gall.* i. 177). Before the close of the year he died at the age of 45, and was buried at Paris in the church of the Apostles (afterwards St. Geneviève's) which he and Clotilda had built. He left four sons, Theodoric, the eldest (illegitimate); Chlodomer, Chilbert, and Lothar, by Clotilda.

The best and only first-class original authority for the reign of Clovis is Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ii. 27-43, contained in the collections of Duchesne, vol. i.; and Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens*, &c., vol. ii. (in the 3rd volume of Bouquet are extracts from the lives of the saints relating to the reign of Clovis). On the authority of Gregory see Löbell, *Gregor von Tours und seine Zeit*, pp. 320 ff.; Monod, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes Études*, part 8, 1872; and Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3rd ed. 1873, vol. i. pp. 76-83. The best monograph on the subject of Clovis is Junghans, *Geschichte der Frankischen Könige Childerich und Chlodovech*, Göttingen, 1857. On the constitution of the kingdom of Clovis and its constitutional history, see Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, ii. pp. 51-71; and G. Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, i. pp. 27-32, 1873. The following are the full titles of the other works referred to above: Binding, *das Burgundisch-*

Romanische Reich, Leipsic, 1868; Bornhak, *Geschichte der Franken unter den Merovingern*, Greifswald, 1863. [T. R. B.]

CLOVIS II. (for orthography, see Clovis I.) was chosen successor, whilst still a minor, to his father Dagobert I. by the chief men of Neustria and Burgundy, A.D. 638 (omnes leudes sublimant in regnum. Fredegar, 79). The government, though nominally under the regency of Nantechilde his mother, was really in the hands of the mayors of the palace, Aega and Erchoald. Pippin, mayor of Siegebert, half-brother of Clovis and king of the Austrasian Franks, demanded a partition of the treasures of Dagobert. A placitum, or common assembly of the chief men of each division, was held at Compiègne and the partition made (Fredegar, 85). Of Clovis it is said that he was the first of his race that allowed himself to be driven in an ox-waggon; at any rate he was weak-minded and profligate (*Gesta Fr.* 44), and towards the end of his reign insane (Fredegar, *Cont.* 91). There are stories of his having broken off the arm of St. Denis, of his having carried off certain silver ornaments from the church of that monastery, and of his having as an atonement released the monastery from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Paris. For this and for his benefactions to other monasteries, such as St. Maur-les-Fossés, Luxeuil, Rebas, &c., see the documents in Bréquigny's collection (ed. Pardessus). Siegebert died at the beginning of the year 656. Grimoald, the Austrasian mayor, attempted to place his own son upon the throne. The Austrasian chiefs rose against him, brought him bound before Clovis at Paris, to whom they offered the crown (*Gesta Reg. Fr.* 43). Clovis thus reunited the whole Frankish realm, but only for a few months, as he died in August of the same year 656. Clovis married Baldechildis or Balthildis, originally a captive from England (afterwards canonised, see her life in *Acta Sanctorum*, ii. 26th Jan.), and by her he had three sons, Clotaire III., Childeric II., and Theodoric III. Clovis was buried at St. Denis. [T. R. B.]

CLOVIS III., son of Theodoric III., youngest son of Clovis II., was chosen king of the Franks on his father's death in 691. He died four years afterwards, in 695, whilst still a minor, and was succeeded by his brother Chilbert III. (Fredegar, *Cont.* 101; *Gesta Reg. Fr.* 49.) [T. R. B.]

CLYDAI, Welsh saint of the 5th century, reputed foundress of a church named Clydai in Emllyn (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 151). [C. H.]

CLYDOG (CLEDOG), Welsh saint of the 5th century, buried at Clodock church in Herefordshire, of which he was the reputed founder; patron of the chapels of Llanfeuno (St. Beuno), Longtown (St. Peter), and Cresswell (St. Mary); commemorated on Aug. 19 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 145). [C. H.]

CNEBURG (Hen. Hunt. *Hist. M. H. B.* 724), CNEBURGA, perhaps (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 342), sister of Ina king of the West Saxons and Cuthburga. [CUENBURH.] [C. H.]

COBHRAN is said by St. Aengus (*De Matr. Hib. SS.*) to be the son of Nenain or Enain and of Mincloth, sister of St. Columba; his brothers were Moab, Moabbus, or Moabbanus, Colman, and

Moeldubius. But as there are in the calendars a Cobhran of Cluain or Cluain-Enach at July 19, and another of Cluain-Cuallacta at Aug. 2, Colgan cannot decide which dedication belongs to the nephew and disciple of St. Columba, or whether they are not both his. (*Tr. Thaum.* 469, c. 86, 482 n.⁴²; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 247.) [J. G.]

COBTHACH is mentioned among the companions of St. Columba in crossing from Ireland to Iona, and Camerarius places him in the calendar on Aug. 7, but without any authority. He was son of Brendan, and brother of St. Baithen, St. Columba's successor at Iona: he was thus cousin-german of St. Columba. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, Add. Note A, p. 245; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 7-8, and *Tr. Thaum.* 418 n.¹⁸.) Camerarius and other Scotch hagiographers call him Cibthachus, brother of Ethernan or Ernan, and nephew of St. Columba; but they are evidently at fault in both kindred and facts, as Ernan was St. Columba's maternal uncle. [J. G.]

COCCA, (COGA, CHOCA, CUACH,) of Cill-Choca, Jan. 8, June 6. St. Cocca is by some identified with Cocha, nurse of St. Ciaran [COCHA], but they appear to have been entirely different. Others, with more probability, think she was the same as the person elsewhere called Ercnat, or Ergnat, the cook and embroideress or robe-maker of St. Columba, Cocca being a form of Coqua, a cook [ERCNAT]. She is commemorated on Jan. 8 and June 6, on the former as "Cuach, Virgin, of Cill-Cuaiche in Cairbre-Ua-Ciardha" (*Mart. Doneg.*), now Kilcock, in the baronies of Ikeathy and Oughterany, co. Kildare. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 379; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* iii. 122; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 465, n.²⁹; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 130; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc.* Ir. 4 ser. iii. 553.) [J. G.]

COCHA, of Ros-bennachair (now Rosbanagher, or Rosmanagher, co. Clare)—June 29. In the *Life of St. Ciaran*, of Saighir, there is an account of the many services St. Ciaran did to St. Cocha, and of their lasting friendship. She was St. Ciaran's nurse, and through him her monastery at Rosbanagher was founded in the 6th century. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 183, 379; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 461, 465, n.²⁹; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 405.) [J. G.]

CODDIANI, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxvi. p. 85) a nickname given to an impure sect of Gnostic heretics. He explains the word as "plattermen," deriving it from a Syriac word, *coddā* (Aram. כִּדְיָ, a platter or dish; and says that they got the name because, on account of their pollution, no one could eat with them, and it was necessary that their food should be given them separately. [G. S.]

COELESTIANI. [COELESTIUS, PELAGIUS.]

COELCHUS, Irish saint. [COLGA (5).]

COELESTINUS I., commonly called CELESTINE, 42nd bishop of Rome, succeeded Boniface I. on Sunday, September 10, 422, without any delay or contest. He was of Roman birth—the son of Priscus. In early life he had visited Milan during the episcopate of St. Ambrose. He had been deacon to Innocent, and at that time had written a cordial letter to

St. Augustine, which he sent to Hippo by a cleric named Projectus. Augustine returned a suitable reply (*Aug. Ep.* 192). Soon after his accession to the see of Rome, Celestine received a letter from Augustine (*Ep.* 209) on the case of one Antony, who had been somewhat precipitately appointed bishop of Fussala, a small town forty miles from Hippo, had gravely misconducted himself in his office, had been compelled by a synod of bishops to leave Fussala, and had afterwards applied to Boniface with a view to his restoration. Boniface had written in his favour, with the saving clause, "if the information which he had given was correct." Augustine entreated Celestine to consider the statement of facts which he now transmitted, and not to impose on the people of Fussala, by aid of the secular power, a prelate so unworthy of the dignity to which he had been inconsiderately raised. "There is no doubt," says Fleury (b. xxiv. s. 34), "that matters were ordered to St. Augustine's satisfaction." After this, the African bishops resolved that they would no longer allow of appeals to Rome from their own country; and when Celestine, apparently in 426, wrote to them in behalf of the priest Apiarius, deposed from his office by his bishop Urbanus some eight years before, and favourably received, on his appeal to Rome, by pope Zosimus, a general council of Africa met and sent a reply to this effect: We have found Apiarius guilty of so many crimes that Faustinus (the deputy of the Roman see, sent by Zosimus to deal with the case) was unable to defend him; therefore we beg you to observe the Nicene rule (can. 5), and not to receive to communion those who have been excommunicated by us. Our African church retains its right to decide the causes of its own members. The Nicene council has ordered that all causes should be decided where they arise; nor can any one "believe that our God will inspire a single individual with justice, and deny it to a large number of bishops sitting in council." That persons should be sent by you to decide causes in Africa has been "ordained by no synod;" and as to the claim made for your see in this matter on the authority of the Nicene council, we proved to your predecessor, by authentic copies of Nicene canons, that it was wholly baseless. Do not, then, send (whoever may ask it) clerics of your own to carry out your orders in Africa, "lest we should seem to be introducing into Christ's church the smoky pride of this world" (*Cod. Can. Ecol. Afric.* ad fin.; Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* ix. 289).

Celestine was zealous against Pelagianism, and constrained Coelestius, the companion of Pelagius, to leave Italy. He retired to Constantinople, where Marius Mercator attacked him in a published "memorial."

The affairs of eastern Illyricum occupied the attention of Celestine, as of his predecessors. This "diocese" was attached, politically, to the eastern empire; but the see of Rome had kept a hold over its churches by committing a sort of vicarial authority to the see of Thessalonica, which was its head. Thus Damasus is said to have made the bishops of Thessalonica his representatives. See Fleury, b. xvii. c. 22. Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 9, thinks this an over-statement; but at any rate, he observes, Siricius (who succeeded Damasus), and afterwards Innocent, gave

a delegated authority to Anysius of Thessalonica. In A.D. 421 a collision took place between the Roman bishop Boniface and Theodosius II., who "claimed the power of transferring to the bishop of Constantinople that superintendence over the bishops of Illyricum" which Rome had entrusted to Thessalonica (Fleury, xxiv. 31). But Theodosius appears to have yielded the point to the remonstrances of his brother and of Boniface; and Celestine having already "interposed" in behalf of an Illyrian bishop named Felix, who was "in peril of being crushed by factious accusers," afterwards wrote (Cel. Ep. 3) to Perigenes of Corinth and eight other prelates of eastern Illyricum, asserting his right, as successor of St. Peter, to a general oversight ("necessitatem de omnibus tractandi"), and directing his "beloved brethren" to refer all causes to his deputy, Rufus of Thessalonica, and not to consecrate bishops, nor hold councils, without the sanction of that bishop. "Dominentur nobis regulæ," writes Celestine, "non regulis dominemur; simus subjecti canonibus," &c. But, says Tillemont, in the significant tone which he sometimes adopts about such cases, "it is difficult to see how he practised this excellent maxim;" for by the sixth Nicene canon the Illyrian bishops would be subject to their several metropolitans and provincial synods (xiv. 150).

Another letter of Celestine's (Ep. 4) was addressed, July 25, 428, "to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne, for the purpose of correcting several abuses" (Fleury, xxiv. 56). Some bishops, he had learned, "surreptitiously" wore the philosophic "pallium," with a girdle, by way of carrying out Luke xii. 35. Why not," asks Celestine, "also hold lighted lamps and staves?" The text is to be understood spiritually. This sort of dress, he adds, may be retained by those who dwell apart (monks), but there is no precedent for it in the case of bishops. "We ought to be distinguished from the people, not by dress, but by teaching; not by attire, but by conduct. . . . We ought not to accustom the simple minds of the faithful to such things. . . . Our duty is not to make an impression on their eyes, but to instil precepts into their minds." On other matters he comments to this effect. Some refuse to give absolution to penitents even at the hour of death: this is a barbarous "killing of the soul:" real conversion of those who are at the point of death is to be estimated *mente*, not *tempore*. Some consecrate laymen to the episcopate. Let no one be consecrated until he has gone through all degrees of the ministry: he who would be a teacher must first be a disciple—this principle is attested by common sense. One Daniel has been consecrated when he was notoriously suspected of grave crimes: let him be suspended from communion, and with him the bishop of Marseilles, accused of "rejoicing at his own brother's murder." Let the metropolitans be "content with their respective bounds," and not meddle with other provinces; and in the appointment of bishops let native clerics have a preference over strangers, and let the wishes of the flock be respected: "*Nullus invitis detur episcopus.*" These words of Celestine's became the recognised expression of a great principle of church law.

With this letter may be compared a short one (Ep. 5), written in the following year, to urge

the Apulian and Calabrian bishops to observe the canons, and not to gratify any popular wish for the consecration of a person who had not served in the ministry. "The people are to be taught, not followed. If they do not know what is lawful, and what is not, our business is to instruct them, not to yield to them." (On this subject of *per saltum* consecrations, see Bingham, ii. 10, 4 sq.)

It was in this year 429 that Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, commonly called St. German, and Lupus of Troyes, were sent over into Britain in order to repress Pelagianism. Prosper, in his Chronicle, says that Celestine, by the negotiation or management (*ad actionem*) of the deacon, sent German as his delegate (*vice sua*) to guide the Britons to Catholic faith. Constantius of Lyons, the biographer of German, whom Bede follows (*H. E. i. 17*), says that German and Lupus were sent by a large synod of Gallic bishops. Each narrator had his own advantage: Prosper was then in Gaul, and ere long became Celestine's secretary: Constantius wrote some sixty years later, but with full access to local information. The accounts may be reasonably harmonized. In German's case there was probably a special commission from Celestine, in addition to that which emanated from the Gallican synod. In this way, apparently, Celestine, as Prosper afterwards wrote in another work (*C. Collatorem*, 21, al. 24), "took pains to keep the Roman island Catholic." And here it will be natural to consider Celestine's further proceedings in regard to "the barbaric island," Ireland, which, says Prosper, in the same sentence, he "made Christian." What did he do in this respect? Two years later than the expedition of German he consecrated Palladius, and sent him to "the Scots, who believed in Christ," *i. e.* to the Irish, "as their first bishop." Such is Prosper's statement in his Chronicle. Christianity had been planted here and there in "the barbaric island" some time before, but there had not been an organised Irish church. Palladius had but little success, and stayed in Ireland but a short time; and there is no sufficient evidence for associating the mission of his great successor, Patrick, with Celestine or with the see of Rome. (See Todd's *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 309, sq. 352, 387, &c.)

We must now turn to the part which Celestine took in the great doctrinal controversy which was raised by the sermons of Nestorius at the end of 428. Celestine had, as he himself says (Ep. 13), entertained, from report, a favourable opinion of the new bishop of Constantinople; and he would be the more disturbed when, early in 429, he received copies of controversial discourses said to be by Nestorius, and wrote on his own behalf, and on that of other Italian bishops, to Cyril of Alexandria, asking for information on the case [CYRIL]. Cyril was in no haste to reply; he purposely kept silence for a year; and before he wrote, Celestine had received from Nestorius himself, by the hands of a man of high rank, named Antiochus, copies of his discourses, with a letter, which may, perhaps, be identified with one still extant in Latin, in which Nestorius takes occasion to write from the circumstance that certain exiled Pelagians, then resident in Constantinople, were impugning the emperor and himself to have their cause re-examined. For his own part, so Nestorius professed, he was

insufficiently informed; he must apply to Celestine for full information; and then he passes on to the controversy about the Incarnation, and describes his opponents as Apollinarians, &c. He wrote more than once again (Mansi, iv. 1023). and another extant letter resumes the same topic. "I am really anxious," he says in effect, "to hear from you whether these memorialists are, or are not, heretics condemned by the Western church. Day after day I put them off without an answer, because I am hoping for a letter from you." He then recurred to the question about the Person of Christ. This letter was brought to Rome by Valerius, an officer of Theodosius' household.

Celestine caused the Nestorian discourses to be rendered into Latin. This work took up some time; and while it was in process he received a letter from Cyril, accompanied by other translations of these documents, made at Alexandria. Thus aided, Celestine formed his own opinion on their theological character, and summoned a synod of bishops at the beginning of August in 430. We possess an interesting fragment of his speech on this occasion. "I remember that Ambrose of blessed memory, on the day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, made the whole people sing to God with one voice—

'Veni, Redemptor gentium,
Ostende partum Virginalis;
Miretur omne saeculum;
Talis decet partus Deum.'

(Ambros. *Hymn* 12; in *Brev. Ambros.* first vespers of Nativ.). "Did he say, 'Talis decet partus hominem?' So, the meaning of our brother Cyril, in that he calls Mary 'Theotocos,' entirely agrees with 'Talis decet partus Deum.' It was God whom the Virgin, by her child-bearing, brought forth, through His power who is full of omnipotence." He proceeded to quote a passage from Hilary, and two shorter ones from Damasus (Mansi, iv. 550; Galland, ix. 304). The council's resolutions were expressed by Celestine in letters to Cyril and to Nestorius. In the former (*Ep.* 11), Celestine commends Cyril's zeal in a cause which is, in truth, that of "Christ our God;" declares that a last effort must be made to rescue from the precipice one who has forgotten the name and the duties of a pastor; adds, that if Nestorius persists in his obstinacy, he must be driven away, as a wolf from the fold; and concludes by desiring Cyril to "join the authority of the Roman see to his own," and, as representing Celestine while acting for himself, to carry out with rigorous strictness the decision, that unless Nestorius should, within ten days, condemn his own wicked doctrines by a written profession of the same faith, as to "the birth of Christ our God," which is held by the Roman, by the Alexandrian, by the entire church, provision must be made for the see of Constantinople as if vacant, and Nestorius must be treated as one "separate from our body." This letter was dated Aug. 11, 430. Celestine wrote also to John bishop of Antioch, to Juvenal of Jerusalem, to Flavian of Philippi, to Rufus of Thessalonica (*Ep.* 12). His meaning is evident: he is not professing to act as the sole supreme judge and oracle of Christendom, or as the mouthpiece of the Catholic church; he announces his resolution, in concert with the

Alexandrian church, to break off all communion with the bishop of Constantinople, unless he retracted his heretical sentiments. Another letter was addressed to Nestorius himself (*Ep.* 13): it is verbose beyond what is usual with Celestine, and its point is contained in the observation, "You have been warned once, twice—I now give you the third warning, according to the rule of St. Paul. The orthodox clerics whom you have persecuted," he proceeds (alluding to some who had withstood Nestorius and experienced his anger), "are confessors: as for those heretics about whom you consulted me as if you did not know the facts about them (although you might have known, for they were condemned by your predecessor, Atticus), the sentences against them were just, and you, whose writings contain orthodox language about original sin, ought to have given them no encouragement. But as to your own matters, 'physician, heal thyself!' if you wish to retain communion with myself and with the bishop of Alexandria, affirm what he affirms—confess our faith." Celestine also wrote (*Ep.* 14) to the clergy and laity of Constantinople: as the "teacher of the Gentiles" bore "the care of all the churches," so, Celestine declares, "do I feel with you, am one with you in the unity of the church. Nestorius teaches error against Christ's Divinity: how unlike your great bishop John (Chrysostom), whose discourses—building up Catholic faith—are read all the world over; how unlike Atticus or Sisinnius, your late bishops, so zealous for orthodoxy!" He exhorts the orthodox clergy to endure manfully, and to take example from St. Athanasius. "Who cannot find comfort in his endurance, and instruction in his constancy, and encouragement in his return home? He was exiled—he was welcomed at Rome, and was refreshed by communion with our see" (alluding to pope Julius); "in all his troubles he never felt weariness, and no Christian can be exiled in respect to the presence of God."

The events which followed the council of Rome may be studied in the biography of Cyril; but it must here be observed that in the November of 430, when Theodosius, at the instance of Nestorius, had summoned an oecumenical council to meet at Ephesus at the coming Whitsuntide, and before the Roman and Alexandrian resolutions had been communicated to Nestorius, the latter wrote to Celestine, complacently remarking that Cyril, frightened at the accusations which would be brought against him before the council, was disposed to make terms. The best terms, said Nestorius, would be found in the adoption of the word "Christotocos," although he did not object to "Theotocos," if it were used so as not to imply "a confusion of natures." This, he added, he had signified to Cyril in a letter, a copy of which he sent to Celestine. "There will," he concluded, "be no difficulty, as far as I see, in treating of the Divinity of our Lord Christ:" but, with him, such a phrase only meant that Christ possessed a titular divinity through His intimate "association" with the Divine Word—an association which, on the Nestorian theory, differed in degree, rather than in kind, from the relation of prophets and saints to God. The question, of course, was complicated by the publication of Cyril's anathemas at Constantinople, and by the discussion raised by the theologians of the Anti-

oche patriarchate as to their alleged affinity to Apollinarianism. In the spring of 431, Cyril wrote again to Celestine, asking what should be done if Nestorius—having refused to retract at the summons of Rome and Alexandria—were to retract at the coming synod. Celestine answered, May 7 (*Ep.* 16), in a tone which exhibits him in a more favourable light than his great Alexandrian colleague. "As water to a thirsty soul, so is news of a friend, according to the saying of the most wise Solomon, from a far country—news 'received through your letter.' As to your question," he proceeds, "let us, in common, consult our common Lord. Does not He answer us by prophet and apostle, that He willeth not the death of a sinner, that He willeth every man to be saved? Let your Holiness, with our brethren, strive to close the controversy." After an assurance that he would be present in spirit at the council, Celestine adds, "I am anxious for the salvation of him who is perishing, provided that he is willing to own himself sick: if not, let our previous decisions stand . . . let him reap what . . . he has sown—being about to perish, not by our design, but by his own act. Let him find that *our* feet are not swift to shed blood, whenever he understands that healing is offered to him." Next day, May 8, Celestine wrote a paper of instructions for the three persons—Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a presbyter—whom he was sending to represent him at the council (*Ep.* 17). The substance of this "memorandum" is, "When you reach Ephesus, consult Cyril in everything, and do what he thinks best. Uphold the authority of the apostolic see: if a discussion takes place you are not to enter into it, but to judge of the opinions expressed. But if the council should be over when you arrive, inquire how the matter was settled: if you learn that the decision was in accordance with the ancient Catholic faith, and that Cyril has gone to Constantinople (*i. e.* to consecrate a new bishop), you must go thither also, and present to the emperor the letter which you will be charged with for him. If you find matters still unsettled, you will be guided by circumstances as to the course which, in conjunction with Cyril, you should take." On the same day Celestine wrote the most remarkable of his letters, that addressed to the council of Ephesus (*Ep.* 18), which was afterwards read, first in Latin, then in a Greek translation, at the second sitting of the council (see Mansi, iv. 1283; Tillemont, xiv. 376). "A gathering of priests (*sacerdotum*, used for bishops) bears witness to the presence of the Holy Spirit." So Celestine begins his letter, and goes on to cite Matt. xviii. 20, and to argue *à fortiori* from "two or three." "Christ," he adds, "was present in the company of apostles when they taught what He had taught them. This duty of preaching has been entrusted to all the Lord's priests in common, for by right of inheritance are we bound to undertake this solicitude." . . . "Go, teach all nations:" observe, brethren, that we have received a general commission. His pleasure is that we should all do that which He thus entrusted in common to all the apostles. . . . Let us all undertake the labours of those to whom we have succeeded in dignity . . . let us act now with a common exertion, that we may preserve what was entrusted to us and has been

retained through succession from the apostles (*per apostolicam successionem*) to this very day." (See, on this remarkable passage, the note in the Oxford ed. of Fleury, vol. iii. p. 23, citing the words of St. Cyprian: "The episcopate is one, and each individual bishop has an equal share in it as joint tenant." Fleury himself remarks that Celestine traces episcopal authority to Christ himself.) Celestine then insists on those recollections of the pastoral epistles which the place of the council's meeting should inspire. "*Idem locus, eadem causa. . . .*" "Let us be unanimous, let us do nothing by strife or vainglory; since the faith, which is one, is attacked, let the whole body (*collegium*) grieve, yea, mourn, in common with us. He who is to judge the world is called into judgment: *discutitur qui discussurus est omnes*: and He who redeemed us is being calumniated." He reminds them of the words of St. Paul to the "episcopi" of Ephesus, Acts xx. 28; and exhorts them to think of "that love in which, according to the words of John the apostle, whose remains you are venerating on the spot (*cujus reliquias præsentes veneramini*) we ought to abide;" to pray, as the apostles prayed, for grace to "speak the word of God with boldness," to "ask for, and to preserve, what will promote the peace of Jerusalem." He concludes by commending to them his three representatives who are to be present at their proceedings, and to "carry out what has been formerly determined by us" (*i. e.* at the Roman council), "to which we doubt not that your Holinesses will give your assent, when that which is read" (*i. e.* in the account or record of the Roman council; *legitur* is probably the right reading, although *agitur* stands now in the Latin text—the *ὑπερ ἂν γράτε* of the present Greek version being a mistake for *ὑπερ ἀνέγνωτε*) "shall appear to have been determined in favour of the peace of the universal church." In this latter sentence Celestine evidently means, "I trust that you will affirm the same conclusion which I expressed last year in my own synod." His deputies did not leave Rome until after the middle of May; for on May 15 he wrote to Theodosius (*Ep.* 19) a short letter, in which, speaking as one of the whole body of catholic bishops, he entreats the emperor to uphold the faith, in the true interests of his own sovereignty. "Whatever you do for the tranquillity of the church, or for the honour of our holy religion, is done *pro vestro imperio*." It was on July 10 that the three deputies appeared in the council, Nestorius having been deposed on June 22; the council, as Firmus of Caesarea told the deputies, had "followed in the track" of Celestine's previous decision; but, it must be observed, after a full and independent examination of the evidence. The deputies, on the next day, heard the "acts" of the first session read, and then affirmed the sentence passed on Nestorius in that session, taking care to dwell on the dignity of the see of St. Peter, while Cyril was not less careful to refer to them as representing "the apostolic chair and the council of Western bishops." After the formal breach between the council and the "Easterns," *i. e.* John of Antioch and his supporters, the council wrote to Celestine as their "fellow-minister" (*Ep.* 20), giving a narrative of events, and not forgetting to say that they had read and affirmed the sentences formerly pro-

nounced by him against the Pelagian heretics. They evidently regarded him as the first in dignity among all bishops, but not as the master or ruler of all: they "admire him for his far-reaching solicitude as to the interests of religion." "It is your habit, great as you are, to approve yourself in regard to all things, and to take a personal interest in the defence of the churches."

The news of Maximian's consecration, on the 25th of October, to the see of Constantinople, did not reach Celestine before Christmas. He read the letters of Theodosius and Maximian, announcing the event, to the people assembled in St. Peter's on "the day on which we celebrated the birth of Christ our God according to the flesh" (*Ep.* 23): but, for some reason unexplained, he did not reply until March 15, 432. In his letter to the members of the council (*Ep.* 22) he dwelt on the care with which, although at a distance from them, he had watched their proceedings. "To the care of the blessed Peter all are present." He refers especially to a point as to which the bishops had not informed him. Nestorius, though sent away from Ephesus, had been allowed to live at his old home near Antioch. Celestine objected strongly to this, and thought that Nestorius ought to be placed where he could have no opportunity of spreading his opinions. The birthplace of the Christian name is beset by a pestilent "disease," &c. "As for Nestorius's adherents, although I have read your sentence against them, yet I also determine what seems fitting. There are, in such cases, many points for consideration, which the apostolic see has always kept in view. The case of the Coelestians attests what I say." He means, as his next words shew, that in any sentence against a party of heretics, a distinction should be drawn between heresiarchs and their followers. The latter "should have opportunity of recovering their position on repentance." The consecrators of Maximian appear to have passed a too indiscriminating sentence against all Nestorianising bishops, and Celestine wished to moderate their zeal. He also wrote (*Ep.* 23) to Theodosius, extravagantly lauding his acts in behalf of orthodoxy, speaking highly of Maximian, and hinting that Nestorius ought to be sent into distant exile. In this letter, as in others of Celestine's, the phrase, "Christ our God," indicates his keen sense of the issue really involved in the controversy. To Maximian he sent a cordial letter (*Ep.* 24), exhorting him, in the difficult position in which he was placed, to strengthen those whose faith had been shaken, to heal those who were wounded, to put away those who refused all treatment, to "shew towards those whom the disturber had scattered that gentle spirit which he was known to possess." "You have a wide field in which to exhibit the glory of a watchful pastor and of a benignant bishop"—words which illustrate Celestine's dislike for measures of extreme rigour. His last letter on the subject, dated at the same time, was addressed to the clergy and laity of Constantinople (*Ep.* 25). He reminds us of the previous letter, in which he had inculcated patience: patience, he says, has reaped its reward. After dilating on the "impiety and treason" of Nestorius, and lauding Cyril's third letter to him, which, he says, "you have read, and retain in your memories," he refers again to "the blessed Peter" as not

having deserted them in their trouble. "We offered him, with the knife, lenitive treatment also: but, while we longed for his life, he chose death," &c. "We did nothing rashly or prematurely." After much more on this subject—so much that "perhaps my somewhat prolix discourse will have wearied you—let us leave the dead to bury their dead," Celestine exhorts his readers to listen to the words of their simple teacher, who would, as they well knew, teach nothing but the old faith; and so this lengthy epistle comes to a close.

"One of Celestine's last actions," says Tillemont, xiv. 156, "was his defence of the memory of St. Augustine as a teacher, against the Semi-Pelagians of Gaul. He wrote to Venerius, bishop of Marseilles, and five other Gallic prelates, urging them not to be silent. When presbyters spoke rashly and contentiously, it was not seemly that bishops should allow their subordinates 'to claim the first place in teaching,' especially when they raised their voices against 'Augustine of holy memory, who, on account of his holy life, has ever been in our communion, nor has a breath of sinister suspicion lighted upon him. His knowledge, we remember, was so great that even my predecessor ranks him among the best of teachers: he was beloved and honoured by all men everywhere. Let those persons, therefore, whom, unfortunately, we see to become more numerous, be resisted, and let us be assured, by your imposing silence upon them, that their language is as displeasing to you as it is to us'" (*Ep.* 21). The nine articles on the doctrine of grace which are appended to this letter are not by Celestine (see note to Oxf. ed. of Fleury, iii. p. 143).

Celestine is described by Socrates (vii. 11) as having treated the Novatians of Rome with harshness, taken away their churches, and obliged their bishop, Rusticola, to hold his services in private houses. "Previously, the Novatians were in a very flourishing state at Rome, and possessed many churches and large congregations. But," adds the historian, who sympathised largely with this sect, "jealousy attacked them also; since the Roman episcopate, like the Alexandrian, had already, for a considerable time, advanced beyond the limits of priestly action to a position of sovereign power."

Celestine died on or about the 26th of July, 432 (Tillemont, xiv. 738), and was succeeded by Sixtus III. [W. B.]

COELESTIUS occupies a unique position among the Hibernian Scots, as he taught not the faith, but heresy. The general belief is that he was a native of Ireland, of noble birth, and, in early years, of singular piety. About A.D. 405 he is found attached to Pelagius at Rome, and the names of these two figure largely in the history of the church, till they are finally condemned in the Ephesine Council, A.D. 431. Coelestius had for some time studied law, and then become a monk, when his speculations upon the conditions of grace and nature attracted attention, as he affirmed the leading points of what were afterwards known as the Pelagian heresy upon the fall of man and the need of supernatural assistance, in effect denying both. These errors he had partly learned, as he said, from a holy presbyter, Rufinus, of whom nothing else is known. From

Rome, on the approach of the Goths, he passed to Sicily, and thence to Carthage: by a council at Carthage under Aurelius, the bishop, his teaching was condemned, A.D. 412, though St. Augustine of Hippo had not yet taken up the controversy against him. He soon after retired to Ephesus, where he obtained the priesthood which he had sought for in vain at Carthage. On an appeal to pope Zosimus, A.D. 417, he presented his teaching in such a light as to procure acquittal before the pope, at first a half-informed judge, who however in the following year saw good reason to condemn him: at Carthage he always met with a determined opposition, and at Constantinople and Rome both the imperial and the ecclesiastical powers were finally arrayed against him. After the condemnation of the doctrines of Pelagius by the oecumenical council at Ephesus, Coelestius passed from sight. His chief opponents were St. Augustine and St. Jerome. (Fleury, *Ecc. Hist.* B. xxiii.-xxv.; Mosheim, *Ecc. Hist.* i. cent. v. ch. 23 sq.; Wall, *Inf. Bapt.* i. c. 19; Ussher, *Ecc. Ant.* c. 9 (wks. v. 250 sq.); Gennadius, *de Script. Ecc.* c. 44; Bright, *Hist. Ch.* c. 10; Pinkerton, *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 260-1; Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* i. B. ii. c. 8; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 97 n.; Gieseler, i. 2; Dupin, *Hist. Ch.* cent. v. c. 2; Liganan, *Ecc. Hist. Ir.* i. 16, 17.) [See PELAGIUS.] [J. G.]

COELICOLAE. The death of Julian (A.D. 363) was followed by a reaction in favour of the Christians and against the Jews. The fierce bitterness of the edicts of Constantine and Constantius was never perhaps renewed, but the decrees of Theodosius the Great (379-395) and his son Honorius (395-423), were sufficiently strong and cruel, to make it evident how the Roman emperors were influenced, both theologically and politically.

The Christians convinced themselves that a stand must be made more earnestly than ever against any heresy which would seduce their members in the direction of either Judaism or Paganism. The possible confusion of Christianity with either was by all means to be avoided. Most especially should this be the case as regarded Judaism. The scandal at Antioch which roused the holy indignation of St. Chrysostom—Christian ladies frequenting the synagogues and observing the Jewish festivals, Christian men bringing their lawsuits by preference before the judges of Israel (Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iv. 315)—found its reflection in many of the chief centres of the Eastern and Western empires. Hence the effort became more and more strenuous to suppress not only such open approximation of the two religious bodies, but also such sects as indicated, by their forms and doctrines, the intention of presenting a compromise with the truth.

Gentle means were tried. St. Augustine (*Op.* ii. Ep. xlv. cap. vi. § 13, ed. Migne) wrote to the "elder" of one of these sects—the *Coelicolae*, inviting him to a conference. It does not appear that any response was made. Recourse was had to imperial threatenings, and the edicts of Theodosius and Honorius denounced the "new doctrine" of the sect. It was said to be marked by "new and unwonted audacity," and to be nothing else than a "new crime of superstition:" hence, the *Coelicolae* must suffer the punishment

of heretics if they refused to be converted to Christianity (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. t. v. viii. x. *Cod. Justin.* i. tit. ix.). Happily there is reason to believe that kinder counsels moderated the severity of such intolerance (Grätz, p. 386, sq.; Levysohn, *Diss. inauguralis de Jud. sub Caesar. conditione*, p. 4 sq.).

It is difficult to ascertain precisely the views of the *Coelicolae*. In one edict they are classed with the Jews and the Samaritans, in a second with the Jews only. But it would be a mistake to consider them simply Jews. Their name is rather an indication of a vulgar error than of an erroneous worship. The Romans, it is well known, called the Jews worshippers of idols through a mistaken notion that the Jewish use of the word "Heaven" for "God" (Buxtorf, *Lex. Rab.* s. v. שמים, p. 2440. Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, i. 303)—a use derived from Babylonian sources (see note to Daniel iv. 26, E. V. *Speaker's Commentary*)—indicated the worship of some created embodiment of heaven (Vitringa, *de Synag.* i. 229). The *Coelicolae* proper would therefore be easily included by the Romans under the one general title "Jews." From St. Augustine's letter it would seem that the *Coelicolae* used a baptism which he counted sacrilege: that is, they probably combined a Christian form of baptism with the Jewish rite of circumcision. If so, the compromise would be most objectionable to St. Augustine, and he would denounce it as dangerous. If, moreover, as would seem to be the case from the name they bore, the *Coelicolae* openly professed their adhesion to the Jewish worship of the One God to the rejection of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, then this would be an error which would not find compensation in their abhorrence of the Pagan forms of idolatry.

More than this it seems impossible to ascertain. But the very existence of a sect which strove to combine Christian and Jewish ceremonies and doctrines, was pregnant with mischief and danger. Therefore the *Coelicolae* of Africa, like their congeners the *Θεοσεβῆς* of Phoenicia and Palestine, and the *Hypistarii* of Cappadocia, were stamped or died out in the course of a few years. (Schmid (J. A.) *Historia Coelicolarum*; Walch (C. G. F.) *Historia patriarcharum Judaeorum*, pp. 5-8; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* vol. vii. 271; Niedner, *K. G.* p. 321 note (1866); Hase, *K. G.* p. 121; Hasse-Köhler, *K. G.* i. 103; Herzog, *R. E.* s. v. "Himmelsanbeter.") [J. M. F.]

COELLACUS (Wend. *F. H.* ed. Coxe, i. 154), bishop of Mercia. [COELLACH.] [C. H.]

COEMACA, COEMOCA. [See CAEMHOG.]

COEMAN. [See CAEMHAN.]

COEMGEN (CAOIMHGHEN, KEVIN), abbat of Glendalough, June 3, A.D. 618. He was descended from Laeghaire Lore, monarch of Ireland, through his father Coemlog, of the Dal Messincorb: his mother was Coemell, daughter of Cenadan or Ceannthionnan, son of Ceisi, also descended from Laeghaire Lore through Cormac Caech, brother of Messincorb. He had at least two brothers and two sisters, St. Caemhan of Ard-chaemhain (June 12), St. Mochaemh or Nathaemh of Tirdaglas (May 1), St. Caemhóg (July 23), called also Coeltigerna and mother of St. Dagán, and Melda mother of St. Abban. Supposing his age at death to have been 120, he

was born A.D. 498, and baptized by St. Cronan; but Lanigan gives strong reasons for objecting to so early a date. In Scotie his name signifies "fair begotten," and he belongs to the second order of Irish saints. At the age of seven years he was committed to the charge of St. Petroc, a learned and holy Briton, and after a stay of five years with him (A.D. 510, Ussher) was put under his uncle, St. Eugenius or Eoghan of Derry, St. Lochan, and St. Enna, with whom he remained for three years, "et apud illos sanctos beatus Coemgenus sedulo legebat." In dread of being elected abbat he fled to Gleann-da-loch (now Glendalough, or the Valley of the Two Lakes, in the barony of North Ballinacor, co. Wicklow), was ordained priest by Lugidus or Lugaigh, and founded the monastery there in A.D. 549. (For an account of the Seven Churches of Glendalough and other remains, see Petrie, *Round Towers*, 168 sq. 445; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Ass. Ir.* 4 ser. i. 194.) There he had a school as well as a church, and among his pupils was St. Berach of Cluaincainrthe. He was also intimately acquainted with SS. Columba, Congall, and Caineach. In the ancient *Life* given by the Bollandists he is said to have led an eremitic life for four years in the upper valley of the glen, then to have been induced to descend to a "clara cella," called Disert-Cavghin, or Disert-Caoimhghen, now Reefert church, and at last to have removed his monastery and awaited the resurrection at the confluence of the rivers where the town of Glendalough now stands. He received his viaticum from St. Mochorog, a Briton, and died A.D. 618. Some writings are attributed to him, but perhaps the most famous was his Monastic Rule. He was very highly esteemed around Glendalough, and his memory is yet gratefully revered throughout Ireland with an honour that is scarcely less than that which is paid to St. Brigida. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 43 sq.; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 302; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 123-4; Butler, *Lives of the SS.* vi. 69, 70; Bollandists, *Acta SS. Jun. tom. i.* 310-322; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 183 sq.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 341, c. 6, and *Tr. Thaum.* 210, c. 2, 459, c. 26; Ussher, *Ant. Eccl. cc.* xiv. xvii. (wks. v. vi.); Hammer, *Chron. Ir.* 121 sq.; Hardy, *Desc. Cat. i.* 217). In the time of the O'Cleries his *Life* in Irish was in the possession of Domhnall Carrach, son of Ferghal Mac Eochadha, at Eanach-mor in Ui Ceinnsellaigh (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 145). There is a *Life* of St. Coemghen in the *Book of Kilkenny* (Marsh, *Lib. Dubl. f.* 64 b sq.). He has a few dedications in Argyleshire. There is another Coemgen, who, however, is generally known by the more endearing and reverential form of the name [MOCHAEMOG]. [J. G.]

COENA (Flor. Wig. *Nom. Archiep.* in M. H. B. 625; Le Neve, *Fasti*, iii. 94; Stubbs, *Regist.* 180), bishop of York. [ETHELBERT.] [C. H.]

COENBURGA (QUOENBURGA) (1), according to Bede a daughter of Cearl, king of Mercia, and wife of Aedwin, afterwards king of Northumbria (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 14). She seems to have died before her husband came to the throne. [J. R.]

(2) Daughter of Heriburg, abbess of Watton (Vetadun), E. R. York, and a nun in that house, who was cured of an infirmity by John, bishop of

York, circa A.D. 686 (Beda, *H. E. v.* 3; *Vita S. Joh.* apud *Corpus Hist. Ebor.* i. 247-8). [J. R.]

COENBURGA (3), abbess, associated with the abbess Cneburga and others in a proposal for mutual intercessory prayer (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 342). [COENBURG.] [C. H.]

COENFERTH, one of two presbyters from the diocese of Worcester attesting an act of the Council of Clovesho, October 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 546). [C. H.]

COENGILSUS (*Epist.* 160, in Würdtwein's ed. of St. Boniface's Epistles, and *Epist.* 108 in ed. of Migne, *Patrol. tom.* lxxxix. 800; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 342, 343), abbat of Glastonbury. [CENGILLUS.] [C. H.]

COENRED (1), son of Ceolwald and the father of Ina king of Wessex. [CENRED.]

(2) King of the Mercians, 704-709. He was a son of Wulfhere and Eormengild, and succeeded his uncle Ethelred on his resignation in 704, having been for two years before the under-king of Southumbria. In 709 he followed the example of his uncle, resigned his crown, and went to Rome in company with Offa king of the East Saxons; there he remained for the rest of his life. Bede mentions him as undertaking, at Ethelred's request, the protection of Wilfrid (*H. E.* v. 19). He confirmed a charter of Ethelheard and Ethelward of the Huiccas to Worcester (*Cod. Dipl. No.* 53) and another to Evesham in 706 (*ibid.* No. 56), and appears as the grantor of several spurious Evesham charters (*ibid.*). His cousin Ceolred succeeded him. [S.]

In A.D. 702, during his uncle's reign, Coenred succeeded to the "kingdom of the Southumbrians," and when his uncle abdicated, A.D. 704, he succeeded to the "kingdom of the Mercians" (*A. S. C.* ad an. 702, 704). Here is a clear distinction between Southumbria and Mercia, the former evidently being a subordinate province; but where situated? Southumbria is a word of rare occurrence (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 449, 697, 702; Gaimar, v. 1594; M. H. B. 299, 325, 783). We might conceive it as applying to that portion of Mercia which lay immediately contiguous to Northumbria, and called elsewhere North Mercia, for the Trent formed a recognised division of Mercia into north and south (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 24). But another solution of the difficulty seems preferable. The country of the Lindisfari, otherwise Lindsey or Lindissa (now Lincolnshire), was subject to the kings of Mercia, but was always spoken of as distinct from Mercia (cf. Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 655), and it always had its own bishop. In A.D. 678 Egfrid king of Northumbria conquered it from Wulfhere king of Mercia; but in 681 Ethelred of Mercia recovered it. Might not this have been Southumbria? Northumbria in its primitive sense was that maritime region north of the Humber estuary which was first colonised, and by analogy Southumbria would be south of the estuary, not merely south of inland Northumbria. The passage of Gaimar seems to bear out this view. On coming to the reign of Coenred, he describes his dominions from the starting-point of Southumbria, and proceeds to a detailed survey of the country which we recognise as Lincolnshire. This is the passage, which

afterwards goes on to mention more briefly other places in Mercia :—

"Kenret regna sur Suthumbreis :
Co est Lindeseye e Holmedene :
Kesteven e Hoiland e Hestdene :
Del Humbre tresk'en Roteland
Durout cel regne, e plus avante.
Par plusurs faiz fu la devise :
Tels lius i out dreit a Tamise," etc.

(*L'Estorie des Engles*, vv. 1594 sq. M. H. B. 783). Lindsey, Kesteven, and Holland are names of districts in Lincolnshire to this day. Bede defines the Lindissa regio to be that "quae est prima ad meridianam Humbrae fluminis ripam" (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 16). Historical connexion as well as geographical position would sufficiently account for the occasional designation of Southumbria in the place of the more usual one. It was contiguous to Northumbria, it was coveted by it, it had been annexed to it, and it had been recovered. It might therefore not unnaturally be called for distinction Southumbria. Moreover the remoteness of this district from the Mercian capital, which was Lichfield, its border situation, its provincial distinctness, would conspire to mark it out as suitable for a prince who was to succeed to the throne. It should be noticed that a passage in Bede's epitome, compared with a passage in the *Saxon Chronicle*, would appear to identify Southumbria with Mercia. But the inference is not necessary. The principes Merciorum of one writer might be Southumbrians in another. The epitome says that Osthryd queen of the Mercians was slain "a suis, id est, Merciorum primatibus" (ad an. 697), and the chronicler writes that "the Southumbrians" slew her.

Coenred could only just have succeeded his uncle when the veteran Wilfrid returned, and for the last time, from Rome, with letters from pope John, one of which was addressed to the late king of Mercia, urging compliance with the exile's claims. It was in consequence of this that Ethelred, who had ever been a staunch supporter of Wilfrid, advised his nephew to maintain a friendly footing with him. That Coenred was a man of strong religious convictions we learn from a story which Bede relates in much detail. There was an officer to whom, for his faithful services, he was much attached, but whose utter indifference to religion deeply grieved him, and he longed for his conversion to a better mind. At last the man fell sick, and the king, by personal visits, assiduously sought to bring him to repentance. All, however, was to no purpose, and Coenred heard from his dying lips an awful vision he had had of his coming condemnation (*H. E.* v. 19). Bede dwells on the circumstance only for the spiritual benefit of his readers; but William of Malmesbury attributes Coenred's abdication and journey to Rome to the deep impression made upon his mind on this occasion (*Malm. G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 111). The step is assigned to various years, A.D. 708, 709, 710; but 709 is the one fixed by Bede (*H. E.* v. 24, *Recapit. Chron.* ad an. 709), who also states that it was the year bishop Wilfrid died (v. 19), and similarly the *Sax. Chron.* (ad an.). See also Pagi (*Baron. Annal.* ad an. 709, § 5, ed. Theiner, 1865). He was accompanied by Offa king of the East Saxons, and at their joint request (*Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad an.) Egwin bishop of the Wicci

(Worcester) went with them. In Rome (Constantine being then pope) Coenred was shorn and made a monk "ad limina apostolorum," continuing to his last hours in prayers, fastings, and alms-deeds (*Bed. H. E.* v. 19; *Flor. Wig. l. c.*; *Wend. F. H.* ed. Coxe, i. 200). A reputed grant to Egwin in favour of Evesham is dated at Rome (*Monast. Angl.* ii. 15; *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 712; *Kemble, C. D.* No. 61, *Acta* 709). Neither wife nor child are attributed to him, but he had a sister Wereburga, and a brother Baerhtwald (*Flor. Wig. Geneal. Merc. Regg.*; *Malm. G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 308, 323, 351; *Lapp. Hist. Eng.* tr. Thorpe, i. 291). Coenred was the fifth of the Anglo-Saxon kings who abdicated on religious grounds, following Ethelred; and he was the second of those who went to Rome and died there, Caedwalla being the first; but Coenred and his companion Offa were the only ones who became monks at Rome. Little is to be said of Mercian church affairs during the reign of Coenred. His bishops were Hedda for the Mercians at Lichfield, Edgar for Lindsey, Egwin for Worcester. Brihtwald was archbishop of Canterbury (*Stubbs, Regist.*). In A.D. 705 there was a Mercian witenagemot, at a place unknown, attended by Coenred, and his bishops, and his "duces religiosi," "de reconciliatione Aelfridae" (*Hadd. and Stubbs, Councils*, i. 273). But the most noted event was the foundation of the abbey of Evesham in or shortly before A.D. 706, for which see *Hadd. and Stubbs*, iii. 278 sq.

The variations of this king's name are COINRED, CENRED, CYNRED, CHENRET, KENRED, KENRET. [C. H.]

COENRED (3), COENRAED, CENRED, KENRED, king of Northumbria from A.D. 716 to 718. He was the son of Cutha, and is said by Malmesbury to have been implicated in the violent end of Osred, his predecessor on the throne (*de Gestis Regum*). There is little or nothing known about Coenred's reign. (See Bede, v. 22; *Saxon Chron.* sub anno 716.) [J. R.]

COENUALD (COENWALD, KENWALD), a monk sent by archbishop Theodore to Rome bearing written charges against Wilfrid before pope Agatho. Malmesbury represents him as supporting the charges in harsh and bitter terms (*Eddius, Vit. Wulf.* c. 29; *Malm. G. P.* i. 222, 223, ed. Hamilton). [C. H.]

COENUALH (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 167), bishop. [COENWALCH.]

COENUUEALHA (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 7); COENWALCH (*Flor. Wig. Geneal. Reg. W. Sax.*, M. H. B. 633), king of the West Saxons. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

COENUULF, -FUS (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 116), king of Mercia. [KENULF.] [C. H.]

COENWALCH, the eleventh bishop of London. His episcopate falls between 789, when Eadgar was bishop, and 796 when Eadbald his successor died. His name is attached to a questionable or spurious charter of Offa, dated 793; *Kemble, C. D.* No. 162. (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 617.) [S.]

COFEN, early Welsh saint, patron of Llan-gofen, in Monmouthshire, and of St. Goven

chapel in Pembrokeshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307). [C. H.]

COGITOSUS, monk of Kildare. April 18 is his festival in *Mart. Tallaght*, where he is called the "Wise," and on that day Marian O'Gorman has the suffrage, "Virtus Cogitosi iusti et veracis nos defendat." In the closing chapter of his *Life of St. Brigida* he calls himself her "nepos culpabilis," tells (c. 32) of the wonders done at her tomb in his day "quas nos virtutes non solum audivimus sed etiam oculis nostris vidimus," and speaks, in the Prologue, of the archiepiscopal see being placed at Kildare. Colgan would not interpret "nepos" strictly according to the letter, but is of opinion that Cogitosus must have written before A.D. 594, and probably about A.D. 550. This date, however, is too early, but Basnage, the editor of Canisius, and Dr. Ledwich (*Antiq. Irel.* 2 ed. pp. 352, 353), who accepts Basnage's opinion and words, are wrong in saying that Cogitosus's account of the decorations upon the tombs of St. Brigida and St. Conlaeth "smell of a later age" than that spoken of by Cogitosus, and must be referred to the 12th century. Lanigan and Petrie prove incontestably that Cogitosus must have written previously to A.D. 831, when Kildare was first plundered, and must have flourished at latest in the beginning of the 9th century [BRIGIDA (5)]. In a paper read before the Royal Irish Academy in 1863 Dr. Graves concludes that Muirchu Maccumachteni, the author of the *Life of St. Patrick* with which the *Book of Armagh* commences, was the son of Cogitosus, and that Cogitosus died about the year 670. (For a defence of Cogitosus and his description of the church and tombs at Kildare, see Petrie, *Round Towers*, 197-207.) His *Life of St. Brigida* contains thirty-six chapters, and follows closely St. Brogan's metrical *Life of the same saint* in his general order of miracles, and is not so diffuse as those by St. Ultan and the others. This *Life* is given by Canisius (*Lectt. Antiq.* tom. v. 416-24); by Messingham (*Floril. Ins. Sanct.* 189-200); by Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 518-526); by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* vol. iv. Feb. tom. i.). It is also given by Surius. As to Cogitosus himself, we know little beyond what we gather from his *Life of St. Brigida*. Among the Praetermissi on April 18, the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* April, tom. iii. 518) mention "Cogitosi Episcopi depositio Turonis" as read in a "MS. Tornacensi et pridie in Laetiensi," but they merely refer to Colgan and *Mart. Tallaght* as above, and sum up with "reliqua ignoramus." (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 379 sq.; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 137 sq.; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 269 sq.; Vossius, *de Scrip. Lat.* iii. 624.) [J. G.]

COIFI, the chief of the heathen priests of Aedwin, king of Northumbria, in A.D. 627. He advised his master to accept Christianity at the preaching of Paulinus, and himself, lance in hand, and riding on a horse, desecrated the temple at Goodmanham in the East Riding of Yorkshire (Godmundingaham), in which he had so often officiated (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 13). [J. R.]

COIMGHEALL, daughter of Mac Iaar. [CAEL.]

COINCHENN, CONCHENN. There were two virgin saints of this name in the 7th and 8th centuries

COINCHENN (1), of Cael-achadh. August 20. She was daughter of Ceallach Cualann, who was son of Gerrtide king of Leinster, and, dying A.D. 713, was the ancestor of the Ui-Ceallaigh Cualann, in the north of Wicklow. Her monastery was probably at Killeigh, bar. Geshill, King's County, and she died about A.D. 743, according to the Irish Annals (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 607; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 313, 341).

(2) On March 13 was the festival of St. Coinchenn the Devout, sister to St. Fintan Munna (Oct. 21). According to Colgan (*Acta SS.* 606), who has collected all that is known regarding her, she flourished in Ulster in the beginning of the 7th century. Her father was Tulchan, and her mother Fethlimidia, both descended from Neill king of Munster; and her brothers are said to have been St. Fintan abbat of Cluain Edneach (Feb. 17, but this relationship is very doubtful), Lugaidh of Cluain Fiachul (now possibly Clonfeakle, March 2), and St. Fintan Munna (Oct. 21). But the chronology casts doubts upon her receiving the virgin's veil from St. Monenna in the monastery of Kill-Sleibhe. In the *Life of St. Munna* [FINTAN (3)] there is a legend of his restoring St. Coinchenn to life, a common miracle in such Lives. She became abbess of Cill-Sleibhe, (now Killeary, at the foot of Slieve Gullion, in the barony of Upper Orior, co. Armagh,) and died A.D. 654 (*Four Mast.*) or 657 (*Ann. Tigh.*). (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 38 sq.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 168 n., 267; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 3 ser. i. 100, 101.)

[J. G.]

COININGEN—April 29. In the Irish Martyrologies she is called the pupil of St. Mac Tail, bishop of Cill-Cuillinn (now Old Kilcullen, co. Kildare), who died about A.D. 548, and is said to have been denounced by the clergy of Leinster on her account. She is also identified with "St. Cuach, of Cill Fionnmaighe, in Ui Feneclais in Fortuatha Laigen," in the present barony of Arklow, co. Wicklow (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 113; *Mart. Tall.* in Kelly's *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xxii.) [J. G.]

COINRED, -DUS (Bede, *H. E.* v. 19, edd. Smith, M. H. B., Giles, Stevenson, Moberly), king of Mercia. [COENRED.] [C. H.]

COINUALCH (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7, edd. Smith, M. H. B., Stevenson, Moberly); **COIN-VALCH** (Bede, *Vit. Abbat.* ed. Smith), king of Wessex. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

COINWALCH (CENWALH), king of Wessex. He succeeded his father Cyneigils in 643, being still a heathen. In 645, having repudiated his wife, a sister of Penda, king of Mercia, he drew down upon himself the vengeance of that great ruler, and was driven from his country. He took refuge with Anna, king of the East Angles, at whose court he was converted to Christianity and baptized by Felix the bishop of the East Angles. After three years of exile he returned with the assistance of Cuthred, son of Cuichelm, introduced Christianity into his dominions, and accepted Agilbert as bishop in succession to Binus. Unable to understand the language of Agilbert he some time after introduced Wini as bishop, upon whose arrival Agilbert left Wessex. But Coinwalch did not agree with Wini any better

than with Agilbert, and on his departure, after proposing that Agilbert should return, he accepted Letherius or Lother as his bishop. His reign was the period of the great development of the West Saxon kingdom; he defeated the Britons in three great battles, and extended his dominions as far as the Parret, but in his later years he had to retire southwards before the advancing power of Mercia. Bede ascribes to him the plan of dividing Wessex into two dioceses for his two rival bishops, and he is the traditionary founder of the see and cathedral of Winchester (*A. S. Chr.* 643; *H. Hunt.*, in *M. H. B.* 716; *Bed. H. E.* iii. 7, iv. 12). One of his last acts was to entertain Benedict Biscop on his way from Rome. He died in 672, leaving Wessex in the hands of his wife, Sexburga. A spurious charter of Glastonbury is ascribed to him (*Kemble, C. D.* No. 7).

[S.]

It was in A.D. 646 (*A. S. C.* and *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad an.) that Coinwalch was persuaded by the pious king of the East Angles to accept the faith which he had refused (*Bed. H. E.* iii. 7) eleven years before to share with his father. On gaining his crown in A.D. 648, Birinus was still bishop, and had the satisfaction of seeing a Christian succession maintained in the kingdom. It was in that same year that Coinwalch caused the minster at Winchester to be built and "halloed in the name of St. Peter" (*A. S. C.* ad an.); the mention of it under the year 643 appears to be intended rather summarily than chronologically, as well as to have been entered at a later date, after the new minster had been built. We are not to understand that erection to imply any alteration in the ecclesiastical government. Birinus still remained seated at Dorchester, and there he was buried in A.D. 650. The Gallic Agilbert, who just then appeared in Wessex conveniently to succeed him, continued likewise in the same episcopal city. The Winchester St. Peter's was meant probably to dignify the royal capital, and perhaps to stand as a pledge and memorial of the king's conversion. Ten years afterwards, A.D. 658 (*A. S. C.* and *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad an.), occurred the military event of this reign which is chiefly interesting to the church historian. Coinwalch fought against the "Welsh" (*i. e.* Britons) at Peonna, and drove them as far as Pedrida (*A. S. C.* ad an.). This was a great and decisive victory; Henry of Huntingdon dwells on it with much emphasis, and speaks of the 'plaga insanabilis' which fell upon "the progeny of Brutus" on that occasion (*M. H. B.* 717). Peonna cannot be clearly identified among the various Pens of Somersetshire (*cf. E. A. Freeman, Old Eng. Hist.* 65), but Pedrida was Petherton on the Parrett, so that here we have the limit of Wessex at this stage of its western progress, and it included all the eastern and bulkiest half of Somersetshire. The ecclesiastical interest of the event is perceived as soon as we begin to examine the dates of the great religious foundations in the western counties. The first of them that we think of is of course Glastonbury, that leads off the *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Now at all events, if not earlier "not much before A.D. 652-658," Haddan and Stubbs, i. 121 n.), that venerable settlement, with all its traditions of British Christianity, of Arthur, of Patrick, of Roman days too, came within the limits of Saxon dominion, and was

CHRIST. BIOGR.

severed for ever from the Britons. It must long have been the outpost of British Christianity against the advancing tide of Teutonic paganism, and many a wistful gaze must have been directed eastward from its walls. It was a grand thing for Glastonbury that the conquest of those parts did not occur when the Wessex kings were pagan. It was not now injured or destroyed, as it might once have been, but fostered and Saxonised. The old British line of abbats was not abruptly broken, as Berthwald, the first of the Saxon, appears to have begun his rule in 668 (*Monast. Angl.* i. 2), and in his day, A.D. 670, Coinwalch himself heads the royal benefactors. Of the other famous houses in the west, Sherborne seems to have been in existence as early as the days of Coinwalch; Malmesbury sprang up in 675, Wimburn somewhat later. [CUTHBURGA.]

Passing from the monasteries (which were the method of those early days for solving the problems we now solve by the parochial system) to the episcopate, we see in the conduct of Agilbert the prevalent ideas of the heptarchal prelacy, that there must be one king and one bishop in a kingdom, however large the kingdom might grow. Augustine was more modest when he allowed Kent to have a second bishop at Rochester. That Wina should have been "subintroductus" (*Bede, H. E.* iii. 7), without Agilbert being consulted, was intolerable. The West Saxon king did in 664 what the Northumbrian Oswy did a very little later, and the case of Wilfrid and Ceadda might be studied in that of Agilbert and Wina. The king was limiting the power of his spiritual rival. The new see of Winchester was not intended to supersede that of Dorchester, but to divide a great bishopric, and the foreign tongue may have been partly a pretence. It is worthy of remark that it was while Agilbert in France, with his wound still fresh, was ordaining Wilfrid for the great bishopric of the north, Ceadda was, after the manner of Wina, subintroductus to York, and Wilfrid not consulted. We should have been sure the two aggrieved men conferred, even if we had not the descriptions of Eddius. Wilfrid acted much as Agilbert had done, refusing to take half a post, retiring to his own home, his monastery at Ripon, while the intruder was in the way. It must, however, be observed that Coinwalch and Oswy may both have given just cause of offence by stretching the royal prerogative and appointing bishops without a synodic election. The 'subintroductus' would seem to imply that.

The *Annales Winton.* (Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* i. 288) assert that Coinwalch constructed the church at Winchester which his father had begun, endowing it with three manors, Duntun, Alresford, and Wordia; and that there he was buried.

The various other spellings of this name are: COINUALCH, COINWALCH, CENWALH, CENUUALH, CENUUALCHUS, CENWALCH, CENWAL, COENWALCH, COENWALCHUS, CENWAILLE, CHENEWOLD, CYNWALH, KENWALH, CONUUALH, CONWALH, COYNWALH, CEONWALH, CYNEWEALH.

[C. H.]

COLACHUS. [See CELLACH (3), of whose name this is probably a Latin form.] [J. G.]

COLARBASUS (Hippol., *Ps. Tert.*; *Colarbasus*, *Iren.*, *Epiph.*, *Theodoret*, *Philast.* cod.,

Aug.; *C. Bassus* Philast. codd.), a supposed Valentinian Gnostic of the 2nd century. The name occurs first, and that only incidentally, in a solitary passage of Irenaeus (p. 65) which has been the subject of much discussion. Volkmar (*Die Colarbasus-Gnosis* in *Niedner's Zeitschrift f. d. Hist. Theologie*, 1855, 603–616) has vindicated the substantial integrity of the Latin version, and restored the original by its help from the corrupt form which it assumes in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 236 D), as follows:—Οὗτος οὖν ὁ Μάρκος μήτραν καὶ ἐκδοχείον τῆς Κολαμβάσου Σιγῆς ἑαυτὸν μονώτατον γεγονέναι λέγων, ἅτε μονογενὴς ὑπάρχων, τὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατατεθὲν εἰς αὐτὸν ὥδε πως ἀπεκίησεν. Αὐτὴν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπερτάτων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁοράτων καὶ ἀκατονομάστων τότεν Τετράδα κατεληλυθέναι σχήματι γυναικείῳ πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐπειδὴ, φησί, τὸ ἄρρην αὐτῆς ὁ κόσμος φέρειν οὐκ ἔδύνατο, καὶ μηνύσαι αὐτὴν ἦν, καὶ τὴν τῶν πάντων γένεσιν, ἣν οὐδενὶ πώποτε οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε ἀνθρώπων ἀπεκάλυψε, τοῦτω μονωτάτῳ διηγῆσθαι, οὕτως εἰποῦσαν, κ. τ. λ. Marcus, Irenaeus seems to say, boasted that he alone was allowed to become the womb and receptacle of the Sigé (*Silence*) of Colarbasus; the offspring to which he gave birth being the statement and revelation recorded afterwards. There is no previous mention of Colarbasus. Irenaeus has for six pages (of Massuet) been speaking of Marcus alone. Eleven pages back he refers briefly to “a certain other *Illustrious* teacher of theirs” [the Valentinians]; but there is no coincidence of doctrine, and nothing to suggest that the nameless, or obscurely named [EPIPHANES], heretic was himself Colarbasus, as some have supposed.

According to Philaster (*Haer.* 43) Colarbasus taught after Marcus and “in like manner:” his two lines of description are merely a vague echo of Marcsonian doctrine. Pseudo-Tertullian (15) combines the two names indistinguishably in one article. Their common source, the lost Compendium of Hippolytus, can have contained no special information about Colarbasus. When Hippolytus wrote the great later treatise *Against all Heresies*, he was evidently not better instructed. At the beginning of the sixth book he promises to describe “the doctrines held by Marcus and Colarbasus;” he devotes in due course twenty-three pages to a repetition of Irenaeus’s account of Marcus; and at the end he considers he has sufficiently shewn who [viz., Pythagoreans and astrologers] were the masters of Marcus and Colarbasus, “the successors in the school of Valentinus;” yet not a word is given to Colarbasus separately. Once elsewhere (iv. 13) Colarbasus is said to have “endeavoured to expound theology by measures and numbers;” but this is simply the Marcsonian method. The proceeding of Epiphanius is more audacious. He has a separate article (*Haer.* xxxv. 258–262) on Colarbasus, the composition of which has been fully laid bare by Volkmar (l. c. 614 f.) and R. A. Lipsius (*Zur Quellengesch. d. Epiph.* 167 f.). The long account of Marcus in Irenaeus is preceded by a series of short notices (mostly without names) of the chief doctrines maintained by different branches of the great Valentinian sect. The passage relating to one group distinguished as “those who are reputed to be the wiser among them,” is transferred bodily by Epiphanius to Colarbasus, and with it, stranger still,

the next paragraph down to the end of the chapter, though it sets forth in single sentences the doctrines of no less than five sets of Valentinians about the Saviour. The passage about the “wise” group immediately follows one on Ptolemaeus; and accordingly Epiphanius makes Colarbasus to spring from “the root of Ptolemaeus,” as well as to borrow from Marcus, and attributes to him a purpose of devising a greater and more ingenious scheme than his predecessors. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 12) merely abbreviates Epiphanius, changing at the same time “Colarbasus” into “the Colarbasians.” A doubtful conjecture has brought Colarbasus into a single sentence of Tertullian (*adv. Val.* 4), where at most no more is said than that a road was marked out for him by Valentinus; Ptolemaeus is named next, then Heraclion, Secundus, and Marcus. All these varicose writers against heresies are known to have learned, directly or indirectly, from Irenaeus; and every statement of theirs about Colarbasus can be at once traced, through transcription or immediate inference, to something in the text of Irenaeus not far distant from the place where the name of Colarbasus occurs. On the other hand, the reports of doctrine have little or nothing in common. Hippolytus and his followers make Colarbasus to have taught only what Marcus taught: Epiphanius and his copyist fathers upon him the discordant views of a miscellaneous cluster of Valentinians.

The credit of detecting the cause of the confusion belongs to C. A. Heumann (*Hamburgische Vermischte Bibliothek*, 1743, i. 145). He got rid of the mysterious double of Marcus by pointing out that *Chol-arba* (כלארבע) means “All-Four,” i.e. the divine Tetrad, which in the scheme of Marcus stood at the head of the Pleroma. He was less successful in dealing with the details of the text: and Baur (*K.G.* d. 3 *erst. Jahrh.* i. 204) has rightly substituted *Col* (כול) for *Chol* (*The Voice of Four for All-Four*). Volkmar (l. c. 612) explains the appearance of s by the Aramaic commutation of ψ with Ϻ, and the o of several authorities by Theodoret’s Κοσσινῶς for Κασσιανῶς: *Colassae* and *Colossae* afford a still better illustration.

Both the Tetrad and Sigé appear in the context as if they made revelations to Marcus, but (what has not been sufficiently observed) in different ways. When Irenaeus is simply recording what he found in his Marcsonian authority, he speaks of the Tetrad or Tetractys. Thus:—“That the Tetrad herself came down to him from the highest and from the invisible [and ininominable] places in female form, because, it is said, the world could not bear her male [element], and that she made known who she was,” etc. (66); “And that the Tetractys, when she had explained this to him, said ‘And I will also shew thee—’” etc. (68); “And as Marcus waited expecting her [*Aletheia* or Truth, another aeon] to say something more, the Tetractys again came forward and spoke” (69). Sigé, on the other hand, is mentioned only when Irenaeus speaks in his own person, and always with a touch of sarcasm. Thus: “. . . the letters of which Marcus’s Sigé (ἡ Μάρκου Σιγῆ) pronounced (ἐδογματίσσε) the ‘Forefather’ to consist” (68); “and he [apparently ‘Perfect

Reason'] uses as his minister the greatness of the seven numbers, as says Marcus's Sigé" (72); "and the seventh [heaven] shouts out the letter O, as Marcus's Sigé positively affirms, she who babbles at great length but says nothing true" (72); "Thus then the all-wise Sigé announces to him the origin of the 24 letters" (74); "Who will endure that Sigé of thine that babbles so much, her who names the Innominate, and declares the Unutterable, and expounds the Unsearchable," etc.? (78 f.) It may therefore be questioned whether Marcus ever represented Sigé as herself visiting him. Two passages indeed suggest pretty clearly that he held her to be faithful to her name. Speaking of "Truth," virtually the alphabet, also called Man, he says (69) that she "is the fountain of every speech, and the beginning of every voice, and the utterance of everything unutterable, and the mouth of the unspoken Sigé" (τῆς σιωπαμένης Σιγῆς). Again we hear (64) that Marcosians were taught to offer a prayer for deliverance from "the Judge" to a female divinity addressed as "thou that sittest beside God and the mystic Sigé before the aeons" (or ages: ὁ πάρεδρε θεοῦ κ. τ. λ.). This address supplies the required clue, for the divinity is presently called "the Mother," in a passage almost immediately preceding the occurrence of the name Colarbasus; and elsewhere (75: cf. 84) "the Mother of the Universe" is identified with "the first Tetrads." Sigé herself then doubtless remains hidden above; but her mysteries are made known to Marcus by the Tetrads, the Colarbas or Voice of Four, who must be the (nameless) "most mighty power from the invisible and innominate places," to whom he boasted that he owed his "knowledge," as we read in Irenaeus's first paragraph about him (60).

The difficulty of the primary phrase τῆς Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆς remains. In the absence of a second article, it can only mean "the Sigé of Colarbas" (or Colarbasus) instead of "the Colarbas (or Colarba) of Sigé," as the sense above elicited requires. The difficulty would be lightened, and the perplexing termination of Κολαρβάσου at the same time removed, by reading τῆς Κολαρβάς ἐκ Σιγῆς, "the Colarba (Voice of Four) proceeding out of Sigé (Silence)." In round continuous uncials the change would be easy, EK and OY having much resemblance when written. The two names would thus stand in the right relation to each other. The phrase however would still be briefer than we should expect. The sudden appearance of the Hebrew term remains likewise unaccounted for. The obscurity evidently lies in the original text of Irenaeus, if not of the authority whom he followed; and it was found as embarrassing in the third and fourth centuries as now. It was only disguised, not removed, by supposing a heretic named Colarbasus. [MARCUS, VALENTINUS.]

[H.]

COLCU (Alc. Ep. 3, Patrol. C. 142), Irish saint. [COLGA (1).]

[C. H.]

COLFRIDUS (MS. described in Hardy, Descr. Cat. i. 412), abbat of Wearmouth. [CEOLFRIÐ.]

[C. H.]

COLGA, COLCHU. Colgan (in a note in Acta SS. p. 379) gives an account of this name and its various forms. It is in Irish Coelchu, and

now more usually Colga: it is derived from *cool*, "rarus vel tenuis," or from *colg*, "gladius vel acies," and *cu*, "molossus vel lupus." It admits of many modifications, as Coelchu, Colchu, Colga, Colgeu, Colcus, Colcius, Colcanus, Colganus, &c.

COLGA (1) the Wise, Lector of Clonmacnoise, Feb. 20. He was a man of eminent piety and learning, and acquired the name of Chiet Scribe or Master of all the Scots. He belonged to the family of the Ua Duineachda, and was appointed to preside over the great school of Clonmacnoise. He was a special friend and correspondent of Alcuin at the court of Charlemagne, and an extremely interesting letter from Alcuin, addressed to St. Colga, is published by Ussher (*Sylloge*, Ep. xviii.), and reprinted by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 379). It is important in itself, and also in shewing the great esteem in which S. Colga was held by Alcuin. His death was about A.D. 796, some placing it earlier. He is said to have composed the Scaip-chrabhaidh, "Scopa Devotionis," or "Besom of Devotion," which Colgan describes as a collection of most ardent prayers, somewhat in the form of litanies, a work full of the warmest and most soul-stirring devotion to God; it was extant in his day, and may be the manuscript called Leabhar-na-hUidhré. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 228 sq.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 55; *Book of Deer*, p. cxxvii.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 378.)

(2) Colgus or Colganus, son of Aedh Draigiche, was of the powerful family of the Hy-Fiachrach, in Connaught, in the modern counties of Galway and Mayo. His sister was S. Failenna or Foilenna (March 3) [FAILA], and his mother Cuilenn or Cuillenda, who was guilty of impurity, and whom St. Colgus was sent to reprove: he had also two brothers, Aedh and Sorar. He had a church and possibly a monastery, called Cill-Colgan, in the diocese of Kilmacduagh, and barony of Doolkillen in the county of Galway, but he is chiefly known in connexion with St. Columba. He flourished about A.D. 580, and probably died in his native land, according to St. Columba's promise. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 328; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 45 sq., 225; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 342, 368, 429; and *Acta SS.* 380-1; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 77.)

(3) Colgius or Colcius, son of Cellach, was another disciple and associate of St. Columba. He appears as an attendant on St. Columba, asked blessed salt to cure his sister of ophthalmia, and was waiting upon St. Columba, when that saint saw in spirit the workman falling from the Round Tower of Derry and sent the angel on the instant to save him. Colgan conjectures that he may have been the same as Colga or Colgus, son of Aedh Draigiche, and also a bishop, but is probably in error regarding both. The obit of Colga son of Ceallach stands in the *Irish Annals* at about A.D. 622 (*Ann. Tigh.*). (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 65, 114, 216; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 388; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 328; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 381-2.)

(4) Colga, abbat of Lusk in Leinster. He flourished about A.D. 694, and was one of the chief prelates who attended the synod at Armagh, convened by Flann Febhla and St. Adamnan about A.D. 697. He was son of Moenach, and must be distinguished from Colga, son of Crunmhael, abbat of Lusk, who died about the year 787, but no more seems to be known of him. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 382; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 140.)

COLGA (5) Caolchu, of Lui-airthir, Sept. 24. This is Coelchus, Caolchus, or Cailcon, son of Caol or Coelius, of the race of Ciar, of the descendants of Rudhraige: he was at St. Barry's school at Loch Erce, and was one of those who gave up their church "to God and to St. Bairre." (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 257; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xxxv.; Colfield, *Life of St. Fin Barre*, p. v.) [J. G.]

COLLA (Wend. *F. H.* ed. Coxe, i. 205), bishop of Selsey. [EOLLA.] [C. H.]

COLLECTA. (Cyp. *Ep.* 21.) [CORNELIA.]

COLLEN, Welsh saint of the 7th century, patron of Llangollen in Denbighshire; commemorated on May 20 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 302). [C. H.]

COLLUTHUS (1) Martyr under Maximian in the Thebais. (*Menology*, May 19.) [E. B. B.]

(2) Presbyter and founder of a sect at Alexandria early in the 4th century. He assumed (on what grounds it is unknown) to exercise episcopal functions; but the council of Alexandria under Hosius (A.D. 324) decided that he was only a presbyter, from which it was held to follow by necessary consequence that ISCHYRAS and others ordained by him were to be accounted only laymen (Athanas. *Apol. cont. Arian.* 12, 75-77, 80, pp. 106, 152). The passages cited mention not only Colluthus, but a sect of Colluthians. Bishop Alexander, in a letter preserved in the *Ecc. Hist.* of Theodoret (i. 4), uses language which seems to imply that Colluthus commenced his schismatical proceedings before Arius had separated from the church. A phrase used by Alexander (Χριστοπopeία) has been understood by Valesius to charge Colluthus with taking money for conferring orders. Valesius also is led by Alexander's letter to conjecture that the cause of Colluthus's separation was impatience that Alexander had not taken stronger measures against Arianism. The name Colluthus is the first among those of the presbyters who subscribed to Alexander's condemnation of Arius (Gelas. *Cyzic.* ii. 3). The authorities thus far cited accuse Colluthus of schism, not heresy; as is also indicated by the mildness of the course taken by the council of Alexandria, which would probably have excommunicated him had he been deeply tainted with erroneous doctrine. Epiphanius mentions in general terms (*Haer.* 69, 728) that Colluthus taught some perverse things, and founded a sect, which was soon dispersed. The giving Colluthus a separate heading in heretical lists begins with Philastrius (79), followed by Augustine and later heresiologists. The heresy charged on him by Philastrius is that he contradicted Isaiah xlv. 7, by teaching that God did not make evil. (Tillemont, vi. 231; Walch, *Hist. der Ketz.* iv. 502.) [G. S.]

(3) A monophysite, extracts from whose writings were read at the Lateran Council, A.D. 649. (Binius, *Concilia*, ii. 2,468, quoted by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* ix. 246, ed. Harles.) [G. S.]

COLLYRIDIANs. Under this name Epiphanius (*Haer.* 79) assails certain women who had brought from Thrace into Arabia the practice of performing on certain days rites in honour of the Blessed Virgin, the chief being the offering of a cake (κολλυρίς), and the partaking of it by the worshippers. Epiphanius condemns their

conduct on the double ground that women ought not to take it on them to offer sacrifice, and that while Mary is to be honoured, God only is to be worshipped. The name Collyris (or kindred forms) is to be found in the Septuagint translation of Levit. vii. 12, viii. 26; 2 Sam. vi. 19, xiii. 68; and the word thence passed also into the Latin versions. [G. S.]

COLMA, virgin, of Leitir; commemorated Jan. 22. St. Colma, or Columba, and her sisters, Bogha and Lassir or Lassara, belonged to the family of the Dalm Buain in the barony of Upper Massareene, co. Antrim, and were pupils or foster-children of St. Comgall of Bangor [BOGHA]. (*Desc. Cat.* i. 210, 224; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 401-2; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 25.) [J. G.]

COLMAN. This is a name of extreme frequency in Irish hagiology. In the Table of the *Mart. Doneg.* are given 97 Colmans, and in the Index 113; Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 480 n. 8) gives them as more than 130; and Ussher (*Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, Wks. vi. p. 540) says there are upwards of 230 described "in Hibernicorum nostrorum sanctorum matriculis." The root of the word Colman is Colum or Colm, which Colgan (*Acta SS.* 155 n. 3) translates "Columba, a dove." To this may be added the diminutives *an* and *og*, and the prefix of veneration or affection *mo*; hence arise the names Colman, Colmoc, and Mocholmog. Therefore the names Colum, Columba, Columbanus, Columbus, Colman, Colmanus, Colmo, Mocholmoc, Mocholmog are all varieties of the same, and may be used interchangeably. Yet as one or other of the forms has usually come to be attached more or less constantly to particular individuals, we are able to divide them into Colmans, Colums, &c., but the favourite name was Colman. (On the derivation and use of the names, see Colgan *ut supr.*; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 29 n. 98 n., and *Ecol. Ant.* 17 n.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 146; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, pp. xliii. n. 148, n. 2.)

COLMAN (1) Son of Comgellain, was a man deeply versed in legal and ecclesiastical learning and a great friend of St. Columba, though much younger. Once, when visiting at Comgellain's house, St. Columba is said to have taken the infant in his arms and prophesied over him his coming greatness. He died in the year of the eclipses, A.D. 625. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 410, c. 10, 432, c. 10 et al.; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 92, 459; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 238; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 42 n.)

(2) Son of Daire, bishop of Doire-mor (now Derrymore or Kilcolman in King's County). May 20, July 31. He is called son of Daire or Dairene, but in *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, p. 207) Dairene is called his foster-mother, sister of his own mother Sant. He is often termed son of Aengus, son of Natfraech, king of Cashel, but chronology requires his being merely a descendant. He was a friend and neighbour of St. Pulcherius or Mochaemog (Mar. 13) of Liathmore, there being little more than a mile between their monasteries. Colman must have flourished in the beginning of the 7th century. He is probably the same as Colman, son of Dairene B. commemorated on July 31. (See Colgan, *Acta SS.* 169, c. 2, 173 n. 10, 593, c. 22; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17 (wks. vi. 529-30); Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 401-2,

ii. 210 sq.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 252 n. 1, 253.)

COLMAN (3) Son of Duach, of Cill-mac-Duach, B. Feb. 3. This appears to have been Colman of the third class of Irish saints, and a man of great virtue and miracles. He was son of Duach, of the race of the southern Hy-Fiachtrach, or Ui-Fiachrach Aidhne, of Connaught, and was closely related to Guaire Aidhne, king of that province, who died according to the *Four Masters*, in A.D. 662. He followed Christ from his youth, and at length retired to a hermit-cell, near the place where afterwards, in the first years of Guaire Aidhne, the church of Kilmacduagh (now in the barony of Kiltartan, and county of Galway) was built. The foundation of Kilmacduagh was probably laid before A.D. 620, on the supposition, which Colgan adopts, that Guaire Aidhne flourished A.D. 630, and died before A.D. 662, the date given above. His festival in the calendars is Feb. 3, but the day observed at Kilmacduagh seems to have been Oct. 27. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 245 sq., for the memoir of Colman, commonly called Macduach; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 341 sq.; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* 110, 148; Bollandists, *Acta SS.*, Oct. tom. xii. 880-892; *Book of Rights*, by O'Donovan, 108 n. 1; *Dubl. Penny Journal*, i. 200.) On the remains of Colman Mac Duach's churches at Kilmacduagh, and on Inishmore in Galway Bay, see Petrie (*Round Towers*, 176-7, 404 sq.).

(4) Son of Eochaidh, Jan. 1. There are several Colmans in the calendars called "Son of Eochaidh," as the present, another on Sept. 6, another called Colum or Colman of Rosglenda, also on Sept. 6, and a fourth called Ua Fiachrach, Oct. 27. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 384, n. 34) gives reasons for thinking that the Columbanus in St. Adamnan's *Columba* (ii. c. 43) is the same as he who is counted founder of Snamluthair, and venerated on Jan. 1; and Dr. Reeves identifies Colman or Colum of Rosglenda as the same person, so that the four referred to above are reduced to two, whose dedications are Jan. 1 chiefly, and Oct. 27. The former (Jan. 1) was son of Eochaidh, descended from Laeghaire, son of Niall of the nine hostages. He is first met with driving St. Columba for a whole day through very rough roads, with a car which had no lynch-pins: there he is called the founder of the monastery which in Scotch is called Snamh-luthair. Again, in the *Life of St. Fechin*, he is represented as blind for a long time, and restored to sight by St. Fechin. As St. Fechin died A.D. 665, St. Colman must have been a young man in the days of St. Columba. He was venerated at Snamluthair, in Carbre Gabhra, which was the monastery of his sister Conaigh, and is now Slanore, in the present parish of Kilmore, in the barony of Upper Loughtee, co. Cavan. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 136, c. 30, 338 n. 11; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 26; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 172, 173; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 5, 239, 287.)

(5) Son of Finnian, Dec. 14. This is the entry in *Mart. Doneg.*, but Mar. O'Gorman calls him son of Finnbar, and about A.D. 703, the Irish *Annals* give the obit of Colman, son of Finnbar, abbat of Lismore (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 793). [COLMAN (25) of Lismore.]

(6) Son of Lenin, of Cluain-namha (Cloyne), Nov. 24. He is counted by Lanigan among the saints of the second order in Ireland, and believed to have flourished in the 6th century.

He was son of Lenin, son of Mogh Nuadhat, king of Munster, and is sometimes surnamed Mitine from Muscraige Mitine, (now Muskerry in Cork,) where he was probably born. He was brother of St. Brigida, daughter of Lenin or Leinin [BRIGIDA (3)], and was one of the saints belonging to the family of St. Foilan. He seems at first to have been a poet attached to the court of Aedh Caemh, king of Cashel, about the middle of the 6th century, and after his conversion to have attended St. Jarlath's school at Clonfois, where he was next in order of sanctity to St. Brendan of Clonfert (May 6). He died in or about A.D. 604 (*Ann. Tigh.*). His character as a poet appears in the very elegant metrical *Life of St. Senan* which he composed, and of which we have now but a fragment mentioned; the substance of it is incorporated into Colgan's second *Life of St. Senan*. (*Acta SS.* 104, c. 2, 533, c. 22, 539; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 41 sq. 212 sq.; Caulfield, *St. Fin Barre*, 18 n. 22 n.; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 208; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* ii. 76; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* 144; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 317; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 225, n. 4; *Journ. Kilken. Arch. Soc.* ii. pt. ii. 253 sq.)

COLMAN (7) Son of Lugaith, priest of Cluain Bruchais, July 12. He was a grandson of Laeghaire, king of Ireland, and is given among those of that race who embraced the faith (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 111, c. 3). O'Clery thinks he was the son of Lugaith, son of Aenghus, king of Munster (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 193). In either case he must have lived not later than the middle of the 6th century.

(8) Son of Murchu, has had attributed to him and his two brothers (Colman, the eldest, being a bishop, and the others priests) the authorship of a hymn in praise of Michael the archangel; it is given in the *Book of Hymns*, and edited by Dr. Todd. He seems to have belonged to Connaught, and for a time at least engaged in missionary labours on the continent before becoming abbat of Merville, where he died A.D. 735 (*Ant. Ult.*). Dr. Todd remains undecided as to the identity of Murchu or Murchon his father, but Dr. Graves is of opinion that Murchu is the Murchu Mac Ua Maichtene of June 8 in the calendars, and the father of Cogitosus. [COGITOSUS.] (Todd, *Book of Hymns*, Fasc. ii. 165 sq.; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 269 sq.)

(9) Son of Roi, of Reachrainn, June 16. His father was Roi, and his mother Eithne, daughter of Concraigh, who was the mother also of many other saints; or at least Eithne was the name of the mothers of several Irish saints, like St. Columba (June 9), St. Maedoc of Ferns (Jan. 31), and St. Comgan of Glen-Uissen (Feb. 27), and this may be all that is meant in the martyrology. He is also called Colman the Deacon, and received from St. Columba the church which that saint had built at Reachrainn, Rachraind, or Rachra, now Lambay island, off the coast of Dublin. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 171; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 400, c. 65, 450 n. 66, 489 n. 25; Reeves, *Adamnan*, pp. lxx. 164, and *Ecccl. Ant.* 292.)

(10) Son of Ronan, Mar. 30. In *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 91) he is said to have been of the race of Conall Gulban, son of Niall. In Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 480, col. 1) he appears among the saints derived from the same paternal stem as St. Columba, as "Columbanus or Col-

manus, son of Ronan, son of Loarn, son of Fergus, son of Conall Gulban," and again (*ib.* 489, col. 1) Colgan places him among the disciples of St. Columba.

COLMAN (11) Son of Tighernach, Jan. 3. This saint is of the same race as Colman the son of Ronan, being son of Tighernach, son of Fergus, son of Conall Gulban, and thus like the last is classed among the disciples and relatives of St. Columba. He was brother of St. Begbile (Oct. 12), St. Conandil (Mar. 8), and St. Cuan Caein (Mar. 2). (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 480 n.^o, 489 n.²⁷; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 15; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 195.)

(12) Son of Ua Laoighse, or Moc-u-Loigse, May 15. He is represented as son of Luagnius, and descended from Laeighseach Ceanm-mohr, the son of Conall Cearnach, chief of the heroes of the Craebh Ruadh, or Red Branch, of the Clanna Rudhraidhe. He was a bishop at Tulachmic-Comghaill in Druimni Togha, that is, Nuacongbail in Laoighis in Leinster, now Oughaval, a townland in the parish of Stradbally, in the south of the Queen's County, and containing the old graveyard where Colman's church once stood (*Ord. Survey*, s. 19; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 212-13 n.). He was a contemporary of St. Columba, and is twice presented to our notice in that saint's life. We have no account of the exact date of St. Colman's death, but it was evidently some time between those of St. Fintan and St. Columba, all the three probably dying at about the same time. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 321, c. 8, 324 n.¹⁰, 417, and *Acta SS.* 353, c. 22, 354 n.²⁸; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 164, 165, 212; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 177, 229 sq.; *Book of Rights*, by O'Donovan, 166 n. 214 n.)

(13) Mac-Ui-Tealduibh, Feb. 8, Dec. 12. This is Columbanus, one of the bishops to whom pope John IV. A.D. 640 (while yet but pope-elect) addressed the well-known letter urging the Scots to observe the true Easter, and avoid the Pelagian heresy (Bede, *Ecccl. Hist.* ii. c. 19). He was bishop of Clonard, and the Irish *Annals* give the death of Colman, bishop, son of Cudelduibh, Aiteldubh, O'Telldubiorum, or Vihely, abbat of Cluain-Iraidh (Clonard) at about A.D. 654 (*Ann. Tigh.*). (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 17 n.¹¹, 406, c. 5, and *Ind. Chron.*; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 412; Reeves, *Ecccl. Ant.* 149 n.; Ussher, *Ant. Ecccl.* c. 17, wks. vi. 536.)

(14) Of Ardbo, Feb. 21. Among the saints belonging to the same family as St. Maidoc (Jan. 31), bishop of Ferns, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 22, c. 4) gives St. Colman surnamed Macaidhe, of Ardbo; he is son of Aedh, son of Amalgaidh, and descended from Colla Uais, monarch of Ireland in the beginning of the 4th century. His church was on the margin of Loch Eachach, now Lough Neagh, in the north-east of Ireland. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 55.)

(15) Abbat of Cam-Achadh (March 31), and of Cammus (Oct. 30). [COLMAN (24) of Linn-uachaille.]

(16) Of Cill-mic-Eoghain, Oct. 1. This saint was of the race of Colla-dá-chrioch, and surnamed Cille. He was son of Eugenius, son of Murdoch, and descended from the family of the Oirghialli (Oriell) in Ulster. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 265; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 713, c. 4.)

(17) Of Cill-ruaidh, B., Oct. 16. The gloss on the *Felire* of Aengus calls him "Son of Cath-

badh." It is related in the *Life of St. Ailbhe* (of Emly) that when St. Ailbhe returned to his native country of Ireland and landed in the north part of the island, his servant (familia ipsius), named Colman, built, at his command, a church, which received the name of Ceall-ruaidh, and there St. Ailbhe wrought several miracles. That church has given its name to the parish of Cill-Ruaidh (Red Church), now Kilroot, in the barony of Lower Belfast, co. Antrim, beside Belfast Lough. In the townland of Kilroot, on the edge of the Lough, is the churchyard, with some remains of the ancient church. The Irish *Annals* place the death of St. Ailbhe after the beginning of the 6th century, and as we have no account of St. Colman's date except in connexion with this saint, we must suppose that he flourished about that time. St. Colman seems also to have received a place among the saints of Scotland, but, with so many of the same name, some doubt must remain regarding the dedications. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 277; Ussher, *Ant. Ecccl.* c. 16 (wks. vi. 346); Reeves, *Ecccl.* 245 sq.; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Ant. Ir.* i. 23 sq.; Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 302.)

COLMAN (18) Of Cluain-eraird (Clonard in Meath), Feb. 9. The second hand in *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 43) has "Riognach, sister of Finnen of Cluain-Eraird, was his mother, but St. Finnian flourished in the first half of the 6th century." Among the saints, prelates, and illustrious men in the school and church of Clonard, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 406, c. 5) cites from the *Four Masters*, A.D. 700, the death in that year of Colman-ua-hEirc, abbat of Clonard. He must not be confounded with St. Colman Mac-Ui-tealduibh, who was also abbat and bishop of Clonard, and died on Feb. 8, A.D. 652 [COLMAN (13) Mac-Ui-Tealduibh].

(19) Of Comhraire, at Uisneach (now Kilcomreragh, near the hill of Uisneach, in the co. of Westmeath), Sept. 25. *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 259) says Bronach, daughter of Miliuc, son of Buan, with whom Patrick was in bondage, was his mother.

(20) Of Druim-mor (Dromore), B. and C., June 6 and 7. This saint is known as Colman, Colmoc, and Mocholmog, probably, too, as Calmaig. In the Irish martyrologies he is usually called Mocholmog, bishop of Dromore, in Iveagh of Ulidia (on the river Lagan and county of Down). He belonged to the noble family of Conall Cearnach of the Dalaradians, and was son of Ua Arta. The dates of his birth and death are unknown, but he evidently flourished in the very beginning of the 6th century, and is not to be confounded with St. Colman Ela who flourished half a century later. Baptized and confirmed by St. Colman his uncle, probably the bishop of Cill-ruaidh or Kilroot (Oct. 12), he became a pupil of St. Caelan or Mochaol, bishop of Nendrum, and afterwards was sent to study the Scriptures under St. Ailbhe of Emly (Sept. 12). By the advice of Macnissi, bishop of Connor, he founded the noble monastery of Dromore, on the banks of the Lagan. As St. Macnissi died A.D. 513 (*Four Masters*), this foundation must have taken place before that date, probably about A.D. 500. His Life is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Junii tom. ii. c. 24-9) and in *Brev. Aberd.* (p. hyem. foll. ci. cii.). Like many others of his time he compiled a Rule for his

monks, and shewed himself a pattern of obedience. He was buried in the city of Dromore. In his honour the monastery of Inchemahol-moch or Inchmahone, on an island in the Loch of Menteith, Perthshire, was solemnly dedicated. As Colmac, Colmoc, and Calmaig, he appears to have several dedications in Scotland. In the Scotch calendars his feast is June 6, and in the Irish, June 7. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 149; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 98, 104, 303 sq.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 424, 431 sq.; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, Fasc. i. 100 sq., and *St. Patrick*, 131, sq.; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 304-5; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* 133; Hardy, *Des. Cat.* i. 224.)

COLMAN (21) Of Glendalough, B., Dec. 12. He was son of Uithechar, and of the race of Cealtchar. His festival is Dec. 12. He died A.D. 660 (*Ann. Tigh.*), and was contemporary with several other Colmans in the third class of Irish saints. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 4; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 536, and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 660; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 247 n.²; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 304.)

(22) Of Glem-delhmaic, in Magh Raighne, in Osraige, Nov. 5. The history of Colman himself is obscure, and the name of his church is changed, yet his memory is preserved in the dedication and holy will at Clara or Claragh, in the barony of Gowran, co. Kilkenny. (See paper on 'Topographical and Historical Illustrations, co. Kilkenny,' by John Hogan, in *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* v. p. 212, new series.)

(23) Of Lindisfarne and Inis-bo-finn, B., Feb. 18, Aug. 8. In *Kal. Drummond.* he is given "apud Hiberniam" at both these days; Cameraus is alone in placing him on March 7. This saint is connected with both Scotland and Ireland, and thus has a double commemoration, in Scotland on Feb. 18, and in Ireland on Aug. 8. He is confounded by Wion with St. Colomannus, the Irish martyr in Austria, and credited with the conversion of king Penda. He first appears in accredited history as successor to bishop Finan in the see of Lindisfarne, to which he was consecrated A.D. 661. From his afterwards having taken up his abode in Mayo and the adjoining coast, Lanigan believes him to have been a native of that part of Ireland; this may be true, but from a comparison of dates it is scarcely possible for him to have been that "Columbanus nepos Briuni" whom St. Adamnan (*Vit. St. Col.* ii. c. 16) mentions as a disciple of St. Columba, and Colgan would wish to identify with this St. Colman. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 382 n.¹⁶; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 61; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 125 n.) He attended the council of Whitby in 664 on the Easter controversy, where he represented the Scottish party and was defeated.

[WILFRID.] Accompanied by all his Scottish or Irish monks, and about thirty of the English, St. Colman returned to his parent monastery of Hy. After remaining some time there, he sailed to the west of Ireland, A.D. 668, and took up his abode in the island called Inis-bo-finne, in Latin *Insula Vaccae Albae*, or the island of the White Cow, now Inishboffin, an island and parish in the barony of Murrisk, off the west coast of Mayo. After he settled at Inishboffin a dispute arose between his Scotch and Irish disciples, and to preserve peace he built another monastery at Mayo, where he placed his English monks, while he and the others remained at

Inishboffin, where he died on Aug. 8, A.D. 676, and where the ruins of his church are still to be seen in the town-land of Knock. (See Bede, *Ecol. Hist.* iii. c. 25, iv. c. 4; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 59 sq.; Bollandists' *Acta SS.* Feb. tom. iii. 82 sq.; Boethius, *Scot. Hist.* B. ix. cc. xxi.-ii.; Grub, *Ecol. Hist. Scotl.* i. 87 sq.; Neander, *Gen. Ch. Hist.* Edinb. 1849, v. 28 sq.; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 209, iv. 60; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* 180 sq., 240 sq.; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* (wks. vi.) cc. xv. xvii. and *Ind. Chron.*; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 171 sq.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 278 n. 279 n.; Fordun, *Scotichronicon*, i. 60 sq.; Ware, *Ir. Ant.* iii. 125; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 303-4; O'Flaherty, *Iar-Connaught*, 116 sq. *Ir. Arch. Soc.*; *Des. Cat.* i. 296.)

COLMAN (24) Of Linn-Uachaille or Lann, Mar. 30. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 792-3) has collected all the scattered notices regarding this saint, and reduced them to what he considers six ascertained facts from ancient writers. 1. That his mother's name was Lassara. 2. That he and another Colman were uterine brothers and living at the same time, but the father of this Colman was of the Hi Guala or Gaill-fine, an Ulster tribe, so that Colman was a native of Ulster; while the name of the other Colman's father was Luachan, the son of Aidh, of the royal family of Meath. 3. That he had two or three churches, viz. Cambois or Camus, which had been founded by St. Comgall of Bangor, on the west bank of the Bann, in the diocese of Derry, Lann Mocholmog in the diocese of Down or Dromore, and perhaps Lann Abhaie in Down, or Lann Ronain in Dromore. (On these churches see Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* 110 n., 313 n., 378 n., 380 n.) 4. That Linn Uachaille, at Cassan-linne in the east of Ulster, called also Linn-Duachail, (now Magheralin, on the river Lagan, in the county of Down and diocese of Dromore,) received its name from a demon who infested that place before St. Colman's time. 5. That in his churches he is commemorated on March 30 and October 30. 6. And that he died on March 30, A.D. 699, according to the *Four Masters*. The saint is often called Mocholmog, and his church Lann-Da-Cholmog or Lann Mocholmog, or more briefly Lann. (For allusions to the saint and his churches see Reeves, *ut sup.* 110 n.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 146; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 91, 289; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 300 n. *) From the confusion in the references it is impossible to define clearly the identity of the various persons who seem to have a certain amount of connexion, but Colgan is probably correct in making the festivals of March 30 and October 30 belong to one person, who is of Linn-Uachaille, and that of June 17 to another, who is uterine brother of the former, and is designated Colman Mór of Lann-mic-Luachan.

(25) Colman or Mocholmog of Lismore, Jan. 22. He was a native of Ibh-Liathain, the country of the O'Lehans, between Cork and Youghal. His father was Finbarr, of the illustrious house of Hua Begna, and descended from the dynasty of that region. He flourished in the reign of Cennfaeladh, king of Ireland, who died A.D. 769, and must have been a considerable time at the monastery of Lismore, where he received the monastic habit. After the death of St. Iarnla

or Hierlog, on Jan. 16, A.D. 699 (*Ann. Ul.*), St. Colman succeeded him as bishop and abbat of Lismore, and during his incumbency scholars were attracted to his school from all quarters on account of his learning and piety. St. Colman died on Jan. 22, in A.D. 703 (*Ann. Tigh.*). (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 304 n., 305; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 154-5; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 145-7; Kelby, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 60; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 397 sq.)

COLMAN (26) Alainn, Dec. 14. In his memoir of St. Colman of Linn-Uachaille (March 30), Colgan notices a Colmanus Lannensis, whose feast is on Dec. 14; but he cannot decide whether he is the saint of Linn-Uachaille or a brother also called Colman, and the son of Luachan; it is possible that he is distinct from both. Marian O'Gorman and his followers have the petition, "Tres S. Colmani nobis suffragentur, S. Colmanus de Rathmaillsidhe, S. Colmanus filius Finbarri, et S. Colmanus de Lann" (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 792, 793 n. ³), but *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 337) commemorates them as Colman of Rath Maillsidhe, Colman, son of Finntan, and Colman Alainn. [COLMAN (24) of Linn-Uachaille.]

(27) Dubhchuilenn, of Dun in the Renna, and of Bealach Chonglais in Leinster, and of many other places (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 315), Nov. 24. He flourished A.D. 570, and was contemporary with SS. Kevin, Mobhi Clairenech, Colman of Doiremor, Colman Ela, &c. He is carefully to be distinguished from St. Colman of Cloyne, whose feast is the same day. (Ussher, *Ecccl. Ant.* (wks. vi.), pp. 529-30, and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 570; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 193, col. 1.)

(28) Eala, Ela, or Colmanellus of Lann-elo, (now Lynally, in the barony of Ballycowan, King's County, and diocese of Meath,) Sept. 26. He was son of Beognai, and descended from Eachach son of Muiredhach. From a nearer progenitor St. Colman Ela is called Mocusailni. By his mother Mór he was nephew of St. Columba, and belonged to the race of Conall Gulban son of Niall of the Nine Hostages (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 261). He was born in Glennaichle, now Glenelly, A.D. 555, and was a pupil of Caemhan of Enachtruim. Three churches are associated with his memory, viz. Connor, Muckamore, and Lynally. But his special and best-known foundation was at Lann-Eala, in Ferceall (now Lynally). Ussher (*Ecccl. Ant.* p. 960) gives a curious account of the way he received the site for this monastery from Aedh Flan, or rather Slaine, prince of Meath. He is said to have owed it to the suggestion of St. Columba, this kinsman, probably about A.D. 580. It is doubtful whether he was bishop or priest, and, if a bishop, whether he became such before or after St. Columba's death. He probably died A.D. 611 (*Ann. Tigh.*), (Reeves, *Ecccl. Ant.* 97 n., 240 sq., and *Adamnan*, 29, 42; Todd, *Book of Hymns*, Fasc. i. 32 n., 52 sq.; Ussher, *Ecccl. Ant.* c. 17 (wks. vi. 529 sq.) and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 560, 580, 610; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 235; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 87, c. 56, and *Acta SS.* 69, c. 21; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 304 sq.; Hardy, *Des. Cat.* i. 210). Besides the churches already named, and Ahogill, co. Antrim, many places in Ayrshire and Argyshire were dedicated to his memory (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*,

305). A life of St. Colman Ela is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Sept. tom. i. 664 sq.). Two are contained in Codex D, Prim. Marsh, Lib. Dubl. fol. 129, and Codex E, 3, 11, Trin. Coll. Dubl. fol. 106.

COLMAN (29) Finn, April 4. In the days when it was customary to join companions under one leader for Christian teaching and practice, we find St. Colman Finn, who is invoked "with his twelve companions in Morthreabh Corcnea," in the litany of St. Aengus (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 436 n. ²; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 300). He died A.D. 771, according to the *Four Masters*, who call him "Colum Finn the anchoret."

(30) Imramha, of Fathan Beg, in Inis Eoghain (now Fahan, in the barony of Inishowen, co. Donegal), July 8. He was of the race of Cairpre Riada, son of Conaire, of the race of Heremon (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 191, and note). Among the abbats and saints of the church of Fahan, where Colgan says there was at one time a noble monastery, and now there is only a parish church in the diocese of Derry, there is cited, but without date, "S. Colmanus cogn. Imromha," &c., and his feast is marked as July 8. He is placed in the list before St. Murus or Mura, who is usually considered the founder of Fahan, which is from him called Fathan Mura. St. Mura must have died some time before A.D. 658, as that is the date given for the death of Cellach, the successor of St. Mura (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 510, c. 9; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 37-8; *Ulster Journ. Arch.* i. 273).

(31) Itadach, or The Thirsty, March 5. He is a characteristic type of the monkhood in ecclesiastical legend, and dies a martyr to monastic obedience. His name does not appear in the calendars, yet his faithfulness is duly chronicled in the *Lives of St. Patrick*, by Evinus and Jocelyne, from which Colgan has taken his memoir. In his strict observance of the patrician rule of fasting, he would not quench his thirst in the harvest field, and died in consequence, at a place called Trian Conchobuir. His death took place in the year in which Armagh was founded, probably A.D. 445 (Ussher), but others place it later (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 476, and *Tr. Thaum.* 101, c. 165, 163, c. 77; Ussher, *Ecccl. Ant.* c. 17 (wks. vi. 414 sq.); Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 319).

(32) Mór, son of Luachan, June 17. [COLMAN (24) of Linn-Uachaille.]

(33) Muilinn, "of the Mill," Jan. 1. He is said to have been of Doire Chaochain (now Derrykeighan, a parish in the barony of Lower Dunluce, co. Antrim, where the foundations of the old church are still in the old churchyard in the village of Dervock). In St. Aengus's tract on the 'Mothers of the Irish Saints' (*Book of Lecan*, fol. 43), his mother is given as Bronach the daughter of Milchu, son of Buan, with whom St. Patrick was in captivity. This Bronach is also given as mother of St. Mochaoi, or Caelan, (June 23,) of Nendrum, who died A.D. 497, and others, which is the only clue we have to the period when he lived. To account for his name, O'Clery says: "It was in a mill he used to make obeisance to his brethren." (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 95, col. 2, 756 n. ⁴³; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 3; Reeves, *Ecccl. Ant.* 78-9, 189; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 18.)

COLMAN (34) Priscus, A.D. 800. He is not to be found in the calendars, but Hector Boethius gives a Colmanus Priscus, who, with St. Medan, St. Modan, and St. Euchinus, was preacher among the Piets and Scots (*Scotor. Hist.* lib. viii. fol. 151A, ed. 1575). Ussher says that he calls him Priscus to distinguish him from St. Colman of Lindisfarne (*Eccl. Ant.* c. 15, wks. vi. p. 220), though Dempster confounds them (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 304).

[J. G.]

He was patron saint of the church of Llangolman (subject to Maenclochog) and of Capel Colman (subject to Llanfihangel Penbedw) in Pembrokeshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 190). [C. H.]

(35) Stellain, of Tir-dá-glas, (now Terryglass, in the barony of Lower Ormond, co. Tipperary), May 26. The *Mart. Doneg.* gives Stellain of Tirdaglas, and Colman, as different persons; but *Mart. Tallaght* has "Colman Stellain Tirdaglass," and they are really "unus et idem sanctus" (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 138). Little appears to be known regarding him; he died A.D. 624 (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 247 n. 2; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17 (wks. vi. 540); Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 2, 4).

(36) Ua Cluasaigh. This Colman is of unknown parentage and obscure descent. He was Fer-Leighinn, or lecturer in the theological school at Cork, and is best known as the tutor or master of St. Cumin Foda of Clonfert. On his pupil he wrote a panegyric, which is quoted by the *Four Masters* at A.D. 661. He wrote also a hymn, which was intended as a protection against the plague; this hymn has been given, with translation and notes, in the *Book of Hymns*, edited by the late Dr. Todd. He died in time of the pestilence, but in what year it is not ascertained, as the mortality rested on Ireland for a considerable time. *Ann. Tigh.* gives his obit at A.D. 662, and the *Four Mast.* the preceding year. (Todd, *Book of Hymns*, Fasc. i. 86, 93; ii. 121 sq.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 271-2; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 149 n. 7.)

(37) Ua Fiachrach, of Senbotha, (now Templeshambo, a parish in the barony of Scarawalsh, co. Wexford,) Oct. 27. He was son of Eochaidh Brec, of the race of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh Muighmhedhoín, and thus was related to Niall, of the Nine Hostages. St. Colman Ua Fiachrach was a contemporary of St. Colman Macduach (Feb. 3), and of St. Maidoc of Ferns (Jan. 31), who flourished in the beginning of the 7th century. The year of his death is unknown, but his festival is Oct. 27. His monastery was situated at the foot of Mount Leinster, where there are the remains of a monastic establishment in the churchyard of Templeshambo. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 2, 5; Bolland, *Acta SS.* Oct. tom. xii. 904-5; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 287; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 141 n. 10, 246, c. 15; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 41 n.)

(38) Uah Eirc, Dec. 5. He was abbat of Clonard, and died A.D. 700. His chief feast was Dec. 5, but he appears to have been also commemorated on Feb. 9. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 406, p. 5; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 327.)

(39) Ua Liathain, doctor, A.D. 725, July 25. This is the entry in *Mart. Doneg.*; but *Mart. Tallaght* (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xxx.) has "Colman idem ac Mocholmóc h. Fiachrach." Colgan (*Acta SS.* 149 n. 10) calls him bishop of Lis-

A.D. 725, which is the year in the *Four Mast.* when "S. Colman O'Liadain, a select doctor, died."

COLMAN (40) Of Uamhach (Huamacensis), scribe of Armagh: died in the year 725 (*Ann. Ult.*), Nov. 24. He is sometimes identified with Colman, son of Lenin, of Cluain-Uamha (Cloyne), but erroneously. In the *Annals* and by the Irish authors he is simply called "Scribe of Armagh," and as such has some *Acta S. Patricii*, ascribed to him. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 317; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17 (wks. vi. 375); Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 128, c. 69, 172, n. 50, 218, 294.)

(41) Oct. 1. It is said in *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 265) that this may be Colman, of Cill-mic-Eoghain, who is of the race of Colla-da-Chrioch. And among the saints of the family of the Oirghialli (Oriel), and race of Colla-da-Chrioch, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 713, c. 4) numbers St. Colman surnamed Kille, son of Eoghain, son of Murchadh, &c., and gives his feast as Oct. 1.

[J. G.]

COLMUS is said by Camerarius and Dempster to have been a bishop among the Orkney Islands, and is commemorated on March 9, and June 6. But the name probably belongs to two or more individuals, and may be the same as the Colmach, Colman, and Colme, of the Scotch calendars, and of the Litany of Dunkeld (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 305-6, et al.)

[J. G.]

COLONATUS. [COLMAN.] At July 8, there are two entries in the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 191), first, of "Cele-Clerch, bp., Aedh, and Tadhg," who suffered martyrdom in Uairseburg in Almania; and then of "Kilianus, Colmanus et Colonatus, Totnanus Diaconus;" but Dr. Todd in his learned note shews that the two entries belong to the same persons, namely, to St. Cilian and his companions, who evangelised Würzburg, and suffered there. [CILIAN.] Colonatus is said to have been honoured in the Enzie, Banffshire, "in Ainziâ provincia Scotiæ." (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 147; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 306.)

[J. G.]

COLONICA. [See MACARIUS.] [E. W. B.]

COLORBASIANUS. [COLARBASUS.]

COLOSSIANUS. [FIRMUS.]

COLUM (COLAM) is the primary form of the name, which becomes also Columbus, Columba, and, as a diminutive, Colman, Colmoc, Columban, and again, with the prefixes Da and Mo, "honoris et singularis deservantiae causa," Dacholmoc and Mocholmoc, or Mocholmog. [COLMAN.] It appears as the proper name of several saints, yet seems always more or less interchangeable with the other forms.

(1) Son of Aedh, of Cuil-Damhain, or Cuil-Briuin, Nov. 8, Dec. 11. On one occasion St. Conall, bp. of Culerathin (now Coleraine), had prepared a hospitable entertainment for St. Columba, and the people had brought countless gifts of food to enrich the feast, but St. Columba refused to taste the gift of Columbus, the son of Aedh, a wise and avaricious man, till he should have repented of his avarice: and, conscience-stricken, Columbus repented (Adamnan, *S. Columba*, i. c. 35). Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 381 n. 107) has himself no doubt, though he will not assert, that this is St. Columbus of Cuil-Damhain, i.e. Cuil Briuin, whose father is called Aedh Claen by Mar. O'Gorman, and who has a double dedi-

cation, viz. at Nov. 8 and Dec. 11. In *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 299, 333) there is given at Nov. 8, "Colum, son of Aedh, of Cuil-Damhain," and at Dec. 11, "Colum, son of Aedh Claen, of Cuil Briuin."

COLUM (2) of Tirdaglas, Dec. 13. He is often called son of Crimthainn, or of Ui Crimthainn, so that the abbots of Tirdaglas (now Terryglass, in the barony of Lower Ormonde, co. Tipperary) were styled the coarbs of Colum Mac Crimthainn. His father was Ninnidh, son of Nasaar, of the race of Cathaoir Mor. He was a pupil of St. Finian at Clonard. He had charge of St. Caemhan of Enachtruim or Annatrim (Nov. 3), Fintan of Clonenagh (Oct. 21), and Mocumin, his own successor at Tirdaglas. After being at Clonenagh for some time with his pupils, apparently before the monastery was founded there by St. Fintan, he went and founded the celebrated monastery of Tirdaglas, about A.D. 548. He is said in his Life to have visited Tours, and brought back with him relics from St. Martin's shrine. He died, with so many other saints, in the plague called the Cron chonaill, about A.D. 552. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 186, 332; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 186 n. 1, 187; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 113, c. 7, 350, 395, and *Tr. Thaum.* 457; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 533, 109, 962, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 550; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 71; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, xii. 259.)

(3) June 4. Cruimthir (priest) Colum, of Domhnach-mor Maighe Imchlaire. This is the entry in *Mart. Doneg.*, but *Mart. Tallaght* has "Colum Mac Cuana Ernain," if it belongs to the same person. On this day Colgan places the Columbanus or Columba, presbyter of Kill-Ernain (in Meath, or Limerick), who is said to have been one of those who met St. Patrick, as they returned from Rome, and received from him the skin to form the book-satchel: this, Colgan says, remained in the church of Kill-Ernain. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 86, c. 93, 130, c. 9, 174 n. 29.)

(4) Priest, of Enach, Sept. 22. It is narrated by St. Adamnan (*Vit. St. Col.* i. c. 2) that when St. Fintan Munna (Oct. 21) was debating with himself as to whether he should go to Iona and join St. Columba, he went before deciding to consult an aged friend, "in sua gente prudentissimum veneratorumque clericum," who was called in the Scotie tongue Colum Crag. But as they were deliberating, two of St. Columba's monks, who had come that morning from Derry, arrived and announced St. Columba's death. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 373 n. 22) is of opinion that this Colum Crag was the "Priest of Enach," but can give no account of the designation "crag." Dr. Reeves (*Adamnan*, 19) quotes this opinion of Colgan as probably true in the absence of the specific name from the calendar, and says Enagh, situated beside the lake of the same name, lies about two miles north-east of Derry, in the parish of Clondermot, barony of Tirkeeran, co. Londonderry. Colgan (*ibid.* 489 n. 29) places him among the disciples of St. Columba, but Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 141, 407) refuses both Colgan's conjecture and Archdall's amplification of it.

(5) Of Inis-Cealtra. This person is often mentioned in Irish history. Yet the details of his

life are lost. He had his monastery on one of the islands in Lough Derg, now included in the parish of Inishcaltra, and called the island of seven churches. He died in the Cron Chonaill or Yellow Jaundice, A.D. 548 (*Four Masters*), and is to be distinguished from St. Caimin (March 24) of the same place (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 187).

COLUM (6) Of Ros-glanda, Sept. 6. [COLMAN (4) Son of Eochaidh.]

(7) Gobha (the Smith), June 7. St. Columba in Hy is said to have seen the soul of Columbus Coiliginus, "faber ferrarius in Mediterranea parte Hiberniae," carried by the angels to the heavenly joys for his abundant alms to the poor. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 328, 334, 365, 388 n. 18) identifies him with St. Colum or Columbus the Smith, who is venerated on June 7, and Dr. Reeves (*Adamnan*, 208 n.) derives Coiliginus from the tribe Calraighe Teathbha, which "gave name to Sliabh gCalraidhe, now Slieve Golry, near Ardagh, in the middle of Longford, not far north of the exact centre of Ireland." [J. G.]

COLUMBA (1), COLUMCILLE, June 9. The life, character, and work of this saint have been exhaustively treated of late years by an Irish and a French author, Reeves and Montalembert, whose treatises leave little to be further done or desired.

St. Columba was the son of Fedhlimidh, son of Fergus Cennfada, and thus descended through Connall Gulban from Niall of the Nine Hostages, monarch of Ireland, his great-great-grandfather: he was also connected with the Dalriads in Scotland through Erca, daughter of Loarne Mor. His mother was Eithne, daughter of Dima, son of Nae, and descended from Cathaer Mor, king of Leinster and afterwards king of Ireland. He was born at Gartán, a wild district in the county of Donegal, on 7th Dec., most probably in the year A.D. 521. He had a brother Iogen, Eogan, or Eugenius, and three sisters, Cuimne, Mincloth, and Sinech. He was baptized by the priest Cruithnechan at Tulach-Dubhglaise, (now Temple-Douglas, about halfway between Gartán and Letterkenny,) under the name, first, of Crimthann (wolf), and then of Colum (dove), to which was afterwards added the suffix *cille*, as some say, from his close attendance at the church of his youthful sojourn, and as others, from the many communities founded and governed by him. His chief instructors were bishop Finnian (Sept. 10) of Moville (by whom he was ordained deacon), the bard Gemman in Leinster, St. Finnian (Dec. 12) of Clonard, and Mòbi Clairenech, [BERCHAN (4)] of Glasnevin, near Dublin. While he was at Clonard with St. Finnian he was ordained to the priesthood by bishop Etchen of Clonfad (Feb. 11), to whom he was sent by St. Finnian for that purpose. Why he was never raised to the episcopate is now a matter of speculation: in the *Scholia* on the *Felire of St. Aengus the Culdee* there is a legend relating how the order of the priesthood was conferred by mistake in place of that of the episcopate. (Todd, *St. Patrick*, 70-1; *Book of Obits of C. C. Dublin*, Dublin, 1844, p. liv.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 306 n. 17.) Bishop Lloyd supposes a political reason, and Lanigan thinks he applied only for the office of chorepiscopus. But Dr. Reeves is of opinion that he really shrank from the responsibilities and many obligations of the

highest ecclesiastical rank. His companions at Glasnevin were Congall, the two Ciarans, the two Brendans, Cainnech, and others who are all included with him in the second order of the Irish saints. When that school was broken up by the plague (A.D. 544) he returned to the north, and at this period we have probably to place the many ecclesiastical and monastic foundations attributed to him in Ireland, his chief favourites being Durrow and Derry. The reasons usually given for his afterwards leaving Ireland are various. The first is the decision pronounced against him at Tara, by king Diarmaid [referred to at the end of this article]. Another reason assigned is, that king Diarmaid disregarded the sanctuary of St. Columba's protection, and dragging Curnan, son of the king of Connaught, from the arms of St. Columba, to whom he had fled for refuge, slew him before his eyes. But whatever the special reasons may have been, he is said to have used his influence to excite a quarrel between the families of the north and south Hy Neill, and the consequence was the battle of Cul-Dreimhne or Cooledvny, fought in the barony of Carberry, between Drumcliff and Sligo, on the borders of Ulster and Connaught, A.D. 561, and gained by the Neills of the north, the party of St. Columba. In consequence of St. Columba's participation in this quarrel, a synod was assembled at Teltown in Meath to excommunicate him for his share in shedding Christian blood, and if the sentence of excommunication was not actually pronounced, it was owing to the exertions of St. Brendan of Birr and bishop Finnian of Moville on his behalf. Be it, however, by the advice of St. Molaisi of Devenish (Sept. 12), or by the charge of the synod of Teltown, that he must win as many souls to Christ by his preaching as lives were lost at Cul-Dreimhne, through his own feelings of remorse, or his great desire for the conversion of the heathen—for all these reasons together, or only for the last as imagined by Lanigan, he left Ireland in the year 563, and in the forty-second of his age, and, traversing the sea in a currach of wickerwork covered with hides, landed with his twelve companions on the small island of I, Hy, I-colum-kille, Iona, or Iona, which is situated about two miles off the south-west extremity of Mull in Argyshire. There on the border land between the Picts and Scots, and favoured by both, St. Columba founded his monastery, and made it the centre from which he and his followers evangelised the Picts and taught more carefully the Scots, who were already Christians at least in name. Hy was henceforth his chief abode, but he frequently left it for Scotland, where he founded many churches, penetrating northward even to Inverness, and probably farther, and eastward into Buchan, Aberdeenshire, sending his disciples where he himself had not leisure to go. His connexion with Ireland also was not broken off, nor did he visit it as an exiled man; his name is still connected with battles that occurred there, and in A.D. 575 he attended the synod of Drumceatt, with his cousin king Aidan of Dalriada, whom he had crowned in Iona the preceding year. But wherever he went his home was Iona, and from that, as a centre, the enthusiasm and thorough earnestness of his character found the means of establishing Christianity on a firm basis to the north of the Tay and the Clyde. It is unfortunate that, valuable as St. Adamnan's

Life of St. Columba is, it is written rather to extol its subject than to present a picture of the time, so that we can give little chronological sequence to the events of the thirty years and upwards of his sojourn in Iona. From it however we gather that in his monastery he was indefatigable in the work of prayer, teaching, study, and transcription of the Scriptures; people came to him from all quarters, some for bodily aid, but most for their spiritual need; and soon smaller societies had to be formed, as at Hinba (one of the Garveloch Islands), Tyree, and other places, for the requirements of the monastery. He visited king Bruide at Craig-Phadrick, beside Inverness, and established the monastery of Deer in the north-east corner of Aberdeenshire, where he left St. Drostan, so that his churches are traced all over the north of Scotland (*Book of Deer*, pref.) He also frequently visited Ireland on matters connected with his monasteries, the superintendence of which he retained to the last. He manifested always the greatest favour for the bards and the national poetry of his country; he himself is accounted one of the poets of Ireland, and poems, attributed to him, are preserved and quoted by Dr. Reeves and Montalembert (see also *Misc. Arch. Soc.* 1 sq.). It is said that one great purpose of his attending the synod of Drumceatt was to defend the bardic order, and its leader, the old and blind Dallan Forgaill (Jan. 29), his friend, from the attempt of king Aidh, son of Airmire, to banish them from the country (O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* ii. 77, iii. 245). In A.D. 593 he seems to have been visited by sickness, and the angels sent for his soul were stayed but for a time. As the time approached, and the infirmities of age were weighing upon him, he made all preparations for his departure, blessing his monastery, visiting the old scenes, and taking his farewell of even the brute beasts about the monastery. On the Saturday afternoon he was transcribing the thirty-fourth Psalm (Ps. xxxiii. E.V.), and coming to the verse, "They who seek the Lord shall want no manner of thing that is good," he said, "Here I must stop—at the end of this page; what follows let Baithen write." He then left his cell to attend vespers, and, returning at the close, lay down on his couch of stone, and gave his last injunctions to Baithen, till the bell at midnight called them to the nocturnal office. St. Columba was the first to enter the oratory, and when the brethren followed with lights they found the saint prostrate before the altar, and he soon passed away, with a sweet smile upon his face, as though he had merely fallen into a gentle sleep. This, according to Dr. Reeves' computation, was early in the morning of Sunday, June 9, A.D. 597. Dallan Forgaill's elegy, the 'Ambra Choluim-cille,' could then be sung without fear of exciting pride in St. Columba, and Ireland might justly mourn for one of the best of her sons, and Scotland for one of her greatest benefactors. (On the Life, etc. of St. Columba, see *The Life of St. Columba*, written by Adamnan, ninth Abbat of that Monastery, by William Reeves, D.D., Dublin, 1857; also *Les Moines d'Occident*, par le Comte de Montalembert, vol. iii. Paris, 1868. See also *The Life of St. Columba*, edited by John Smith, D.D., Edinb. 1798. In his preface Dr. Reeves gives a full bibliographical account of the Irish and Latin Acts and Life of St. Columba, with a notice of the MSS., codices, authors, and edi-

tions. See also Liganan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 107 sq. In his *Acta Diversa Columbae Abbatis* in the *Tr. Thaum.* 319–514, Colgan gives five Lives, with five Appendices, and an ‘Epilogus seu Anagraphe Magnalium St. Columbae.’ See also *Book of Deer*, Pref.; Canisius, *Lect. Ant.* i. 674 sq. Antwerp, 1725; Grub, *Ecol. Hist. Scott.* i. 45–68; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. xv. sq., and *Ind. Chron.*; O’Conor, *Rer. Hb. Scrip.* ii. 144 sq., iv. 122 sq.; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 306–7; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* B. i. cc. ix.–xi.; Chambers, *Encycl.* iii. 136–7; *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* i. 27–8, 71; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 151–163; *Four Mast.* by O’Donov. i. 192 sq.; Neander, *Gen. Ch. Hist.* v. 11, *Edinb.* 1849; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, vi. 163–8; Bede, *Ecol. Hist.* iii. c. 4; iv. c. 9.) Dr. Reeves (*Adamnan*, 276 sq.) gives the lists of 37 dedications in Ireland, 32 among the Albanic Scots, and 21 among the Picts of Scotland, yet these lists are confessedly incomplete. [J. G.]

To the migratory tastes so usual among Hibernian saints Columba added a passionate love of fine manuscripts, and he would incur any amount of risk and trouble in copying them. Having once transcribed a Latin Psalter belonging to abbat Finian, he was brought to answer for the offence before king Diarmaid at Tara, who in the following words sentenced him to the surrender of his treasure,—“To every book belongs its copy as to every cow its calf.” Columba revenged himself by inciting to arms the powerful clans of his friends and relations, and in the “Battle of the Psalter” Diarmaid was defeated. The precious object of this civil war was afterwards enclosed in a sort of portable shrine, and under the name of *Cathach* or *Cuah* was venerated as a palladium in the clan O’Donnell, who for more than a thousand years carried it into their battles as a sure pledge of victory. The history of this relic down to present times, when it was placed in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy, is narrated by Reeves (*Adamnan*, *Intro.* p. lxxxvii). Sir William Betham’s exact account, illustrated by drawings, describes the case as a brass box 9½ inches by 8, and 2 inches deep, the top being a silver plate riveted to one of brass (Betham, *Ir. Antiq. Research.* 1827, i. 109); but whether the MS. can be so old as the time of Columba is doubted. That sanguinary feud, as well as others into which an excitable temperament betrayed him, appears to have been the principal among the alleged causes of Columba’s entering upon a new career of life. It is related that he was charged in the synod of Teltown to win to Christ as many pagan souls as the number of Christians whose death he had occasioned; that he embraced the idea with characteristic ardour, and, establishing himself in Iona, laboured as a missionary both among his Christian countrymen, the Irish Scots, occupying the islands and part of the western coasts of Scotland contiguous to his abode, and also among the heathen Picts of the north and east beyond the great mountain barriers.

Columba occupies in missionary history the entire generation preceding the arrival of Augustine (A.D. 597). The Celtic apostle of Caledonia died the very year in which the Roman mission set foot in the south of Britain. The first abbat of Iona laboured much longer, in a far wider sphere, and personally with more success as well as prodigiously more romance

than the first archbishop of Canterbury. His mission, however, although it has become the most famous, was by no means the only attempt made at that period to Christianise the northern parts of this island. Other efforts, either accompanying or following it up in a subsequent generation, are illustrated by the names of Comgal, Mochonna, Cormac, Ernan, Lugneus, Mocumin, Baithen, Findchan, Cailtan, Diuni, Drostan, Moluag, Congan, Donnan, Maelrubha (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 116, 121; ii. 107). Adamnan (3, 5, 22) describes him as angelic in appearance, graceful in speech, with a holy joy ever beaming in his face; and from this we may safely picture a noble specimen of the Celtic type without adopting the imaginative portrait drawn by the historian of Western monachism. But while Adamnan implies that he was dove-like in character, according to his name, Montalembert, taking facts into consideration, must be nearer the truth in saying that in temper he was no “Columba,” gentleness being the one virtue that he most lacked; that he was vindictive, passionate, bold, a man of strife, born to be a soldier rather than a monk; full of contradictions and contrasts; tender and irritable, rude and courteous, ironical and compassionate, caressing and imperious, grateful and revengeful. Dr. Reeves, the learned editor of Adamnan, remarks, that if we may judge from the biographical records that have descended to us, primitive Irish ecclesiastics, and especially the superior class commonly known as saints, were very impatient of contradiction and very resentful of injury. Excommunication, fasting against, and cursing, were in frequent employment, and inanimate as well as animate objects are represented as the subjects of their maledictions. St. Columba, who seems to have inherited the high bearing of his race, was not disposed to receive injuries or even affronts in silence (*Intro.* xxxix.). In the language of the French author already quoted, Iona was for two centuries the nursery of bishops, the “centre of education, the asylum of religious knowledge, the point of union among the British Isles, the capital and necropolis of the Celtic race. Numerous kings and princes were buried there at the feet of Columba. During these two centuries it retained an uncontested supremacy over all the monasteries and churches of Caledonia and over those of half Ireland. It disputed with the Roman missionaries for authority over the Anglo-Saxons of the north (*Monks of the West*, iii. 269, 279). The settlement of Iona was in 801, 805, 877, burnt by the Danes, who were attracted by the offerings lavished upon the tomb of the saint. In the 9th century his remains were removed to Down, and are said to have been laid with those of St. Patrick and St. Bridget. Ussher (*De Antiq. Brit.* c. xvii.) says that four monastic rules are extant in the old Irish tongue, and amongst them that of St. Columba, which was followed, as may reasonably be assumed, in Scotland and in the churches founded by the Scottish monks among the northern Anglo-Saxons. Montalembert maintains (iii. 282) that there is not sufficient proof of Columba himself having left his disciples a monastic rule distinct from that of the other Celtic monasteries. Until 716 the monks of Iona differed from Rome in the observance of Easter (Bede,

H. E. v. 22). On this point see also ADAMNAN.

[C. H.]

COLUMBA (2) A Columba, said to have flourished about A.D. 640, is often given as the first bishop of Dunkeld, and the educator of St. Cuthbert and St. Brigida (Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 15, wks. vi. 248 sq., and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 610; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 165; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 679, c. 4, 690 n. 6). So at first thought Dr. Reeves, on the strength of what seemed good authority, but maturer consideration has convinced him (*Adamnan*, 6 n., 296-8) that the only Columba connected with Dunkeld is St. Columba of Iona, whose relics were deposited there, and who was honoured as the patron saint (Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 129 sq.).

[J. G.]

(3) Another Columba was the son of the Regulus or Lord of Appleby, Congere, Troolyng-ham and Malemath, all situated in England, who is said to have been raised from the dead, and baptized by St. Blane. He was "in vitâ mirabilis, et miraculis coruscans," and is buried at Dunblane, Perthshire. Whether this was the true reason or not, the see of Dunblane had some rights of property in these places (Fordun, *Scotichron.* lib. xi. c. 21; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 307; and see BLANE).

[J. G.]

COLUMBANUS (1) Abbat of Luxeuil and Bobbio, Nov. 21. On this day, in the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 315), is the entry "Columban, abbat, who was in Italy." Thus simply does the Irish calendar refer to an Irishman whose name is celebrated in France, Switzerland, and Italy, the great champion of public morals at a court notorious for its cruelty and profligacy, the zealous preacher of the Gospel in lands where the Holy Name had been all but forgotten, and the pious founder of monasteries. His life has been written with great care and minuteness by Jonas, of Susa in Piedmont, a monk of his monastery at Bobbio, in the time of Attala and Eustace, his immediate successors, and is now published by Mabillon (in the *Acta SS. Ord. St. Bened.* tom. ii. sec. ii. 2-26), and by Messingham (*Flor. Ins. Sanct.*, 219-239), who also appends the account of miracles omitted by Jonas, and some additions to his Life (*ib.* 239-54). Messingham further gives the Rule of St. Columbanus in ten chapters, a short Homily by the saint on the fallaciousness of human life, and some carmina (*ib.* 403-14). The fullest account of St. Columbanus, his works and writings, is given in Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra* (fol. Lovan. 1667), which contains Jonas' Life, St. Columbanus' writings, and all that will illustrate the history and character of the abbat of Bobbio. His writings are also contained in *Bibl. Mag. Vet. Pat.* vol. viii. Paris, 1644, and *Bibl. Max. Vet. Pat.* vol. xii. Lyons, 1677. His poems were first printed by Goldastus (*Paræen. Vet.* pars i. 1604). Wright (*Biog. Brit. Lit.* 157 sq.) gives a useful notice of the time, place, and form, in which his prose and poetical pieces have been published.

St. Columbanus was born in Leinster in or about A.D. 543, the same year in which Benedict, his great monastic predecessor, died at Monte Cassino. He is said to have been first under St. Sinell, the abbat of Cluain-Inis, in Lough Erne, but his chief training was in the monastery of Bangor, on the coast of Down,

under the eye of St. Comgall. There he was educated in all sacred and monastic learning, and there he accepted the monastic vows and habit. At the age, most probably of a little over forty, he was seized with a desire to preach the Gospel beyond the limits of Ireland. Urged by that "ignitum igne Domini desiderium," he wrung an unwilling consent from St. Comgall his master, and with twelve companions crossed over to France, about A.D. 585, making a short visit to Britain as he went. For several years he traversed the country, teaching the faith, but without, to all appearance, building any monastery, till coming to Burgundy and yielding to the solicitations of Gontran, the king, he took up his abode in a deserted part of the Vosges mountains. Wealth from the king he refused, and all his desire was a quiet retreat, where he could bear the cross and follow Christ. He first chose the ruined Roman fort of Anagrates, now Annegray, a hamlet of the commune of Faucongy (Haute-Saône); then, finding the need of a larger foundation, he removed, in A.D. 590 or 591, to the more extensive ruins of the ancient Luxovium, about eight miles distant from Annegray, and clearing the tangled thickets which overspread the once famous Roman watering-place, established his celebrated monastery of Luxeuil, on the confines of Burgundy and Austrasia. But soon he had to erect another monastic establishment at Fontaines, or Fontenay, and divide his monks among these houses. Over each house he placed a superior, who yet was subordinate to himself, and for their management he drew up his well-known Rule, derived no doubt in great measure from his master St. Comgall, and perhaps to some extent too from St. Benedict of Monte Cassino. The great principle of this Rule was obedience, absolute and unreserved; and the next was constant and severe labour, to subdue the flesh, exercise the will in daily self-denial, and at the same time set an example to the people of industry in the cultivation of the soil; the least deviation from the Rule entailed a definite corporal punishment, or a severer form of fast as laid down in the Penitential. (See the Rule given in Messingham, Fleming, and *Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr.* tom. xii. Lyons, 1677, as noted above; and on it see Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, ii. 447 sq.; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 267-9; Neander, *Gen. Ch. Hist.* v. 36-7; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 484 sq.; Fleury, *Eccl. Hist.* iib. xxxv. sect. 10; Mabillon, *Ann. Bened.* lib. viii. sect. 17; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, xi. 438-40; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* b. ii. c. 9.) For twenty years in the wooded and all but inaccessible defiles of the Vosges ranges of mountains St. Columbanus laboured with his monks, and all classes of men gathered round him, notwithstanding the severity of his discipline. His own inclination was always to retire into the wood and caves, and hold unrestrained communion with God; but in addition to the claims of his monasteries, Christian zeal and charity asserted their claims and drew him forth into the world. He excited against himself a strong feeling on the part of both the Gallican clergy and the Burgundian court. The cause of the clerical antipathy was twofold. A worldly priesthood could not but feel the reproach of his exceeding earnestness and

self-denial, so that his pure severity was a constant accusation of loss of love and truth in them. And going from Ireland, he carried with him the peculiar rites and usages of his mother-church. He would not give up the Irish mode of computing Easter, the Irish tonsure, or the "Cursus Scotorum" he had received from St. Comgall. This gave great offence to the Gallo-Frank clergy, and in A.D. 602 he was arraigned before a synod, where, however, he defended himself with the utmost freedom and force, pleading that if error there was it was not his, but had been received from his fathers, and he asked of them but the licence "to live in silence, in peace and in charity, as I have lived for twelve years, beside the bones of my seventeen departed brethren." At the same time he wrote to pope Gregory the Great several letters on the subject, as afterwards he addressed himself to pope Boniface IV., but with what immediate result we do not hear, though the haughty bearing and generally independent tone, in words and letters, of "Columbanus the sinner" were little calculated to propitiate the favour of either bishops or popes; while at the same time Gregory's very friendly connexion with queen Brunehaut would make that pope give little heed to the appeals of the stranger whom she disliked. Indirectly, however, his earnestness had a rousing effect upon the Gallican church. But the opposition he received from the Burgundian court was of a more dangerous character from the influence of the famous Brunehild, or Brunehaut. Thierry II., called also Theodoric, was under age, and his grandmother Brunehaut not only ruled with violent and arbitrary bearing, but encouraged the young king in every form of vice, and the grossest system of concubinage, so as to retain in her own hand the entire control of the kingdom. Such open profligacy St. Columbanus did not hesitate to reprove by word and writing, and thus he incurred the bitterest enmity of the king, and specially of the queen-mother. When gifts and flattery proved to be in vain, he was first carried prisoner to Besançon, and having escaped from that, he was finally banished from the kingdom, in A.D. 610. He departed from Luxeuil and the other monasteries after twenty years' labour there, never to return. With his Irish monks he was hurried across the country to the Loire, visited St. Martin's tomb at Tours, and at Nantes was to be put on board a vessel to carry him to Ireland. But before leaving he addressed a letter full of the most passionate grief and affectionate tenderness, yet the sternest resolve, to the monks of Luxeuil. Whether he afterwards embarked and was cast upon the shores of Neustria, or found his way inland to that kingdom, is not known, but he next is found at the court of Clotaire II., king of Neustria; thence he proceeded to the court of Theodebert at Metz, king of Austrasia, and brother of Thierry. There he was visited by some of his monks from Luxeuil, but he did not venture again into Burgundy. From Metz he crossed to the Rhine, and, embarking below Mayence, proceeded upwards along the Rhine and its tributary the Aar and Limmat, till he reached the Lake of Zurich. At Tuggen, where the Limmat leaves the Lake of Zurich, he took up his residence, preaching to the Alemanni and Suevi; but, having given great

offence to the idolatrous population there, by destroying their temples and gods, he and his associates had to flee eastward to the Lake of Constance. First he came to Arbon on the west coast of the lake; then, hearing of the ruins of Bregentium, now Bregenz, at the south-east corner of the Constance Lake, he went thither with St. Gall and his other monks, and there spent three years, preaching to the people, and contending with privation and difficulty. When the arms of Thierry prevailed, and Bregenz was brought under the power of Burgundy, having before been under Austrasia, St. Columbanus had again to flee, and leaving St. Gall at Bregenz he himself, with only one disciple, passed southward across the Alps into Lombardy, where he was honourably received by king Agilulf. When he came to Milan, he was soon engaged in a controversy with the Arians who abounded in Lombardy, and about this time he wrote also to the pope Boniface IV. at the suggestion of king Agilulf and his queen Theodelind. In so doing he espoused the cause of the Nestorians, as represented by the "Three Chapters," which had been condemned in the 5th General Council at Constantinople, in A.D. 553, though his zeal seems to have outrun his knowledge, with regard to the true state of parties and the real points at issue. In writing to the pope he used his accustomed freedom of address, entreating him to bring the matter fairly before a synod, defend the Roman church against the charge of heresy, and put an end to the present divisions. Agilulf, in the year 613, presented him with a district in the wild gorges of the Apennines, between Genoa and Milan, not far from the Trebbia, and there he built his celebrated monastery of Bobbio. Thither the messengers of Clotaire II. followed him, and invited him to return to France, now that his enemies were dead, and Neustria, Austrasia, and Burgundy were all under one rule, but the aged saint would not be tempted from Bobbio, and there, on Nov. 21 A.D. 615, he calmly resigned his spirit. (For an account of St. Columbanus's Life and Times, see Lanigan, *Eccles. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 13; Ussher, *Eccles. Ant.* cc. xv. xvii. and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 589, 614; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, ii. book vii.; Butler, *Lives of the SS.* xi. 435 sq.; Neander, *Gen. Ch. Hist.* v. 35 sq.; Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christ.* ii. book iv. c. 5; *Ulster Journ. Arch.* i. 168 sq., ii. 253 sq.; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* i. pp. clxiii. sq., iv. 180 sq.; Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 25 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* i. cent. vi. c. 2, §§ 5-9, cent. vii. ch. i. § 3; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 117-157, c. 12, and *Tr. Tharum.* 88, c. 98, 113 n. ¹¹⁰; Hardwicke, *Middle Age*, 17-8; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* B. ii. cc. 8-9; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 142 sq.) In his writings he everywhere gives evidence of sound judgment and solid ecclesiastical learning, of an elegant taste, and deep spiritual discernment, which says much for the man and for the school in which he was educated. This is well pointed out by Moore in his *Hist. of Ireland* (i. p. 267). "The writings of this eminent man display a varied and extensive acquaintance, not merely with ecclesiastical, but with classical literature. From a passage in his letter to Boniface, it appears that he was acquainted both with the Greek and Hebrew languages; and when it is recollected that he did not leave Ireland till he was nearly fifty

years of age, and that his life afterwards was one of constant activity and adventure, the conclusion is obvious, that all his knowledge of elegant literature must have been acquired in the schools of his own country. Such a result from a purely Irish education in the middle of the sixth century is, it must be owned, not a little remarkable." [J. G.]

It is the great distinction of Columbanus, as Neander has observed, that he first gave the example at the end of the 6th century of that missionary enterprise in remote countries of the continent of Europe, which was afterwards so largely followed up from England and Ireland. The names of Cilian, Wilfrid, Willebrord, Boniface, Willibald, Willehad, will illustrate this remark. Possibly it was that the monasteries of Ireland were overfilled, Bangor for instance under Comgall, and that thus a foreign direction was given to the restless energy of the native character. Colonies of those pious monks, not finding scope enough at home, would journey forth under the leadership of able abbots, carrying the light of Christianity through the dangerous wilds of continental heathendom. It was about 12 years before the arrival of the Roman mission in England (A.D. 597), and the same before the death of Columba the apostle of Caledonia, that Columbanus, fired perhaps by the example of this energetic missionary, passed over into Gaul.

Columbanus's mission, moreover, made its mark on the times in respect of (1) his monastic Rule and (2) the development of his first great foundation, Luxeuil. As to the former, so eagerly was it adopted that it became at one time doubtful if the Columbanian Order would not become prevalent rather than the Benedictine. The rule of Benedict achieved the ascendancy over its rival, as Montalembert has observed, half a century after the death of Columbanus; and it is interesting to notice that this event just synchronises with the great defeat sustained by the Celtic party in England at the council of Whitby (A.D. 664). The victory of the Benedictine Rule is considered to have been owing partly to the principles upon which it was framed, and to its meeting human nature half-way; but chiefly to its having received the sanction and patronage of the see of Rome, which was naturally not accorded to its rival, an off-spring of the Celtic church that was ever so jealously regarded at Rome. The Columbanian Rule is shorter and less distinct, as well as more severe than the Benedictine, with which however it agrees in all essential points. Columbanus's foundation of Luxeuil achieved as great a celebrity as his Rule, and a more enduring one. It became the parent of numerous streams of monastic colonies, which spread through both Burgundies, Rauracia (the ancient bishopric of Basel), Neustria, Champagne, Ponthieu, and the Morini. Luxeuil was in short, as Montalembert expresses it, the monastic capital of Gaul, as well as the first school in Christendom, a nursery of bishops and saints. Nor did it altogether eclipse the splendour of the later foundation in Italy. Bobbio, although it remained for so brief a period under the government of its founder, became a stronghold of orthodoxy against the Arians, and long remained a school of learning for North Italy.

The works of Columbanus, which are contained in Patrick Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra* (Lovanii, A.D. 1667) are as follows. *Prose*:—I. *Regula Monastica*, in 10 short chapters.—II. *Regula Coenobialis Fratrum, sive Liber de Quotidianis Poenitentibus Monachorum*, in 15 chapters.—III. *Sermones sive Instructiones Variæ*. These are 17 discourses, of no great length, bearing various titles, the first being "De Deo Uno et Trino;" and the last, "Quod per Viam Humilitatis et Obedientiae Deus quaerendus et sequendus sit."—IV. *Liber seu Tractatus de Modo seu Mensura Poenitentiarum*, the second title being *De Poenitentiarum Mensura Taxanda*. It prescribes penances for various sins.—V. *Instructio de Octo Vitiis Principalibus*; a very short piece, occupying less than a column. The vicia are gula, fornicatio, cupiditas, ira, tristitia, aedia, vana gloria, superbia.—VI. *Epistolæ Aliquot ad Diversos*. These are five in number: 1. "Ad Bonifacium IV.;" 2. "Ad Patres Synodi ejusdam Gallicanæ super Questione Paschæ Congregatæ;" 3. "Ad Discipulos et Monachos suos;" 4. "Ad Bonifacium Papam;" 5. "Ad S. Gregorium Papam."

The letters are especially interesting on account of the information they afford on the dispute between the Roman and Irish churches. In reference to the first of them, see BONIFACIUS IV.

The Poetical Works, *Poemata Quaedam*, occupy about 8 pages folio. They range in length from 4 lines to 164, and the metres are both classical and mediæval. The titles of the pieces are as follows:—"Ad Hunaldum;" "Epistola ad Sethum;" "Epistola ad Fedolium;" "Epigramma de Muliere;" "Monosticha;" "Rythmus de Vanitate et Miseriâ Vitæ Mortalis." Each separate piece, both prose and verse, is copiously annotated. [C. H.]

COLUMBANUS (2) ST., or COLOMBAN, was a French poet, and abbat of St. Trudo (St. Trond). He died about the middle of the 9th century. Amongst the works of Rabanus Maurus is a poem or dirge on the death of Charlemagne, written by a certain Colomban, who is supposed to have been the abbat of St. Trond. It is addressed to a bishop named André, not otherwise known, and it is certain that it was written immediately after the death of the prince. To him is also attributed the poem entitled 'De Origine atque primordiis gentis Francorum (stirpis Carolinæ).' It was written about the year 840, and dedicated to Charles the Bold, and published, with the notes of Thomas Aquinas, Paris, 1644, in 4to. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, iv. 422 and ix.; *Patrol. Lat.* cvi. p. 1257. [D. R. J.]

COMAIGH (COMAGIA), of Snamhluthair, virgin, May 27. The *Book of Lecan* gives her genealogy; she was daughter of Eochaidh, and in the 6th generation, through Laeghaire, from Niall of the Nine Hostages. Her mother was Aiglenn, daughter of Linin, of Killiney near Dublin. She is commemorated at Snamhluthair (now Slanore, a townland in the parish of Kilmore and barony of Upper Loughtee, co. Cavan), where she had a monastery, and where her brother Colman is also commemorated [COLMAN (4)] (Reeves, *Adumnan*, 172 sq.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 384 n. 34). [J. G.]

COMAIL, British king, slain in battle by the

West Saxons, A.D. 577, at Deorham (A. S. C. ad an.). [C. H.]

COMAN (COMMAN), son of Ernan, March 18. *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 81) calls him bishop, but Colgan in his memoir (*Acta SS.* 651) calls him only confessor, and seeks to identify him with the "honorabilis presbyter," nephew of Virgnous, with whom St. Adamnan (*St. Columb.* iii. 20) says he conversed. He was son of Ernan, son of Fiachna, of the famous race of Conal Gulban in Tyrconnel, and Cumin Finn abbat of Hy (Feb. 24) was his brother. Following the example of his brother, and uncle St. Virgnous or Fergna, abbat of Hy (March 2), he too came there as a monk, and was alive in the time of St. Adamnan. But the date of St. Coman's death is unknown, though Colgan says he is the "Coman bishop," who, according to the *Four Masters*, died A.D. 676; and Ussher, by identifying him with St. Coman of Ferns, puts his obit at A.D. 678, while it is probable that he was identical with neither. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 12, 128; Ussher, *Eccl. Antiq.* c. 17, wks. vi. 540; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 225 n.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 386 nn. ²¹, ²², 480 n. ¹³, 489 n. ³⁰.) His church is Kilchoman in the Rinns of Islay, and the name appears on the cross at Campbelltown (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 307).

[J. G.]

COMASIVS, a rhetor in the 5th century, who turned monk, and still continued in the monastery collecting "the rubbish" of classical Greek literature, for which he is severely rebuked by Nilus (*Ep.* ii. 73, p. 153; cf. ii. 257, p. 251).

[E. B. B.]

COMDHAN (1) Of Cluain-connaidh, Oct. 13. [**COMAN** and **CONGAN.**]

(2) Of Glenn-Uissen, Feb. 27. [**COMGAN.**]

COMEGERN, eighth bishop of Llandaff, contemporary with Ywyr, king of Gwynedd (Stubbs, *Registr.* 156). [C. H.]

COMGALL (CONGALL) (1), abbat of Bangor, May 10. This is one of the most prominent leaders of monasticism in Ireland, and he is said to have had as many as 3000 monks under him at one time in Bangor and affiliated houses. Like so many other of the Irish saints, he had both a Scotch and Irish connexion, but in the Scotch tradition (*Brev. Aberd.* p. aestiv. f. cxvii.), there is nothing of special importance.

By the Irish account he was of the race of Fiachra Araidhe, founder of the kingdom of Dal-Araidhe or Dalaradia, and thus one of the Cruthnii or Irish Piets. His father was Setna or Sedna, and his mother, Brig or Briga. He was a native of Mourne, now Magheramorne, a district and village in the barony of Lower Belfast, co. of Antrim, and on the shore of Lough Larne. The year of his birth is variously stated, but the most probable is A.D. 517, which is given by Tighearnach, and accepted by Dr. Reeves. His name, which is interpreted "pulchrum pignus" and "faustus," is written Comgall, Comgill, Congal, and by Ussher, Gomogillus. He is said to have been under St. Finnian (Dec. 12), at Clonard, Mòbi Clairenech (Oct. 12), at Glasnevin, and St. Fintan (Oct. 21), at Clonenagh. Apparently after he left St. Fintan and while on his way northward, he was ordained priest by bishop Ligidius at Clonmacnoise, who afterwards

used his influence, as others were doing, to prevent St. Comgall's going away from Ireland into Britain. Yielding to their solicitations he returned to the north, and after teaching for some years in the province, founded in A.D. 558 his great monastery at Bennchair-Uladh, now Bangor, in the Ards of Ulster, and co. of Down. (On the derivation and meaning of the name, which is not "Fair or White Choir," but has its root in *beanna*, the Irish word for horns, peaks, crests, pointed hills or rocks, see Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 199-201.) To his monastery multitudes flocked from all quarters, and for it and kindred institutions he drew up a Rule which was considered one of the chief ones of Ireland, as he himself was one of the eight who composed rules there and formed orders. His most noted disciples at Bangor were Cormac, son of Diarmaid and king of South Leinster, who in his old age abdicated the throne and became a monk in the monastery of Bangor, as is related in the *Life of St. Fintan*; and St. Columbanus, abbot of Luxeuil and Bobbio, who went out with his companions from Bangor, preached the faith among the Franks, Suevi, and Alemanni, and established monasteries where the institutions of Bangor and the *Cursus Scotorum* were the chief characteristics. [**COLUMBANUS.**] But others of his pupils are named, such as St. Lachtain (March 19) of Achadhur, St. Fionnchu (Nov. 25), his successor, and St. Mochua or Cronan (March 30), of Balla. He was uncle of St. Maeldubha (April 21), and St. Molua (Aug. 4) is given as his confessor. The author of his life (*Vit.* c. 22) says that in the 7th year after he founded Bangor that is in 565, St. Comgall sailed to Britain, intending to visit some of the saints there and stay with them for a time. This is probably the occasion referred to by St. Adamnan (*St. Columb.* iii. 17), when the four saints, Congellus Mocu Aridi (his tribe name as belonging to the Dal-Araidhe), Cainnechus Mocu Dalon, Brendenus Mocu Alti, and Cormacus Nepos Lethain came to St. Columba on the island of Hiberna. During his stay in Scotland he founded a monastery in Heth (now the island of Tiree), and either now or afterwards he seems to have accompanied St. Columba on a visit to king Brude, at his chief residence on Craig Phadraick, beside Inverness. Yet St. Comgall and St. Columba do not appear to have been always thus friendly, as the battle of Cul-Rathain (now Coleraine) is said to have been occasioned by some dispute between these two saints regarding the church of Ross-Torathair, somewhere near Coleraine. But the quarrel is more likely to have been between the tribes to which the saints severally belonged, and any dispute about monastic jurisdiction may have inclined them to regard the conflict with more favour. After ruling the monastery of Bangor and its dependencies for "ten days, three months and fifty years," as the calendars say, but about forty-four years according to computation, St. Comgall died at Bangor on May 10, A.D. 602, aged eighty-five, having received his viaticum from St. Fiachra (Feb. 8), of Congbail. He is justly reckoned among the fathers of the Irish church. He was buried at Bangor, and the first to open his shrine seems to have been the above-mentioned St. Fiachra, who took out an arm and carried it with him to Leinster. But worse fortune befell the holy place when in 824 the

Danes plundered the city and abbey, and breaking open St. Comgall's shrine, scattered the contents to the four winds. (On Bangor and its monastic history, see Reeves, *Eccl. Hist.* 93-5, 152-4, and *Adamnan*, 213, 317; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 473 sq.) Of this saint there are two Lives given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Maii, tom. ii. 577-87); these, along with some miscellaneous extracts, are given by Fleming (*Collect. Sacra*, 303-16). There is also a life of St. Comgall in the *Codex Kilken.* (in Primate Marsh's Library, Dublin, fol. 90 b), and a metrical composition of great age, called the 'Rule of St. Comgall of Bangor,' written in Irish but probably not the composition of St. Comgall, is preserved in the valuable Irish collection at Brussels. The 'Antiphony' of St. Comgall is still preserved at Milan, and has been published by Muratori; in it there is a curious alphabetical hymn concerning St. Comgall. (On his Life, &c. see more in Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 10; Reeves, *Adamnan*, pass. and *Eccl. Ant.* pass.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 123; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 189, 225 n.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 190 b, 192 a, 352, c. 18, 423, and *Tr. Thaum.* 88, c. 98, 127, c. 65; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* cc. 13-17, wks. v. vi., and see *Ind. Chr.* A.D. 456, 516; Butler, *Lives of the SS.* v. 195 sq.; *Uist. Journ. Arch.* i. 173, ii. 214-5, 235-6; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 5, 27, and *Ir. Ant.* 93; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 108-10; O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 168-9, iv. 45 n., 122 sq., 155.) He is commemorated in the Scotch calendars, but Camerarius places him on Jan. 2, and suggests a Scotch Bangor. His dedications in Scotland were at Durris, Kincardineshire, and possibly Dercongal, or Drumcongal, now Holywood, in Galloway (Bp. Forbes, *ut supra*). [J. G.]

If Comgall was not the father of Hibernian monachism, as some overlooking St. Patrick have sought to make him, he was an early and most successful promoter of it. In the 6th century the Irish Bangor, Bangor on the Dee [DINOTHUS], which has been sometimes confounded with it, and Iona, were the three great lights of Celtic Christianity in the British Islands and were already in vigorous activity when the Roman mission first set foot in Kent, A.D. 597. The Celtic church seems to have been, if we may so express it, organised more on a monastic than a diocesan basis. Its strength lay less in great bishops than in great abbats. Its teeming cloisters, reckoning their 3000 inmates—a favourite traditional figure, as Montalembert (iii. 93, 94) remarks—must have been analogous to the colleges that crowd our university towns. The Bangor monastery, like others on the sea-coast, fell on the first appearance of the Danish fleets in the 9th century. The village which now represents it still looks out upon the bay of Belfast, but no vestige remains of the vast institution to which it owes its fame. Ussher (*Antiq. Eccl. Brit.* c. xvii. wks. 1847, t. vi. p. 483) mentions the Rule of St. Comgall among the four which were extant in his day in archaic Irish. Sir Roger Twissden, as quoted by Tanner (*Notitia*, Pref. s. ii.), says that the monks of Bangor were not (inlike the order of St. Basil, if not of it. Hadlan and Stubbs (i. 116) mention Comgall as one of those who sought to Christianise North Britain in Columba's period, and refer to Reeves or a list of Irish missionaries whose attempts resembled his. They quote the *Four Masters*

and Lanigan for his death in A.D. 601. For the MSS. materials of his life see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 190, 753). [C. H.]

COMGALL (2) Son of Eochaidh, of Bothconais, Sept. 4. He was brother of Celechrist (March 3), and son of Eochaidh Cais, of the race of Eoghan, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages. His monastery was at Bothconais in Inis-Eoghan, a name which is extinct, but the place is now probably Temple-moyle, in the parish of Culdaifi, barony of Inishowen and county of Donegal. He is said to have received this monastery from St. Cieran (Nov. 24) of Duleek, but his brother died A.D. 722 [CELE-CHRIST], and St. Cieran was a contemporary of St. Patrick [CIANAN] (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 237; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 454, 455, nn. 2, 4; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 345, iii. 162). [J. G.]

(3) Of Gobhal-luinn, July 28. His monastery was at what is now Galloon, in the S.E. corner of Fermanagh, and seems to have been included in the ancient Dartraighe-Coininse, which has given its name to the barony of Dartry in the S.W. of Monaghan, at the head of Loch Erne (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 205). On July 27 Butler (*Lives of the SS.* vii. 425) gives a short memoir of St. Congall, abbat of labhnallivin, and says that before his death he committed the government of his monastery on the upper part of Lough Erne to his beloved disciple St. Fegnarnach. [J. G.]

COMGAN (COMDHAN, CONGAN).

(1) Of Cluain-Connaidh, Oct. 13. Among the relatives of St. Columba we find St. Comganus, son of Degillus, and of Cuman or Camenia, sister of St. Columba. Maguir thinks this was St. Comgan of Glenn-Uissen (Feb. 27), but Colgan is of opinion that it must either be Comgan Kele-de or Deicola, or else Comgan of Cluain-Clonnaidh, in Cuirene (in the barony of Kilkenny West, Westmeath), but in support of this he quotes from the *Four Masters*, A.D. 663, the obit of St. Comman Mac Ua Theimhne (Feb. 27). (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 478 n. 3, 479 n. 13.) [CONGAN.]

(2) Of Glenn-Uissen, Feb. 27. He was son of Diarmaid, son of Deghaidh, of the race of Cormac Cas, son of Oilíoll Olum, and his mother was Ethne, daughter of Feidhlimidh, son of Tighernach; but as to his also being nephew to St. Columba, Colgan shews that this could not have been, the chief reasons being the chronological, and the paternity of Feidhlimidh. He founded a monastery in his native province at Ceann-indis or Keann-indse, and succeeded St. Diarmaid (July 8) in the government of the monastery at Glenn-uissen (now Killeslin, a parish and a remarkable glen called the Cut of Killeslin, situated about two Irish miles to the west of the town of Carlow). The precise year of his death is unknown, but it must have been before A.D. 569 if the story be true which represents St. Ita (Jan. 15) as attending his deathbed, and closing his mouth when dead, which was believed to secure for him eternal safety. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 76 sq.; Reeves, *Adamnan*, lxx. n.; Bollandists, *Acta SS.* Feb. tom. iii. 682; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 464 n. v; Archdall, *Mon. Hib.* 398.) [J. G.]

COMMAN is a not uncommon name among

the Irish saints, and is often exchanged with Colman, Comgan, Coeman.

COMMAN (1) Mac Ua Theimhne, Feb. 27. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 417) distinguishes "St. Comgan Hua Teanne" from St. Comgan of Glenn-uissen (whose commemoration is on the same day), and gives from the Irish *Annals* the date of the former's death as A.D. 663, in the great mortality in Ireland. O'Donovan is of opinion that he was probably the brother of Muirchu Maccuthennius, who wrote a Life of St. Patrick from the dictation of Aidus, bishop of Sletty, as stated in the *Book of Armagh* (fol. 20, b. 1), and if so he may have been son of Cogitosus. [COGITOSUS.] (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 274 n. m. 275.)

(2) Of Roscommon (Ross-Commain), Dec. 26. Regarding this saint there is no little confusion. Ussher (*Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 532-3, and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 540), quoting from a Life of the saint, tells of a Coeman or Comman, of the seed-royal of Ulster, whose father was Fealcon and mother Scribside, and who, having been educated by St. Finnian of Clonard (Dec. 12), received from the king of Connaught the rich and fertile vale of Ross, where he built his monastery, and gave his name to the whole county of Roscommon. On this authority Colgan places him among the disciples of St. Finnian, but this legend appears to be a later invention, and it seems best to follow the *Four Mast.* with Ware and Lanigan, and place his decease in the year 742, though O'Donovan would prefer the earlier foundation of Roscommon by St. Comman, and Colgan and Ware adopt both dates in different parts of their writings. He is said to have been of the race of Irial, son of Conall Cearnach. He wrote a monastic Rule, and in the *Annals*, about the year 790, there is mention made of the promulgation of "the law of St. Coman" throughout the three divisions of Connaught. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 343, 349, 395; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 349; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 405 b, 721 n. 12; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 225, iii. 177-8; Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 14, and *Ir. Ant.* 113.)

[J. G.]

COMMANDMENTS. [DECALOGUE.]

COMMENTATORS, ANCIENT. [INTERPRETATION, BIBLICAL.]

COMMODIANUS, the author of two Latin poems entitled respectively, "*Instructiones adversus Gentium Deos pro Christiana disciplina*," and, "*Carmen Apologeticum adversus Judaeos et Gentes*." The *Instructions* were discovered by Sirmond, and first edited by Rigault, at Toul, 1650; the *Apology* was first published, 1852, in the *Spicilegium Solismense* of Dom. Pitra, from a MS. in the Middlehill collection, said to have been brought from the monastery of Bobbio. The poet is mentioned by Gennadius (*De Vir. Illustr.* c. 15), who speaks slightly of his versification and latinity. His *Instructions* are included "inter apocrypha" in a synodal decree of Gelasius (*Concil.* tom. iv.), most probably on account of certain heterodox statements they contain respecting Antichrist, the Millennium, and the First Resurrection. With these exceptions, ancient writers appear to be silent respecting him. The question as to the age in which he lived has been the subject of much

dispute. Rigault was of opinion that a corrupt passage of the *Instructions* (§ xxxiii. 5) contained an allusion to pope Silvester, the contemporary of Constantine, and Clinton (*Fast. Rom.* vol. ii. p. 450) places him even later for reasons which, however ingenious, are insufficient to outweigh the internal evidence of the poem, that the author lived in the days of persecution. The style of the *Instructions* points to the age of Cyprian, with whose works they have more than once been edited. There is an allusion to the Novatian Schism (§ xlvii. ad fin.), and the language of § lii. seems to be aimed against the "Thurificati" and "Libellatici" of the 3rd century. In § lxvi. 12 there is mention of a "subdola pax," which Cave refers to the temporary quiet enjoyed by the Christians under Gallienus, after the Decian and before the Aurelian persecution. Other expressions (e.g. *agonia propinqua*, § liii. 10) clearly point to the expectation of fresh suffering. But the most important passage as affecting the date of the poem is one in which the author upbraids the Gentiles for perseverance in their unbelief, though Christianity has prevailed for 200 years (§ vi. 2), and this, which singularly enough seems to have escaped the notice of the earlier critics, must be held to fix the date of Commodian approximately to the year A.D. 250. The barbarity of his style, and the peculiarity of certain words he uses (e.g. *Zabulo*, *Zacones*), led Rigault to infer that he was of African extraction. It is true that he applies to himself the epithet "Gazaenus," but this refers in all probability to his dependence upon the treasury of the church (*gazophylacium*) for support, and not to any connexion with Gaza. Originally a heathen (*Instruct. Praef.*, 5, § xxvi. 24), he was converted by the perusal of the Scriptures (*Praef.* 6), and if the words "Explicit tractatus sancti Episcopi . . ." discovered on the MS. of the *Carmen Apologeticum* by Pitra, may be taken to refer to the author of the poem, who, from internal evidence, is conclusively proved to have been Commodian, it would seem that he ultimately became a bishop.

The works of Commodian, though utterly valueless in a literary sense, are of considerable interest as a landmark in the history of the Latin language. Although purporting to be written in hexameter verse, they are composed with regard not to quantity but to accent only. The following lines may be taken as a specimen of these Versus Politici, as they are called; they are part of a remonstrance against the pomp of female dress, which at least has the merit of strong moral earnestness:

"Obruitis collum monilibus, gemmis et auro,
Neonon et in aures gravissimo pondere pendent:
Quid memorem vestes et totam Zabuli pompam?
Resputis legem, cum vultis mundo placere."

From this example it will be seen, that at the time when Commodian lived, the change had already passed upon the Latin tongue, which gradually resulted in the formation of the Romance languages. The poet, not having been brought up, like Ausonius and Claudian, in the schools of Alexandria or Gaul, read Virgil as he would have scanned his own lines by accent alone, and, in attempting to imitate him, set to work much as a modern scholar might do who

was unacquainted with the rules of prosody. For further information upon this subject, the student is referred to an interesting paper by Mr. H. A. J. Munro, upon an inscription copied by Dean Blakesley, at Cirta (Transact. Camb. Phil. Soc., vol. x., part ii., 9).

The *Instructions* are divided into 80 sections, each of which is an acrostic, and denotes its title by its initial letters. To this rule the 60th is an exception, which, being in sense a repetition of the preceding section, follows instead the order of the alphabet. The last section read backwards gives *Commodianus Mendicus Christi*. The poem contains over 1200 verses. The *Apology*, which is imperfect, consists of 1020 lines, divided into 47 sections. The text of both poems is very corrupt.

The first edition of the *Instructions* is that of Rigault, 4to, 1650 (Tulli Leucorum); the latest is to be found in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. v. The *Apology* is contained in Pitra's *Spicilegium Solis-mense*, vol. i.

[E. M. Y.]

COMMODIUS, one of the seventeen guards in the story of CHRYSE.

[G. S.]

COMMODUS, A.D. 180-193. The monstrous vices of the degenerate son of Marcus Aurelius brought with them at least one counterbalancing advantage. The persecutions which had been carried on in his father's reign ceased for a time in his. There was a lull throughout the empire. The popular feeling against the Christians, though it still continued, was no longer heightened and directed by the action of the Imperial government, and the result was a marked increase of numbers. Many of the rich and noble, with all their household and kindred, professed themselves Christians (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 21). Even in the emperor's palace, but it is uncertain whether as officers, or freedmen, or slaves, believers were to be found (Iren. *adv. Hæc.* iv. 30). Marcia, the favourite mistress of the emperor, is said by Dio Cassius (lxxii. 4) or Xiphilinus, writing in his name, to have used her influence with Commodus in their favour, and to have done them much good service. It is, of course, scarcely possible to think of one who lived as she did, as being herself a Christian, but the fact stated by Irenæus makes it possible that there may have been others in the imperial household who were so, and who were able to work through her instrumentality. The strange history of Callistus in the recently published *Refutation of all Heresies* attributed to Hippolytus (ix. 6) throws fresh light on Marcia's connexion with the Christian church at Rome. The epithet by which he describes her as a "God-loving woman" may be, as Dr. Wordsworth suggests, ironical; but the facts which follow it shew that she was in frequent communication even with the officers of the church. Callistus had been brought before Fuscianus, the prefect of the city, on the charge of disturbing a synagogue of the Jews, and was sentenced to hard labour in the mines of Sardinia. Marcia, wishing to do some good work, sent for Victor, a bishop of the church, and asked what Christians were suffering for their faith in Sardinia, and on receiving their names obtained from Commodus an order of release. The order was given to an eunuch, Hyacinthus, who carried it to Sardinia, and obtained the liberation of Callistus, as well as of the

others, alleging his own influence with Marcia as his warrant, though the name of Callistus had not been included in the list. The narrative clearly implies that Hyacinthus was a Christian. The remarkable name of one of the conspirators who with Marcia planned the assassination of the emperor, Eclectus, might almost suggest that there also there was some point of contact with the brotherhood which claimed it as peculiarly their own.

The story just given implies that some Christians had, as such, been condemned to exile; that persecutions, though less frequent, had not altogether ceased. One sufferer of the time takes his place in the list of martyrs. Apollonius, a Roman citizen of distinction, perhaps a senator, of high repute for philosophical culture, was accused before Perennius, the prefect of the city, by one of his own slaves. In accordance with an imperial edict sentencing informers, in such cases, to death even when the accused was found guilty, (may we trace Marcia's influence in this also?) the slave had his legs broken. Apollonius was brought before the senate, called upon for his defence, and so was able to deliver an elaborate *Apologia* for the faith which he professed. By what Eusebius speaks of as an ancient law (possibly the edict of Trajan) he was beheaded (*H. E.* v. 21).

[E. H. P.]

COMMUNION, HOLY. [EUCCHARIST.]

CONMAT (CONNATAN, CONNAT), V. A. of Kildare, Jan. 1. She appears among the prelates of Kildare on this day; but of her abbacy we know nothing beyond its close. She died abbess of Kildare in A.D. 590. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 5; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 629 a; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 24-5.)

[J. G.]

CONAID, a companion of St. Sampson. He is called by the French St. Mein, and is probably the same as Mevennius. He is said to have died A.D. 590, and his day was June 15 (Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Britt.* lib. xi. c. 28).

[C. H.]

CONAING. [CONANG.]

CONALL. In *Mart. Doneg.* there are seven Conalls, and Colgan (*Acta SS.* 367) says there are nine or ten in the Irish *Martyrologies*.

(1) Son of Aedh, of Cluain-dallain B. April 2. He was son of Aedh, son of Savan, of the race of Coelbadius, and succeeded his relation St. Cairpre of Cuil-raithin (Nov. 11), now Coleraine, as bishop there. But before he was bishop at Coleraine, he was abbat at the monastery of Cluain-dallain, now Clonallan, lying along Carlingford Bay and Newry river, in the county of Down. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 93; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 380 n. ¹⁰⁵; and *Acta SS.* 281 n. ¹¹; Reeves, *Ecll. Ant.* 114 n.)

(2) Abbat of Inis-Caeil, May 22. By Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 480 n. ¹⁰) he is cited among the descendants of Conall Gulban, and called son of Manius Coelius, son of Caitherius; he was much honoured in Tyrconnel, especially at his church of Inis-Caeil (now Iniskeel, an island off the west coast of the parish of Iniskeel and barony of Boylagh, Donegal), where Colgan says his fast was strictly observed even in his day. He may also be the St. Conall whose holy well, reilig or cemetery, and other antiquities at Bruckless, near Killybegs, on the north coast of Donegal Bay, are still held in honour. There was a panegyric

written upon him by St. Dallan Forgaill, the poet (Jan. 29), and this may enable us to fix his date as anterior to A.D. 594, as on or about that year St. Dallan was killed on the island of Inishkeel, and buried in St. Conall's church. He is said to have brought over from Rome, though there is good reason to believe that it was not promulgated for more than a century after his death, a curious law-tract or rule, still extant, entitled the *Cáin Domnaigh*, for the observance of Sunday as a day totally free from labour, with certain unavoidable exceptions. The Bearnan Chonail, or Gapped Bell of St. Conall, said to have been received from St. Patrick, has disappeared since the year 1844. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 204, cc. 8, 9, and notes; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* ii. 32-3; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4th ser. i. 466-70; Butler, *Lives of the SS.* v. 345-6.)

CONALL (3) Bishop. March 18. At this day Colgan (*Acta SS.* 632) gives a memoir of St. Conall, founder of the church of Kilconnell, near Aughrim, in the barony of Kilconnell, co. Galway. He was made bishop by St. Patrick, and afterwards he and St. Etchen (Feb. 11) negligently, and without St. Patrick's knowledge, ordained some persons who were unfit for the episcopate. For this they were severely reprov'd by St. Patrick, who prophesied that their churches would ever continue small, and the town of Kilconnell is an insignificant place to this day. He also offended his sister St. Attracta (Aug. 11), through his excessive fear lest any woman should approach his monastery. But St. Conall could not have been brother of St. Attracta and contemporary of St. Patrick, and Lanigan (*Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 429) doubts the connexion with St. Patrick, though the story comes through Ussher (*Ecccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 463).

(4) There is a St. Conall or Connell in Scotland, who gives his name to Kirkconnell, a parish in Nithsdale, co. Dumfries, and whom it seems impossible to identify. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 311.) [J. G.]

CONAMHAIL (CONAIN), son of Failbhe, abbat of Hy. Sept. 11. He was of the race of Colla Uais, and therefore one of the Orlais. He was the first abbat of Hy, or Iona, that was not of the race of the founder, and was the last under whom the Scotie usage regarding Easter prevailed. He succeeded St. Adamnan (Sept. 23) A.D. 704, and died A.D. 710 (Ussher, *Ecccl. Ant.* c. 15, wks. vi. 245, and Ind. Chr. A.D. 710, calling him "Conain"), but by the Annalists Dunchad is said to have been holding the "principatum lae" in A.D. 707. To account for this Reeves (*Adamnan*, 379) supposes that St. Dunchad either administered the affairs of the society, as a tanist-abbat, in consequence of St. Conamhail's age or infirmity, or perhaps headed a schism possibly on the Paschal question. (Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 150, 153; Grub, *Ecccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 113-4; *Four Must.* by O'Donov. i. 309.) [J. G.]

CONAN, fifth of the metropolitan bishops of London in the British period. (Jocelin of Furness, given in Ussher, *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* cap. v., Works, ed. 1847, t. v. p. 88; Godwin, *Praesul.* 170; Le Neve, *Fasti*, ii. 273; Stubbs, *Regist.* 152.) [C. H.]

CONAN was a common Irish name, and assumed several forms, as Cona, Conan, Conna, Connan, and with the affectionate or honorific prefixes *Do* or *Da* and *Mo*, Dachonna, Mochonna. In *Tr. Thaum.* 178 n. ¹¹⁵, Colgan gives a long list of saints bearing these names, while in *Acta SS.* 60 n. ¹, he adds largely to the list of nominal variations.

(1) Jan. 13. In the Irish calendars on this day there are Mochonna, bishop of Leamhchoill (now perhaps one of the Loughills, co. Kilkenny) and Mochonna of Inis-Patraig. Of the latter, as Connanus bishop, Colgan attempts to give a memoir, but mixes up the notice of him with what belongs to the bishop of Mann [CONAN (3)], and supposes that Inis-patrick or Inis-patraig is only another name for Mann. But Conna, here called Mochonna, is more likely to have lived on the island of Inis-Patrick, near Skerries, off the coast of Dublin. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 59-60; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, 55; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 303-7; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 191, 195, 447; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 15.)

(2) Dil. of Eas-ruaidh, March 8. He was son of Tighernach, son of Fergus, of the race of Connall Gulban, and nearly related to St. Columba. Besides Conan, he is called Conna, Connan, Conda, Mochonda, and he came to be generally and affectionately known as Conan dil, "Connanus dilectus." By St. Aengus he is called "St. Conanus Dil, athleta gloriosus." He had three brothers, St. Begbille (Oct. 12), St. Colman (Jan. 13), and St. Cuan Caoin (March 2). He flourished about the end of the 6th century, and gathering a number of disciples around him, ruled over a monastery which was probably of his own foundation, at Cnodain, on the north bank of the river Erne, near Easruaidh (now Assaroe, or the Salmon Leap, on the Erne, at Ballyshannon): he probably was also a bishop, and is numbered among the disciples of St. Columba. Maguir says he rests either at Easruaidh or at Easmacneire (now Assylin, near the town of Boyle, in the county of Roscommon). (Memoir in Colgan, *Acta SS.* 563, Index Chron. A.D. 596, and *Tr. Thaum.* 480 n. ¹, 489 n. ²²; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 222, 226; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 89.)

(3) Bishop of Sodor or Mann, Jan. 26. Though Colgan (*Acta SS.* 59-60) has identified Conan or Mochonna of Inis-Patrick with Conan, bishop of Mann, [CONAN (1)], yet they appear to have been different persons. From what we can gather in the Scotch hagiographies, St. Conan was bishop in Mann, or ancient Ebena, in the beginning of the 7th century, and his influence extended through the Hebrides and great part of Scotland. He is said to have been tutor to St. Fiace, Ferquhard, and Donualdus, sons of Eoghan IV. king of Scotland, but this is mere legend. He died about A.D. 648, and is honoured in the Hebrides, Perthshire, and Forfarshire. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 446-9; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, i. 377-8; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 76; Boece, *Hist. Scot.* ix. cc. 19, 20; Chambers, *Book of Days*, i. 165; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 307-8; Russel's Keith, *Cat. Scot. Bps.* 296.)

(4) Of Aeg, Jan. 12. O'Hanlon suggests that St. Conan of Aeg, or Egg, may have given his name to the neighbouring island of Canna, among the Hebrides, but beyond the mention of the name and dedication in the calendars there is nothing known of this saint of St. Donnan's

island of Egg (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 308; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 180-1).

[J. G.]

CONANG (CONAING), son of Lucunan, Sept. 23. This person is identified with Conainguus O'Daithil, coarb of St. Ailbhe (Sept. 12) of Emly, and called archbishop in the *Life of Mochoemocus* (March 13). If this identification is correct he died in A.D. 661 (*Ann. Tigh., Four Masters*). In the *Life of St. Molagga* (Jan. 20) there is mention made of St. Conaing O'Daithil as being one of the sureties given to St. Molagga by king Caius of Munster, that he would stand to his promises of granting certain immunities and privileges to the church (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 148, c. 19, 150 n. ²⁷, 217 n. ²⁹; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 34, 35).

[J. G.]

CONANTIUS, a Spanish bishop of the 7th century. His see was Pallentia (Palencia in Old Castile) of which he was bishop for more than thirty years, from the reign of the Visigothic king Gondemar, A.D. 610, to that of Sisenand, A.D. 636. He subscribed the decrees of the 4th, 5th, and 6th councils of Toledo. His appearance is described as corresponding in gravity to the seriousness of his character and the weight of his judgment. His eloquence was ready and pleasing; his devotion to his ecclesiastical duties unceasing. He was acquainted with ecclesiastical music, and added many new melodies to the repertory of the church. He was the author of a book of discourses on the Psalms, "de omnium proprietate Psalmorum." (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 582; *Patrolog. xvi.* 203; Hildefontus *Uletanus de Vir. Illust.* xi.)

[E. V.]

CONANUS (*Chron. Monast. de Abingd.* ed. Stevenson, ii. 272, 273), second abbat of Abingdon. [CUMANUS.]

[C. H.]

CONCEPTION, THE MIRACULOUS. [MARIOLATRY.]

CONCHENN. [COINCHENN.]

CONCORDIUS. [CORDIUS.]

(2) Deacon of the church of Arles, present at the election of Hilarus to the see of Rome, A.D. 461. He apprised Leontius, bishop of Arles, of the succession, as we know from the letter of Leontius to pope Hilarus. (*Patrol. Lat.* lviii. p. 22; Ceillier, x. 336.)

[W. M. S.]

(3) Presbyter, suffered martyrdom at Spoleum in the time of the Emperor Antoninus; while in prison consoled by an angelic visitation; commemorated Jan. 1 (Usuard, *Mart.* and *Obs.*).

[C. H.]

(4) Bishop of Arles (A.D. 374—circ. 409), canonised. One of the twenty-two or thirty bishops present at the first council of Valence (A.D. 374). One of the decrees of this council was that those ecclesiastics who in order to rid themselves of the burden of office, accused themselves of mortal sin, should be taken at their word. Under this canon came Acceptus, bishop of Frejus. Concordius defended him in the council. (Tom. i. *Concil. Hard.* p. 798; Tillemont, tom. viii. *Hist. Eccl.* p. 551-3; Ceillier, iv. 600.)

[W. M. S.]

CONCUPISCENCE, in ecclesiastical Latin: viz. in the sense put upon it by St. Augustine in controversy with the Pelagians, not desire simply,

but irregular, inordinate, lawless, rebellious desire: lust in every sense, and not merely sexual. In a word, the moral malady produced in man by sin: and since then, indissolubly linked to the manner of his procreation: and never eradicable, though less prominent, and less irrepressible in all his other acts, mental as well as bodily, through life. But it is stripped of its guilt *ipso facto*, by having the merits of Christ applied to it, and may be kept under perfect control afterwards through life by His grace. Thus it is not sin absolutely, though the effect of sin, and exciting to sin again: just as rebellion begets anarchy, and is fomented by it in turn. Man no sooner disobeyed his Maker, than his passions disobeyed him, making him ever afterwards their slave, to be set free by Christ alone. Or, to give this in his own words, "Natura quippe hominis primitus inculcata, et sine ullo vitio creata est. Natura verò ista hominis, quâ unusquisque ex Adam nascitur, jam medico indiget, quia sana non est. Deus autem qui dives est in misericordiâ, cum essemus mortui delictis, convificavit nos Christo cujus gratiâ sumus salvi (*De Nat. et Grat.* c. 3). Porro autem, si interrogetur illa carnis concupiscentia, quâ pudenda facta sunt, quae prius pudenda non fuerant, nonne respondebit, se in membris hominis post peccatum esse coepisse? Et ideo legem peccati verbis Apostolicis nuncupatum, quod hominem sibi subditum fecerit, quia Deo suo subditus esse noluit: seque esse, de quâ et primi conjugati tunc erubuerunt, quando pudenda texerunt: et nunc omnes erubescunt, quando ad concumbendum secreta conquirunt, neque hujus operis testes audent habere vel filios quos inde genuerunt (*De Nupt. et Concup.* c. 22) . . . Servatum est igitur, ut ex viro et muliere, id est, per illam corporum commixtionem, nemo videatur expers esse delicti." . . . as he quotes further on from St. Ambrose (c. 35). "Peccatum autem, inde a nascentibus trahitur, non ad nuptias pertinet, sed ad malum quod accidit hominibus, quorum conjunctione sunt nuptiae (*ib.* ii. 26) . . . Sic autem vocatur peccatum, quia peccato facta est: cum jam in regeneratis non sit ipsa peccatum: sicut vocatur lingua locutio quam facit lingua: et manus vocatur scriptura, quam facit manus. Itemque sic vocatur peccatum, quia peccatum, si vincit, facit: sicut vocatur frigus pigrum, non quod a pigris fiat, sed quod pigros faciat (*ib.* i. 23). . . Si autem quaeritur, quomodo ista concupiscentia carnis maneat in regenerato, in quo universorum facta est remissio peccatorum . . . ad haec respondetur, dimitti concupiscentiam carnis in baptismo, non ut non sit, sed ut in peccatum non imputetur . . . quae tamen concupiscentia quotidie minuitur in proficientibus et continentibus . . . donec sanetur omnis infirmitas nostra, proficiente renovatione interioris hominis de die in diem, cum exterior induerit incorruptionem" (*ib.* 25) . . . They who cannot understand, how lust should remain in us, when its guilt is gone, should ask themselves how it is, that of sins which were committed by us ages ago the guilt remains, up to the day of its being remitted, in full force (*ib.* 26). Finally, lust remains in us, for two reasons:—1. that we may accomplish our moral probation in fighting against it here and 2. be persuaded of our need of the grace of God to fight against it with success. "Reatus ejus

regeneratione solutus est, conflictus ejus ad agonem relictus est. Malum est, clarum est. Non viribus nostrae voluntatis . . . huic obsistimus, nisi divinitus adjuvemur. Debellandum hoc malum est, non negandum: vincendum est, non defendendum. Postremo, si ei consentis, malum agnosce peccando: si ei resistis, malum agnosce pugnando" (C. Julian, *Op. Imp.* i. 72.) Such is his luminous paraphrase of the teaching of St. Paul on this head (Rom. v. vii.) long since become the basis of Christian anthropology by general consent, though its elucidation has been almost entirely confined to the West. Witness the volumes that have been written on the latter half of the second book of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, drawn in each case from St. Augustine. The attention given to these subjects in the East may be measured by the length of the single chapter in the corresponding work of St. John Damascene, which refers to them in any way (*De Orthod. Fid.* iv. 22). [E. S. Ff.]

CONDA. [CONNA.]

CONDEDUS, ST., presbyter and recluse, connected with Fontenelle. Called also Condelus, Condedes, Candidus, but his genuine name was Condedus. He was a native of Great Britain, but migrated into Gaul in the time of Theodoricus, son of Clovis, about A.D. 511. After crossing the Channel, he took up his abode in the neighbourhood of Fontana St. Walarici (St. Valerien-Caux, or more probably St. Valeri-sur-Somme), where he led a solitary life. Then hearing of the fame of St. Lambert and the brothers of the monastery of Fontenelle, he visited them. He then sailed to an island called Belcinaca, in the Seine, and took up his abode there. It was in the forest of Arles, called in the vernacular *La forest de Bretonne*, because Condedus, a Briton, inhabited it. There he was visited, by king Theoderic, who used to hunt in the forest. Theoderic treated him with much honour, and made the island over to him. In that island Condedus built two churches, those of the Virgin Mary and SS. Peter and Paul, in the latter of which there was probably an oratory dedicated to St. Walaricus. Condedus was buried in the church of SS. Peter and Paul, but his body was afterwards translated to the monastery of Fontenelle, and placed in the church of St. Peter, where it was put in the same place with the body of St. Errembert (A.D. 1027).

EPITAPH ON CONDEDUS IN FONTENELLE.

"Extitit in Gallis meritis dignissimus olim,
Cujus membra sacra hic tumulata jacent;
Nomine Condedus, virtutum flore coruscus,
Pro quibus in coelis nunc viget eximius.
Qui, Theodorico Francorum scepra regente,
Rura Britannorum transvena deseruit.
Gallorumque adiit partes, lux Christicolarum
Insula nunc Sequanae, quae Belcinacca vocatur,
Curriculis multis pavit et hinc sepelit.
Cujus sacratos cineres post tempora longa
Egregio cultu turba sacra tult;
Fontanellensi tumulans in cespite pulchro.
Nunc ibi poscentes muneribus cumulat."

Condedus is commemorated on the 21st of October. The date of his death is uncertain; but Heuschenius places it in the year 673, Mabillon in 683 (*AA. SS. Boll.* Oct. ix. pp. 351-358; Le

Cointe, *Ann. Ecol. Franc.* tom. ii. pp. 58, 316; Migne, *Encycl. Théol.* xl. p. 645). [D. R. J.]

CONDIDAN, British king, slain in battle by the West Saxons, A.D. 577, at Deorham (A. S. C. ad an.). [C. H.]

CONDLAEDH. [CONLAED.]

CONFESSION, as a church ordinance, is, in some form or other, as old as St. James: and it is even doubtful whether the last six verses of his epistle, which in our Authorised Version are disjointed, from being referred to the bodily "sick" in part (v. 14-20), should not all be understood of the penitential discipline of his day. St. Chrysostom at all events understood them so (*De Sacerd.* iii. 6) "God has given more power to priests than parents," he says: "the difference between them being as great as that between the life now, and the life to come. For the latter cannot ward off either death or even disease from their children; but the former frequently succeed in saving the soul that is diseased (*καρμινουσαν*) and about to die: in some cases assuaging its pain: in others securing that it should never fall—and that, not merely by teaching and admonishing, but by the power of prayer: nor in regeneration only, but in virtue of their prerogative to condone sins in after life. For as the apostle says: 'Infirmitatibus in vobis? advocet presbyteros ecclesiae, et orent super eo . . . et si peccata fecerit, remittentur ei.'" This passage thus construed (and indeed the clause *ἀσθενεῖ τις*, might almost seem to have been suggested by 2 Cor. xii. 29-30, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 22: though of course, St. John xi. 2, countenances the A.V.) the next verse (16) comes with redoubled emphasis: "Confess your sins one to another" and then the Greek verb *ἐξομολογεῖσθε* is directly suggestive of the "vox solemnis" for confession in primitive times, "exomologesis." Now, this word, Albespinus has shewn incontestably, was not a simple, but a complex term: and included the whole discipline which penitents had, in those days, to go through before they were restored: of which public confession in the face of the whole church formed the last act. Further, this was at first allowed but once in a lifetime, so that it was never performed by the same person twice. (*Observat.* ii. 26: and 5-7.) Tertullian, in his treatise on penance, which, like that on baptism, has become classical, accounts in the same breath for its origin, and goes dogmatically through its component parts: making, in principle, the counterpart of conversion as taught now. As concupiscence is not extinguished by baptism though its guilt is cancelled, the enemy of souls feels he has just one chance left him of ruining man in spite of the victory which has been won for him by Christ. "Itaque observat, oppugnat, obsidet: si qua possit aut oculos concupiscentiæ carnali ferire, aut animum illecebris saecularibus irretire, aut fidem terrenae potestatis formidine evertere, aut a viâ certâ perversis traditionibus detorquere: non scandalis non tentationibus deficit. Haec igitur venena ejus providens Deus . . . collocavit in vestibulo poenitentiam secundam, quae pulsantibus patefaciat: sed jam semel, quia jam secundo: sed amplius nunquam, quia proxime frustra" (c. 7). Thus penance, he says in another place, (c. 4), is life, as it stands between us and death.

Lay hold of it, cling to it: and like the plank to him who has been shipwrecked, it will bring you safe to port. He who has appointed to punish for sin, has promised forgiveness through penance. If you doubt this, hear what the Spirit saith to the churches. "Omnes ad poenitentiam commonet, sub comminationibus quidem. Non comminaretur autem non poenitenti, si non ignosceret poenitentem." (c. 8). What mean those lessons given in the parables of our Lord? That a woman lost a piece of silver, and sought it again, and found it, and called her friends to rejoice with her, is it not an emblem of the restored sinner? . . . And whom are we to understand by the father of the prodigal son? Verily it is God: none so much a father, none more devoted. He will receive you, his own son, because you have returned, though you have wasted what you had from him, though you have returned naked: He will even rejoice more over your return, than over another that has never strayed. But this, on condition of your repenting heartily . . . on condition of your abandoning the swine that have been your companions: on condition of your returning to your offended Father, and saying, "Father, I have sinned, I am no more worthy to be called thy son." Confession of sins lightens their burden, as much as concealment of them aggravates it. For confession is the act of one who would make satisfaction for them, but concealment, of one who continues as hardened as ever (c. 8). "Hujus igitur poenitentiae secundae et unius, quanto in arto negotium est, tanto operosior probatio est, ut non solâ conscientia praeferatur, sed aliquo etiam actu administretur. Is actus, qui magis Graeco vocabulo exprimitur et frequentatur, exomologesis est: quâ delictum Domino nostrum confitemur, non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur, confessione poenitentia nascitur, poenitentia Deus mitigatur. Itaque exomologesis prosternendi et humiliandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens misericordiae illicem . . . In quantum non peperceris tibi, in tantum tibi Deus, crede, parcat." (c. 9). The objection made to all this, he continues, is its publicity. People shrink from such a publication of themselves as it entails, thinking of their shame more, than of the saving of their souls. Thus, from a false modesty which leads them to conceal their ailments, they throw away their chance of being cured. "Quid consortes casuum tuorum, ut plausores, fugis. Non potest corpus de unius membri vexatione laetum agere; condeat universum, et ad remedium collabere necesse est. In uno et altero ecclesia est, ecclesia vero Christus. Ergo cum te ad fratrum genua protendis, Christum contractas, Christum exoras. Aequae illi, cum super te lacrimas agunt Christus patitur, Christus Patrem deprecatur . . . Grande plane elemosumentum verecundiae occultatio delicti pollicetur . . . An melius est damnatum latere, quam palam absolvi?" (c. 10). . . . Is not this, clearly, the exomologesis which St. James enjoins, when he says: "Confess your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed"? The satisfaction of which Tertullian speaks consisted in the outward self-chastisement which every penitent underwent in public to manifest his contrition: his confession, addressed to the presbyters, was heard by all present, his absolution consisted in the prayer

offered for him by them, in which all the rest joined. The 9th c. of the 8th book of the *Apostolical Constitutions* contains a prayer of this kind, which the following passage from St. Ambrose will interpret in the sense put upon it by contemporaries. "When our Lord said 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them,' He shewed it was by the Holy Ghost that sins are condoned. Men exhibit their ministry, but exercise no direct power at all, for the remission of sins. They remit them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not their own. They ask, Divinity grants; they officiate, heaven confers the gifts" (*De Spir. S.* iii. 18.) St. Ambrose likewise testifies to the course pursued in the fourth century being identical with what Tertullian attributes to the second. "They are deservedly censured," he says, in his own work on the subject, "who think that penance may be performed again and again, as making too free with Christ. For did they perform it sincerely, they would not consider it could ever be repeated, any more than baptism. Quia sicut unum baptismum, ita una poenitentia. True, penance must be performed in public, and we must repent of sin daily; but in the latter case we have to do with lighter offences, in the former with graver" (*De Poen.* ii. 10). For the first seven or eight centuries, when recourse was had to priest or bishop apart, it was with reference to this public penance. Origen again and again recommends it as a means: "pronuntiare peccatum = in publicum proferre," being the end in view (*in Levit. Hom.* iii. 4. *Comp. Homil.* ii. 6, *in Psalm.* xxxvii.). The story told by Socrates (v. 19) and Sozomen (vii. 16) of the abolition of penitentiary presbyters at Constantinople points the same way; public penance, which had dictated their appointment, being shaken in practice considerably by their removal. Trivial sins of daily commission, of course, neither excluded from communion, nor were to be confessed in this way. The repeating of the Lord's Prayer daily was confession enough in their case. "Delet omnino haec oratio minima et quotidiana peccata," says St. Augustine (*Enchir.* § 71). The belief of the church from the earliest times had been, that sin acts on the soul like poison, and that confession, in some form or other, is its precipitant. "Consider what the Scripture teaches us," says Origen, "that we must not conceal sin within our breast. For just as people who have taken food that has disagreed with them and are oppressed with indigestion, are relieved by vomiting, so they who have committed sin if they conceal and retain it are diseased inwardly: but on becoming their own accusers, and confessing their sin, they vomit it up as it were, and with it the cause of their malady" (*on Ps.* 37, as before). Origen said this in counselling preliminary confession of sins to a priest. "If thou drawest back from confession," says Tertullian, in enlarging on the obligation of public penance, "consider in thine heart that hell-fire, which confession shall quench for thee, and first imagine to thyself the greatness of the punishment, that thou mayest not doubt concerning the adoption of the remedy" (*De Poen.* c. 12). Possibly, the last verse of the epistle of St. James may have suggested this. "How can you expect to be forgiven your sins," asks St.

Chrysostom: "never having confessed them? . . . It is not enough to call ourselves sinners in general: we must recall our sins, and specify them one by one." But then he adds: "I am not saying, that you are to make a parade of yourself, or accuse yourself before others: but I exhort you, in the words of the Psalmist, to commit your way unto the Lord: confess them before God, confess your sins to your judge, praying if not with the tongue, at least with the memory: and thus ask to be forgiven" (*Hom. xxxi. 3. in Heb. xii.*). Confession to God alone was a favourite theme with St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine suggests, in a passage which may be seen in Bingham at length (xviii. 3. 3: or *Ep. cliii. 7, ad Maced. ed. Ben.*) it had this advantage over public penance, that it could be repeated indefinitely. Besides: "What have I to do with men," as he says elsewhere, "that they should hear my confessions as though they would heal all my weaknesses . . . Again, how know they, when they hear from myself about myself whether what I tell them is true?" (*Confess. x. 3*). Then, in another place, he has this further question to ask about confession to God. "When Thou hearest my confession O Lord, Who hast eternity, can You be supposed ignorant of what I tell You or a spectator in time of what is done in time? To what purpose then, should I trouble You with so long a tale? Not certainly, that You should learn it through me! But I quicken my affection for Thee, by confessing to Thee all my wretchedness, and all Thy loving kindness towards me, to the end that Thou mayest complete my deliverance" (*ib. xi. 1*). His own work, in which this passage occurs, is a noble illustration, all through, of the principle which is here laid down. Daille's work on auricular confession threw a flood of light on the subject in general, which Albespinus (*Observat. ii. 1 and sqq.*) Bingham, *Ant. xviii. 3 and sqq.*) Marshall (*Penit. Discipl. c. 2*) and others have turned to good account: and Morinus (*Comment. de Discipl. Poen. ii. et sqq.*) and others have been forced to acknowledge. Comp. notes K, L, and M, pp. 369-408 to the Oxford Tr. of Tertullian, where this is learnedly summarised. [E. S. Ff.]

CONFESSOR. [*Dict. Christ. Ant.*; see also CYPRIAN in this Dict.]

CONFIRMATION. Confirmation anciently was a part of baptism, or rather its completion, and this it is, according to the *Greek rite*, still—far from being a distinct ordinance. It was administered with imposition of hands and prayer—in the first instance by the apostles themselves, afterwards by their representatives and successors, the bishops—and, so far, just as it is administered in the church of England at present. In other respects it has undergone many changes. It was not anciently called by the name it has borne so long in the West, though this was probably borrowed from the title given to it in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (iii. 17)—*Βεβαίωσις τῆς δόξης*—which was, in turn, founded on 2 Cor. i. 21, in common with its earlier name, and the no less early ceremonial, with which it was administered at the conclusion of baptism, for many centuries, in the East and West alike, viz. the "sealing," or "anointing with chrism." For its ritualistic developments, indeed, con-

sidered in themselves, see the *Dict. of Antiq. s. v.* It is only their connexion with dogma that concerns us here.

First, then, our Lord, "*having been baptized*," and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove, upon Him," as St. Luke says (iii. 21). Similarly, "when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (*Acts viii. 14*). There was a medium in both cases, and a clear interval after baptism in both cases; but in His case the medium was prayer alone made by Himself, and the interval was next to none. In the other, the interval was of days or weeks, and the medium prayer made by His apostles, followed by the laying on of their hands. The thing bestowed in each case was the Holy Ghost; and this, in the second case, its recipients are distinctly said *not* to have received before—"having," in the words of the inspired writer, "only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," as yet. A similar instance being recorded Acts xix. 6, we may assume that such was the rule then. That the Holy Ghost should have fallen upon the first Gentile converts while St. Peter was preaching to them, and before they were baptized at all, indirectly witnesses to it, both from their having been baptized the next moment and from their having been baptized in the same name (*ib. x. 44*).

Thus the rule which prevailed in the apostolic age seems to have been that baptism was administered in the name of the Lord Jesus, yet that the Holy Ghost was not bestowed in baptism on those who were so baptized, but conveyed to them subsequently by a distinct act, which could only be performed by the apostles themselves, and had for its matter imposition of hands, and for its form prayer—prayer, of course, for the gift it was designed to convey. It was with reference to this gift, clearly, that St. Paul wrote of the Giver: "Now He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us is God" (2 Cor. i. 21)—and St. John, of its recipients: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things" (1 John ii. 20). The same unction which Christ had received after His baptism, and from which He derived His name, had been bestowed upon them after their baptism, and was implied in their name no less. Again, the effects it produced in them extended to the power of working miracles similar to His, in addition to that of regenerating their inner man. That such was the rule rather than the exception, may be inferred, not only from the passages of the Acts already quoted, but from 1 Cor. xii. xiv.; otherwise St. Paul must be held to have expended three whole chapters on non-existing phenomena. Further, when he speaks of the "doctrine of laying on of hands," in his Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 2), the context shews it must have been the laying on of hands *after baptism* which was uppermost in his mind then.

Subsequently to the apostolic age, this laying on of hands was viewed as a complement of baptism no less, and maintained as a prerogative of their successors. They allowed others to baptize

for them, as the apostles had done. As the apostles had done, they retained this, its appendix, in their own hands, to be administered sooner or later, at their convenience. Yet it was not the self-same thing in their hands that it had been in the hands of the apostles, nor was it performed by them with the same ceremonial either of form or matter, as time went on. It was not the self-same thing in their hands, for two reasons: 1, as soon as baptism began to be administered in the name of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost was held, and held scripturally, to be conveyed, and to confer regeneration and sanctification in the baptismal act itself, whether confirmation followed or not; and 2, the effects produced by the laying on of hands subsequently were confined in general to the strengthening and expanding of those graces which had been received in baptism, instead of including the power of working miracles in general as well. It was not performed with the same ceremonial; for, in process of time, there was less of prayer than of ceremony; less of imposition of hands than of chrism; less of a supplement to baptism in its dogmatic aspect than a distinct sacrament. Thus it may be said to have gained in theological importance in proportion as it decreased in intrinsic value. Whether the narrowing of its effects brought about its ceremonial changes, or was brought about by them, it may be hard to decide: it is a simple fact that both commenced almost simultaneously, and have gone together ever since. We can no more define when baptism began to be administered in the name of the Trinity than when chrism began to be used in connexion with it. Of course, so far as there was a Divine command for the one, and no command even of the church for the other, they must always stand on a different footing. It is a pure question of history which commenced first; and of this the New Testament affords no clue. The only baptisms recorded in the New Testament are said to have been administered in the name of the Lord or the Lord Jesus (see the Art. on BAPTISM). St. James bids "the elders of the church pray over the sick, anointing him with oil" (v. 14); but there is no proof of his having bade them do so likewise by the newly baptized. But by the end of the 2nd century the universal practice was to administer baptism in the name of the Trinity, and for the bishop to anoint all the newly baptized—infants as well as adults—with chrism. There was even an anointing which took place before baptism, but it is not this with which we are concerned here. What, it may be asked, could have suggested the introduction of chrism thus universally, yet thus absolutely, without positive command of any kind, into the baptismal rite?

The answer is, plainly, that according to Roman, as well as Eastern notions, to make the body perfectly clean, it was necessary that it should be not only washed but anointed. No baths were complete without their ἀλειπτήριον or unguentarium. (On this, see *Dict. of Rom. and Greek Ant.* s. v.) It was the same at the "gymnasium" or "palaestra," when people went into special training as athletes. Anointing, under both aspects, was so relevant to the Christian profession that St. Theophilus asks his friend Autolyceus (i. 12), "Think you, that the name Christian is a term of reproach? Do you

not know that whatever is anointed, instead of being contemptible is both pleasant and trustworthy? What vessel, for instance, can be pronounced fit for sea till it has been anointed? What house or castle, if it has not been anointed, is weather-proof? What man, either entering upon this life, or coming forward as an athlete, is not anointed? What work of art, what ornament, has any finish, that has not been anointed and polished? Even the air we breathe is in some sort anointed with light and life—and are you averse to being anointed with the oil of God? It is because we are anointed with the oil of God that we are called Christians."

In general, of course, the fathers derive the word Christian from Christ; still Christ Himself owed His name to His having been anointed, and "anointed with the Holy Ghost," as St. Peter says (Acts x. 38). There were two causes, therefore, that prompted the introduction of chrism into the baptismal rite: 1, the current custom of anointing, after washing, the body, for cleansing purposes; and 2, the unction, as the apostles had phrased it, of the Holy Ghost bestowed on every believer at the font. This it was which the material unction or chrism was intended to symbolise; and this was the reason of its administration having been annexed to the prayer and imposition of hands with which the Holy Ghost had been originally conveyed by the apostles, and of its consecration being reserved so jealously to their successors. This is, however, far from proving that they authorised it, or from disproving that it was not an unauthorised, and has not been an unprofitable, innovation on what they practised. St. Basil, in short, meets us half-way when he says: "We bless the water with which we baptize and the oil with which we anoint, and even him who is baptized in addition. But what is the scriptural authority for either? Is it not rather secret and silent tradition? Certainly, the custom of anointing with oil was not learnt from any written document whatsoever" (*De Sp. S.* l. 66). It is true that Tertullian speaks of it (*De Bapt.* c. 7) as belonging to the ritual of his day; but it is also true that, among the earlier works in which we hear most about it are those published under fictitious names, such as the False Decretals, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. St. Cyril of Jerusalem devoted a whole lecture to its elucidation (Cat. xxi. *De Sacro Chrismate*), thus dissociating it in appearance from baptism, and giving colour to the notion that he looked upon it as a distinct sacrament. Again, he speaks of it in a way that few would speak now. "Be careful," he says, "not to hold that chrism cheap: for, as the bread of the eucharist, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer common bread, but Christ's Body, so that holy chrism is no longer common after invocation, but the gift of Christ and of the Holy Ghost: for, by the presence of His divinity, it is invested with efficacy and while the body is anointed with it visibly the soul is sanctified with the holy and life-giving Spirit" (l. 3). And the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, similarly, of the prayer with which, according to him, it was to be administered: that, "unless some such prayer is made for every baptized person, he who is baptized goes down into the water, like the Jews, and is merely

cleansed from the filth of the body, not that of the soul" (vii. 44). These views were improved upon in the middle ages, and were current much later. As late as A.D. 1666 we find a Greek metropolitan, who had been educated at Rome, telling a synod in Moscow that "the unction with chrism gives the illapse of the Holy Ghost" (Paisius, *Hist.* iii. 10)—a thing which scripture is careful not to assert even of the laying on of hands by the apostles themselves. It is true that the author of the Constitutions explains his meaning in an earlier chapter (vii. 22), where his language had been equally strong of the unction before baptism. "You first anoint him with oil," he says, "baptizing him with water next, and signing him with chrism in conclusion; so that the anointing with oil may be a *partaking of the Holy Ghost*: the water—symbolical of his death: the chrism—a seal of his engagements. But should there be neither oil nor chrism at hand, water will suffice for the anointing and for the sealing, as well as for the token of His death." And this, again, is carried a step further by the Council of Elvira, A.D. 305, which says: "that if any baptized person die before being blessed by the bishop, he may be justified by the faith with which he believed" (can. 77). But the administration of chrism being reserved to the episcopal order, there was always a tendency to make the most of it, even when it was administered at the same time with baptism. A deed, it was said, might be copied out by any scribe, but to be valid, it must be signed by the authority giving it force (S. Thom. pt. iii. q. 72, art. 11). And this was one of the reasons urged by St. Cyprian and his colleagues in proof that heretical baptism could not be valid. "It is necessary," say they, "that he who has been baptized should be anointed; that, having received the chrism, he may be the anointed of God, and have the grace of Christ within him. But one that has neither church nor altar cannot consecrate the material oil. . . . Heretics, therefore, cannot possess the spiritual unction either, as it is certain that they can neither consecrate the oil nor administer the eucharist" (*Ep.* 70 ad Januar.). In another place, referring to Acts viii. 14-17, but without adverting to the difference of the baptismal formula *then* in use, he says: "Which custom is now observed amongst ourselves, that they who are baptized in the church should be presented to the heads of the church, that by our prayer and imposition of hands they may obtain the Holy Ghost and be consummated with the seal of the Lord" (*Ep.* 73 ad Jul.). As though the Holy Ghost was not regularly conveyed to the baptized of his own days in the baptismal act. Similarly, St. Cornelius doubted whether Novatus could have received the Holy Ghost, because, though baptized, he had not been episcopally confirmed (Euseb. *E. H.* vi. 43), and St. Augustine was ready to agree with St. Cyprian, that "remission of sins" was not to be had from heretics, though he maintained against him that baptism was (*De Bapt. c. Don.* v. 22). In another place, he says: "What our ancestors meant by maintaining that the *Holy Ghost is given by imposition of hands in the Catholic church alone*, was nothing more than what the apostle says: 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given us,'

For this love they have not who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic church, and hence, though they speak with the tongues of men and angels, and know all mysteries and all knowledge . . . it profits them nothing. For the love of God they have not who love not the unity of the church. And thus it is quite intelligible that it should be said with truth that the Holy Ghost is *not given but* in the Catholic church. For the Holy Ghost is not now attested by outward and visible miracles to be given by imposition of hands as He was once, to encourage faith in its infancy and enlarge the church on its being first planted. For who now expects that they on whom hands are laid for the receiving of the Holy Ghost should, on a sudden, begin to speak with tongues? But the love of God is understood to be breathed into their hearts secretly and invisibly through the bond of peace, that they may be able to say: It is 'shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us'" (ib. iii. 16).

Finally, when it had been decreed by the council of Laodicea that "those who were baptized should afterwards be anointed with the heavenly chrism, to be partakers of the kingdom of Christ" (can. 48), and by the second general council (can. 7), that heretics, whose baptism was admitted, "should, on coming over to the church, be received by sealing them with the sacred unction on the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears," and saying "the seal of the Holy Ghost;" in other words, with the ceremonial of confirmation, it was practically ruled that the road to church-membership lay in the unction with chrism, and in that alone; also that baptism without it was incomplete where it could be had. Again, from its connexion with baptism, it was sometimes called a sacrament; or, rather, baptism was occasionally spoken of as a two-fold or a three-fold sacrament, from the ceremonies attendant on it. St. Cyprian, for instance, referring to St. John iii. 5, says: "Imposition of hands is not sufficient for the receiving of the Holy Ghost unless the baptism of the church is received also. For then may persons become fully sanctified when they are born of each sacrament" (*Ep.* 72 ad Steph.). And St. Pacian: "These things cannot be completed otherwise than by the sacrament of water, of the chrism, and of the priest" (*De Bapt.* c. 6). And the so-called Areopagite, in his exaggerated style: "Moreover, the chrism, with its perfecting unction, bestows on him who has been initiated in the sacred mystery of regeneration, the indwelling of the Divine Spirit—symbolising, I presume, that the Holy Spirit is supplied to us by Him, Who, by the same Spirit, was sanctified for us, as man without ceasing to be God" (*Ecol. Hier.* iv. 11). However, as long as it continued to be administered at the same time with baptism, it was never practically separated in idea from baptism, or placed on a basis of its own. And, owing to circumstances, infant baptism had not by any means the effect of dissociating it from baptism formerly, that we might be disposed to think now. For, in the first place, infants had the Eucharist administered to them for many centuries, in common with adults, as soon as they had been baptized. In the next place, baptisms came to be restricted, in general, to the mother-church, and to the festivals of Easter,

Pentecost, and Epiphany, when the bishop was almost sure to be there. Everybody was thus ordinarily baptized, confirmed, and communicated on the same day. "In after ages," says Mr. Palmer, "when baptisms were administered in other churches besides the cathedral, and the presbyters and deacons received a commission from their bishops to administer this sacrament, it became necessary either to disjoin confirmation from baptism, or to give presbyters a commission to perform both. The former course has been followed by the Western churches of England, &c. where confirmation is always administered by the bishop, and generally several years after baptism; and the latter has been adopted by the patriarchate of Constantinople and all the Eastern churches, in which presbyters have, from time immemorial, been permitted to confirm; and in those churches confirmation is always administered to infants immediately after baptism" (*Orig. Liturg.* vi. 1). But this it was also, for nine centuries or more, throughout the West—"cujus rei fidem certam et indubitam faciunt, non modò rituales libri et pontificales a nobis superiori capite prolati: sed patres ferè omnes, qui his de rebus aliquandò scripserunt"—as Martene says (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* i. 2, 1, comp. Assemani, *Cod. Liturg.* iii. 1, note); nor could its dogmatic relation to baptism be better explained than by reference to the rubric and prayer of the Gelasian sacramentary following the administration of the one by the presbyter, and preceding that of the other by the bishop. "Afterwards," says the rubric, "the infant, on ascending from the font, is signed on the crown of his head with chrism by the presbyter, in these words: 'God Almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath regenerated thee with water and the Holy Ghost, and given thee remission of all thy sins, anoint thee with the unction of salvation unto life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord.'" He answers, "Amen." Then the sevenfold Spirit is conveyed to them by the bishop, who lays hands on them for consigning them, in these words: "God Almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath regenerated Thy servants with water and the Holy Ghost, and given them remission of all their sins: send on them, Lord, Thy Holy Ghost the Comforter, and grant them the Spirit of wisdom and understanding: the Spirit of counsel and might: the Spirit of knowledge and piety: fill them with the Spirit of the fear of God, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who liveth," &c. They answer, "Amen." Afterwards he signs them on the forehead with chrism, saying: "The sign of Christ unto life everlasting." They answer, "Amen." Then, "Peace be with you." They answer, "And with Thy Spirit" (*Murat. Liturg. Rom.* i. 510). In the Gregorian sacramentary this is called "confirmation;" and it is added, that "if the bishop be not there to administer it, the infant may be communicated by the priest" (*ib.* ii. 158). The same prayer and the same rubric is repeated almost word for word in every Western ritual of the same date. The corresponding rubric and prayer of the Eastern office for baptism is at least as old; though other parts of the office may not be. They run as follows: "The baptismal robe having been put on him, the priest adds this prayer: 'Let us pray.—Blessed art Thou, Lord God Almighty: fountain of blessing, sun of

righteousness, Who hast lifted up the light of salvation on those that were in darkness, by the manifestation of Thy Son and our God: and bestowed on us unworthy the blessed purification of the holy water, and the divine sanctification of the life-giving chrism: Who hast also now vouchsafed to regenerate Thy servant just baptized with water and the Spirit, and to confer on him the remission of his sins voluntary and involuntary: be pleased, O merciful and omnipotent Lord, to grant him also the seal of the gift of Thy sacred, all-powerful, and adorable Spirit, and the participation of the holy Body and precious Blood of Thy Christ. Mayest Thou keep him in Thy holiness, and confirm him in Thy true faith: deliver him from the evil one and all his devices: and maintain his soul in Thy saving fear: in righteousness and purity: that, pleasing Thee in every word and work, he may be made Thy son, and heir of Thy heavenly kingdom.'" Choir: "For Thou art our God: a God of saving, and of shewing mercy: To Thee do we give glory: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now, ever, and evermore, Amen." This prayer finished, he anoints the baptized person with the holy chrism, making the sign of the cross on his forehead, eyes, nose, ears, and feet, and saying: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost: Amen" (*Goar, Eucholog.* p. 355). The purport of both prayers is thus briefly: "Stablish the thing, O God, that Thou hast wrought in us," as the Psalmist says (*lxviii.* 28); and churches have believed in all ages as they prayed. Hence, whatever expressions may have been dropped by particular fathers, what they believed individually, and what the universal church taught collectively, was that the Holy Ghost was communicated as well in the baptismal act as at the later ceremony which followed it—called by us confirmation—and that He was communicated in this last only to strengthen and complete what He had commenced in baptism, viz. the regeneration and sanctification of the soul of man, and not to confer any new gift, as, for instance, the ministerial or prophetic character. Confirmation was therefore distinguished from baptism in ancient times, only so far as, externally considered, it was a separate ceremony; and further, as the one ceremony connected with baptism which the bishops insisted on retaining in their own hands. But it was regarded by nobody for 1000 years, even in the West, as a distinct sacrament; and to infer that it was, merely because communion usually followed it, as it followed baptism, is to assume that confirmation was instituted by our Lord, and had a distinct office assigned to it, as such, in those days, like the other two, which it had not. Indeed, it is included in the baptismal office, and administered at the same time with baptism in the Greek church still, though the Greeks have been inveigled of late years into reckoning it a distinct sacrament, contrary to their traditions. In ancient, as in modern times, nobody could be confirmed or receive the Eucharist who had not been baptized; but in the West, where confirmation has long been dissociated from baptism, persons are constantly permitted to receive the Eucharist who have not been confirmed. In ancient, as in modern times, anybody might administer baptism upon emergencies; and in the East, though the chrism used in confirmation must have been consecrated by a

bishop, any priest may confirm. Finally, confirmation, as distinct from baptism, has never been considered necessary to salvation in either church, though penalties were decreed in the West against parents for not bringing their children to confirmation when it might be had. And clearly, what led to its being dissociated in the West from baptism was, not theory, but the practical instinct which seized on it as a fit supplement to the baptism of infants, who needed to have their responsibilities solemnly brought before them in maturer years, when able to appreciate them. That it was postponed for that purpose originally, and not from having been looked upon as a distinct sacrament originally, is a plain historical fact; and then, by degrees, its having a distinct minister and a distinct office, led to its being considered a distinct sacrament. Probably there is nothing that has obscured its true character more, or created false impressions of it, than the prominence given to chrism in its administration, for which in the words of St. Basil, no written warrant of any sort exists. The East now viewing it as a sacrament, is at a loss to explain its origin. In the West, perhaps the chief of the dogmatic links associating it still with baptism is, that it can never be repeated.

For the current views respecting it in the 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries, see St. Ildefons. *de Cogn. Bapt.* c. 123-31; the *Lib. de Div. Off.* c. 19, attributed to Alcuin; Leidrad, *de Sacram. Bapt. ad Car. M.* c. 71; Amalar. *Ecol. Off.* i. 27; Theodulph. *de Ord. Bapt.* c. 17. Bingham, *Ant.* xii. 1-3, represents the views of the fathers fully and fairly. Pouget, *Instit. Cath.* pt. iii. § i. c. 3, and Moroni, *Diz. Ecol.* xvi. 69, that of the modern Latin—the Eastern patriarchs, in their answers to the non-jurors, pp. 46-7 and 153 (by G. Williams), and Neale, *Hist.* pt. i. b. iv. c. 6, that of the modern Greek church. [E. S. Ff.]

CONGAL (CONGALL). Commemorated on Jan. 2. Camerarius has "S. Congallus Abbas Benchorensis Monasterii in Scotia" (*De Scot. Fort.* 74). Possevin makes him flourish A.D. 590. Notker, in his *Martyrology*, at 5 Id. Jul., makes him a pupil of St. Columba, and preceptor of St. Columbanus and St. Gall. But this is, no doubt, St. Comgall of Bangor in Ireland, and not an abbat of Banchory in Scotland. (Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 233, 310.) [J. G.]

CONGAN (COMPHAN, COMGAN), A. Oct. 13 St. Congan, brother of St. Kentigerna (Jan. 7), and uncle of St. Fillan (Jan. 9), was the son of Cellach Cualann king of Leinster, and was in his youth trained as a soldier. On succeeding his father, A.D. 715, he governed his dominions as a Christian prince ought to do; but after a time he left his kingdom and native country. In company with St. Kentigerna his sister, and her sons Fillan, Fursey, and Ultan, and also seven other clerics, he went to Lochelch, (now Lochalsh, in Ross-shire) where they lived a severe life. At a great age he died, and was buried in Iona. His nephew, St. Fillan, built a church at Lochalsh to his memory, and his name was held in special honour in the district in the 16th century. We do not know the date of his decease, but his sister died A.D. 734. He had many dedications, and has given his name to many places in the islands and west of Scotland; in the east he is

found only at Turriff, Aberdeenshire. (Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 310; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 384, 419; *Book of Deer*, p. cxxiv. sq. *Brev. Aberd.* pars aestiv. f. cxxvi.) [J. G.]

CONGUSSIVS (CONGUS), bishop and scribe of Armagh. He was a native of Kinell Ainmire, and confessor of Aedh Ollan, king of the Northern Hy Neill of Ulster. He is famous apparently for but one transaction, the inciting Aedh Ollan or Allan to attack Aedh Boin, king of the Ulidians, for having pillaged some churches, his own amongst them, in the diocese of Armagh. He succeeded Suibhne (June 21) at Armagh, A.D. 730, and held the see for twenty years. In the *Four Masters* is given the quatrain which St. Congus composed to incite the king to revenge the profanation of the church. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 294, col. 1; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 331, 352 n. 2, 353; Ware, *Ir. Bishops*, 4.) [J. G.]

CONINANUS, Dec. 9, A.D. 710. He is described by Camerarius, on the authority of Wion, as having been abbat of Hy, and preceptor to king Ferquhard's sons. Perhaps he is Conamhail (Sept. 11), tenth abbat of Hy, and the first who was not of the race of Conall Gulban. [CONAMHAIL.] He cannot be Conang Ua Beiceleighinn of 1128, nor Conang (Sept. 23). (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 378, 404.) [J. G.]

CONLA. [CONNLA.]

CONLAEDH. (CONDLAEDH, CONLAIDH, CONLIAN.) May 3. Though Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 117), at March 15, gives "S. Conleatus Sodorenensis Episcopus," yet under this name we recognise the anchorite who was selected by St. Brigida to be her chief artist, and with her to govern her churches. He is called Conlaedh, Conlaedh, latinised Conlianus, a name which the scholium or gloss on St. Aengus the Culdee tells us is *Cundail-Aedh*, i.e. Aedh the Wise. If so, his name was Aedh or Hugh, but the same scholiast adds that his original name was Ronchend (Todd, *St. Patrick*, 19-20). When St. Brigida founded her monastery at Kildare, she chose the learned and pious Conlaedh to be her bishop, and to have episcopal charge there and in the affiliated houses in all spiritual matters, as she had a continuous charge in all monastic affairs. He was simply bishop, first and chiefly for the monastery, and then "in rebus exterioribus," but always in monastic submission to the head of the monastery. He was of the race of Laeghaire Lore, son of Ugaire Mór, monarch of Ireland, and was distantly related to St. Brigida through their common ancestor Ugaire Mór. As well as being bishop, he is always referred to as St. Brigida's chief artist, artificer, or brazier, for the working in all kinds of metals and making chalices, patens, bells, shrines, &c. He was devoured by wild dogs or wolves as he was on his way to Rome, A.D. 520, and his tomb on the other side of the altar from that occupied by the tomb of St. Brigida, in the church of Kildare, was, like St. Brigida's, very highly ornamented. [BRIGIDA (5)]. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 524 n. 1, 552, c. 19, 565 n. 12, and *Acta SS.* 217-8 n. 29; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 170 n. 171; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 119; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 197 sq.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* i. 409, 450; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 311; Todd,

S. Patrick, 19-27; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.*, 4th ser., iii. 556-7.) [J. G.]

CONMACH. [CONNACHTACH and CONNMACH.]

CONNA (CONDA, DACHONNA), abbat of Daire-Dachonna, in Ulster, April 12. He was of the race of Connall Gulban, son of Niall (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 101). There are so many saints of the name of Conna, and its honorific forms, Mochonna and Dachonna, that it is impossible to keep the lines of identification clear. For a long list, see Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 178 n. 115). Conna, an artificer, brother of St. Sacellus, received a church from St. Patrick in Kierragia-Airteach, a district in the present Roscommon (Colgan, *ibid.* 137, c. 56; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 245). There are two Mochonnas of Doire (March 8 and May 15), but there is nothing of any real value to attach them to a place in history (*Mart. Doneg.* 71, 127; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 565). [J. G.]

CONNACHTACH. (CONMACH.) May 10. This was the eighteenth abbat of Hy or Iona, and he presided A.D. 801-2. In the *Annals* he is called "choice scribe," and is known as Conman, and Conmach. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 388; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 252; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 125; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 500-1.) [J. G.]

CONNELL. [CONALL.]

CONNLA is found twice in the Irish calendars, first as Connla, son of Leinin, bishop, at May 10, and next as Connla, bishop of Ruscach (qu. Ros-each, now Russagh, bar. Moygoish, co. Westmeath?), at Dec. 30. But the most famous person bearing the name was a renowned worker in brass, whose memory was fresh in the days of St. Columba, and who must have lived in the 5th century or early in the 6th. One of his shrines is said to have been extant in the time of Colgan, at Dun Cruthen in Ard-Magilligan, on the eastern shore of Lough Foyle. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 405, c. 99, 451 n. 82; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 202-3.) [J. G.]

CONNMACH (CONMACH), of Armagh, succeeded Cudiniscus, but in what year is uncertain, probably some time after A.D. 790 (*Four Mast.*). He died suddenly in the year 807, and the *Psalter of Cashel* gives him a rule of fourteen years. Under his influence St. Fothad the Canonist drew up the remonstrance which procured for the clergy of Ireland the right of exemption from military service. [FOTHAD.] (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 233, 244, 252; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* ii. 1106.) Of Connmach of Ath-blair, July 9, we have no account. [J. G.]

CONOC. [CANOC.]

CONODHAR [CONODRAN], of Fobhar, A., Nov. 3, A.D. 706. This seems to have been a person of note, as his death is entered in most of the Irish annals, but of his parentage or life at Fobhar (now Fore, co. Westmeath) we have no trace. He died A.D. 707 (*Ann. Tigh.*). (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 296; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 143, c. 3.) [J. G.]

CONON (1) Martyred under Decius in Pamphylia, March 6, was a gardener, said to have come from Nazareth, a simple, poor, hospitable man. When told the prefect wanted him, he said, "What can he want me for? especially

as I am a Christian." When bidden sacrifice, he groaned, and wished the prefect could renounce idols and come to Christ. His ankles were pierced, and nails driven through them, and in that state he was made to run before a chariot till he died. Another story was afterwards told of him, or perhaps of another man of the same name, in Isauria, to suit the taste of a later age. He was baptized by the chief captain Michael. He used to make the devils guard his fields, and then shut them up in casks. He taught the people to say, "There is one God, even Conon's." And when he was tortured there was a rescue, and he survived two years, and died in peace. (*Menology of Basil.*) [E. B. R.]

CONON (2) Bishop of Edessa, who in the year 313 laid the foundations of a church in that city, which was completed by his successor Saades, and enlarged by Aitallaha (Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* iii. 646). [E. V.]

(3) Bishop of Apamea, who in the Isaurian rebellion in the reign of Anastasius, A.D. 542, "left his throne, and was converted from a priest to a soldier and a general." Theophan. p. 118. Conon became a leader of the rebels, and was killed while besieging the town of Claudiopolis, A.D. 543 (*ib.* p. 19). [E. V.]

(4) Bishop of Tarsus (flourished c. 601), a disciple of Joannes Philoponus, whose cause he defended in conjunction with Eugenius against the Eutychians Paul and Stephen before John the patriarch of Constantinople. The acts of this disputation existed in the time of Photius, and were read by him. Conon subsequently disagreed with Philoponus as to the perfect equality of the three natures in the Trinity, and, separating from him, founded a new church of which he acted as bishop. His quarrel with Philoponus led to his anathematization of his former teacher, and the publication of an *Oratio Invectiva* directed against the views of Philoponus as to the resurrection of the flesh, which Photius records having read. Photius speaks of Conon and his followers under the name of Tritheists (Phot. *Cod.* 23, 24; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 573.) [CONONITES.] [E. V.]

(5) Abbat of Lérins, lived about the year 600. Pope Gregory I. wrote a letter to him on the government of his monastery. "Let the good," he said, "find you mild, and the wicked severe. Maintain such order in your corrections that you may appear to love the persons and hate the vices, lest, if you act otherwise, your corrections may appear to change into cruelty, and you may lose those whom you wished to correct. Mingle in your corrections severity with mildness, so that love may make the good determine to keep on their guard and teach the wicked to love their duty." Pope Gregory says that he is equally delighted at the vigour, ability, and excellence of Conon as he had been distressed at the remissness of his predecessor (Stephanus). Le Cointe regards Conon as the restorer of Lérins to its ancient character and dignity. (Greg. Mag. *Epist.* xi. 12, *Patrol. Lat.* ciii. 1126; Le Cointe, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* vol. ii. p. 478; Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 520.) [D. R. J.]

(6) A native of Sicily, but of Thracian extraction, chosen bishop of Rome Oct. 20, A.D. 686, in the room of John V., who died rather more than two and a half months before. Factions had stood in the way of a speedier election,

and his own, the effect of a compromise, was perhaps due to his great age. He survived it but eleven months, incapacitated the greater part of that time from ill-health. No letters of his are preserved (*l'Art de Vérif. les Dates*, i. 254; Mansi, xi. 1097). [E. S. Ff.]

CONON (7). [CONAN.]

CONONDRIUS, supposed to have been bishop of Man, consecrated by St. Patrick, A.D. 447 (Stubbs, *Regist.* 154). [C. H.]

CONONITES. The followers of Conon, [CONON (4)] at the opening of the 7th century. They held the Tritheistic views of Conon's teacher, Johannes Philoponus (d. c. 617), but differed from him and his disciples with respect to the resurrection of the body, the Philoponites asserting that both the form and matter of the human body perished after death, while the Cononites maintained that the form passed away, but that the matter was eternal. The sect had entirely disappeared by the time of Justinian II. A.D. 685-705. [E. V.]

CONRACH (CONRY), Feb. 23. On this day the calendars give Cruimther Conrach. Colgan says this is Conrach or Conry, brother of St. Aidan, and one of the Mocuheim, or Moccuceim, i.e. sons of the descendants of Kien or Cian. His mother is said to have been Sinecha, sister of St. Columba, and he was buried at Durrow. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 478 nn. ⁵⁻⁶, 479 n. ³⁵, 489 n. ³⁵; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 247, 277.) [J. G.]

CONRAN. [CAEMHAN (3).]

CONRINTINUS (Bede, *Martyrol.* May 1, *Auct.*), bishop of Quimper. [CORENTINUS.] [C. H.]

CONSECRATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE COMMUNION. [EUCARIST.]

CONSENTIUS, a lay theologian of the time of Augustine, lived in certain islands, probably the Balearic, and wrote to submit some treatises of his to the judgment of Augustine (*Ep.* 119 (221), vol. ii. 449). Augustine's answer follows (ii. 516, ed. Migne). This was probably about A.D. 408. Consentius's letter is interesting in several ways: (1) As one of the earliest specimens of that curious union which, according to Sir J. Stephens, we find in the schoolmen, "of the aspirations and prostrations of the mind of man, prostrating itself to the most arbitrary of human dogmas, aspiring to penetrate the loftiest and most obscure of the divine attributes." This is very much what Augustine remarks upon it. Consentius had said, "If the faith of holy church were to be apprehended by reason of disputation, not by piety of credulity, none but philosophers and orators could possess bliss. We must not so much ask a reason of God as follow the authority of saints." And yet he had shewn a desire to be instructed. "If I grant your request," says Augustine, "I shall do nothing else but render you a reason." "If it be reasonable that in some great things faith should precede reason, the reason that persuades us that it is so must precede faith." "The prophet said reasonably, Except ye believe, ye shall not understand (Is. vii. 9)." (2) The letter is interesting as shewing how the thought of the church was tending to the questions that were uppermost in the Nestorian

controversy. It was not merely "mid tumult of her war" that the church was guided into truth, but in lonely meditations far and wide. The question of the relation of the human to the divine personality much perplexed Consentius. Augustine explains "ascending to the Father" to mean being recognised as equal to the Father. His *reductio ad absurdum* of a corporal anthropomorphism in conceptions of God is complete, but ludicrous, and therefore painful.

(3) The letter is interesting because of the nature of Consentius's difficulty in apprehending Augustine's doctrine. Belief in divine personalities was to him inseparable from a material conception of God as a surpassingly glorious light. To him Augustine's doctrine that God is righteousness seemed to make God no longer a living Being, but a dead abstraction. Augustine answers by asking, Is not life itself alive? As the body lives by the soul, and the soul lives on without the body, so the soul lives by righteousness, and Christ is made to us righteousness; "the highest God is true righteousness, and the true God is the highest righteousness; our righteousness is to hunger after Him here, and to be filled with Him hereafter." The substance or essence of God (into the distinction of *ὁμοστασις* and *ὁμοία* he declines to enter) are not to be distinguished from the divinity.

Consentius wrote again (this letter is lost) for further information on the nature of the risen body, and Augustine answered him at length (*Ep.* 205 [146]).

The spirit of Consentius's letter, his profound humility, and entreaties that he may be publicly corrected that others also may profit, is so similar to that of the Spaniards who write shortly after to Capreolus, that we are led to ask whether for Constantius or Tonantius there, we should not read Consentius. [E. B. B.]

CONSORTIA, ST., virgin, of Clugny. Her legend is as follows. Eucherius and his wife Galla, a pious couple, of senatorial rank, being possessed of much wealth, but having no children, prayed to God to give them one, and in answer to their prayer a daughter was born to them, whom they dedicated from her infancy to the service of Heaven, under the name of Consortia. They afterwards had a second daughter, whom they called Tullia.

Consortia was sought in marriage by a youth of noble family, and was greatly importuned by his friends to accept him. For some time she evaded the matter, but at last she proposed that they should go together to the church, and having joined in prayer during the celebration of mass, should open the book of the Gospel, and learn the will of God from the first verses that happened to turn up. This was done, and the first words that they read were from the 19th chapter of St. Matthew: "Jesus said unto His disciples, Whosoever loveth father and mother more than Me is not worthy of Me."

This decided the matter, and Consortia remained unmarried. Her father Eucherius had already separated from his wife and become a hermit, retiring to a cave in Mont-Maur, where his faithful spouse fed him through a hole or window. [EUCHERIUS, ST.] In A.D. 523 he became bishop of Lyon.

After the death of her parents, Consortia built

on her own land a church, which she called after the mother of St. Stephen, and a Xenodochium.

She lived about the end of the 6th century, in the reigns of Clothar and his son Siegebert, and in both reigns was much persecuted by suitors, whom, however, she steadfastly resisted. In the reign of Clothar she made a journey to that king to beg his protection for her religious house, and having miraculously healed his daughter who was dying, she obtained more than she desired in the way of large endowments. She is commemorated on the 22nd of June (*AA. SS. Boll.* June, iv. p. 250). [D. R. J.]

CONSTANS I. [CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.]

CONSTANS II. [CONSTANTINUS IV.]

CONSTANS, supposed bishop of Winchester, A.D. 293, according to Rudborne (Stubbs, *Registr.* 153). [C. H.]

CONSTANS, priest and anchorite of Eo-inis, in Lough Erne, Nov. 14. He was son of Fuasclace, of the race of Colla Uais, son of Eochaidh Doimhlen, monarch of Erin. He is counted among the saints belonging to the family of St. Maedoc (Jan. 31), and the *Ann. Ult.* give the obit of "Constans sapiens Locanerna" in A.D. 777. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 309; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 222, c. 4, where he is called "Abbat of Inis-eo.") [J. G.]

CONSTANTIA, sister of the emperor Constantine the Great, and wife of the emperor Licinius, patroness of Eusebius of Caesarea and Arius. Before A.D. 323 Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, met accidentally a woman carrying in the streets a picture representing two figures of philosophers, to which she gave the names of Paul and Jesus Christ. Eusebius, writing to Constantia, says he took the picture, to avoid the scandal of seeing representations of God hawked about the streets after the manner of pagan deities. Constantia writes back, asking Eusebius to send her the picture, or to get it copied. Eusebius is unwilling to comply, and tries to turn Constantia from tangible objects to the invisible reality, and persuades her to look forward to seeing God face to face in the world to come. The iconoclasts produced this letter at the Seventh General Council; but it was rejected as the writing of an Arian. During his sojourn at Nicomedia, Arius attempted to persuade Constantia to share his opinions; and St. Jerome says that he succeeded. At any rate Constantia was persuaded by a presbyter whose name is said by writers of a later date to have been Eutocius, that Arius had been misrepresented and unjustly condemned. On her deathbed, A.D. 327-8, she did her best to convince the emperor Constantine, and commended the presbyter to him. By him the emperor, who had never clearly understood the question, was persuaded to invite Arius to his court, where he soon established an exclusive influence. (*Euseb. Epist. ad Constant. August.*, Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* xx. 1546; Rufinus, *Eccl. Hist.* I. xi.; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xxi. 482; Soz. ii. 27; Soz. i. 60; Robertson, *Hist. Christ. Ch. Bk.* II. chap. i.; Ceillier, iii. 250, 417.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTIANUS, ST., abbat and recluse, was born of a good family in Auvergne, in the beginning of the 6th century. In early

youth he decided to become a monk, and betook himself to the cloister of Micy, in the neighbourhood of Orleans. Longing, however, for a still greater solitude, he retired to a wood in the province of Maine, where he became renowned for the sanctity and asceticism of his life, as well as for the number of wonderful cures which he was said to have performed on the sick who flocked to his retreat. St. Innocent, bishop of Le Mans, obliged him to become a presbyter, for the sake of the neighbouring villages.

When Clotarius I., king of the Franks, travelled through that neighbourhood to make war against his son Chramnus in Brittany, he paid a visit on the way to Constantianus in his cave. The saint promised the king a successful campaign, for which Clotarius handsomely rewarded him. With that money Constantianus enriched a cloister of his own, which stood long after his death, A.D. 570. His life, written by an almost contemporary author from the report of his disciples, is to be found in the histories of Maine, written by Courvaisier and Boudonnet. He is commemorated on the 1st of December (*Le Cointe, Ann. Eccl. Franc.* i. pp. 398, 863; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, tom. iii. Dec. 1). [D. R. J.]

CONSTANTINA, wife of the Eastern emperor Maurice (A.D. 582-602), and daughter of his patron and predecessor, Tiberius II. (A.D. 578-582). She received letters from pope Gregory the Great: one, in reply to her request for certain relics of St. Paul for a church which she was building, in which he excuses himself by saying that it is impossible to venture near so sacred a body (*Letters of Gregory*, iv. 30, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii.); another, in which pope Gregory warns her against the pretensions of John, patriarch of Constantinople, who wishes to be sole bishop, and is protected by the emperor Maurice. Such pretensions, says Gregory, ought to shew him that antichrist is near. In the 41st letter of the 5th book, pope Gregory petitions her on behalf of the oppressed Corsicans and Sicilians. After the murder of Maurice by the assassin Phocas (emperor A.D. 602-610) Constantina attempted an insurrection in vain. With her three innocent daughters, she was brutally tortured and then beheaded at Chalcedon. The details of her life with the emperor Maurice, of her romantic disposition, and of her insurrections, are given by Theophanes. (*Patrol. Graec.* cviii. §§ 211, 213, 215, 244, 246, 247; Ceillier, vi. 96, xi. 497, 498; Gibbon, *Smith's ed.* v. 387.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT AND HIS SONS.

CONSTANTINUS I. born about A.D. 274, Emperor 306-337.

I. Authorities. A. Ancient. B. Modern.

II. Life. Three Periods—

i. Up to A.D. 312.

ii. A.D. 312-324.

iii. A.D. 324-337.

III. Legislation and Policy.

A. Secular. B. Religious.

IV. Character and Writings.

V. Vision of the ✠.

VI. Coins.

CONSTANTINUS II. Emp. 337-340.

CONSTANS I. .. " 337-350.

CONSTANTIUS II. .. " 337-361.

CONSTANTINUS I.

I. *Authorities*.—A. Ancient. B. Modern.

A. Ancient (Heathen).

Eutropius, *Breviarium*, *Hist. Rom.*, the end of the 9th and beginning of the 10th book. This historian was secretary to the emperor, and his short account is therefore valuable. The *Caesares* and the *Eptome*, current under the name of Aurelius Victor, were doubtless the work of different authors. The first, who wrote under Constantius was a friend of Ammianus, and praefectus urbi towards the close of the century; the second, who excerpted from the first, lived a generation later, and continued his compilation down to the death of Theodosius the Great. They seem to have used the same sources as Zosimus, whom they supplement. The Panegyrists, as contemporary writers, deserve more attention than has been given them, allowance being made for the defects incident to their style of writing. Those relating to our subject are *Anon. Panegy. Maximiano et Constantino* (A.D. 307), Eumenii *Constantino in natalibus urb. Trevir.* (310), and *Gratiani actio Flaviensium nomine* (311), *Anon. de victoria adv. Maxentium* (313), and Nazarii *Paneg. Constantino* (321). They are all the product of Gallic rhetoricians. The *Scriptores Hist. Augustae* contain several contemporary references to Constantine; those in Julian's *Caesars* are, as might be supposed, unfriendly and satirical.

The first volume of the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians contains the fragments of Eunapius, Priscus, Dexippus, &c., but what is preserved of them directly is of little moment. The same may be said of the extracts from Praxagoras in Photius, *Cod.* 62. Indirectly it is supposed that we have the matter of these earlier writers in Zosimus's *ιστορία νέα*, book ii. This historian lived probably about the year 450. He is a bitter enemy of Constantine, whom he accuses of various crimes and cruelties, and blames for the novelties of his policy, shewing at the same time a particular dislike of his conversion. He falls into several historical blunders, one of which however is shared by other Greek historians, who confuse Maximinus Daza and Maximian (e.g. Zos. ii. 11 *ad fin.*; cf. 17 *ad f.* and Socrates, *H. E.* i. 2; Zos. ii. 39 *ad init.*; cf. 29 *ad med.*). The part of Ammianus' *Histories* relating to this reign is most unfortunately lost. Some remarks on it occur in the part that is preserved, from which we may conclude his general agreement with his friend and contemporary Victor. The text of Ammianus, recently published by Gardthausen (Teubner, 1874), may be recommended. He has also given a revised text from the MSS. of the anonymous excerpts generally cited as *Anonymus Valesii, Excerpta Valesiana*. They have of course received this name from being first printed by H. Vaisset, at the end of his edition of Ammianus. Some of these extracts may be traced word for word in Eutropius and Orosius, whence we conclude that their author did not live earlier than the 5th century. Others are valuable as coming from sources which are elsewhere unrepresented.

(Christian.) The earliest contemporary authority is Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, a tract published after the defeat of Maxentius and before Constantine had declared himself the enemy of Licinius, i.e. probably 313 or 314.

His bitterness is very unpleasant, and his language is exaggerated and somewhat obscure, but his facts are generally confirmed by other authors, where we can test them. The most important is no doubt Eusebius. Three of his works especially treat of Constantine, *Hist. Eccl.*, ix. and x., down to the year 324, and probably published before the death of Crispus in 326; *De Vita Constantini*, in four books, with a translation of Constantine's *Oratio ad Sanctorum coetum* as an appendix, published after his death; and, thirdly, *τριακονταετηρικὸς*, or *Laudes Constantini*, a panegyric at his tricennialia, containing little but rhetoric. The attempt to harmonise Eusebius and Zosimus is a difficult one. Fleury's dictum, "On ne se trompera sur Constantin en croyant tout le mal qu'en dit Eusebe, et tout le bien qu'en dit Zosime," may be perfectly true, but it is a very inadequate guide when a detailed account is in question, for Zosimus says very little good of him and Eusebius very little harm. Eusebius has great weight as a contemporary and as giving documents, which have not for the most part been seriously challenged; on the other hand he is discredited by the fulsomeness and bad taste in his later works, and by the inconsistencies of tone between them and his history. He gives notice, however, that he will only recount those actions of the emperor which belong to his religious life (*V. C.* i. 11: *μόνα τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεοφιλή συντείνοντα βίον*), and he throws himself open to the criticism of Socrates (*H. E.*, i. 1) as *τῶν ἐπαίνων τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς πανηγυρικῆς ὑψηλοῦς τῶν λόγων μάλλον ὥς ἐν ἐγκωμίᾳ φροντίσας ἢ περὶ τοῦ ἀκριβῶς περιλαβεῖν τὰ γινόμενα*. But we must make allowances for the natural exultation of Christians over the emperor who had done so much for them, and who openly professed himself an instrument of Providence for their advancement. While we feel a certain distrust of Eusebius on one side (as of Zosimus on the other), we must take care not to push our distrust too far. The best edition of the historical works of Eusebius is that by F. A. Heinichen, recently republished and enlarged (Leipz. 1868-1870, 3 vols.).^a

Of the works of Constantine himself we shall speak in § IV. Besides these we possess very important contemporary documents in the laws issued by him (after 312) contained in the *Theodosian* and *Justinian Codes*. The first are in a purer state, and may be consulted in the excellent edition of Hänel (Bonn, 1842-44), or in the older standard folios of Godefroy, with their valuable historical notes. The series of laws from both codes are arranged chronologically in the volume of Migne's *Patrologia, Opera Constantini*, which also contains the Panegyrists and the documents relating to the early history of the Donatists.

Socrates, *H. E.* i., and Sozomen, *H. E.* i. and ii. (living both about a century later) give us an account of the last period of his reign. Of these Socrates is generally the safer guide. On his relations with Arianism much will be found in the treatises and epistles of St. Athanasius, and occasional facts may be gleaned from the other fathers. As a hero of Byzantine history and

^a For a careful judgment of Eusebius's Life of Constantine Heinichen's 23rd Meletema may be consulted (vol. iii. p. 754). Compare also De Broglie, *l'Eglise et l'Empire*, vol. iii. p. 39.

σπαστολος, Constantine has become clothed in a mist of fiction. Something may be gathered from Joannes Lydus, *de Magistrat. P. R.*, and among the fables of Cedrenus and Zonaras may be found some facts drawn from more trustworthy sources.

B. Modern.

It will be unnecessary to enumerate the names of the well-known writers of church history who treat of Constantine. Nor are there wanting a multitude of minor essays on separate points of his life. As early as 1720 Vogt (*Hist. Littér. Const. Mag. Hamburg*) gave a list of more than 150 authors, ancient and modern, and the number since that date is infinitely increased. The first critical life of importance is by J. C. F. Manso, published about the beginning of the century (*Leben Constantins des Grossen*, Wien, 1819, &c.), but it is hard and one-sided, unchristian, if not antichristian. Jacob Burckhardt in great measure follows Manso, but his book is much more interesting and popular (*die Zeit Constantins des Gr.*, Basel, 1853). It is not always fair, and some misstatements in it will be noticed below. The author views the emperor merely as a great politician, and shews much bitterness against Eusebius. Theodore Keim's *der Uebertritt Const. des Gr.* (Zürich, 1862) is in many points a good refutation of Burckhardt, as well as a fair statement in itself, from one not at all disposed to be credulous. Of larger works the first two volumes of *l'Eglise et l'Empire au IV^e Siècle*, by Count, now duke, A. de Broglie, the head of the Conservative party in France (Paris, 1855, &c.), give the views of a learned and enlightened Roman Catholic, generally based on the original authorities. This is perhaps the most useful of modern books upon the subject. The section (134) in Dr. P. Schaff's *Gesch. der Alten Kirche* (Leipz. 1867, also translated) is as good a short account of Constantine as can be named. In English we have a short life by a Nonconformist, Mr. Joseph Fletcher (London, 1852, 16mo.), but no standard work of importance. The brilliant sketch by Dean Stanley in his *Eastern Church* is probably also the fairest picture of Constantine in our language. For his relations with Arianism we may refer to Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century* (1st ed. 1833; 3rd ed. 1871); Neale's *Eastern Church, Patriarchate of Alexandria*, and Bright's *History of the Church*, A.D. 313-451, 2nd ed. 1869.

II. *Life*.—Three Periods. i. To 312. ii. 312-324. iii. 324-337.

Period i. To 312.

Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus, surnamed Magnus or the Great, was born Feb. 27, probably in the year 274, at Naïssus (Nissa), in Dardania or Upper Moesia, the country where his family had for some time been settled. Victor (*Caes.*), makes him 62 at the time of his death, but Socrates (i. 39) says he was in his 65th year. The place of his birth is given as Naïssus by Anonymous Valesii, Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De Thematibus*, ii. 9), and Stephanus Byzant. s. v. *Ναϊσος*. Julius Firmicus (1, 2) places it at Carsus (cf. Ammian. xxi. 10), and Nicephorus Callisti at Drepanum, the birthplace of Helena. The opinion that he was born in Britain, and of a British princess, current since the time of William of Malmesbury, and accepted by Baronius, seems to have arisen from a mere misunderstanding.

CHRIST. BIOGR.

ing of two passages in the Panegyrist, who address him as "taking his rise" from Britain (*Pan. Max. et Const.* iv. and Eumen. *in nat. urb. Trev.* ix.), and possibly from a confusion of his mother Helena with her namesake, wife of Magnus Maximus.

His father, Constantius Chlorus, was still quite young at the time of his son's birth. He was of a good family, being nephew by the mother's side of the emperor Claudius, the conqueror of the Goths. A few years later we find him high in favour with Carus, who intended, it was said, to make him Caesar. His mother Helena, on the other hand, was of mean position, apparently a servant at an inn, and as such seems to have had the status only of a "concubina" (Zos. ii. 8), and not to have been fully married till after her son's birth. (St. Ambrose calls her a "stabularia," *de obitu Theodos.* Migne, vol. iii. 1209; cf. Anon. Val. "matre viiissima.") Burckhardt (*Leben C.* p. 349 note 2) refers to Eutychius Alex. ed. Oxon. pp. 408, 456, and Hamza Isphahens. p. 55, as asserting that she was a Mesopotamian captive and a Christian; but Eusebius (*V. C.* iii. 47) ascribes her conversion to her son, and Eutychius is notoriously untrustworthy. Her marriage is implied by many historians, and by her subsequent repudiation in favour of Theodora (292), and asserted by Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 13 *app. παῖδα γνήσιον*) and in inscriptions. On the other hand, the positive statements of her "concubinatus" outweigh the deductions drawn from Victor and Eutropius. Constantine, the child of these parents, was, it seems, brought up at Drepanum in Cilicia, his mother's birthplace (Procop. *de aedif. Justin.* v. 2). His father, on becoming Caesar, and taking at the same time another wife, sent him, when about 16 years old, as a sort of hostage to Diocletian at Nicomedia, who treated him with kindness. His first military service was to accompany that emperor in his expedition against Achilleus in 296, and Eusebius saw him as a young and handsome man, as they passed through Palestine into Egypt (*V. C.* i. 19). In the following year he took part in the successful war of Galerius against the Persians.

We must place the first marriage of Constantine with Minervina about this time. We know that he married early, and that Crispus was over twenty when appointed Caesar in 317 (*ἡδὴ νεανίας*, Zos. ii. 20; cf. *Pan. Max. et Const.* iv.). Minervina, of whose character nothing is known, died before her husband's alliance with Fausta, but about her status there is much the same doubt as about Helena's. On the one hand we have the special eulogy of his morality (*Pan. Max. etc.*, ut supra *de Vict. adv. Max.* iv., *pudicitia soli dicata conjugio*, but both after his marriage with Fausta), on the other the assertion of Zosimus that she was a "concubina," to which positive statement it seems best to assent (ii. 20, so Zonar. *Ann.* xiii. 2). In both cases we may remark that the relation was one recognised by the Roman law, and by no means in itself a sign of depravity. Marcus Aurelius, for instance, took a concubine after the death of Faustina, and Alexander Severus required his provincial governors to have such a companion if they were unmarried. Constantine continued in the East while his father was fighting in Gaul and Britain. In 303 he was present, when the

edict of persecution against the Christians was promulgated at Nicomedia, and the palace soon after struck by lightning. The concurrence of these two events and the comments made upon them seem by his own assertion to have made a strong impression upon him (*Orat. ad Sanct. coet.* 25). He was a witness also in 305 of the abdication of the two Augusti, Diocletian and Maximian, and may have expected something from the partiality shewn him by the former; the son of Constantius had at any rate as just pretensions as the nephew of Galerius, Maximinus Daza (*De M. P.* xviii., xix.; cf. xiv.). He remained, however, probably against his will, with Galerius, who it is said attempted to destroy him by exciting him to combats with wild beasts and exposing him to encounters with Sarmatian champions (Praxag. *Frag. Hist.* ed. Müller, vol. iv. p. 2; *De M. P.* 24; Anon. Val. 3; Zon. *Ann.* xii. 33).

But a higher destiny was awaiting him in another part of the empire. His father insisted upon his return, and Galerius at length was persuaded to give his permission and the seal which was necessary for the public posts, ordering him not to start before receiving his last instructions on the morrow. When the emperor rose the next day, having purposely delayed till the afternoon, he found Constantine had taken flight in the night. He had probably good reasons for his mistrust, and to stop pursuit he maimed the public horses on many of the stations on his road (Zos. ii. 8; Anon. Val. 4; Victor *Caes.* 21), which (as De Broglie remarks) lay in part through countries where the persecution was raging. He arrived at Gesoriacum (Boulogne) just in time to accompany his father, who was on the point of sailing to Britain on his last expedition against the Picts (Eumen. *in nat. urb. Trev.* vii.). Constantius died at York, July 306, in the presence of his sons, after declaring Constantine his successor, who was much older than any of the children of his second wife (*De M. P.* xxiv.). He was almost immediately proclaimed Augustus by the soldiers (Σεβαστὸς πρὸς τῶν στρατοπέδων ἀναγορευθεὶς, Eus. *H. E.* viii. 13. Other authorities speak of him as Caesar, Zos. ii. 9; Anon. Val. 4. Eumenius, *in nat. urb. Trev.* viii. is indecisive. See below § VI. Coins) a movement which was supported also by Erocus, king of the Alamanni (Vict. *Epit.* 41). It is perhaps idle to dispute whether this act is to be called an usurpation or not. Constantius was as much Augustus as Galerius, and the principles of inheritance of empire, however vague and fluctuating, gave his son at least a right to prefer his claims to his father's colleague. Galerius received with some reluctance the laurel-crowned image, which was sent according to precedent, but refused him the title of Augustus, which he bestowed on Severus. Almost at the same time another claimant of imperial power appeared at Rome in Maxentius, son of the retired Maximian, who now came forward again to assist his son. This apparently more important rival occupied the attention of the Augusti, and left Constantine free to strengthen himself in his western provinces. His first act is said to have been to shew favour to the Christians (*De M. P.* xxiv.) who had been exposed to little of the violence of persecution under the mild rule of Constantius. (*V. C. i.*

13-17. Eusebius seems here to exaggerate. Cp. *Episcop. partis Majorini preces ad Constantinum*, in *Op. Const.* Migne, col. 747.) Like his father, he occupied himself with his own subjects, and was now particularly engaged in defending Gaul against the Franks and German tribes, who had risen during the absence of Constantius in Britain (Eumen. *ib.* x.). In 307, between the time of Severus's defeat and death and the expedition of Galerius against Maxentius, Maximian, who had quarrelled with his son, crossed the Alps and allied himself with the Caesar of the West. Constantine received as wife his daughter Fausta (born, we may remark, at Byzantium), and with her the title of Augustus, to which Galerius assented in the following year (*Pan. Max. et Const.* v.). For three years after his marriage he found sufficient employment in consolidating his government in the West, and in wars upon the frontier of the Rhine, over which he began to build a bridge at Cologne. The seat of his court was Treves, which he embellished with many buildings. The circus maximus, several temples and basilicas, and the forum, are mentioned by his panegyrist as his gift to the city (Eumen. *l.c.* xxii.). The chief of the existing remains, the baths, amphitheatre, basilica and Porta Nigra, whether all his work or not, belong in all probability to the same period. In the amphitheatre, cut out of the low hills above the city, he exposed a great multitude of Franks to the wild beasts, more, says the rhetorician, than they could dispose of without satiety (*l.c.* xii.). During one expedition against this people, Maximian, who was once more in retirement, third time assumed the purple, giving out that his son-in-law was dead. Constantine hastily returned and blockaded him in Marseilles, but when that place surrendered, was content to let him live in obscurity. Maximian could not rest, and plotted to murder him, a scheme in which his daughter pretended to join. She informed her husband; and the old man was taken dagger in hand—a worthless slave having been laid in the emperor's bed as his substitute—and was obliged to be the instrument of his own death (Eumen. *l.c.* xvi.—xx.; *De M. P.* xxix., xxx.; Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 12; *V. C.* i. 47). In the mean time Galerius was seized with a painful illness, and on April 30th, 311, shortly before his death, issued his haughty edict of toleration, the first of the series, to which the names of Constantine and Licinius were also affixed. Constantine, however, still remained in the West engaged in wars with the Alamanni and Cherusci, and in restoring the cities of Gaul (cf. Eumen. *Gratiarum actio Flaviensium nomine*, on the restoration of the schools of Autun). He is said, indeed, to have interfered by letter on behalf of the Eastern Christians whom Maximinus Daza now began to molest, and this is in itself sufficiently probable (*De M. P.* xxxvii.).

To understand the history that follows we must remember that there were at this time four Augusti, Licinius and Maximinus in the East, and Maxentius and Constantine in the West. The two latter had for some time acknowledged one another (see below, § VI. Coins), and it is probable that by a kind of tacit consent the four restricted themselves pretty nearly to the limits which afterwards bounded the four great prefectures. But there was little united

action between them, and sole empire was perhaps the secret aim of each. Maxentius now felt himself strong enough to break with Constantine, and declared war against him. The latter determined to take the initiative, and crossed the Cottian Alps, by the pass of Mont Genève, with a force certainly much smaller than that of his opponent (Gibbon says, by Mont Cenis; but the road to Susa and Turin was then by the Cottian Alps and Mons Matriona, as may be seen in the *Itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem* made in 333, which may be found in Migne's volume, *Opera Constantini*, &c.). Later historians affirm that the Romans besought him by an embassy to free them from the tyrant (Zon. *Ann.* xiii.; Cedrenus, § 270). Maxentius had certainly done almost everything that folly, insolence, and brutality could do to alienate his subjects, and no writers, however adverse to Constantine, speak in his behalf (e.g. cp. Julian, *Caes.*). There is therefore some probability in the statement. Constantine had also allied himself with one of the Eastern Augusti, Licinius, whom he engaged in marriage with his sister Constantia. On the other hand he had to proceed against the counsels and wishes of his generals, and against the advice of the augurs (*Pan. de vict. adv. Maxent.* ii.). After taking Turin, he rested some days at Milan, where he was received in triumph, and gave audience to all who wished to consult him (*ibid.* vii.). We may assume also that two other events took place at the same place and time, the spring or summer of 312, viz., the betrothal of Constantia with Licinius, and the issue of a second edict of toleration to the Christians, that somewhat *hard edict* to which the emperors refer in the more celebrated announcement of the following year (see below § III. B. *Religious policy*, and cf. Keim, *Uebertritt*, note 11).

After taking Verona, Constantine, according to the common accounts, met with little resistance till within a few miles of Rome, though this is not quite consistent with the statement of Lactantius (*De M. P.* xlv.). He had turned the advanced guard of the enemy at Saxa Rubra, close to the Cremera, and then pressed forward along the Flaminian road to the walls of the city itself. With great rashness Maxentius had determined to give battle exactly in front of the Tiber, with the Milvian bridge behind him, about a mile from the gates of Rome. It was the 26th of October, two days before the 6th anniversary of the accession of Maxentius, and during the night, according to our earliest authority, Constantine was warned in a dream to draw the monogram of Christ, the ✠, upon the shields of his soldiers (transversa littera X summo capite circumflexo Christum in scutis notat, *De M. P.* xlv.); and now, if not before, he learnt to invoke the name of Christ to help his arms (*H. E.* ix. 9, 12). The different accounts of the vision are discussed below, § V. Maxentius, in the mean time, spent the night in sacrifices and divination (Zos. ii. 16, &c.). The next morning the two armies met. That of Maxentius was totally routed after a vigorous resistance on the part of the praetorians. The fugitives crowded upon the bridge, and upon the pontoons placed at its side, which Maxentius had devised, according to an almost incredible statement, in order to give way be-

neath his opponent (*Eus. H. E.* ix. 9; 5, 6; *V. C.* i. 38; Zos. ii. 15). He was himself precipitated into the river, where his body was found the next day. The victor entered Rome in triumph, and was received with great joy by the people (*Pan. de vict. adv. M.* xix.). The head of the tyrant was carried on a spear into the city (*ib.* xviii.; Zos. ii. 17), and then sent to Africa, the province which he had particularly oppressed (Nazar. *Pan.* xxxii.). Constantine used his victory on the whole with moderation. He put to death the son of Maxentius, and disbanded the praetorians, who had formed the "faction" of his opponent, and razed their camp (Zos. ii. 17); but he repressed the delators (*Cod. Th.* x. 10, among the earliest laws in that collection). Eusebius tells us further that he set up a statue of himself with a spear terminating in a cross in his right hand, and an inscription to the effect that by this salutary sign (*or* standard) he had restored the Roman senate and people to their ancient glory and freedom (*H. E.* ix. 9; cf. *V. C.* i. 40). To this time also are referred the enlargement and endowment of many churches in and near Rome (*V. C.* i. 42), and the letters to Anulinus in behalf of the Catholic church in Africa, which led to such important consequences (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5, 7). From these documents it is evident that Constantine had already a strong disposition to favour the Christians, especially the Catholic body. The answers to one of them brought the case of Caecilian and the Donatists to his notice, and involved him during the succeeding years in the affairs of the African church. On the other hand he accepted the title and insignia of Pontifex Maximus, both of which were borne by his successors till the time of Gratian (Zos. iv. 36).

The triumphal arch erected to commemorate the victory, with materials drawn in great part from other monuments, particularly those of Trajan and (?) Marcus Aurelius, still stands over the Via Triumphalis between the Coliseum and the Palatine. The inscription on it has been the subject of considerable debate. It runs thus (Orelli 1075, Wilmanns 1073):—

IMP · CAES · FL · CONSTANTINO MAXIMO
P · F · AVGUSTO · S · P · Q · R
QVOD INSTINCTV DIVINITATIS MENTIS
MAGNITVDINE CVM EXERCITV SVO
TAM DE TYRANNO QVAM DE OMNI EIVS
FACTIONE VNO TEMPORE IVSTIS
REMPUBLICAM VLTIVS EST ARMIS
ARCVM TRIVMPHIS INSIGNEM DICAUIT
i.e., *Imp(erator) Fl(avius) Constantino Maximo P(io) F(elicio) Augusto S(enatus) P(opulus) q(ue) R(omanus), quod instinctu Divinitatis, mentis magnitudine, cum exercitu suo, tam de Tyranno, quam de omni eius factione, uno tempore iustis Rempublicam ultius est armis, arcum triumphis insignem dicavit.*

On the sides we have *votis x* and *votis xx* and *sic x* and *sic xx*, and inside the centre arch *liberatori urbis* and *fundatori quietis*.

The expression *Instinctu Divinitatis* has sometimes been represented as an after insertion in the place of some heathen formula, e.g. *nutu Iovis o. m.* (see Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. p. 113; cp. King, p. 18), and writers like Burckhardt are very ready to make a point against Constantine upon this supposition (*Die Zeit Const.*

p. 363 and note). But the careful examination made by Commander G. B. de Rossi, proves that no alteration has been made, or indeed was easily possible, since the words are cut upon the actual blocks of the structure, five of which would have required removal in order to effect the change alleged (*Bulletino d'Archeologia Cristiana* for 1863, Nos. 7 and 8). The arch appears to have been dedicated in 315, when Constantine was again for two months in Rome at his Decennalia. In fact the title *Maximus* does not seem to have been used by him before that date. But the inscription seems not so much to express his own feelings, as those of a temporising senate. The words *instinctu divinitatis* are exactly of that guarded character which we should expect from them. The same vague theism prevails in the heathen Panegyrists, especially in speaking of this campaign, and is very common in other pagan writers of the period. (*Pan. de v. adv. M. ii. iv.*, "te divina praecepta, illum superstitiosa maleficia," and especially ch. xi., where Constantine is spoken of as "divino monitus instinctu," almost the same phrase as on the arch, and the address, ch. xxvi., which is like nothing so much as Pope's *Universal Prayer*, cf. Nazar, *Pan. xxvi.*, xxviii. etc.) The belief of Constantine himself at this time was limited to a very few articles, but it was centred upon the person of Christ as the representative of the highest God, to whom the other gods were opposing demons rather than powers approaching to an equality.

Period ii. 312-324. Commencement of the cycle of *Indictions*, Sept. 1, 312. Constantine sole emperor of the West.

We have up to this point followed the steps by which Constantine at the age of about thirty-eight became sole Augustus of the West. The course of the next twelve years saw him reach the summit of his power, and ready to change the seat of empire to the East. Having settled the affairs of Rome, he proceeded early in the year 313 to meet Licinius at Milan. There the marriage of the latter with Constantia was consummated, and the full edict of toleration, the *Edict of Milan*, was promulgated. The emperors then separated, Licinius to defend himself against Maximinus Daza, Constantine to guard the Rhine. Both were victorious. Constantine had strengthened his army by enlisting many of the troops of Maxentius, and was able to inflict great losses on the Franks. Notwithstanding his advances towards Christianity, he still sacrificed large numbers of his captives in the arena at Treves, unless we suppose his panegyrist to be referring to the earlier campaign (*Pan. de v. adv. M. xliii.* caedibus hostium utitur etiam ad nostrum omnium voluptatem). Licinius soon after became sole master of the East by the death of Maximinus at Tarsus (*Zos. ii. 17; De M. P. xlix.*). The latter had followed the edict of Milan, according to the behest of the other emperors, by an act of toleration of his own, but of a less full and generous nature. (So Eusebius, *H. E. ix. 9, 14*, who gives the text; but it seems almost more probable that this edict was parallel to the harder edict of Constantine and Licinius of the year 312. Eusebius is often not accurate in the chronology of the documents he gives.) But this did not prevent him from taking advantage of the absence of Licinius to invade his territory, who in consequence had to fight him at Adrian-

ople with a force half as large as that opposed to him. The battle was in many details like that against Maxentius—Licinius was favoured with a mysterious dream, and solemnly put his army under the protection of the God of the Christians, and on the morning of the battle repeated aloud three times with his officers a prayer to the holy and supreme God (*De M. P. xlv.*). After his victory he entered Nicomedia in triumph, and proclaimed the edict of Milan, June 13th, and then pursued Maximinus into Cilicia, where he found him dying a horrible and painful death, the last of the persecutors (*De M. P. xlix.*; *Eus. H. E. ix. 10, 14*).

The brothers-in-law were thus raised to an equality of power, and their dispositions were not likely to keep them long at peace. The occasion of their quarrel is obscure—an intrigue in which Bassianus, husband of Anastasia, half-sister of Constantine, was concerned. Constantine accused him of conspiracy against him, and Licinius of fomenting it, a charge to which Licinius gave some colour by protecting the family of the accused (*Anon. Vales. 14*, but *Zos. ii. 18: Κωνσταντίνου κατὰ τὸ σύνθηρος αὐτῷ . . . φανέντος ἀπιστοῦ*). Licinius was defeated at Cibalis in Pannonia, and after an indecisive action at Mardia, near Adrianople, made peace by putting his Caesar Valens to death, and by the cession of Illyricum—that is, of the whole peninsula of which Greece is the extremity. Constantine was not too busy during this campaign to attend to the arrangement of the council of Arles, and to interest himself vehemently in the Donatistic disputes. The peace that followed lasted for nine years, during which the emperor employed himself with barbarian wars, especially against the Sarmatae, and with legislation civil and religious, as detailed below. His Decennalia were celebrated at Rome 315, 316, and the triumphal arch dedicated. Two years later Crispus, now a young man, and his infant son and nephew, Constantine and Licinianus, were raised to the rank of Caesar at Arles (*Zos. ii. 20, &c.*). His other sons by Fausta were born also in this period, Constantius in 317 and Constans in 323. Licinius in the mean time began to oppress his subjects, especially to act unfairly towards the Christians among them. He forbade the synods of bishops, he interfered with their worship, and in many cases destroyed their churches (even Julian, *Caes. p. 315*, is unfavourable to Licinius). Constantine, on his part, was engaged in defending his Danubian frontier from Goths and Sarmatians, and took the Sarmatian king Rausimodes prisoner (*Zos. ii. 21*). In some of these expeditions he had not been careful to avoid trespassing across the boundaries of Licinius, and this was an easy pretext for a quarrel. The debate which arose between them was increased by the expostulations of Constantine against the treatment of the Christians, and after some changes of temper on the part of Licinius, an open rupture was the consequence (*Anon. Vales. 21; Anon. ap. Müll. Fr. H. Gr. iv. 199* records an insult offered to the coins of Constantine's Sarmatian victories).

The character of the former war was ambiguous. This, however, in great measure assumed that of a religious war or crusade (*Eus. H. E. x. 9*). Before any conflict had been fought (it was said) the subjects of Licinius thought they saw the victorious legions of Constantine marching through

their streets at midday (*V. C. ii. 6*). The monogram of Christ was stamped at this time on the coinage of almost all the mints in his dominions (§ VI.). The labarum became in the different engagements a talisman of victory (*ὁλοῦν τι νικητικὸν ἀλεξιφάρμακον*, *V. C. ii. 7*). The emperor surrounded himself with Christian priests, and believed himself favoured with visions as he prayed in the tent which contained the standard of the cross, and then leapt up as if inspired to victory (*ib. 12*). We must confess that he was in part self-deluded, and that the motive of personal ambition entered largely into his actions. But it is too much to say with Neander, that "the war beyond all question was undertaken on no other grounds than those of a selfish policy" (*vol. iii. p. 32*; ed. Bohn). The sentiment of a divine vocation was probably a real one to him, and it was fostered by the approbation of all the Christians. It will be unnecessary to follow all the details of the war. Licinius, on the very scene of his conflict as a Christian champion with Maximinus, prepared for battle by sacrifice and worship of the gods, against whom he then had fought, and Constantine on his side by prayer and by giving the watchword *Θεὸς ὁ σωτὴρ* (*V. C. ii. 5* and *6*; cf. *Soz. H. E. i. 7* on the perversion of Licinius). This second battle of Adrianople, July 3, 323, was a second victory for the Christian arms. Constantine pursued his opponent to Byzantium. In the mean time Crispus, who had already won his youthful laurels against the Franks, shewed himself most active in command of the fleet, and defeated the admiral Amandus in the Hellespont. This caused Licinius to quit Byzantium for Chalcædon, where, as in the former war, he appointed one of his chief officers, Martinianus, as Caesar. But Constantine did not hesitate to pursue him, and on the 10th of September, after some negotiations, achieved a final victory at Chrysopolis. Licinius, on the entreaty of Constantia, was permitted to retire to Thessalonica; but Martinianus was put to death. Licinius, however, was not allowed to live above a year longer. Socrates relates that after remaining quiet a short time, "he collected some barbarians, and attempted to repair his defeat" (*H. E. i. 4*; so Zonaras and Niceph. Call.), and Eusebius justifies his execution by the law of war (*V. C. ii. 19*). Zosimus and the heathen historians make it an instance of the emperor's faithfulness (Zos. ii. 28; Victor, *Epit. l. c*; Eutrop. *Brev. x. 6*), and as such too it appears in the chronicle of Jerome (ann. 2339, Licinius Thessalonicae contra ius sacramenti privatus occiditur). Yet, as far as we are aware, his wife Constantia did not resent the execution of her husband, any more than Fausta did the death of her father. Constantine thus found himself master of the whole empire, and his first act was to issue edicts of toleration and favour to the Christians of the East (*V. C. ii. 24* sq., cited as *Provincialibus Palaestinae* and *48 sq. Prov. Orientis*). He now specially assumed the title of Victor (*νικητὴς*) as a part of his name (*V. C. ii. 19*; Vales. ad loc. asserts that he had used this title in some of the previous epistles about Caecilian and the Donatists, but this seems incorrect). He had won it by the constant success of his arms against barbarians on the Rhine and on the Danube, against

rival emperors from the Tiber to the Bosphorus: his twenty years of empire had brought him from London in the far West to Byzantium, the centre of the Eastern world, and their course had been one of uninterrupted conquest. He was not by any means void of thankfulness to the Providence which had guided him, or indisposed to acknowledge that something was due from him in return (*Prov. Pal. V. C. ii. 28, 29*). But his progress had not led him to a victory over himself, or rather his success under the hand of God made him forgetful of his own liability to crime.

Period iii. 324-337. Constantine sole emperor.

The history of the last twelve years of Constantine's reign is of a very different character from that of the preceding periods. As sole emperor he loses rather than gains in our estimation. He had no longer a religious cause to fight for or a dangerous rival to overthrow. The hardness of his character fitted him for a life of strong excitement, but not for the intrigues of an Eastern court and the subtle questions of Eastern theology. His immoderate profusion in building and other expensive operations gained him the name of "spendthrift" (*decem novissimis [annis] pupillus ob profusiones immodicas nominatus*, *Vict. Epit. 41*), and his liberality towards the church was by no means free from the evils that attend prodigal benevolence. But he had no less a providential part to play in the internal history of that church, than he had had up to this time in the destruction of her persecutors. As emperor of the West he had been led to interfere in her councils by the African schism, on which his decision was desired by both parties. As monarch also of the East he was brought directly into contact with the speculations on points of Christian doctrine which seemed there to have their proper origin and home. Here again he attempted to realise his idea of unity. Taking as his precedent the great council of Western bishops which he had summoned at Arles (Aug. 314) in the case of Caecilian, he determined to call together representatives of the whole empire to decide on the doctrines of Arius and the Paschal controversy (see below, § III. 2 and *Nicaea, Council of*). To Constantine is due in great measure the credit of the council of Nicaea (June and July, 325); without his intervention it certainly would never have been held. But the success of that great meeting filled him unfortunately with overweening pride. The flattery interchanged between himself and its members, hurtful to both parties, was especially hurtful to him, as he understood most indistinctly the merits of the points under debate. The conclusion of their session fell at the beginning of the twentieth year of his reign, and he celebrated the condemnation of Arius as a second triumph (*V. C. iii. 14*). He entertained all the bishops at his table. "The guards," says Eusebius, "kept watch with drawn swords round the vestibule of the palace; the men of God passed through their midst without fear, and entered the inmost parts of the royal dwelling. Some of them reclined by his side, and others were placed on couches on either hand. One might have seemed to picture to oneself an image of Christ's kingdom; the whole thing was more like a dream than a reality" (*ibid. 15*). The same

writer suggests, we may remember, that the church of the Anastasis, built by Constantine, fulfilled the prophecies about the New Jerusalem (*V. C.* iii. 33). The interest of Constantine in the success of the council did not end with its dispersion. He wrote letters of various import to the different parties concerned in its decrees, strongly enforcing conformity with them (see below, § III. 2 c.) The same feelings led him to compose and deliver theological declamations, and to attempt the conversion of his courtiers. Large crowds attended to listen to the philosophising prince, who did not spare their faults. But the matter was not one merely of philosophy. It may be, as Burckhardt suggests (p. 454), that he took such opportunities of seriously warning or even denouncing those of his "companions" and "palatines," whose presumption on his favour had become intolerable. The passionate and almost eloquent law of this year, promulgated at Nicomedia, calls upon any one who feels wronged by such officials to declare their grievances freely, and promises personal vengeance on those "who up to this time have deceived us by simulated integrity;" and when Constantine felt himself wronged he did not hesitate to strike (*Cod. Th.* ix. 1, 4 in 325).

After a prolonged sojourn in the East his presence was now required in Rome. He advanced thither by slow stages, arriving about the 8th of July, in time to celebrate the completion of his twentieth year of empire, July 25, 326. He left it certainly before the end of September; but in that short space of time all that was tragical in his life seems to have reached its climax. There was much in the city itself to irritate and disturb him. The ancient aristocracy, in the absence of a resident emperor, preserved many of its old traditions, especially those of which the heathen spirit was the life. Though he came determined to be tolerant (*Cod. Th.* xv. 1, 3) and desirous of gaining the favour of the senate (*id.* xv. 14; 3, 4), it soon became evident that he was out of harmony with Rome. He would not join in the solemn review of the knights held on July 4th, and in their procession and sacrifice to Jupiter Capitolinus; but he viewed it contemptuously from the Palatine and ridiculed it to those who stood around him (*Zos.* ii. 29). Such an action, joined with the Oriental dress and general bearing of the emperor, seemed to have caused a popular outbreak of indignation against him. Though tempted to revenge himself by force he was wise enough to refrain. (See esp. De Broglie, *l. c.* ii. ch. 5, for the events of this year. He puts together Liban. *Or.* 12, p. 393; *Or.* 15, p. 412, and Chrys. *Or. ad pop. Antioch.* 21.) But this outburst was followed by far heavier tragedies within the circle of his own household. In relating them we have to rely on the vague and inconsistent tales of later writers, those nearest the emperor, Eutropius and Eusebius, being markedly silent. They seem to have originated with divisions, such as easily arose in a family composed of so many different elements. The half-brothers of Constantine, the sons of Constantius and Theodora, naturally took part with their mother's half-sister, Fausta, and her sons. On the other hand, Helena had reason to sympathise with her grandson Crispus, the son of Minervina. We may conclude that it was in connexion with these divisions, though the

matter is most obscure, that Crispus was suddenly arrested, and conveyed to Pola in Istria (*Amm. Marc.* xiv. 11), where he perished by an unknown death. Whether he was the victim of political or of domestic jealousy, or, as is possible, of both at once, can never be known to us. Niebuhr thought it not improbable that the accusation of treason against his father, reported by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. 36), had some foundation of truth. Another, but not an early account, represents Fausta as playing to him the part of Phaedra towards Hippolytus (*Zos.* ii. 29), and certainly other authors name her as his accuser without specifying the nature of the charge. (*Vict. Epit.* 41, Philostorgius, ii. 4. Sozomen, *H. E.* i. 5, implies that the death of Crispus was required of Constantine by others.) The young and promising Caesar Licinianus was at the same time put to death, an act for which it would be hardly possible to find a justification (*Eutrop.* x. 6: *Hieron. Chron. Ann.* 2342). The following satirical distich, attributed to the city prefect Ablavius, was found on the palace doors after the death of Crispus (*Sidon. Apollin. Epist.* v. 8):—

"Saturni aurea saecula quis requirat?
Sunt haec gemmae, sed Neroniana."

But he was avenged much more tragically, and at no distant date. (Jerome puts it three years later, the others connect the two events.) Fausta herself was executed in as sudden and as dark a way as Crispus. The complaints of Helena seemed to have aroused her son to this dire act of retribution (*Zos.* ii. 29; *Vict. Ep.* 41). Later writers represent the empress as guilty of adultery (Philostorg. ii. 4; *Sidon. Apoll. l. c.*; *Greg. Turon. H. F.* i. 34), and her punishment is said to have been suffocation in the steam of a warm bath. (*Philostorg. l. c.*; *Zos. l. c.*, the inconsistency in chap. 39 is curious, but not unparalleled in the author. The allusion in Chrysostom, *Hom. in Philipp.* 15, is incorrect in circumstance, but preserves the memory of the deed.) There are indeed difficulties, first raised by Gibbon, which have led some historians to doubt the death of Fausta. The conclusion of Evagrius, drawn from the silence of Eusebius, extends also to Crispus and is of little moment. But Julian in his *Oratio to Constantius* (i. p. 9 B. ed. Spanheim) praises the virtue, beauty, and gifts of his mother; and the author of the *Monody on the younger Constantine* (ad calcem *Eutrop.* ed. Havercamp), talks of her as alive and about to hear the news of her son's death. But the first is not decisive even of the innocence of Fausta, and the second appears to be on other points of doubtful authority, perhaps to be merely a school declamation of later date. (See Wesseling's *Observations*, reprinted in a recent edition *Anonymi Graeci oratio funebris in Const.* ed. C. H. Frotscher, Friburg, 1856. Wesseling inclines to refer it to Theodorus, brother of Constantine Palaeologus.)

There cannot, we think, be any real doubt that Crispus and Fausta perished, both probably in the year 328, by the orders of Constantine, acting as the instrument of family jealousies. The death of Fausta had also its sequel in the execution of many of his friends, those it may be presumed who had taken part against Crispus (*Eutrop.* x. 4). Popular traditions represent

Constantine as tormented by remorse after his delirium of cruelty had passed, and as seeking everywhere the means of expiation. Zosimus relates that the heathen priests refused to purify him, and that a certain Egyptian from Spain advised him to try the effects of Christian doctrine; whereupon he gave up the religion of his fathers (Zos. ii. 29). A similar pagan fable is that refuted by Sozomen (*H. E.* i. 5), which represents the emperor as repulsed by Sopater the philosopher, and then falling in with certain bishops, who promised him purification for all his sins after repentance and baptism. Though rejected by the church historians of the East, another form of this fable was long credited in the West, and Constantine it was said was actually baptized by pope Sylvester, and bestowed on the see of Rome his famous donation, the fatal gift of temporal power. This has long ago passed, as Ariosto described it, to the world of nonentities in the moon. Yet nothing can be more in harmony with the character of Constantine and of the age, than to suppose that he sought for means of religious expiation. Tillemont (*Vie de Const.* 24) suggests that the "Egyptian from Spain" may mean Hosius of Cordova, though he connects the circumstance with the earlier date of his conversion. Hosius or any other Christian bishop could have done nothing else except urge him to repentance to be followed by baptism. But for reasons which we do not thoroughly know, Constantine put off this important step, and also delayed the baptism of his sons. That he bestowed some possessions on the church at this time, and built or handed over basilicas to it, is very probable. From the number which claim foundation at his hand we may perhaps select those of the Vatican, which was destroyed to make room for the modern St. Peter's; of St. Agnes, which has an inscription referring to his daughter Constantina; and of the Lateran, once the palace of Fausta, and the seat of the first council about the Donatists, and still the real cathedral of the pope. It is probable that the pilgrimage of Helena to Palestine in pursuance of a vow, and the 'Invention of the Cross,' is to be assigned to the time that immediately follows. Constantine gave her every assistance, and authorised her to spend money freely both in alms and buildings. (Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 11, *ad Sulpic. Sever.*; cf. *V. C.* iii. 47, 3). It is possible that he delayed his own baptism in the hope that he might soon follow her example and be washed in the holy waters of Jordan (*V. C.* iv. 62). He now left Rome never to return to it, but with the project of founding a new Rome in the East, which should equal if not surpass the old.

The beauty and convenience of the site of Byzantium had long been noticed (cf. *Hdt.* iv. 144); it was, as has been remarked, the birthplace of Fausta, and the immediate neighbourhood had been the scene of the final defeat of Licinius. The emperor had perhaps already formed the idea of embellishing it and calling it by his own name, as he changed the names of Arles and Ciria to Constantina and Drepanum to Helenopolis. He had probably moved a mint thither as early as 325, and used the name (*Constantinopolis*) upon his coins. But now his intention may have been strengthened by his distaste for Rome, joined with a superstition that its fall from power was at hand (*Chron. Pasch.* ed. Bonn,

p. 517). Other cities had before attracted his attention. At one time he was in the habit of saying "My Rome is Sardica" (Anon. ap. Müll. *Fr. H. Gr.* iv. 199), at another he had set his eyes upon Thessalonica and Chalcedon (Burkhardt, p. 465). At last he seemed to have fixed on Ilium, following out the dream of Julius and Augustus at the beginning of the monarchy. He even went so far as to erect walls and gates, when he was warned in a dream to remove to another site (Zos. ii. 30; Soz. ii. 3). His final choice was for Byzantium. Many stories are told of the ceremonies with which he laid out the plan of the new Rome, enclosing like its prototype the tops of seven hills. One of them is very characteristic. As he advanced, spear in hand, tracing the immense circuit, those who followed asked him how far he was going. "I shall go on," replied he, "till he that goes before me stops." (Philostorg. ii. 9; see here Burkhardt, p. 467, who places the date of this foundation Nov. 4, 326. Authorities differ much upon the point. Socrates i. 16 relates it directly after the council of Nicaea, and so Theophanes, anno 5816. But if the chronology of the Theodosian code is correct Constantine was at Arles Nov. 3, 326, and does not seem to have been in the East till June 327, when a law is dated at Constantinople. De Broglie places the foundation in 328 or 329, *l. c.* ii. 441; Éclairc. C.) From another source we hear of the presence of Sopater and other heathen mystics, implying perhaps the usage of heathen rites (Joann. Lydus, *de Mensib.* iv. 2). Yet the Christian historians assert that the absence of heathenism from the city was the express desire of the emperor (*e. g.* *V. C.* iii. 48). No doubt he was surrounded by various influences and was susceptible to changes of religious feeling. Sopater about this time was particularly influential, but he had many enemies, especially the powerful Ablavius. He was accused of delaying by magical arts the arrival of the corn-ships at Constantinople, the people clamoured for their doles, and Constantine hastily gave the order for his death (Eunap. *Vit. Aedes.* p. 41).

The removal of Sopater perhaps gave room for the power of Helena to reassert itself. She communicated to her son the success of her pilgrimage, and forwarded him certain relics, which he received with great joy, especially two nails from the cross. One of them he set in a diadem, the model of the iron crown of Lombardy, the other he formed into the mouthpiece of a horse's bit (Socr. i. 17; Soz. ii. 1, who quotes Zachar. xiv. 20; cf. Ambros. *De obitu Theod.*). With the aid of his liberality she built two churches, one on the cave of the nativity at Bethlehem, the other on the place of the ascension upon Olivet (*V. C.* iii. 43). At the same time she probably overlooked the construction of his great work, the church of the Holy Sepulchre or Anastasis, as well as the one under Abraham's oak or terebinth at Mamre. All these churches were already places of pilgrimage in 333, and are mentioned in the *Itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem*. (Socrates, i. 17, speaks of the Holy Sepulchre as a building of Helena's, cf. Theodoret i. 18; Eus. *V. C.*, iii. 30, sq., describes it and gives Constantine's letter to Macarius, but does not mention Helena as concerned with it.) Having thus accomplished her vow she returned to die in the presence of her son, and was carried into the "imperial city," that is most

probably Constantinople (ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλεύσαντα πόλιν, *V. C.* iii. 47, which in Eusebius generally means Rome, and so it was understood by Niceph. Call. iii. 30, who makes her die there, and be translated two years afterwards to Constantinople. But Socrates, i. 17, says particularly εἰς τὴν βασιλεύσαντα νέαν Ῥώμην, which seems intended for a gloss on Eusebius, and he is likely to have known where she was buried. See further Heinichen on *Eus. l. c.*). Another death about the same time had important consequences. His sister Constantia was much under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and had in her household an Arian priest, who persuaded her that Arius had been most unjustly treated. She had not courage to speak on the subject herself to her brother, but on her deathbed strongly recommended the priest to him, and he was taken into the imperial family. This man soon succeeded in gaining influence over the emperor, the result of which it is said was his gradual alienation from the Catholics (*Socr. i.* 25; see De Broglie, ch. v., at the end).

In the mean time the building of the new capital went on with great vigour, temples and cities, especially in Greece and Asia Minor, were despoiled to beautify it: the statues of Castor and Pollux and the tripod of Delphi, dedicated by the conquerors of Plataea, were placed in the new hippodrome (*Zos. ii.* 31), where the serpent-twined base of the latter still stands; in two temples at the side of the Forum, were the image of Cybele from Dindymus, transformed it is said into a suppliant attitude, and that of the Fortune of Rome (*Zos. l. c.*). In the centre of the great square was the celebrated porphyry column, a fit emblem in its strange combinations of the character of the emperor. Taken itself from a temple at Heliopolis or Ilum (see Garucci in King, *Early Christian Numismatics*, p. 18), it was originally surmounted by a statue of the sun-god. This was altered into one of Constantine with the inscription, "To Constantine, brilliant as the sun." The aureola round his head resembled, we are told, the nails of the cross, but this may be merely the historian's fancy (*Codinus De sign. C. P.* p. 41; *Zon.* xiii. 3; cf. *Chron. Pasch.* pp. 664, 666). Beneath the column was placed the Palladium of Rome or an exact copy of it (*Chron. Pasch.* p. 664), and a relic of the true cross (*Socr. i.* 17). Other more distinctly Christian works of art are described by Eusebius (*V. C.* iii. 3 and 49; iv. 15). Among the churches erected at this time may be mentioned those of St. Irene (taken afterward into St. Sophia's), of the apostles, St. Anne and St. Michael; and a letter from the emperor to Eusebius is extant, in which he orders fifty copies of the Scriptures to be prepared for the use of the churches he was building (*V. C.* iv. 36).

Other constructions went on with great rapidity to fit the city for the residence of a new nobility, some created and others transferred from Rome. Of the population that gathered together into it almost all the pagans and a good number of the Jews became Christians. The city was solemnly consecrated on the 11th of May, 330, followed by a feast of forty days (*Idatius, fasti, Chron. Pasch.* A.D. 330), and the anniversary (May 4th) was long kept as the nativity of Constantinople.

It is indeed a very important era, marking the greatest political transformation that the Roman empire underwent. With it were connected the great constitutional changes detailed below, § III. 1, under which grew up the Byzantine spirit with its peculiar character, turbulent, slavish, and unimaginative, but yet capable of endurance tempered with a certain kind of morality.

The years that followed brought Constantine more than ever into the debates of the church. The emperor recalled Arius, but Athanasius, now made bishop of Alexandria, refused to receive him. The steps by which the latter was at length exiled (in 336) and Arius received in triumph into the church, belong to the history of COUNCILS (Caesarea, Tyre, Jerusalem) and of ARIANISM (see also § III. B (3) *infra*). After the building of Constantinople Constantine engaged in few wars. We hear of a Gothic and Scythian war in which the success of the labarum in battle caused the conversion of many barbarians (*V. C.* iv. 5). Constantine used his victories with moderation, and left a grateful memory amongst those he conquered (*Eutrop. Brev. x.* 4); he allowed, for instance, a large body of Sarmatians to settle within the boundaries of the empire (*V. C.* iv. 6; cf. *Amm. Marc.* xvii. 13, xix. 11, "Sarmatae limigantes"). In 333 he received an embassy from Persia, and in returning it wrote a letter on behalf of the Christians dwelling in the dominions of Sapor II. (*V. C.* iv. 8, sq.; Theodoret, i. 25). After crushing the insignificant rebellion of Calocerus in Cyprus, he was induced, by some motives unknown to us, to divide the empire which he had with such labour united. He may have been disgusted with his ill success in promoting religious unity, he may have foreseen the quarrels likely to arise amongst his sons. At any rate, in the middle of his thirtieth year, 335, he distributed the territories under his dominion between his three sons and two nephews. The eldest, Constantine, received the provinces of his grandfather, Britain, Spain, and Gaul; Constantius, Asia, Syria, and Egypt; Constans, Italy and Africa. Dalmatius, with the title of Caesar, had the large province of Illyricum; and Hanniballian, Armenia and Pontus, with the extraordinary name of *king*. The evidence of coins would lead us to see in this measure a reconciliation of the two branches of the family, whose divisions we have already noticed (see § VI. *Coins*).

The end of Constantine's eventful life was now at hand, and as some of his first military services had been against the Persians, so now he was obliged at its close to prepare for war against that people, though he never actually engaged in it (*V. C.* iv. 57). The labarum had now been for many years the recognised standard of the empire, wherever the emperor was present; and as in the time of the war with Licinius the monogram of Christ was in these last years largely stamped upon its coins (see § VI.). He made also other preparations for the use of religious service in war, especially of a tent for his own chapel (*V. C.* iv. 56; *Socr. i.* 18), and he had some time before taught his soldiers, heathen as well as Christian, a common daily prayer, and ordered Sunday to be kept as a holy day (*V. C.* iv. 19 and 20; *L. C.* ix. 10; cf. *Cod. Th.* II. 8. 1 in 321). We may hope that

with these observances the inward meaning of Christianity was becoming clearer to the emperor, when at Easter 337 he completed and dedicated the great church of the Holy Apostles, in which he desired to find a place of burial. In the week that followed, his health, which up to this point had been extremely good, gave way, and he sought relief in the warm baths at Helenopolis. Feeling here that his death was approaching, he made confession of his sins in the church of the martyrs (of the martyr Lucianus?), and received imposition of hands as a catechumen—for he had not even taken this step before. Then he moved back to the villa Ancyrona, a suburb of Nicomedia (Eutrop. x. 8; Vict. *Caes.* 41), and desired baptism of the bishops whom he there assembled (V. C. iv. 61). He had wished once, he said, to be baptized in Jordan, but God had decided otherwise. He felt that now was the time when the blessing he had so long hoped for was offered him. "Let there be no doubt about it," he added, "I have determined once for all, if the Disposer of life and death sees fit to raise me up again to fellowship with His people, to impose upon myself rules of life such as He would approve" (V. C. iv. 62, see Heinichen's note). Baptism was administered to him by the Arian relate Eusebius of Nicomedia (Hieron. *Chron.* ann. 2353). From that moment he laid aside the purple robe, and wore only the white garment of a neophyte. He died on Whitsunday in the same year, being within about two months of the completion of the 31st year of his reign, dating from July 25, 306.

III. Legislation and Policy.

A. Secular Policy.

1. The new Constitution—Civil, Military, Ministers of State.
2. Financial Policy.
3. Penal and other Laws.

B. Religious Policy.

1. Acts of Toleration.
2. Donatist Schism.
3. Arianism.
4. Relation to Heathenism.

A. SECULAR POLICY.—It would be out of place here to give a very detailed account of the secular policy of Constantine. Yet his reign was almost as remarkable as a turning-point in the history of the world as it was in that of the church. Nor were the changes that took place merely or chiefly consequent on the union of church and state, much as that conduced to the peculiar character of the empire that followed. No one, either Christian or heathen, could have expected that union; whereas the course of secular policy was one for which previous emperors, esp. Diocletian, had done much to prepare (cf. for example *De M. P.* 7, *provinciae quoque in frusta concisae, multi praefides et plura officia singulis regionibus ac saepe iam civitatibus incubare*: see also the refs. and quotations in Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. pp. 81 and 422). Indeed in recounting these civil changes we are often at a loss to know where to fix their date and origin, and we are very little qualified to censure their expediency. Probably very little was wholly new, whilst much that was partial and inconsistent became general and equal under Constantine's direction. However this may be, historians generally ascribe the greatest share in these

measures to him. No emperor of the time had either the length of reign or the personal vigour requisite for them except himself; no one in fact but the founder of Constantinople could have changed the constitution of the Roman world.

(1.) *The New Constitution.* The building of a new capital sealed the division of the Eastern and Western empire, on which the whole subordinate constitution depended. Yet we must remark that even in the time of Diocletian the government of East and West had been practically distinct, and the scheme of division into praetorian prefectures, dioceses, and provinces was fairly complete. The following is the division into dioceses of the reign of Diocletian, preserved in a document of about the year 297 (*Verzeichniss der Röm. Prov.*, Th. Mommsen, Berlin, 1863, 4°, from a MS. at Verona, which he compares with the later lists of Polemius Silvius, the *Notitia dignitatum* and Hierocles).

The twelve dioceses are,—1. Oriens; 2. Pontica; 3. Asiana; 4. Thracia; 5. Moesia; 6. Pannoniae; 7. Britanniae; 8. Galliae; 9. Viennensis; 10. Italiciana; 11. Hispaniae; 12. Africa. It is to be noted that Oriens = Oriens and Aegyptus of later times; that the two Moesiae and Pannoniae = Illyricum of Silvius, afterwards divided into (1) Dacia and Macedonia, and (2) Illyricum; and that Galliae and Viennensis = the later diocese Galliae. These dioceses were under Constantine divided between the four praetorian prefects of Oriens, Illyricum, Italia (including Africa), and Gallia (including Spain and Britain). To these great officers were assigned the highest judicial and political functions, with great freedom in their exercise, but with hardly any military power. The dioceses were governed by *vicars* or *counts* (*vicarii*, *comites*) dependent upon the prefects, and forming with the *proconsuls* of Asia, Africa, and Achaia the second order of civil governors. Beneath them came the *provincial governors* (*rectores*, *correctores*, *praesides*, *consulares*). To secure impartiality as much as possible, none of these was allowed to govern the province of his own birth. At Rome the *city prefect* retained his independence of the praetorian: and Constantinople received a like honour in the reign of Constantine in 360 (Soz. iv. 23). Constantine had already given his city two praetors (Joan. Lyd. *de M. P. R.* ii. 30). The older magistracies were still objects of ambition, but their power was merely nominal. That of consul carried with it great honour and influence if the holder liberally entertained the public. That of praetor was scarcely more than a tax upon the senators, like an Athenian liturgy, requiring the bearer of it to spend a certain sum, which he would naturally exceed if he was rich and ambitious. Besides these greater magistrates were others subordinate to them in all parts of the empire whom we cannot here enumerate. Details may be gathered from the *Notitia dignitatum utriusque Imperii* (ed. Böcking), composed perh. about 425, and from the obscure treatise of Joannes Lydus, *de Magistrat. P. R.*, bks. ii. iii., written in the time of Justinian, as well as from the two codes and the commentators upon them (see also Manso, *L. C.* pp. 107 foll. and 9^{te} Beilage; De Broglie, t. ii. ch. 6).

Parallel to this civil constitution was the military establishment. The power over the troops was assigned to a *master of the horse*

and a *master of the foot* (*magister equitum, peditum*), although the praetorian prefects seem to have retained some military state till the time of Arcadius (*Jo. Lyd. de M. P. ii. 10*). These officers, afterwards increased in number to eight, had directly beneath them a number of *dukes and counts* (*duces, comites*), with territorial titles taken generally from the marches and territories of the empire. Among the soldiers themselves Constantine carried out the distinction into two classes; the first stationed in the interior, with a higher rank, and including the household troops or *palatini*, the second being employed to guard the borders. (There is a difficulty as to their classification. Manso divides, 1. *legiones = Palatini, Comitatusenses and Pseudo-Comitatusenses*; 2. *riparii, riparesenses, or limitanei*. Burkhardt quotes Lange, *Hist. rei militaris. Rom.* p. 100, sq., to shew that the division was rather into 1. *palatini*, 2. *legiones = Comitatusenses*, in provincial towns, and *Pseudo-Comitatusenses*, on the boundaries.) As to their disposition, Zosimus makes it a principal charge against Constantine that he massed them together and set them to garrison the large towns instead of distributing them as before in the lines of smaller forts and castles (*ii. 34*; cf. *Jo. Lyd. de M. P. R. ii. 10*). As to the policy of these measures we cannot now decide, but Zosimus does not appear at all a profound reasoner on such matters, and Constantine surely was not ignorant of barbarian warfare. Still his policy of conciliation towards the German tribes, referred to above, was not pleasing to the Romans, and had dangerous results under his feeble successors, which he probably would have been able to avert. In conformity with the general tendency of the times the soldiers became almost a caste, not volunteers from the various ranks of society, but furnished by each municipality as part of the tax assessed upon them.

To this constitution of civil and military affairs must be added that of the court and aristocracy, which seems to have been determined more by Constantine than any other emperor, though in part of earlier, part of later origin. Some dignities were invented by him, such as the three orders of *comites* and the title *illustrissimus* (*V. C. iv. 1*), others were adopted and made regular from earlier times; for instance, the first *magister aulae* known to historians was Martinianus, the short-lived Caesar of Licinius (*Jo. Lyd. de M. P. R. ii. 25*). This aristocracy was almost entirely official, and so owed its existence directly to the emperor, though the senates at Rome and Constantinople continued to coopt their own members. It was not at first hereditary, but had a tendency to become so from the frequency with which privileges were extended to the sons and grandsons of those who were ennobled. It consisted of the great ministers of state and their subordinates, among whom, as among the civil and military officers above referred to, were distributed substantial privileges attached to the well-known titles of honour. These were of two chief classes, I. consisting of *illustres, spectabiles*, and *clarissimi*, not exactly defined from one another in the time of Constantine, but distinctly subordinated in the *notitia dignitatum*; II. *perfectissimi* and *egregii*, distinctly inferior to the first class from the time perhaps of Diocletian. These had not only rights of admission to the presence

of the emperor and to the courts of justice, but immunities, of which exemption from the *curia* was most important. In civil matters the first class could only be cited before prefects, praetorian or urban; and the second before their vicars. In criminal trials, however, a law of Constantine took away these privileges (*C. Th. ix. 1. 1* in 317). The title *nobilissimus* was reserved for the royal family, while the emperor himself was addressed as *Your Eternity*, and the word *sacred* applied to his surroundings.

The great ministers just referred to were as follows:—First two of finance, the *count of the sacred largesses* (comes *sacrarum largitionum*), the treasurer and paymaster of the whole public staff of the empire, and the *count of the private estate* (comes *rei privatae*) who managed the enormous revenues of the *fiscus* and kept account of the privileges granted by the emperor (*liber beneficiorum*, Hyginus *de Const. Limit.* p. 203, ed. Lachm. and Du Cange, s. v.). These two presided jointly over a court of final appeal in civil matters where the state was either plaintiff or defendant. Next came the officers of the palace or Domus Augusta—the *grand chamberlain* (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*); the two *commanders of the body-guard* (*comites domesticorum*); and the *master of the offices* (*magister officiorum*). This latter was a most important functionary, being in fact minister of police for the whole empire, having control over the posts, the police, the arsenals and manufactories of arms, together with the charge of the imperial correspondence (*serinia*). As his chief business was to guard against conspiracies and insurrections, he had also jurisdiction over all offences committed in the palace. The last of these great ministers was the *quaestor palatii*, a general secretary of state, who had the keeping of all edicts, rescripts, and ordinances, and of all such documents as bore the emperor's signature. These ministers, with the large departments subordinate to each, formed a centralised body which rapidly grew in extent and influence, till they overshadowed all the other powers of the state. The tendency of legislation was to increase their dignity at the expense of that of the praetors and provincial governors and the other aristocracy (see *Cod. Theod. lib. vi.*). The chiefs of these departments with a number of independent councillors formed the *consistorium sacrum* or privy council.

(2.) *Financial policy.* The general scope of these changes in administration was to obtain security by centralisation and by the division of power in the hands of different officers. The Eastern empire henceforth becomes the model of a stable despotism; standing by its organisation, the product in its outset of vigorous minds, but afterwards able to endure in the absence of personal vigour either in the monarch or his ministers, though this was often not wanting. The object of the financial charges appears similar. The chief direct taxes existing before Constantine were three: 1. the *land-tax* (*capitatio jugorum or praedii*); 2. the *poll-tax* (*humana capitatio*) falling chiefly on the agriculturists; 3. *five per cent. on inheritances* (*vicesima hereditatum*). To these we may add the so-called *coronary gold*, dating from the time of Augustus, as a voluntary contribution on any joyful occasion, in the shape of wreaths of gold; then reduced to a money equivalent, and at last imposed by the em-

eror's will upon different cities and communities, at never quite losing the idea of a "benevolence." The first of these, the *land-tax*, consisted of contributions in kind as well as in money, varying very year in amount according to the supposed needs of the empire. The document describing the gross amount of the various produce required, was signed by the emperor's hand and called the *Indiction*. It was collected by the governors of provinces from the different municipalities, for each of which the *town-council* (*curia*) was responsible. The legislation of Constantine in reference to this tax consisted, as far as we know it, in various enactments with regard to the town-councillors (*curiales*, *decuriones*), and in prolonging the period between each survey from 10 to 15 years, whence it comes that the cycle generally styled the *Indiction* begins on Sept. 1, 312. The laws concerning *decurions*, possessors, that is, of a certain amount of land within a given territory, are some of the most curious and painful in the Theodosian code. They shew how miserable was the internal state of the empire; their chief object being to prevent the evasions by which the office was perpetually avoided. The whole title is one of the largest in the code, and 22 sections of it are from the hand of Constantine (*Cod. Theod.* xii. 1). To these taxes Constantine is said to have added two, which were in aftertimes particularly odious, though their object appears to have been a very just one, to lay burdens upon those who were least affected by the existing imposts. These were the *folles senatorius* and the *chrysargyrum*. The first was a charge upon all the property of senators or *clarissimi* in addition to their other burdens. The privileges they enjoyed, especially that of exemption from the *curia*, might seem to make this at least equitable, but in fact it pressed very heavily upon them, and many like the *decurions* were desirous of renouncing their dignity. The *chrysargyrum* was levied every four years upon traders of every kind, and was productive of great misery. (*Zos.* ii. 38; *Liban. 2. Florent.* ed. Reiske, iii. p. 477.) Its abolition by Anastasius was a most popular act. The institution of both is ascribed to Constantine by Zosimus, but Evagrius (iii. 40) regards it as a calumny, and Tillemont inclines to assign it an earlier origin (*Emp. Constant.* art. lxxx.). We have here a difficulty such as meets us continually in describing the organisation of the empire by Constantine.

In the administration of financial laws he was continually alternating between the desire of conciliating and relieving the people and the necessity of filling his treasury. Many of the laws express just feelings as to the protection of those who were less capable of paying taxes or bearing public burdens, and a hatred of fiscal exaction couched in no measured terms (*e.g. Cod. Th.* x. 4. 1; xi. 7. 2, 3; 16. 4; cf. *Vict. Caes.* xli, *fiscales molestiae severius pressae*). According to a rather obscure statement of Eusebius he remitted yearly a quarter of the land-tax (*V. C.* iv. 2), and we have a more definite account of a larger temporary remission at his quinquennialia to the citizens of Autun (*Eum. Grat. Act.* xi., xii. in 311). Victor bears witness to his clemency and desire to relieve the provincials, and instances the cases of Nicæa and

Tripolis (*Caes.* 41; cf. *Epit.* 41, *commodissimus . . . audire legationes et querimonias provinciarum*). It was forbidden also to carry away husbandmen from the harvest for the public service (*Cod. Just. de agricolis*, xi. 47. 1; *C. Th.* xiv. 24. 1 in 328). But though Constantine could attempt to adjust the public burdens, and regulate the collection of taxes, he could not do away with the prejudice against taxation as a tyranny, to which even the exercise of special acts of imperial clemency gave a colour. His expensive tastes in building, his prodigality of favours on unworthy courtiers, and his endowment of a new Rome with all the largesses of the old, obliged him to draw heavily upon his subjects. His immoderate profusion in the last decade of his life got him the nick-name of "pupillus," and he might have applied to himself the name of "wall-flower" (*herba parietaria* or *wall-pellitory*) which he gave to Trajan, "*ob titulos multis aedibus inscriptos*" (*Vict. Ep.* 41). Under this pressure it became necessary to define perpetually the share which each member of the community must take, and allow none to shift to an easier station. A system almost of castes was the result, from which escape was rendered illegal. The sons of *decurions*, of officials of all kinds, and of soldiers were required to remain in the profession of their fathers (*C. Th.* vii. 22. 1, 2, 3; xii. 1. 7). The same tendency was evident in other professions, as of physicians and literary teachers (*professores*, *id.* xiii. 3. 1, 2), as well as in the various guilds of artisans. Slavery was of course hereditary, and it was not till later that escape was allowed even to Christians from a slavery enforcing or implying vice (*C. Th.* xv. 7. *de scenicis*; 8. *de lenonibus*). Great freedom indeed was given to emancipation, which was placed directly under the guardianship of the church; but freedmen were still bound to do service to their patrons, and if ungrateful or contumacious might be reduced again to slavery (*C. Th.* iv. 10. 1).

It may be that the impulse given to emancipation concurred with other causes to raise into prominence a new class between the slave and the freemen; that of colons or serfs, "*adscripti glebae*." A modern writer tells us that "Marcus Aurelius began, and Aurelian and Valentinian continued the system of settling great numbers of barbarian captives upon the Italian soil and compelling them as slaves to cultivate it" (Lecky, *Eur. Morals*, i. p. 1). Constantine pursued the same policy especially with regard to frontier lands, but in tracing the rise of serfdom, we must also allow for the degradation of the free peasantry who were unable to pay their own taxes, and sunk, perhaps willingly, into the condition of colons.

The want of elasticity in trade, which is shewn by the failure of the *chrysargyrum*, left the possession of land as almost the only source of private greatness and the only basis of public revenue. The state also, as represented by the emperor, became the great landlord—just as in former times the Roman republic had been in theory—and granted military fiefs (*beneficia*) and lands in a sort of copyhold (*emphyteusis*). Hence in the legislation of Constantine, which brings these facts into prominence, we see the germs of much that afterwards grew into the feudal system. One power indeed happily resisted

this stereotyping process, though it was in danger from time to time of yielding.

The ranks of the clergy and the monasteries, though circumscribed by the state and partially absorbed by it, gave openings from the oppression which coerced the rest of the empire. Entrance into the clerus was not indeed free to all. For when Constantine had granted the Catholic clergy immunity from the curia, it was found that many sought ordination for the sake of this evasion, just as they contracted servile marriages (*C. Th.* xii. 1. 6) or entered the army (*ibid.* 11 etc.). By a singular exercise of power he forbade any one whose fortune made him capable of bearing public burdens to become a clerk (*id.* xvi. 2. 3, a law of 320), alleging in a later law, that it is fit that the opulent "should support the needs of the world, and the poor be sustained by the riches of the churches" (*ibid.* 6. in 326). Though he did not molest those who were already ordained, he decreed that in future any one declining public duties by this means should be separated from the body he had joined and be restored to the curia. But though thus restricted, the clergy did not actually become a close corporation or caste, notwithstanding the tendency to hereditary succession among them apparent in the West, which seems also contemplated by several laws of Constantius (*ibid.* 9, 10, 11, 14; see on the general subject Lecky, *Eur. Morals*, ii. p. 349, ch. 5 and the refs. there).

The prevalence of celibacy had in this respect, at any rate, the beneficial result of preserving a certain amount of freedom in the midst of great social tyranny and restraint.

(3.) *The alteration in general and penal legislation* brings us nearer to the religious side of Constantine. It is in these and in his laws directly concerning the Christians that he may be called, as Julian termed him, "novator turbatorque priscarum legum et moris antiquitus recepti" (*Amm. Marc.* xxi. 10). The reforms introduced by him in the laws relating to women, children and slaves, and the directions about certain punishments, may be mentioned as indicating a Christian influence. The Institutes of Lactantius were dedicated in at least one edition to Constantine (*cf. Inst. Div.* books i. ii. iv. v. ad init.; vii. 26, is possibly an interpolation), who had already shewn his confidence in the author by making him tutor of his eldest son, Crispus. It may be that passages like those in book vi. ch. 20, against gladiatorial shows and the exposure of infants had some effect upon his actions. The influence of Hosius of Cordova would no doubt be exerted in the same direction, as well as that of Eusebius in later years. One of the first laws in the Theodosian code decrees that if a slave condemned to the games or mines be branded it should not be on his face, "that the face which is fashioned in the likeness of the divine beauty be not marred" (*ix.* 40. 2, March 315). Victor mentions the abolition of the punishment of crucifixion and breaking the legs by Constantine, apparently about the same time (*Vaes.* 41). A rescript of his later years lays down the principle that in dividing estates the families of slaves should not be separated (*C. Th.* ii. 25, in 334).

Nevertheless slaves were far from having full protection of life accorded to them. Fugitives were to be examined by torture (*Cod. Just.* vi. 1,

4, in 317). Masters, indeed, were not wantonly to kill and torture their slaves; but inquiry was not necessarily to be made for the death of one in prison or under the lash, so that a master could only be accounted guilty if it was proved that he intended murder (*Cod. Th. de emend. serv.* ix. 12. 1, 2, in 319 and 326). A good deal was done however to reform the abuses of prison discipline. Of two laws of the year 320, the first forbids debtors to the state to be scourged or incarcerated, ordering them to be kept in "free custody" (*id.* xi. 7. 3); the second provides that persons under accusation should be allowed light and air, and be chained only for purposes of security, while all despatch should be used in bringing them to trial (*ix.* 3. 1). Again in 326 it was provided that no one should be committed to prison without being examined (*auditus apud acta*, ix. 3. 2), and in 328 that a copy of the "acta" should be given to the parties accused in criminal as in civil causes (*ix.* 1. 6). A law of Constantius, three years after the death of his father, ordered the separation of the sexes in prison (*ix.* 3. 3).

The prevention of infanticide and the reckless exposure of children was a subject which also early engaged his attention. Augustus and Nerva had given public aid for the support of children: Trajan, Antoninus, and Marcus founded institutions for their nurture, especially for that of girls, in Italy. Alexander Severus followed their example, and the names of other like benefactors are known. But their charities were of partial or local extent. Constantine (acting perhaps on the suggestion of Lactantius) issued a law in 315 from his own birthplace, Naissus, which was to be placarded in all the cities of Italy. This law made the fiscus and private estate of the emperor liable for the sustenance of all children whose fathers declared their inability to rear them. It was followed in 322 by another addressed to Africa, but apparently extending its provisions to other provinces (*xi.* 27. 1, 2). It may be readily doubted how far such indiscriminate benevolence is useful. But the pressure of public destitution was no doubt now very great. It seems to have been the reason for another and still more doubtful measure. This was one legalising the sale of children (forbidden under Diocletian), and securing the possession of exposed children to their preserver against the claims of the parents (*C. Th.* v. 8. 1, in 329, and v. 7. 1, in 331). The object no doubt was a good one, to give children of destitute parents a better chance of life. Exposure of children was, it is believed, not punishable by law till 374, by a law of Valentinian, Valens and Gratian (*Cod. Just.* viii. 52, 2), but the phrase there—"animadversioni quae constituta est"—is not explained.

A similar desire to express Christian feeling dictated it would seem many of the laws relating to women and to marriage. There are not infrequent provisions for the saving of female modesty in judicial proceedings (*e.g.* i. 22. 1, 2, in 316 and 334). In 320, celibates and childless persons of both sexes were freed from the taxes laid upon them, a measure very grateful to Christians (*vii.* 16. 1; *cf. Euseb. V. C.* iv. 26). A law again of 316 took away the right of appeal from provincial courts possessed by clarissimi in criminal cases,

the first named of which is rape. In 321 or 325 cohabitation with a concubine was forbidden to a married man (*C. Just. v. 26*). But to these must be added other laws of an extraordinary harshness, such that we can hardly believe them to have been put in execution. The first in cases of illicit intercourse punished both parties with death, the woman even if not consenting with disinheritance, while nurses and servants betting the crime were to be executed with circumstances of great atrocity (*C. Th. ix. 23. 1*, also in 320, modified by Constantius *ib. 2*, in 49). The second doomed to death any free woman who had committed adultery with a slave, and condemned him to be burnt (*ix. 9. 1*, in 326). The marriage of free persons with slaves and others of mean condition was meanwhile discouraged and disallowed in every way.

Another attempted reform was the prohibition of gladiatorial games, issued at Berytus in 325 *xv. 12. 1. cp. V. C. iv. 25, Socr. i. 8*). The scope of this law certainly did not extend to Italy, though expressed in general terms (*omnino gladiatores esse prohibemus*), for there are in the code laws of Constantius and Honorius regulating their performance in Rome. We have also an inscription containing a decree of Constantine (probably of a later date than 325) in which he sanctions a new establishment of *ludi scenici* and gladiatorial games at Spello in Umbria, with the restriction that the temple there dedicated to his name should not "be polluted with the deceits of any contagious superstition." (*O. Henzen 5580*.) At Rome, as is well known, they continued till 404, the date of the heroic act of Telemachus. Constantinople on the other hand was never disgraced by such spectacles, and this we may well ascribe to the emperor's own desire. He who in his youth had sacrificed so many barbarians at Treves, grew in his later years notoriously averse to severe punishments and to bloodshed, so that his leniency to criminals became a matter of common and perhaps just animadversion (*V. C. iv. 31*; cf. *iii. 1. 7*).

A few civil laws may be mentioned. Usury on commodities in kind was restricted to 50 p. c. and to the rate of 12 p. c. for money (*C. Th. ii. 33. i. in 325*). The power of foreclosing mortgages was abolished (*iii. 2. 1. de commissoria rescindenda*). Something was done to relax the old severity of the *patria potestas* especially in allowing sons to receive inheritances from their mothers (*viii. 18. 1, 2, 3*). But the loosening of such ties had in part a political significance, as it increased the number of persons liable to be decurions (*xii. i. 7*). As to Divorce the number of legitimate causes was limited to murder, poisoning and violation of sepulchres in the man, and adultery, poisoning and acting as a 'conciliatrix' in the woman. The principle of Antoninus Pius (*Augustine ad Pollent. ii. 7*) which equalised the guilt of the man in adultery was not yet carried out. On the other hand donations at betrothal were secured to the woman with a good deal of care (*C. Th. iii. 5. 3, 5*). Constantine also discouraged the use of *concubinatus*, but gave facilities for legitimising children born under it, by after-wedlock in the case of freeborn women (*Cod. Just. v. 27. 1 and 5*).

The general tendency of these laws to recognise the rights of the individual, contrasts with the other attempts to reduce all men to castes

prompted by political and financial necessities. They coexisted with other and no lesser inconsistencies in the mind of Constantine. He was great enough to see the importance of the moral teaching of Christianity, and great enough to organise his empire firmly according to the ideas which he gathered from his predecessors, but he was not great enough to combine and reconcile the two. He could not impart moral vigour to his official system; and he happily did not succeed in subjecting religion entirely to state control, though he laid the foundation of that Caesaro-Papalism, which afterwards so much fettered the Byzantine church. Nevertheless, we must give him credit for a sincere desire for moral reform, and confess that henceforward there was a marked increase, if not in nobility of character, at least in outward respectability of conduct.

B. RELIGIOUS POLICY.—The great change which makes the reign of Constantine an epoch in church history is the union between church and state, and the introduction of the personal interference of the emperor. The proximate cause of the great influence possessed by him, was the reaction of feeling which took place, when the civil governor from being himself a persecutor or an instrument of persecution became a promoter of Christianity. Something, no doubt, too, was owing to the teaching of Christian moralists as to submission to the powers that be, and to the general tendency towards a system of official subordination, of which the political constitution of Constantine is the great example. His success in establishing that constitution, without any serious opposition, seems to shew the temper of men's minds at the time, and the absence of individual prominence or independence of thought amongst either followers or opponents. This was true as well of the church as of the state. The great men who have left their mark on church organisation and policy had either passed away, like St. Cyprian, or had not yet attained their full powers. The two seeming exceptions are Hosius, bishop of Cordova and St. Athanasius. The first had great influence over the emperor, but probably lacked genius, and is but obscurely known to us. His assent in old age to the heretical formula of Sirmium, though extorted by persecution, was at any rate a sign of weakness. Athanasius, though he might have sympathised with some of the wide conceptions of Constantine, never came sufficiently into contact with him to overcome the prejudices raised against him by the courtiers: and the emperor could not really comprehend the importance of the points for which Athanasius was contending. The period, too, of his greatest activity was in the succeeding reign. The other ecclesiastics, as well as statesmen, who surrounded the emperor seem to have been deficient in sincerity and strength of character. Persecution had perhaps been effectual in strengthening their tenacity of dogma, but it had not fitted Christians for the direction of society at large.

Constantine, therefore, was left very much to make his own way, and to be guided by his own principles or impulses. In civil legislation we have seen two often discordant tendencies at work in him, the one towards uniformity, the other towards a recognition of individual rights. With regard to his religious policy we have an

expression of his own, in his letter to Alexander and Arius, which may help us in our judgment of its merits (Eus. *V. C.* ii. 65). Two principles, he said, had guided his actions; the first to unify the belief of all nations with regard to the Divinity into one consistent form, the second to set in order the body of the world which was labouring as it were under a grievous sickness. Such, no doubt, were the real desires of Constantine, but he was too impulsive, too rude in intellect, too credulous of his own strength, to carry them out with patience, wisdom and justice.

In giving some details of this policy we shall arrange the matter under four heads:—(1) His acts of toleration, (2) relations with the Donatists (3) relations with Arianism, (4) his policy towards heathenism. As to the documents on which the narrative is mainly based, we must not discredit them too much on account of the affectation and exaggeration of their style which characterises almost all writings of the period. We must remark, however, that some of those reported by Eusebius are not—as he was himself conscious—very well translated from the Latin, and of this we shall point out one or two instances further on. Their genuineness, nevertheless, must be assumed in default of any serious case made out against them: though it is quite impossible to say how far they represent in all cases the feelings of the emperor, or how far he allowed them to be inspired or formulated by others.

(1.) *Acts of Toleration.* The policy of Constantine towards the Christians during the first period of his reign had not been very decided, though it is probable that he as well as Constantius Chlorus prevented any violent persecution. His first public measure of toleration, of which we have any certain record, was to join together with Licinius in the edict issued by Galerius in 311 (given in *de M. P.* 34 and more diffusely by Eus. *H. E.* viii. 17). The edict acknowledged that the persecution had failed and gave permission to the Christians to worship their own God and to rebuild their places of meeting, provided they did nothing contrary to good order (contra *disciplinam*, misrendered *ἐπιστήμην* in Eus.). Nay the emperors regret that the God of the Christians has, owing to persecution, failed to receive their intercessions for the good of the state, and they make a restoration of these a condition of toleration. The idea evidently is to bring in Christianity into the state as a 'religio licita,' a position with which it seems to be insinuated the Christians of earlier times were contented. The further details of this limited measure are lost. The death of Galerius followed almost directly, and in the spring or summer of the next year (312) Constantine and Licinius promulgated another of their own, which may not have been very different from that of Galerius. The text of it is lost, but we can to some extent infer its provisions from the references to it in the edict of Milan (*de M. P.* 48; Eus. *H. E.* x. 5) and from the parallel document promulgated by Maximinus Daza, which Eusebius compares with that of Constantine and Licinius (*H. E.* ix. 9: the matter of these edicts has been carefully discussed by Keim, *Ueb. Const.* pp. 14 sq., 79 sq., cf. his paper in *Gött. Theol. Jahrb.* 1852). The spirit of this one seems, as we have said, little in

advance of that of Galerius. It allowed indeed liberty of worship, but specified certain hard conditions.^b These seem to have been amongst others that no heathen converts should be made; that no sect should be tolerated outside 'the body of Christians, the Catholic Church'; that confiscated property should not be restored, except, it may be, the sites of churches. This edict, issued before the conflict with Maxentius, contrasts strikingly with the much more liberal edict of Milan issued in the spring of 313, after the return of Constantine from Rome, which gave free toleration to every religious body. Constantine did not act in this matter without inquiry, though it is only accidentally that we hear of his particular examination into one of the largest of the sects, that of the Manichaeans (reference to the commission to Strategius afterwards called Musonianus in Amm. Marc. xv. 13. The date is unknown, but may have been about this time.) The purport of the edict may be summed up as follows—"We have sometime perceived that liberty of worship must not be denied to Christians and to all other men, but whereas in our former edict divers conditions were added, which perhaps have been the cause of the defection of many from that observance, we Constantine and Licinius, Augusti, meeting in Milan, decree that both Christians and all other men soever should have free liberty to choose that form of worship which they consider most suitable to themselves in order that the Divinity may be able to give us and our subjects His accustomed goodwill and favour. We abolish all those conditions entirely. Further for the body of the Christians in particular, all places of meeting which belonged to them, and have since been bought by or granted to others are to be restored; and an indemnity may be claimed by the buyers or grantees from our treasury; and the same we decree concerning the other corporate property of the Christians. The execution of the law is committed to the civil magistrates, and it is everywhere to be made public." The change of feeling here evinced was more strongly marked in other documents that followed, which more peculiarly expressed the mind of Constantine. The first in order is a letter to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa, giving directions for the execution of the edict, in which the term 'Catholic Church' is substituted for that of body of Christians (Eus. *H. E.* x. 5, 15). Then follows another addressed to the same official liberating the clergy 'in the Catholic church of which Caecilian is president' from the pressure of public burdens. This concession at first apparently made to Africa alone was extended to the whole church in the year 319 (*C. Th.* xvi. 2, 2). The description of Christianity in the privilege granted to the African church is remarkable "as the religion in which the crowning reverence is

^b αἰρέσεις. The meaning of this word has been questioned, and most historians render it "sects." But (1) it is evident from a comparison of Lactantius that ἀφαίρεσις παντελῶς τῶν αἰρέσεων is a translation of "remotis omnibus omnino conditionibus." (2) The word is elsewhere found as a general substitute for "condicio." See Steph. *Thes. s.v.* (3) Exactly similar mistranslations occur in Euseb., e.g., besides the one referred to above, in the edict of Milan lower down, "aliquid vicarium postulant," which means "demand an indemnity," is rendered προσέλθωσι τῷ ἐπὶ τόπων ἐπάρχῳ δικάζοντι.

observed towards the holiest powers of heaven" (*H. E.* x. 7). The mention of Caecilian and this definition of the Catholic church in the same document was not allowed to pass unchallenged by the Donatists. They presented to Anulinus an appeal, *libellus Ecclesiae Catholicae criminum Caeciliani*, and a request for a commission of inquiry, both of which he forwarded to the emperor (August. *Ep.* 88 (68). 2; Migne, *Const. Mag.* col. 479). This occurrence brings us to a new stage in the religious policy of Constantine—his relations with the Donatist schism.

(2.) *The Donatist Schism.* The appeal of the Donatists brought Constantine directly into the heart of church controversies and was the first occasion of his gradually growing interference. Though his relations with this schism form only an episode in its history, their consequences were so important as to require a somewhat detailed account. The Donatists were a puritan party, very like the Novatianists some 50 years before, who held extreme doctrines with reference to those who had lapsed in persecution. They took their name first from Donatus of Casa Nigra who impugned the elevation of Caecilian to the bishopric of Carthage in 311, and secondarily from a greater Donatus who succeeded Majorinus as schismatic bishop. The objection to Caecilian was chiefly on the ground of his consecration by Felix of Aptunga, accused as a 'traitor' or betrayer of copies of the scriptures to the agents of persecution. Caecilian was consequently deposed by a conventicle of 70 Numidian bishops, who had at any rate only co-ordinate rights with the Africans, meeting in the private house of one of his enemies at Carthage, and Majorinus was elected in his place. This was the state of affairs when the letters of Constantine to Anulinus arrived. He was much discomposed at receiving the Donatist appeal which followed them (*Eus. H. E.* x. 5, 19): for he had, it seems, no idea of interfering in the internal affairs of the church. The position was rather thrust upon him, and though the catholic party in Africa seem to have accepted his intervention without reluctance, it is worth observing that the appeal to an emperor, practically to define Catholicity, came from the Schismatics. Neander certainly goes too far in representing the Donatist schism as a reaction against the confusion of ecclesiastical and political elements (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 258, E. T.). Their position of remonstrance was a later one—'*Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?*' belongs to a considerably subsequent date—A.D. 349 (see below under *CONSTANS period i.*).

The first reply which the emperor sent to the Donatists' petition was to bestow a sum of 3,000 'purses' (φόλλαις, folles here of uncertain value) on Caecilian, and to give him further credit with the procurator of his private estates. The sum was to be distributed according to a brief (βρέβιον) drawn up by Hosius, who now first appears as possessing the confidence of the emperor. He further advised Caecilian if he or his people were molested by "any persons of an unquiet disposition" to bring them without hesitation before the magistrates who had instructions how to deal with them (*Eus. H. E.* x. 6). The Donatist petition had, however, requested the emperor to appoint judges in Gaul, as a country where no persecution had raged and where consequently impartiality might be expected, and

the Catholics may also have joined in this demand. At any rate Constantine named the bishops of Autun, Arles and Cologne, and desired them to meet at Rome. At the same time he wrote a letter addressed to Miltiades bishop of Rome and Marcus (perhaps the Presbyter who succeeded Silvester), requesting them to hear the case with the Gallic bishops. The letter expresses, as we have implied, the discomposure he felt at the appeal, his regard for the Catholic church and his wish to leave no schism in it (*Eus. H. E.* x. 5, 18 foll.). The council was accordingly held on the 2nd of October 313 in the house of Fausta in the Lateran, a memorable site. To the three Gallican bishops were added fifteen from Italy and Rhaetia, and ten of either party were brought before them. Donatus was accused on his own confession of having practised rebaptism, and of having laid hands upon lapsed bishops which was contrary to church rule, and Caecilian on his part was unanimously pronounced innocent, but great facilities were offered to the Donatist bishops to return to the Catholic communion (*Optat. de Schism. Don. i.*; cp. Augustin. *Breviculus Collationis Carthag.* d. iii. c. xii. 24 sq. etc.). But the matter was not allowed to rest. Donatus appealed again apparently to the emperor and on the suggestion of one of his party, Filumenius, two bishops were sent to Africa by Constantine to decide by personal inspection which was the Catholic church (ubi esset Catholica). Caecilian meanwhile was retained at Brescia for a short time. The commissioners found great party commotions going on in Carthage, where they remained forty days, and in the end they decided by communicating with the clergy of Caecilian and then returned. Both the leaders then returned to Africa and the seditions went on as before. The Donatists complained that Melchisedes had not considered the case of Felix, on whose character as a 'traitor' the whole matter turned. Consequently early in the spring of the next year (314), Constantine gave orders to Verinus, the vicarius praefectorum, 'to make public inquiry into the life of Felix of Aptunga,' a commission executed by the proconsul Aelianus in consequence of the failing health of Verinus. The letter by which the guilt of Felix was supposed to be proved, was declared a forgery and he himself in his absence was absolved (*Gesta Purg. Felicis* apud *Optat.* and Migne *Const. Mag.* col. 718 sq.). Even this did not content the Donatists, and the emperor determined finally to heal the schism, and extending the precedent of the Lateran Synod, summoned representatives of the whole church of his dominions to meet at Arles the 1st of August, 314. It is obvious to remark that this would not have been done if the judgment of Rome had been held in any sense to be final. We possess two letters of Constantine with reference to this matter, one to Aelianus (also written *Aelafius* or *Ablavius* probably an error) authorising him to give public carriages to the bishops of both parties (evectio publica, δημόσιον ἔχημα, Migne, *Const.* col. 483), and one to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse, invoking his attendance and that of a certain number of his suite (*Eus. H. E.* x. 5, 21). The number of bishops attending has been variously stated, but Dupin believes them to have been only thirty-three, though the number of 200 is perhaps gene-

rally assumed (see authorities in Hefele, *Councils*, § 15). They came at any rate from every quarter of the Western empire, from Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Britain (three bishops, a priest and a deacon), Spain and Africa, and so far might deserve the description which St. Augustine seems to give of it as "plenarium ecclesiae universae concilium" (*Ep.* 43. 7, § 19; his words, however, may admit of another explanation). They deliberated under the presidency of Marinus, bishop of Arles, and decided as all the other courts had done against the Donatists, who were 'aut damnati aut repulsi,' though we have no complete copy of the Synodal acts relating to them. It seems probable also that as great if not greater privileges were again offered to reconciled bishops, as were granted by the Lateran Synod. (Hefele, *l. c.* p. 179, French Tr.) They then proceeded to discuss other matters, especially the Paschal controversy, rebaptism and the position of the lapsed. The 7th canon is interesting as illustrating the rising connexion between church and state. Members of the church becoming provincial governors (*praesides*), and as such according to the constitution being always sent to a distant province, were to receive letters of communion (*litteras ecclesiasticas communicatorias*) but to be watched by the bishop of the place where they were appointed to govern, and excluded from communion only when they began to act contrary to discipline: and the same provision was extended to other officials. This therefore repealed the 56th canon of Elvira (305 or 306) which prohibited a municipal magistrate from the church during his tenure of office. These canons were communicated to the new pope Silvester, who had himself been unable to attend. (Migne, *C. Mag.* col. 815 sq. Mr. Ffoulkes informs the writer that he now (1876) believes all these canons to be spurious.) The emperor meanwhile was engaged in an important war with Licinius, yet he found time to interest himself in no small degree with what had taken place at Arles. His letter to the bishops of the council is one of the most curious of the documents which bear his name (*C. Mag.* c. 487). He confesses the goodness of God in bringing him out of darkness. He acknowledges that he had himself received great benefits when he had by his unrighteousness deserved evils. He rejoices that the providence of Christ the Saviour had been shewn in their judgment, even upon such arrogant and erroneous persons. He expresses his anger at their appeal. "They demand," he says, "my judgment, who myself expect the judgment of Christ. The judgment of bishops (sacerdotes) ought to be accounted as if God himself was sitting on the tribunal . . . O, raging audacity of their madness, after the example in Gentile causes they have interposed an appeal." He then dismisses the bishops, begging them to remember him that the Saviour may have mercy on him, with the assurance that he had ordered these seditious deceivers to be brought to him from Africa "that they may be kept from doing anything that will excite the wrath of God." The criticism of this important letter is rather difficult. We seem to trace an ecclesiastical hand in the expression "to expect the judgment of Christ," a phrase occurring twice in the mouth of Cyprian (see *Ep.* 67 and *Sentent. Episcop. Cypriani*). In other respects too the language

has a clerical turn about it, which suggests the influence of such a man as Hosius. Similarly in the first letter to Anulinus the mention of Caecilian by name can hardly be explained except by supposing some such counsellor at work beside the emperor. On the other hand the vehemence of expression is not unlike Constantine, and he would hardly have permitted any one else to introduce the personal reflection as to his own sinfulness. The latter is striking as being almost the only evidence we have that Constantine had any feeling of self-distrust.

The result of the council was the return of a good many Donatists to the church, but others persevered in sedition and were summoned to the court. Here their impunity seems to have prevailed upon the emperor to reopen the question and to judge it himself. Both parties were cited by him to Rome, but Caecilian, for some unexplained reason, did not appear, and the trial was postponed. Finally it took place at Milan, Nov. 316, both parties being present. The emperor's own decision, like that of the two councils, was to condemn the Donatists and assert the innocence of Caecilian (*Aug. Brev. Coll. Carth.* d. iii. c. xix. 37; *contra Epistol. Parmen.* i. 11). His first impulse was to order the leaders of the schismatics to be put to death, but happily he was restrained (possibly by Hosius) and they were ordered into banishment and their churches confiscated (*Aug. C. Ep. Parm.* i. 13, *Epist.* 88, § 3, etc.). In 321, however, perceiving the uselessness of repressive measures and beaten by the obstinacy of the schism, he recalled the exiles and issued an edict of toleration, to the practice of which he exhorted the Catholics (*Epist.* 141, § 9, *ad Verinum* in *L. post Collat.* 54). Persecution was, however, renewed by Constans with even worse results; and the remains of the schism, notwithstanding the vigorous efforts of St. Augustine, lasted on till the seventh century.

The results of these proceedings are such a mixture of good and evil as seems inseparable from the union of church and state. To the church accrued the advantage of the development of her system of councils, and generally a growth in organisation and polity; the emperor gained a nearer insight into the feeling of the church, and the state in general obtained a most important support. On the other hand must be set the identification of the Catholic with the dominant and worldly church, and the precedent allowed of imperial interference in questions of schism. From the banishment of the Donatists for schism, was no great step to the persecutions of Arians and Catholics for heresy, and not much further to the execution of the Priscillianists by Magnus Maximus. But it is very difficult to lay our fingers upon the exact point of this process where the evil began. If Donatists made the first appeal, the Catholics had no scruples as to the power to which they made it, nor does Constantine himself seem to have been actuated by a wish to strain his prerogative, but only to produce unity and peace. The matter also was very much complicated by the civil turbulence of the Donatists, which necessitated the continued interference of the state, when it would gladly have left the matter alone.

(3.) *The Arian Controversy.* The relation of the emperor to this great movement was, as we have said, the result of his last achievement of

power. His complete victory over Licinius in 323 brought him into contact with the controversies of his new dominions in the East, just as his victory over Maxentius had led to the Donatist appeals in the West. The first document which connects him with this controversy is a letter to Alexander and Arius (Eus. *V. C.* ii. 64-72; Soc. i. 7 gives only the latter half of it). Like most of these letters it is very verbose and contains very little. He expresses his longing for "calm days and careless nights," and exhorts the opponents to reconciliation. The whole has arisen from an unpractical question stirred by Alexander, and from an inconsiderate opinion expressed by Arius. Again and again he insists on the insignificance of the dispute (ὅπερ μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἐλαχίστων φιλονεικούντων—ὅπερ τῶν ἐλαχίστων τούτων ζητήσεων ἀκριβολογεῖσθε, etc.), shewing in a remarkable manner his own ignorance and self-confidence. This letter was sent by the hands of Hosius, but it had naturally no effect: though we are ignorant of his proceedings at Alexandria, except that he combated Sabellianism (Soc. iii. 8, p. 394 Migne; Hefele § 22). Arius seems to have now written a letter of remonstrance, to which Constantine, who was under other influences or in a different mood, replied in an extraordinary letter of violent invective. (This is the letter *Ario et Arianis* which Socrates, i. 9, places after Nicaea. But according to Epiphanius, *Haer.* lix. 9, it was despatched before the council, and so the best modern historians: see De Broglie, i. p. 388. It is printed in Migne, p. 510 f.) The detailed history of this time is involved in difficulty, but it is pretty clear that the expedient of a general council was a natural one both to the emperor and to the church at large. The Meletian schism in Egypt, and the Paschal controversy required settlement, and in Constantine's mind the latter was equally important with Arianism. The idea and its execution is ascribed to Constantine without any mention of suggestions from others, except perhaps from Hosius (Sulpic. Sever. *Chron.* ii. 40, S. Nicaena Synodus auctore illo confecta habebatur). He sent complimentary letters in every direction, and gave the use of public carriages and litters to the bishops. We have a letter of Constantine which (if genuine) shews that they assembled first at Ancyra and removed to Nicaea by his orders (*Analecta Nicaena*, pub. by B. H. Cowper, 1857. But see the criticism in the *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxxv., pp. 63-69). Besides the Catholic prelates, whose names may be seen elsewhere, he particularly invited the Novatian bp. Acesius. The council first met in the cathedral but probably not for regular deliberation (Eus. *V. C.* iii. 7 speaks of εἰς οἶκος ἐκκλησίης; but see De Broglie, ii. p. 27, note). The year of the council is allowed to be 325, but the day is much debated. The bishops seem to have waited some days or even weeks for the emperor, who was celebrating at Nicomedia the festival of his triumph over Licinius. Hefele discusses the various dates, and places the solemn opening on the 14th of June (Councils, § 26). The bishops were arranged round a great hall in the middle of the palace, when Constantine entered to open the proceedings, dressed magnificently, and making a great impression by his stately presence, lofty stature, and gentle and even modest demeanour. He replied in

Latin to the loyal speech of Eustathius of Antioch—who, as far as there was one president of the council, seems to have held the first place. He did not disdain to use Greek in his efforts to smooth over or to repress the differences of opinion that immediately shewed themselves. His speech, recommending peace and unanimity (as usual) and claiming the position for himself of fellow servant with those whom he was addressing, may be read in Eusebius (*V. C.* iii. 12). This is not the place to attempt to trace the course of the discussions that followed; how long the emperor was present at them is uncertain (cf. Hefele, § 30). Two points are deserving of note, first the story of his burning the memorials and recriminations of the different parties addressed to him; secondly, his relation to the *ὁμοούσιον*. As to the first, it is said that he brought them into the Synod in a sealed packet and threw them into the fire, saying to the bishops to this effect, "You cannot be judged by a man like myself: such things as these must wait till the great day of God's judgment," adding, according to Socrates, "Christ has advised us to pardon our brother if we wish to obtain pardon ourselves" (Soc. i. 8, p. 63 Migne; Soz. i. 17). It is curious however that Eusebius, who is ever ready to glorify his hero, makes no mention of the circumstance, which in itself is probable enough. The relation of Constantine to the *ὁμοούσιον* rests on the epistle of Eusebius to his own church, in which he gives an account of the Synod to his own advantage (Socrat. i. 8; Theodoret i. 12, Athanas. *Decret. Synod. Nic.* 4). He gives the text of the creed which he proposed to the council: and tells us that after it was read no one got up to speak against it, but on the contrary the emperor praised it very highly and exhorted everyone to embrace it with the addition only of one word—"consubstantial." He then proceeded to comment on it, declaring that the word implied neither a corporeal substance, nor a division of the divine substance between the Father and the Son, but was to be understood in a divine and mysterious sense. In another place Eusebius lays stress on the emperor's presence at the discussion; and it is evident that he wishes it to be believed that the creed of Nicaea was his work rather than that of the bishops—a conclusion with which other authors certainly do not harmonise (see Hefele, § 34). We must suppose, however, that something of the kind occurred, and though it is pretty clear that the word *ὁμοούσιος* was in the minds of the orthodox party throughout, they may not have felt it safe to propose it at first, inasmuch as its association with the case of Paul of Samosata was provocative of much disputation. Hosius, it may be, suggested to the emperor that the proposition of it should come from his lips. It is certain that he must have had some tuition in theological language, and that from an orthodox theologian, before he could give the interpretation of the word with which Eusebius credits him. When the creed was finally drawn up the emperor accepted it as inspired, and with his usual vehemence in the cause of peace proceeded to inflict penalties upon the few who still refused to sign it. He exiled Arius, Secundus and Theonas, and the priests who were attached to them, to Illyria. He ordered the books of Arius and his friends to be burnt and threatened with

death anyone who concealed them. He wished even to abolish the name of Arians and to change it into that of Porphyrians (*Epist. ad ecclesias*, Migne, p. 506; Soc. i. 9). Later on Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea were also deposed and banished, inasmuch as they had not recognised the deposition of Arius, though they had been brought to sign the creed. Constantine indulged particularly in invectives against Eusebius of Nicomedia, whom he accused of having stirred up persecution under Licinius, and of having deceived himself at Nicaea (*Ep. ad Nicomedienses c. Euseb. et Theognium*, Migne, p. 519 foll., from Gelasius, iii. 2, and the collections of councils). The other matters decided upon by the council may only just be mentioned; the Meletians were very gently handled, and the Paschal question was definitely settled, Easter being fixed as at present to the first Sunday after the full moon following the 21st of March. Constantine's dialogue with Acesius, on the occasion of these decrees, is characteristic (Socrates, i. 10). Acesius, who fully acknowledged them, tried to explain the reasons of the Novatian schism. Constantine merely remarked, "Set a ladder, Acesius and go up to heaven by yourself."

Constantine expressed an immoderate joy at the success of the council, considering it a personal triumph. Eusebius has preserved the letter which he wrote to all the churches on the occasion (*V. C.* iii. 17-20). He begins by speaking shortly and generally of the discussions on points of faith at which he glories he was himself present, and he declares that the unanimity which prevailed henceforth leaves no room for doubt. Then he goes on to enlarge on the anti-Judaic aspect of the decree about Easter, on which he lays great stress. A parallel letter to the church of Alexandria speaks rather more of Arius (Migne, *Const.* p. 507). Both these letters contain the phrase εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν, συνθεράπων ὑμέτερος, and it seems very probable that it was on the occasion of the banquet given after the council that he gave himself the title of "bishop of the externals of the church by divine appointment" (ὁμοῖς μὲν τῶν εἰσὼ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένους ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην, *V. C.* iv. 24; for the date cf. De Broglie ii. p. 61; and for the meaning cf. *H. E.* ix. 8, 15, and Heinichen's *Meletema*, xxvii.). We have spoken above (*Life*, period iii.) on the declamations of Constantine, one of which is still preserved to us, the *oratio ad Sanctorum coetum*, which Eusebius gives as an appendix to his life. It is an interminable piece of rhetoric delivered shortly before an Easter, but in what year is unknown, and the doctrinal positions taken up in it are too vague to enable us to conjecture accurately.

The events of the next few years were, as we have seen, very tragical. The journey to Rome, the murders of Crispus and Fausta, the foundation and dedication of Constantinople, and the pilgrimage of Helena to Palestine have been already recounted, as well as the alteration of the emperor's feelings in regard to Arianism. The alienation of Constantine from the Catholics and the restoration of Arius is ascribed to the influence of an Arian priest, commended to him by his sister Constantia on her death-bed (Soc. i. 25). There is a difficulty in the narrative here caused by the fact that Eusebius of Nico-

media and Theognis, in their "libellus paenitentiae" addressed to the bishops, speak of Arius as already recalled (Soc. i. 4; Soz. ii. 16). This seems improbable (as Socrates himself saw), and it is perhaps best to suppose that the document is false or belongs to some other circumstance in this long affair, for there are other inconsistencies in the libellus which it is not necessary to state here (see De Broglie, ii. p. 132 note). The natural sequence of events is to suppose that Eusebius was first to return, and that he prevailed over the emperor to restore Arius in the year 330. We have a letter from Constantine to Arius, in which he speaks with some wonder that he had not *long ago* answered a previous letter or letters by appearing before him (Soc. i. 25). If this *παλαι* may be understood literally, it is possible that Eusebius and Theognis referred to some earlier despatches addressed to Arius, as if they constituted a recall from exile. Constantine was satisfied with his profession of faith, which alike avoided the bolder phrases of his own mis-belief, and the distinctly Catholic formulae (ap. Soc. i. 26; Soz. ii. 27). It would be only to repeat much that has been said elsewhere if we recounted here the tactics of the Eusebian party pursued during the remainder of Constantine's reign. Their programme was: "1. to maintain their hold over the emperor; 2. to get rid of the leading Catholic bishops; 3. to propagate Arianism in forms less offensive to general Christian feeling than those which the Council had anathematized" (Bright, *History* p. 35). The subtle influence of these men, aided largely by that flattery which was so dear to the emperor and so soothing to his troubled and in some ways sensitive conscience, obtained complete ascendancy over him. The false charges against Eustathius and Athanasius, though disproved again and again in civil courts and councils, were made to tell upon him by the extraordinary craft of the Arians. When after the profane and tumultuous proceedings of the council of Tyre, Athanasius was able to force the emperor in person to hear the truth, it seemed for a moment as if his cause would prevail (Athan. *Apol.* 86). Constantine wrote a peremptory letter to the bishops who had met at Tyre, recording his interview with Athanasius, and ordering them to appear before him (Soc. i. 34). They did not appear, but the chiefs of the party attacked the emperor on his weak side, and asserted that Athanasius had threatened to delay the corn ships, an absurdity which it was vain for him to deny. The result was the banishment of Athanasius to Treves, Feb. 336, but his see was happily not declared vacant. (Soc. i. 35; Soz. ii. 28 says that they revived the matter of Ischyra and the chalice, which Athanasius declares they durst not do, *Apol.* 9, 87; Bright, p. 42 n. For the charge about the corn ships cf. the case of Sopater, above *Life*, iii.)

The triumph of the Arians now seemed secure. Arius himself had all this time been unable to recover his position at Alexandria and appears to have been in retirement, but he was now again brought forward. Constantine examined him as to his faith, which was apparently expressed in the terms referred to above; and made him take an oath as to his orthodoxy, reminding him of the punishment of God for perjury. Upon this ground Arius was to be

forced upon the communion of the church of Constantinople, notwithstanding the refusal of the bishop Alexander. His sudden death (whether that evening or the next morning is uncertain) must have reminded Constantine of his own warning, and may have caused him to reflect "that the witness of God had confirmed the creed of Nicaea" (Soc. i. 38). It was in vain however that attempts were made to induce him to recall Athanasius, by St. Anthony and others. He wrote to the Alexandrians that Athanasius had been banished as a seditious and arrogant man, and as condemned by a council, the members of which from their number could not have been influenced by prejudice and party spirit. The only thing obtained from him was the banishment of John the Meletian bishop, who was particularly distasteful to the Catholics of Egypt. This was his last official act in relation to the church.

Constantine's relation to Arianism is as we have seen a most perplexing subject. He was obviously the instrument for good as well as for evil. On the one hand he acted with good intentions, and was able by the superiority of his position to take a wide view of the needs of the church; on the other he was very ignorant, very self-confident, very credulous, and very violent. We know too little of the influences by which he was swayed; how, for instance, Hosius came to acquire and how to lose his ascendancy; what Eusebius of Caesarea really did; how Eusebius of Nicomedia obtained the power which he shewed in the last period of his life. We only know that the emperor, in his anxiety above all things for peace, was led to do violent acts of an inconsistent character that made peace impossible; but then we must always remember he was living in an age of violent men.

(4.) *Relations with Heathenism.* It will not be necessary to repeat here what has been already said as to the general and special legislation of Constantine. There are, however, a good many facts which remain to be recorded. For further details we may refer to two special works—A. Beugnot, *Histoire de la destruction du Paganisme en Occident*, 2 vols., Paris, 1835, an important and thoughtful book, unfortunately scarce; and E. Chastel, *Histoire de la destruction du Paganisme dans l'Empire d'Orient*, Paris, 1850—both crowned by the Academy. Less important is *der Untergang des Hellenismus und die Entziehung seiner Tempelgüter durch die Christlichen Kaiser*, by Ernst von Lassaulx, München, 1854.

We may distinguish changes in the animus of Constantine towards heathenism, which it will be well to refer to three periods. In the first, from his conversion till the final rupture with Licinius, he kept up pretty fairly an equilibrium between the two religions. In the second, that is till within a few years of his death, he depressed paganism and exalted Christianity more decidedly; while in the last, he shewed a tendency towards forcible suppression of the old religion. We must remember, however, that his wishes were not always equalled by what was politically and morally possible, and that especially in the West he was obliged to tolerate and even sanction much that he personally disliked and disavowed. The far greater vitality of paganism in the West than in the East, is most forcibly perceived when we compare the Christian apolo-

gists Lactantius or Firmicus Maternus with Eusebius and the church historians of the East, as Beugnot has done very effectively, pp. 118–129. The former shews that paganism towards the close of the reign of Constantine still swayed cultivated and enlightened men: the latter, addressing Constantine's sons, calls for edicts to repress the ancient religion by force.

First period. After the edict of Milan had enunciated the principle of universal tolerance, Constantine did all in his power to place the Christian church and priesthood on an equality with heathenism. We have already spoken of the subsidies first granted to the African church and of the privilege of exemption from the curia. He permitted enfranchisements to take place in churches as well as in temples (*Cod. Th.* xvi. 2, 4: 316–321), and he granted them similar privileges with regard to the reception of legacies. He commanded in the same year, 321, the observance of Sunday, by the interruption both of public works and of the sitting of the courts (*Cod. Just.* iii. 12, 3; cf. *Cod. Theod.* ii. 8, 1). It would be a mistake to suppose that he went much further at this period; the laws of 319 against divination and consultation of the haruspices, though severe in their penalties, were really re-enactments of an edict of Tiberius (*Cod. Th.* ix. 16. 1 and 2; cf. Chastel, p. 54). "Adite aras publicas atque delubra," runs the second law, "et consuetudinis vestrae celebrate solennia; nec enim prohibemus praeiteritae usurpationis officia libera luce tractari." The law that follows against magic (in 321) expressly excepts those rustic ceremonies which were used for healing or for the preservation of the crops, &c. Similarly in 320 he decided that when public buildings were struck by lightning the haruspices should be consulted (*Cod. Th.* xvi. 10. 1). In his own person he retained the office of pontifex, and exercised some of its functions. We may notice, too, that shortly after his elevation to the empire he had instituted the *ludi Francici*, a. d. xiii. Kal. August., and in 322, after his victories over the Sarmatians, he appointed similar Sarmatic games which took place a few days later (vi. Kal. Aug.). Such games were mixed with heathen rites, and were frequently censured by the Christians on this account. (Beugnot, l. c. i. p. 92; cf. however the case of the games at Spello mentioned above, *penal and other laws* in which certain ceremonies are forbidden.)

Second period. This equilibrium was no doubt disturbed by the conflict with Licinius, detailed above. "After that," says Eusebius, "the emperor put his hand seriously to the work. And first he sent out to the nations of the several provinces governors who were for the most part sanctified by their saving faith, and forbade as many as appeared to be pagan to sacrifice; and the same law applied to those who were even of higher rank," &c. (Eus. V. C. ii. 44). He then goes on to speak of two laws, one forbidding sacrifice and pagan rites in general and the setting up of images, and the other ordering the enlargement and building of churches (*ibid.* 46). The first of these is unfortunately not preserved to us, but that Constantine *did* issue such a law is certain from a reference to the "law of our divine father" made by his sons in 341. (*C. Th.* xvi. 10, 2. See Chastel, l. c. pp. 61, foll., and on

the other hand Beugnot, l. c. p. 100, who with La Bastie limits the prohibition to secret cults.) We must remain in doubt as to the exact date and provisions of this law, and must suppose that it was by no means regularly carried out, especially in the West. (See the Roman inscriptions quoted by Beugnot, p. 100.) The destruction of heathen idols by private persons among the Christians, and other acts of zeal of the same kind, was the natural result of such a law. Constantine was obliged to restrain them in his edict addressed to the *provincials of the East* (V. C. ii. Esp. 56 and 60), but the language of that document was not likely to make the position of pagans very secure. In the meantime he increased the privileges of the clergy in various ways (Soz. i. 8, 9), and did all in his power to promote conversion by indirect means, rewarding towns that had turned their temples into churches (Soz. ii. 5), and recommending such means to the bishops assembled at Nicaea as well as contributing to them from his own revenues (V. C. iii. 21). In 326 he decreed that all unfinished public buildings *except pagan temples* should be completed as soon as possible (C. Th. xv. 1, 3).

Third period. The contrast between East and West, which we have already pointed out, was sharpened by the foundation and dedication of Constantinople. There can be no doubt that many temples were spoiled to decorate it, and that the statues, &c. were regarded in general not as objects of worship, but simply as ornaments—and these were transported not only from Greece and Asia, but even from Rome, Sicily and Antioch (Chastel, p. 72, citing Heyne's essay *priscae artis opera quae Constantinopoli existisse memorantur*). See also the description in Eus. V. C. iii. 54). Libanius complains of these proceedings, asserting at the same time that liberty of worship was still allowed, though the temples were denuded of their revenues for the purpose of beautifying the new city (*Pro templis*, pp. 161, 162, and 183). Some temples, however, were actually closed and destroyed. The first naturally was the sanctuary of Aphrodite, erected over the Holy Sepulchre, which was of course removed from the foundations. That at Aphaca in Coele-Syria was destroyed, if we may so understand Eusebius's vague expressions (V. C. iii. 55), though there was still a place of worship there in the time of Zosimus (i. 58). The emperor also suppressed the immoral practices at Heliopolis in Phoenicia, and founded a church on the site (V. C. iii. 58), and destroyed a temple of Aesculapius at Aegae in Cilicia, famous for its oracle and miraculous cures (ib. 56), and did away with the cultus of the Nile, which was carried on by a set of androgynous priests (ib. iv. 25, cf. for all these Soz. i. 18, Soz. ii. 4, 5). The temple of Aesculapius was probably afterwards restored: see Chastel, p. 74; Beugnot, p. 92). Whatever may be said as to the restoration of heathenism or heathen practices in any of these cases we have a general confirmation of these statements in a passage of Eunapius who tells us that Aedesius of Cappadocia on succeeding his master Iamblichus [four years before the death of Constantine] did not exhibit an equal enthusiasm perhaps concealing his sentiments on account of the times. "Then Constantine was reigning, who overturned the most celebrated temples to

raise churches upon their ruins" (*Vit. Aedes.* p. 37). The date of the doubtful law against sacrifice may possibly belong to the same time, i. e. a few years before his death. After his death "inter divos mernit referri," says Eutropius (*Brev.* x. 8), a statement fully confirmed by coins and inscriptions. (See the quotations in Beugnot, i. 109, 110, and the coin described below.)

IV. *Character and Writings.*—Constantine without doubt deserves the name of Great, whether we consider the political or the religious change that he effected, but he belongs to the second rather than the first order of great men. Notwithstanding his wide successes, and his tenacious grasp over the empire in which he worked such revolutions, notwithstanding his high sense of his own vocation and the grandeur of some of his conceptions, his personal character does not inspire us with admiration and scarcely with interest. With many of the impulses of greatness it remained to the last unformed and uncertain, and never lost a tinge of barbarism. He was wanting in the best heathen and Christian virtues; he had little of dignity and cultivation, little of depth and tenderness. The combination which he did exhibit was rather one of ambition to be great with religious zeal untempered by any real sense of personal shortcoming or sinfulness. This was no doubt in great measure the result of obvious circumstances, and a similar temper is observable in others of his house. It is sometimes remarked that religious pressure of a peculiar kind is characteristic of certain families, however differently it may shew itself in the different members. This was the case with the Flavian family, though the courses taken by Constantius the elder, by Constantine and his sons, and by Julian and Gallus were very different. It caused them to be very active in religious questions, and to be perpetually interfering with religious policy, while (judging from those we know best) the true sentiment of religion never penetrated thoroughly into their characters. Constantine and Julian both believed in their own vocation, and both looked for supernatural confirmations of it, and yet were wanting in a real sense of mystery. That Constantine was by nature "unreligious," and had merely fatalism as the foundation of his faith, is an assertion of Burckhardt's (p. 389), that can only be supported by discrediting and distorting the most trustworthy documents, e. g. those in the case of the Donatists. Rather we should say that he had strong and persistent, though imperfect feelings about religion, which were coloured very variously by the circumstances and persons about him. He looked upon himself as a minister of Divine Providence to glorious ends not as exalted by Fate (see esp. *ad Prov. Pal. ap. Eus. V. C. ii. 28, 29, and Orat. ad. S. C. ad finem* and elsewhere). If we compared him with any great man of modern times it would rather be with Peter of Russia than with Napoleon.

The thoughts of Constantine had been early set on empire. "From his boyhood," writes Victor (*Caes.* 40), "his strong and masterly mind was disturbed by the eager desire of reigning." Like many other aspirants he was confirmed in his hopes by oracles and divinations (Eumen. *in nat. Urb. Trev.* 21). Apollo or the

Sun-God was the special object of his worship, the foreteller of his successes and the "unconquerable companion" of his triumphs. Through the worship of this deity as the supreme God, may perhaps be traced Constantine's approach to monotheism. His own personal appearance was compared to that of Apollo, and like Diocletian and Maximian, he was inclined to assume the character of his patron god, and was addressed by Eumenius as "praesentissimus deus" (*ib.* 22). This was of course a usual piece of flattery, and must not be made too much of. But even after his conversion he was constantly addressed as a sort of Sun or Light of the world (see King, *Early Christian Numismatics*, p. 19). His nature, though at times passionate and violent, was ordinarily cold, sensible, and unimaginative. He had been early trained to wait and to bear hardship, and he rose gradually without any acts of flagrant crime or great rashness. He was free from the grosser sensual vices, with which so many previous emperors had been stained; and though vain, and in later life extravagant in his surroundings, he had sufficient sympathy with human nature not to act as a mere despot from caprice and formality. His violent acts were the result of gusts of passion, inflamed in all probability in all cases by the intrigues of interested relatives and courtiers, and did not proceed from continued malice. It is in them that we see the barbarian soldier carrying out the law of war and the instinct of personal vengeance against those most near to him. "Proximorum fauces aperuit," is a slur on his memory that we can neither explain nor palliate. His self-confidence and self-satisfaction was no doubt at times disturbed by remorse, but continued good health, success, and a great capacity for the fatigues of business, kept him sanguine and at ease. In his latter years he required more and more the stimulant of an "intoxicating flattery" (as Eunapius well expresses it *vit. Aedes*, p. 41), and avoided contact with anything that could wound his sensibilities. We have often cause to wonder at the energy with which he threw himself into the most varied occupations within a short period. He had the instinct of work and of princely position far beyond a calculation of political expediency.

His conversion to Christianity, though obviously real as far as it went, was an adherence to a philosophy rather than a creed, obedience to a law rather than an energy of faith. Christianity in this form suited his character. It aimed like his policy at embracing the world; it appealed to his moral sense by its purity and simplicity; it satisfied his consciousness of inward greatness, and his craving for supernatural assistance by the doctrines of grace and of divine providence exercised by the Saviour, and specially by the lessons it drew from the Old Testament which have proved so constantly attractive to great soldiers. Christianity was to him an historical religion, the proofs of which could be arranged in a clear and systematic form, a side of it which he evidently much appreciated (see his *oratio ad Sanctorum coetum*). His natural contempt for idolatry and for the delusions of the masses, found a ready response among the Christians: and he found also an enthusiastic or superstitious side in many Christians which exactly adapted itself to his nature. A reve-

rence for relics, a belief in his constant intercourse with the Deity in dreams and visions, a trust in the magical efficacy of a deferred baptism, were more congenial to his temper than the hot enthusiasm for Asian mysteries which swayed the sensuous temperament of Julian. He could not believe in the gods of Rome whom he had so often conquered, and the Greeks had long ceased to believe in their own Apollo. It is possible that the influence of Sopater, in those years of tragic passion and domestic bloodshed between Nicaea and the consecration of Constantinople, gave him for a time a turn towards heathen mysticism. But generally his intellect was too straightforward and sensible to indulge in the flimsy speculations and nervous excitements which made up the more pretentious heathenism of the time. He was, then, by no means a good Christian, but still a Christian, and one whom we must recognise decidedly as an instrument of God, and so far justified in believing as he did most strongly in his personal vocation as a Christian emperor.

As to the lighter side of his character we have some but not very detailed information. His nature was in general undoubtedly kindly, and he was inclined to friendship, and to trust those about him. Unfortunately he wanted subtlety in discerning character. He was lavish in his favour to his friends, "omitting no occasion (says Eutropius, *Brev. x.* 4), to render them wealthier and more honourable." But in many cases he was deceived, especially by the "ineffable dissimulation of those who crept into the church, and hypocritically assumed the name of Christians" (*V. C.* iv. 54, cp. *Vict. Caes.* 41, as to the admission of many unworthy persons to office). His wrath on the discovery of such deceit was unmeasured, and his vengeance summary. His manner towards such of his friends was "sarcastic rather than tender" (*irrisor potius quam blandus, unde proverbio vulgari Trachala*, *Vict. Epit.* 41). We may imagine him with his large person and ruddy upturned face and head always encircled with a diadem, thrown back upon its thick neck as he conversed with a supple courtier whose protestation he more than half suspected, while he greedily drank in his adulation.^c His conversation like his character must have been strange and inconsistent; at times a flow of wordy rhetoric or a burst of passion; at times a touch of genuine and simple humour. Some of his sayings have been preserved. When a courtier announced to him on one occasion that in a popular tumult his statues had been stoned, he smiled and passed his hand across his face remarking "it is surprising, but I feel no wound" (*S. Chrys. ad pop. Antiochen.*, &c.). The anecdote about Acesius has been told already. A graver rebuke to a covetous official, probably Ablavius (see *De Broglie*, ii. p. 83), is also characteristic. "How far," cried he, "shall we strain our cupidity?" Then, with a lance which he happened to have in his hand, he drew upon the ground a space equal in length to that of a man's body, "If thou shouldst gain all the wealth of this life and the whole world, thou wilt carry away no more than this little span of earth, if thou hast even that" (*Eus. V. C.* iv. 30).

We have said that Constantine was deficient in

^c There is a striking statue of Constantine in the large portico of the church of St. John Lateran.

cultivation, but he was superior to all the emperors of the time except perhaps Diocletian. He was a patron of letters and of literary professors, as well as of artists and men of science to whom he granted immunities (*C. Th.* xiii. 31, 2; cf. *id.* 4, 1; *Vict. Epit.* 41). Lactantius was the tutor of his eldest son, and Arborius of Toulouse, the uncle of Ausonius, the friend and probably the teacher of the others (*Auson. de Prof. Burdig.* 16). He directed in part the composition of the Augustan history, some books of which as well as the Institutes of Lactantius were dedicated to him. The poet Optatian won his favour and a recall from banishment by his extraordinary and laboured compositions, and a literary correspondence passed between them which is still extant in part (Tillemont, *Const.* lxi.; Teuffel, *Römische Lit.* § 379). Constantine addresses him as 'frater carissime,' and discusses the difficulties of writing verses.

The bent of his own genius, however, was towards declamation, and we possess one long oration *ad Sanctorum coetum* of which Eusebius has preserved a Greek translation. We have also a number of epistles collected from Eusebius, Athanasius, Socrates, &c., and the acts of councils. These are all to be found in Migne's useful volume, the arrangement of which might be improved. On the whole we may accept the substance of these letters as expressing the mind of Constantine, though something of the rhetorical flourish may be his secretary's. There are two, however, of the most interesting among them that must be doubtful; that from Helena to her son and his reply. These are found in the spurious acts of S. Silvester, and are of the following import. Helena writes to approve his desertion of idolatry, but gives the Jewish account of the death of Christ. Constantine replies by asserting that a prince is empowered by God, and his will must be followed; and orders the "bishops of the Jews" to come before him and dispute out of the holy scriptures to the profit of his own faith as well as theirs. The contents of these letters are curious, but perhaps not sufficient to prove them either spurious or genuine. The phrase *Ἰουδαίων ἐπίσκοποι* is rather in their favour, on the other hand the place where they are found is against them, as well as the phrase about the "holy scriptures." Eusebius we may remember ascribes Helena's conversion to her son.

The oratio *ad Sanctorum coetum* has been already mentioned more than once. It is a somewhat rambling treatise on Christian evidence, in the form of a declamation, taking up the recognised topics—the vanity of idolatry and of fatalism, the proofs of design in nature, proofs of Christianity from the character and miracles of our Saviour, and from Christian and heathen prophecy. In the last category he relies much on the Sibylline verses and on Virgil's Pollio. It ends with a comparison between Christian and heathen morals, between his own successes and the miserable deaths of the persecutors, among whom he does not however mention Licinius. This fact and the similarity of certain parts of his work to passages of Lactantius, as well as the quotations from Plato, whom he was not likely to have read, have induced some persons to suppose that the oration was not his own, but

chiefly that of his panegyrist. (See the arguments of Rossignol's *Virgile et Constantin le Grand* in Broglie, ii. 79.) But Eusebius's account of it seems to leave no room for such a supposition, as he speaks of the emperor's orations as translated not by himself, but by those whose duty it was, *i.e.*, regular officers of the court (*V. C.* iv. 32). It may be worth while to give the references to the parallels between the oration and Lactantius, as pointed out in Heinichen's edition: *S. C.* 3, 3=Lact. *Inst.* iv. 3, 18, sqq.; 4, 2=ii. 2, 4; 10, 3=i. 11, 17, sqq.; 11, 8=iv. 8, 13; 18, 2 foll.=iv. 15, 26 and vii. 15 foll. Cp. the reasoning on virtue and vice in his edict, *V. C.* ii. 48, with Lact. v. 7, 3, sqq. To say that Constantine in respect of theology was a learner from others, including Lactantius and Eusebius, is an obvious truism; to say that he was also an imitator and plagiarist is no more than is true of most writers of his age; but we have no real reason to doubt that Constantine was as much the author of this oration as most of the later defenders of Christianity were of their apologies. Whatever Eusebius's demerits were (and they are great in point of taste, especially in his *Life* of Constantine) no case of forgery can be made out against him.

We have obviously small means of judging Constantine's powers even as an orator, but tiresome as this piece is it is the work of a man who has taken pains with his subject, and who is capable of understanding argument, wherever he acquired his knowledge.

Besides these writings of which we have some knowledge, Constantine wrote his own memoirs, which are several times cited by Joannes Lydus.

V. *Vision of the R.*—The question of the reality of this vision is perhaps the most unsatisfactory of the many problems which meet us in the life of Constantine. The duty of the writer of an article like the present is to give the statements of the earliest authorities, and to point out the different ways in which they may be interpreted, and the reasons which make for this or that conclusion.

The almost contemporary account of Lactantius has been already referred to. *Life*, period i.; from *De M.* p. 44; "Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus ut caeleste signum Dei notaret in scutis atque ita proelium committeret. Fecit ut iussus est et transverſa X littera, summo capite circumflexo, Christum in scutis notat." This took place on the night before the battle of the Milvian bridge.

Eusebius's narrative (*V. C.* i. 27–32) contrasts very strikingly with this. He represents Constantine as looking about for some god to whom he should appeal for assistance in his campaign against Maxentius, and as thinking of the God of his father Constantius. He besought him in prayer to reveal himself, and received a sign, which the historian would perhaps have scarcely believed on the report of anyone else, but could not distrust on the word and oath of the emperor given to himself many years later. About the middle of the afternoon (for so the words seem to be best interpreted), he saw with his own eyes the trophy of the cross figured in light standing above the sun, and with the letters *τοῦτο νῦν* attached to it. He and the army

that was with him were seized with amazement, and he himself was in doubt as to the meaning of the appearance. As he was long considering it, light came on, and in sleep Christ appeared to him with the sign that appeared in heaven, and ordered him to make a standard of the same pattern. The next day he gave directions to artificers how to prepare the Labarum, which was adorned with gold and precious stones. Eusebius describes it as he afterwards himself saw it. It consisted of a tall spear with a bar crossing it, on the highest point of which was a Φ encircled with a crown, while a square banner gorgeously embroidered hung from the cross bar, on the upper part of which were the busts of the emperor and his sons. He immediately made inquiries of the priests as to the figure he had seen in his vision, and determined with good hope to proceed under his protection.

Eusebius nowhere states exactly where or when this circumstance took place; on the whole his vague expressions make one suppose he means to place it near the beginning of the campaign. We have seen that the senate acknowledged an *instinctus divinitatis*, and that the contemporary panegyrist refers to *divina praecepta* in the campaign with Maxentius.

Another sort of divine encouragement is recorded later by the heathen panegyrist Nazarius in 321, ch. 14. "All Gaul," he says, "speaks of the heavenly armies who proclaimed that they were sent to succour the emperor against Maxentius." "Flagrabant verendum nescio quid umbone corusci et caelestium armorum lux terribilis ardebat . . . Haec ipsorum sermone, hoc inter audientes ferebant 'Constantinum petimus, Constantino imus auxilio.'" A distinct incident is added by the late and antagonistic Zosimus, but he tells us nothing of what happened to Constantine, only of a prodigious number of owls which flocked to the walls of Rome when Maxentius crossed the Tiber (ii. 16).

On the Christian side the only independent account of later date seems to be that of Sozomen, i. 3, who afterwards gives the account of Eusebius. "Having determined to make an expedition against Maxentius, he was naturally doubtful of the event of the conflict and of the assistance he should have. While he was in this anxiety he saw in a dream the sign of the cross flashing in the sky, and as he was amazed at the sight, angels of God stood by him and said, 'O Constantine, in this conquer!' It is said too that Christ appeared to him and shewed him the symbol of the cross, and ordered him to make one like it, and to use it in his wars as a mainstay and pledge of victory. Eusebius Pamphilus however," &c. Ruffinus also gives both accounts. Later writers repeat one or other of these narratives in Eusebius and Sozomen, adding details of time and place, for which there is no warrant.

That something took place during the campaign with Maxentius which fixed Constantine's mind upon Christ as his protector and upon the cross as his standard, no unprejudiced person can deny. It is equally certain that he believed he had received this intimation by divine favour and as a divine call. Those who give him credit for inventing the whole story out of political considerations seem totally to misapprehend his character. But granting this, two questions

obviously remain to be discussed, (1) which account is to be preferred, that of Eusebius or Sozomen? (2) can we speak of the circumstance as a miracle?

1. Eusebius's account, as in itself the most striking and as resting on the authority of the emperor, has been most popularly received. It is open to obvious difficulties, arising from the silence of contemporaries and the lateness of the testimony. Dr. J. H. Newman in his *Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles* has said perhaps all that can be said for Eusebius. He thinks it probable that the panegyrist of 313 refers to this vision as the adverse omen which he will pass over and not raise unpleasant recollections by repeating (trans-acto nutu adversi ominis et offenso revocati cap. 2)—for the cross would be to Romans generally a sign of dismay, and Constantine (says Eusebius) was at first much distressed in mind with regard to it. The panegyrist also praises Constantine for proceeding "contra haruspicum monita," and asserts "habes profecto aliquod cum illa mente divina, Constantine, secretum, quae, delegata nostri diis minoribus cura, uni se tibi dignetur ostendere?" Optatian also, writing about 326, though he does not mention the vision, speaks of the cross as 'caeleste signum.' Those modern writers too, who think of a solar halo or parhelion as an explanation, must of course prefer the account of Eusebius. J. A. Fabricius was perhaps the first to offer this explanation (*Exercitatio critica de cruce Const. Mag.* in the 6th vol. of his *Bibliotheca graeca*) which is followed by Manso, Milman, Stanley, Heinichen and others.^d The latter in his 24th Meletema gives a useful *résumé* of the modern literature of the subject. It is curious how few historians adopt the alternative, which Schaff accepts, that of a providential dream (§ 134). It is difficult in fact to resist the impression that there was some objective sign visible in daylight such as Eusebius describes. The omission of it by Lactantius is not a sufficient argument to the contrary.

2. Can this sign be considered a miracle? The arguments for this conclusion are well put by Newman. He shews that little or nothing is gained by explaining the circumstances as a natural phenomenon or a subjective vision, if once we allow it to be providential; and that a priori this seems a fitting juncture for a miracle to have been worked. "It was first a fitting rite of inauguration when Christianity was about to take its place among the powers to whom God has given rule over the earth; next it was an encouragement and direction to Constantine himself and to the Christians who marched with him; but it neither seems to have been intended nor to have operated as a display of divine power to the confusion of infidelity or error" (§ 155). Schaff on the other hand thinks that "the combination of the holy symbol of redemption with the bloody standard, and of the mild king of peace with the God of battles is shocking to a healthy religious feeling, and requires almost too great an extension of the theory of the accommodation of divine revelation to the spirit of the time and the passions and interests of individuals" (§ 134,

^d Mr. Whympster has given a good picture of such a phenomenon, observed by him after the fatal accident which occurred on the first ascent of the Matterhorn. (*Scrambles amongst the Alps*. London, 1871, p. 399.)

pp. 458, 459). But Newman seems to be right in arguing that nothing is gained—in regard to difficulties like this—by transferring the event from the category of miracle to that of special providence. What is gained or is thought to be gained is agreement with an historical theory, generally adopted by Protestants, that miracles are restricted to certain epochs such as the first century after the incarnation and cannot be proved to have occurred at other times. This is a subject on which further argument is impossible here (see MIRACLES).

Some minor points of difficulty may be mentioned. 1. Was the inscription in Greek or Latin, and what were the words? Eusebius gives the impression that it was in Greek, and this is expressly asserted by the emperor Leo. In this case the words would be *τοῦτ' ἡνίκα*. Philostorgius, Nicephorus and Zonaras say that it was in Latin; the words would then have been *hoc (or hac) vince* or *vinces*. The popular version in *hoc signo vinces* seems to be an expansion of the earliest formula. *Hoc signo victor eris* is found on coins of Vetricano, Magnentius, and Constantius junior. That the earliest form was in Latin seems pretty clear from the fact that Constantine's own language was Latin, not Greek. He wrote and naturally spoke in Latin, though he could speak in Greek if necessary in later years. 2. What was the form of the symbol? Lactantius's words are somewhat obscure, so are Eusebius's: and we are inclined to doubt whether the monogram was  or  Both monuments and coins, however, seem to shew that the first form was the earliest (see De Rossi in *Spicilegium Solesmense*, t. iv. pp. 517–539 and the section on coins). It is curious that a very similar monogram is found on Athenian tetradrachms and on coins of the Ptolemies () in the latter case probably = *ΧΡΥΣΙΝΟΣ*. It was also introduced, probably by a Christian moneyer, into the legend on a coin representing the triumph of Bacchus issued at Maeonia in Lydia in the reign of Decius Trajanus A.D. 259–261, where the formula

B. A  A. TO B.

= *δὲς ἀρχόντος ἀγωνοθέτου τὸ δεύτερον* (see a paper by F. W. Madden communicated to the London Numismatic Society, 1866). The other form  is however found on coins of Herod the Great, forty years before Christ (Garrucci, in King, p. 13).

VI. *Coins*.—We are now in a much better position for estimating the evidence afforded by coins as to the history of the lower empire than at any previous time. The principle of classification by mints rather than types or legends—devised by the late Count J. F. W. de Salis and introduced by him into the British Museum in a most public-spirited and devoted manner—has led the way to a chronological arrangement of all the coins, fixing their dates in most cases within short periods of years. The following paragraphs are chiefly based on his conversation and letters, and on personal inspection of the coins, especially those in the British Museum and at Berlin. At the latter place the writer also received some kind assistance from Professor Friedländer.

The best printed account of the coins is in Henry Cohen's *Histoire des Monnaies frappées*

sous l'Empire Romain, Paris and London, 1863. See also Eckhel's well-known book, and some papers by Garrucci in the *Revue Numismatique* ii. and iii., and Cavedoni in the 5th vol. of the *Opuscoli di Modena*, and a paper by Mr. de Salis, *Roman Coins struck in Britain*, Numismatic Society, London, 1867. Mr. C. W. King's *Early Christian Numismatics*, Lond. 1873, contains a translation of one of Garrucci's papers and some important observations of his own.

The coins of Constantine may best be considered for our purposes under three periods, the first up to about 320, in which heathen types predominate and Christian signs where they do occur are rare, and probably rather owing to the artist than to government authorities. After 320 the indifferent types (camp gates, dates in a wreath, &c.) prevail; and for the time just previous to the second war with Licinius the monogram of Christ appears in almost all the mints of the western empire, evidently for political reasons. The third period is after the dedication of Constantinople in 330, in the last few years of which, after the deaths of Helena and Theodora, and especially in the last few years of the emperor's life, Christian signs again become frequent.

First period. The first thing that is noticeable is a deficiency in the coins of London, at the time of Constantine's proclamation, of any bearing his own name, although he then coined himself as Caesar at Lyons and Treves; a fact which seems explicable by his indecision whether or not to take the title of Augustus. In the middle of this period Constantine acknowledged Maxentius by striking coins with his name at Tarraco (not at Treves or Lyons) as Maxentius did for him at Ostia and Rome. The mint of Tarraco (which has sometimes been confounded with that at Treves: in the exergue T = Tarraco, TR = Treves, TS = Thessalonica) is remarkable as affording the most certain instances of early coins of Constantine with a Christian symbol. The monogram  occurs double on the upper part of the emperor's helmet, which is generally filled with indifferent signs, and the date of this may be fixed at the end of the campaign (cf. Eus. *V. C.*, i. 31, iv. 21, and Sozomen i. 8 towards the end, who mentions such coins as existing in his time).

The significance of the signs  and  on other coins of Constantine and Licinius of the same place and date with the legend SOLI INVICTO COMITI is more doubtful, as is that of the signs  and  on the helmeted coins struck at Siscia. The  on coins of Constantine with the same legend on the reverse, struck at Rome soon after the defeat of Maxentius, are much more remarkable (see figs. in Garrucci in *Revue Numismatique*, iii. 8). The rarity however of these, and of the helmeted coins of Tarraco, would lead to the belief that the idea was rather one of the particular moneyer than ordered by authority.

Second period. The universality, on the other hand, of the monogram in connexion with the labarum on coins of the Western empire previously to the war with Licinius, leads us to conclude that it was intended to give great weight to Christian feeling. Such were struck at Tarraco, Aquileia and Siscia with the names of Constantine and his sons and even of Licinius and Licinianus, while on those of London, Treves and Thessa-

lonica the point of the spear which supports the banner was made to terminate in a cross. These may be placed between 321-323. It is remarkable too that no coins with the sun and the legend SOLI, etc., on the reverse occur after 320 or 321. The statement of Burckhardt is much exaggerated; the proportion of SOLI's being rather one in five than four in five as he gives it. On the defeat of Licinius coins were struck with the legend BEATA TRANQVILLITAS; and Helena and Fausta (first as NOBILISSIMA FEMINA, then as AVGVSTA) took his place to a limited extent in the Gallic mints. (King assigns the coins with *Nobilissima femina* to Helena, wife of Julian, and an unknown Fausta, p. 38.) Yet the name of the younger Licinius is still found after his father's death *e.g.* at Treves. Very soon after this, perhaps about the time of the council of Nicaea, Constantine moved a mint to Byzantium, the same probably which had previously been moved from Sardica to Sirmium (circ. 315), and struck coins with the exergal mark CONS etc., standing for Constantinople. About the same time the name of Constantina for Arles came into use, the marks for which are sometimes liable to confusion with those of Constantinople, but may be distinguished by the *Latin* differential letter standing before CON. or CONST. or the figures I. II. or III. in the field of the reverse. To the same period we may refer two remarkable things, the substitution of the oriental bearded diadem satirised by Julian in his *Caesares*) for the oak-leaf chaplet of the earlier emperors, and the introduction of the type called the praying head. The first is never found except upon the emperor, and is always employed instead of the old diadem upon the latter type. This attitude in which the head is represented as slightly raised, with no legend surrounding it, represents perhaps really a position of prayer (to which Eusebius seems to refer it *V. C.* iv. 15, though we have no trace of the hands he mentions), certainly not a superstitious devotion to the sun or moon. Some numismatists (like De Salis) see in it an imitation of the well-known idealised head of Alexander the Great, with the horns of Ammon, which appears for instance on coins of Lysimachus, on those of Macedonia under the empire, and on contorniate medals of this very time. The similar position of the features is very noticeable, and in that imitative age Constantine seems to have had Alexander especially in his mind as a model (cf. Julian, *Caes.* where he is made to compare himself also with Caesar and other emperors, and his panegyric on Constantine, Eutrop. *Vit. Const.*). It may be noticed that Crispus is also represented in this attitude. Scarcely any light is thrown on the deaths of Crispus and Fausta by the coinage of the period: the name of Crispus appears till about 326, that of Fausta probably rather later, that is, till the date usually assigned for their execution respectively.

Third period.—At the reorganisation of the empire consequent on the dedication of Constantinople in 330, the mint of London appears to have been suppressed, as the coins struck after this date are not found there. Such are the two with legends CONSTANTINOPOLIS and VRBS ROMA. The latter of these has on the other side the she-wolf and twins, above which between the two stars the ✱ is sometimes found, perhaps rather

to mark a particular year than as a sign of any change in religious feeling, as the same place is filled by various indifferent signs. What is known as the 'two soldiers' type with the standard and GLORIA EXERCITUS, and sometimes (as at Siscia*) with a ✱, also belongs to this period: as do coins with the legends HELENÆ and THEODORÆ in the dative case, struck after their death, and commemorating in all likelihood the reconciliation of the two branches of the family of Constantius Chlorus. No support is given by coins to the theory of a Helena wife of Crispus, nor does Helena wife of Julian appear. Coins of Dalmatius and Hannibalian may be placed after 335; and the majority of those of this period with Christian signs seem to belong to these last years, perhaps even to the short interval between the emperor's baptism and death.

Constantine had a double commemoration, heathen and Christian, after his decease. He is represented veiled as DIVVS—being the last emperor so consecrated—and on the reverse in a quadriga with a star above him and a hand stretched out from heaven to receive him (*So Eus. iv. 73*). Heathen emperors had been represented as soaring aloft on the eagle, the bird of Jove. Then coins of Constantine are found with mint-marks of Alexandria, Antioch, and Carthage, and are not of rare occurrence (*King, p. 53*). Besides the coins with Christian emblems mentioned above, others have been at different times cited by numismatists, but from their rarity or doubtful genuineness they are not of much importance historically. Such are the two referred to by Eckhel as probably forgeries, IN HOC SIN (sic) VIC and the monogram, and the SPES PVBLICA with the labarum surmounted by the monogram, or ✱, and resting on a serpent. The banner has what seems, to some eyes at least, to be the word DEO upon it. Only four or five specimens of this last coin are known to exist, but it is now generally allowed to be genuine. It is quite small, and has on the obverse the head of Constantine the Younger with the title CONSTANTINVS AVG. It may have been minted on his appointment as Augustus just before his father's death. The idea was probably taken from the picture mentioned by Eusebius (*V. C.* iii. 3). See *King, pp. xvi. 25, 58 f.*

THE SONS OF CONSTANTINE—

CONSTANTINUS II. born Aug. 7, A.D. 312. Emp. 337-340.

CONSTANS I. born about A.D. 320. Emp. 337-350.

CONSTANTIUS II. born Aug. 6, A.D. 317. Emp. 337-361.

I. Authorities.

II. Characters of the three Emperors.

III. History.

IV. Legislation and Policy—

- (1) In favour of Christianity;
- (2) Relation to Heathenism;
- (3) Laws with regard to Marriage, &c.

I. Authorities.—The same ancient writers as those cited above for Constantine, with the exception of Eusebius. On the other hand we have the valuable contemporary history of Am-

* Mr. A. J. Evans, *Bosnia and the Herzegovina*, p. 68, Longmans, 1876, says, "during the fourth century the sacred monogram may almost be regarded as a Siscian mint-mark."

mianus after 353 and frequent references in the works of Julian (ed. Spanheim and the *Epistles* by Heyles) and Libanius (*Orations* ed. Reiske and *Epistles* ed. Wolf). Few modern authors have treated specially of these emperors, but the writers on Julian (q. v.) are naturally obliged to say a good deal with regard to Constantius. The history of the Arian troubles is fully given by St. Athanasius, especially in his *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*, his *Apologia contra Arianos* and *Apol. ad Constantium*: references are made to the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1698. The ecclesiastical chronology of this period is often confused, but is generally to be restored from the *Paschal letters* of St. Athanasius lately discovered in Syriac (in Migne's edition and the *Library of the Fathers*) and the *Fragmenta Historica* of St. Hilary.

The sons of Constantine are, it need scarcely be said, personally of but little importance when compared to their father: and it will be unnecessary to treat of them in such detail. We shall first briefly characterise each of them, and then trace the history of their lives, chiefly noticing their connexion with the affairs of the church. Lastly, we shall give some account of the course of legislation and policy in their reigns, especially with reference to religion.

II. *Characters of the three Emperors.*—CONSTANTINUS II., the eldest son of Constantine by Fausta, born in A.D. 312, was made Caesar in 316 together with Crispus, and his quinquennalia were celebrated by the panegyric of Nazarius in 321. At the death of his father the empire was redivided, and Constantine as the eldest son seems to have made some pretensions to Constantinople, but these were overruled: see below *History*. Of his character we know little or nothing, especially if we reject the *monody* usually referred to his death (see above Constantine, *Life*, period iii.). He appears to have been a staunch Catholic, but his attack upon the dominions of his brother Constans does not put his character in a favourable light. His short reign makes him very unimportant.

CONSTANS I. the youngest of the three, was born about 320 and made Caesar in 333: he reigned as Augustus 337–350 when he was killed by the conspiracy of Magnentius. His character has been drawn by De Broglie (iii. pp. 58, 59) in terms which cannot well be improved. "As far as we can discriminate between the contradictory estimates of different historians, Constans was of a simple, somewhat coarse, nature, and one without high aims though without malice. As regards the inheritance of his father's qualities, while Constantius seemed to have taken for his share his political knowledge, his military skill and his eloquence (though reproducing a very faint image of them), Constans had only received great personal courage and a straightforwardness that did him honour. He was besides a lover of pleasure: he was suspected of the gravest moral irregularities—an accusation all the more accredited since, having been betrothed in his father's lifetime to the daughter of the minister Ablavius who was still a child, he had faithfully kept his promise notwithstanding her father's disgrace, and though now of mature years had remained a bachelor waiting till she was of age to be married. A great weakness of character which put him in the power of unwise counsellors,

want of money and expensive tastes which made him at once avaricious and prodigal, rendered him on the whole a very mediocre sovereign. But he had firm, though certainly unenlightened, faith, and frequently gave proofs of it by distributing largesses to the churches and favours to the Christians;" cp. *Entrop. Brev.* x. 9, *Vict. Caes.* 41, *Epit.* 41. Zosimus, ii. 42, gives him a worse character than the others, two of whom mention his vices. Libanius in 348 delivered a panegyric on Constans and Constantius, which is of course favourable: it is called *βασιλικὸς λόγος*, vol. iii. ed. Reiske, pp. 272–332. St. Chrysostom in the difficult and probably corrupt passage of his 15th *homily on the Philippians*, p. 363, ed. Gaume, speaks of him as having children and as committing suicide, statements elsewhere unsupported. St. Athan. *Hist. Arian. ad. mon.* 69 refers to his betrothal to Olympias, mentioned above as daughter of Ablavius, whom Constantius married to Arsaces, king of Armenia, cf. *Ammian.* xx. ii. The most favourable evidence for Constans is the praise of St. Athanasius (*Apolog. ad Constantium* 4 sqq.; cf. the letter of Hosius in *Hist. Arian. ad monachos* 44). His conduct with respect to the Arian and Donatist controversies gained him the esteem of the Catholics, and he was a baptized Christian—while Constantius remained unbaptized till very near his death. (His baptism is referred to in *Ap. ad C.* 7.)

CONSTANTIUS II. The character of this emperor is much better known to us than that of his brothers, but what we know is hardly favourable to him. He was the second of the sons of Fausta, born at Sirmium Aug. 6, 317, and was emperor from 337 to 361. It may be worth while to give his character from the same writer whom we have quoted for his brother (De Broglie, iii. pp. 7, 8). "Of the sons of Constantine he was the one who seemed best to reproduce the qualities of his father. Although very small in stature, and rendered almost deformed by his short and crooked legs, he had the same address as his father in military exercises, the same patience under fatigue, the same sobriety in diet, the same exemplary severity in all that had regard to continence. He put forward also, with the same love for uncontrolled preeminence, the same literary and theological pretensions: he loved to shew off his eloquence and to harangue his courtiers. But the solid basis of talent and genius, which set off Constantine's brilliant external gifts and palliated faults only too real, was totally wanting in Constantius—no greatness in his ideas, no firmness in his resolutions, no generosity in his feelings shewed itself to justify his thirst for absolute power. Impatient of all rival authority, jealous of merit even when it pretended to be acting under his orders, he was at bottom weak and irresolute and secretly was entirely ruled by influences acting on him from below. A sort of consciousness of his own incapacity penetrated even through his ridiculous conceit, and contemporary writers amused themselves from time to time with his affected gravity, which did not permit him (so they said) to make any motion in public, neither to cough nor to spit nor to stir a finger, for fear lest a natural movement should in some way injure his theatrical dignity." Victor *Caes.* 42 to whom he is "noster princeps" speaks well of Constantius: the writer of the *Epitome*

ves him credit for some virtues but speaks of e eunuchs &c. who surrounded him, and of the lverse influence of his wife Eusebia. Ammianus i. 16 gives an elaborate and balanced character of onstantius which seems to be fair. He accuses m of cruelty, suspiciousness and of misgovernent; and, what is remarkable in a heathen, lames him as "Christianam religionem absolutum et simplicem anili superstitione confundens." ulian (before his usurpation) and Libanius lauded onstantius during his lifetime, and were bitter nd sarcastic against him after his death. Christian riters are naturally not partial to an emperor ho leaned so constantly towards Arianism, and as such a bitter persecutor of the Nicene faith, nd do not scruple to call him by the names of hab, Pilate and Judas. St. Athanasius neverheless addressed him in very complimentary erms in the apology which he composed as late s 356. Constantius was not baptized till his last ear, yet he interfered in church matters with he most arrogant pretensions.

III. History.—Period i. 337–350, to the death of Constans—Period ii. 350–361, Constantius sole Augustus.

Period i., 337–350.—Constantine II., Constans, Constantius II., Augusti. On the death of Constantine, Constantius hurried to Constantinople to take part in the funeral of his father. The armies, says Eusebius, declared unanimously that they would have none but his sons to succeed him (V. C. iv. 68)—to the exclusion, therefore, of his nephews, Dalmatius and Hannibalian. This was followed shortly after by a general massacre of the family of Constantius Chlorus and Theodora. The victims were two of Constantine's half-brothers, Julius Constantius and another; and seven of his nephews, including the two excluded from power;—as well as the patrician Optatus, and his former minister Ablavius (Zos. ii. 40; Julian *ad Athen.* p. 270 ed. Spanheim; Athanas. *H. Arian. ad mon.* 69). There remained only two of his nephews, sons of Julius Constantius, Gallus who was supposed to be dying and the infant Julian who were saved by the care of the bishop, Mark of Arethusa. Many writers, and those of such distinct views as St. Athanasius, Ammianus and Zosimus as well as Julian, openly charge Constantius with being the author of this great crime, others imply only that he allowed it. (Ammianus says in his character xxi. 16, 8, "inter imperandi exordia cunctos sanguine et genere se contingentes stirpitus [or turpiter] interemit", unfortunately his detailed account is lost. Eutropius, x. 9, says of the death of Dalmatius "oppressus est factione militari et Constantio, patruale suo, sinente potius quam iubente," and so Socr. ii. 25.) Beugnot, however, is inclined to see in it a pagan reaction which had long been brewing, and which would not have spared his children if they had not known how to strengthen their position by sacrificing the detested Ablavius (vol. i. p. 135). He allows that the cause of paganism really gained nothing; and we must conclude that this theory is not sufficiently substantiated. Constantine and Constans are in no way implicated in this tragedy. A new division of empire of course followed; for which purpose the brothers met at Sirmium. There are some difficulties as to the details of the partition, which need not be discussed here; generally speaking Constantine

had the west, Constans the centre, and Constantius the eastern portion of the empire.

Constantine thus came into contact with St. Athanasius in his exile at Treves, and at once took him under his protection. He wrote a letter to the Alexandrians, declaring his respect for "the interpreter of our adorable law," and asserting that his father had banished him for his own safety and had intended to restore him [facts of which there is no sufficient proof], and evincing his intention to put this resolve into practice. (St. Athan. *Apol.* p. 805. Sozomen iii. 2 who gives this letter, says also "it is said that Constantine declared this resolve in his last will." This letter is dated June 17th; if it is of the year 337, St. Athanasius did not avail himself of it till about a year later.) A sort of compromise seems to have been established: other exiled bishops were restored, while Eusebius of Nicomedia was entrusted by Constantius with the education of his cousins Gallus and Julian, and was soon afterwards translated by him to Constantinople to the exclusion of the orthodox Paulus (Socr. ii. 7). In the year 340 Constantine invaded the dominions of Constans and penetrated into Lombardy, where he was killed in a small engagement. Constantius in the mean time was engaged in the war with Persia, which lasted in an indecisive way the whole of his reign. It may be mentioned that in 343 and later the Christians in Persia suffered terribly from persecution, being suspected as favouring the Romans.

It is from the division of empire between Constans and Constantius that we must begin to date the separation of the churches. The Eastern church recovered indeed at length from Arian and semi-Arian influences, but the habit of division had been formed, and varieties of theological conception became accentuated; lastly, the Roman church grew rapidly in power and independence, having no rival of any pretensions in the West, while in the East the older apostolic sees were gradually subordinated to that of Constantinople, and the whole church was constantly distracted by imperial interference.

Constantius was especially ready to intervene. In 341, in deference to the Dedication council of Antioch, he forcibly intruded one Gregorius into the see of Alexandria: in the next year he sent his magister equitum, Hermogenes, to drive out Paulus from Constantinople (who had returned after the death of Eusebius). Hermogenes was torn to pieces in a popular tumult, and Constantius came in person to punish the rioters, but was content with depriving the city of about half the dole granted by his father, and expelling Paulus: but he did not confirm Macedonius, the rival claimant of the see (Socr. ii. 13). These events took place while St. Athanasius was received with honour at the court of Constans, for whose use it may be noticed he had prepared some books of Holy Scripture (Athan. *Apolog. ad Const.* 4; *πικρία* seem not to be a synopsis, but simply = libri). Constans determined to convoke another oecumenical council, and obtained his brother's concurrence. The place fixed upon was Sardica, on the frontier of the Western empire, where about 170 bishops met in 343. (For the numbers, see Athan. *Hist. Arian. ad mon.* c. 15. Socrates, ii. 20, and Soz. iii. 12 give the date 347, which was generally accepted, but this is probably an error in chronology like others in

their histories. The discovery of the Maffean fragment and the festal letter proves the earlier date. See Hefele, *Councils*, § 58, De Broglie, iii. p. 66, Bright, *Life of St. Athanasius*, p. xlvii. note.) Then occurred the first great open rupture between the East and West, for which we must refer elsewhere [COUNCIL OF SARDICA], the minority consisting of Western bishops siding with St. Athanasius, while the Eastern or Eusebian faction seceded to Philippopolis across the border. After the dissolution of the council Constans still attempted to give force to the decrees of Sardica, by requiring of his brother the restoration of Athanasius and Paulus, threatening force if it was refused (Soc. ii. 22; Soz. iii. 20). The shameful plots of the Arian bishop of Antioch, Stephen, against the messengers of Constans were happily discovered, and the faith of Constantius in the party was somewhat shaken (St. Athan. *Hist. Arian. ad mon.* 20; Theodoret, ii. 9, 10). The pressure of the war with Persia no doubt inclined him to avoid anything like a civil war, and he put a stop to some of the Arian persecutions. Ten months later—after the death of the intruded Gregory—he invited St. Athanasius to return to his see, which he did in 346, after a curious interview with the emperor at Antioch (see the letters in Soc. ii. 23 from Athanas. *Apol. c. Arianos*, 54 foll.). Other exiled bishops were likewise restored.

In the West, meanwhile, Constans was occupied with the Donatists, whose case had been one of the elements of division at Sardica. He sent a mission to Africa which was intended to be conciliatory, but his bounty was rudely refused by that Donatus who was now at the head of the sect—himself a secret Arian as well as a violent schismatic—with the famous phrase: “*Quid est imperatori cum ecclesiâ?*” (cf. above, *CONSTANTINE, relations with the Donatists*). The turbulence of the Circumcellions provoked the so-called “Macarian Persecution;” some of the schismatics were put to death, others committed suicide, others were exiled, and so for a time union seemed to be produced. (Bright, pp. 58–60; Hefele, § 70, *Synod of Carthage*. The history is in Optatus Milev. iii. 1, 2.) Early in the year 350 Constans was assassinated, or rather forced to commit suicide, by the partisans of the usurper Magnentius. His death was a great loss to the orthodox party, whose sufferings during the next ten years were most intense.

Period ii., 350–361. Constantius sole Augustus. The usurpation of Magnentius in Gaul seems to have been in great measure a movement of Paganism against Christianity, of the provincial army against the court. It was closely followed by another, that of Vetranio in Illyria. We need not follow the strange history of these civil wars, nor recount how Vetranio was overcome by the eloquence of Constantius in 350, and Magnentius beaten in the bloody battle of Mursa, Sept. 351, that cost the Roman empire 50,000 men. Between these two events Constantius named his cousin Gallus Caesar, and attended the first council of Sirmium. Some time before the battle he must have received the letter from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, describing a cross of light which appeared “on the 7th May, about the third hour,” “above the holy Golgotha and stretching as far as the holy mount of Olives,” and seen by the whole

city. St. Cyril praises Constantius and reports this marvel as an encouragement to him in his campaign. The genuineness of the letter has however been doubted, especially from the word “consubstantial” appearing in the doxology at the end. At the time of the battle of Mursa Constantius came much under the influence of Valens, the temporising bishop of the place, who pretended that the victory was revealed to him by an angel, and from this time he appears more distinctly as a persecutor of the Nicene faith, which he endeavoured to crush in the West. His general character also underwent a change for the worse after the unexpected suicide of Magnentius, which put him in sole possession of the empire. It is difficult to say whether he appears to least advantage in the pages of Ammianus or of St. Athanasius. It would take too long to recount the disgraceful proceedings at the council of Arles in 353, where the legates of the new pope Liberius were taken in, or at Milan in 355, when Constantius declared that his own will should serve the Westerns for a canon as it had served the Syrian bishops, and proceeded to banish and imprison no less than 147 of the more prominently orthodox clergy and laity (*Hist. Ar. ad mon.* 33, &c.; see De Broglie, iii. p. 263). The most important of the sufferers were Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Dionysius of Milan. Soon after followed the exile of Liberius, and in 355 that of Hosius. All this was intended to lead up to the final overthrow of Athanasius. Early in 356 Syrianus, the duke of Egypt, began the open persecution of the Catholics at Alexandria, and Constantius when appealed to confirmed his actions, and sent Heraclius to hand over all the churches to the Arians, which was done with great violence and cruelty (*Hist. Ar.* 54). George of Cappadocia was intruded into the church, and Athanasius was forced to hide in the desert. In the same year Hilary of Poitiers was banished to Phrygia.

In the mean time Constantius had been carrying on a persecution of even greater rigour against the adherents of Magnentius, which is described by Ammianus (xiv. 5) whose history begins at this period. His suspicions were also aroused against his cousin Gallus, whose violence and misgovernment in the East, especially in Antioch, was notorious. The means by which Constantius lured him into his power and then beheaded him are very characteristic (Amm. xiv. 11). At the end of the same year, 355, he determined to make his younger brother Julian Caesar in his place, putting him over the provinces of Gaul, and marrying him to his sister Helena.

In the church worse things were yet to come: the fall of Hosius, who accepted the creed of the 2nd council of Sirmium, then that of Liberius, the first after torture and severe imprisonment, the second after two years of melancholy exile, both in 357. We cannot go into the details of the numerous councils and synods at this time. The most famous and important was that of Rimini in 359, in conjunction with one in the East at Seleucia, when the political bishops succeeded in carrying an equivocal creed approved by the emperor, and omitting the homoousion. Constantius, tired of the long controversy, attempted to enforce unity by imposing the formula of Rimini everywhere, and a number of

bishops of various parties were deposed (Soz. iv. 3, 24). In 360 Julian was proclaimed Augustus by his army, and made a proposal for the division of the empire which Constantius did not accept (Amm. xx. 8). A civil war was impending: Constantius was at first contemptuous, but ere long began to be haunted with fears of death and caused himself to be baptized by Euzoius, the Arian bishop of Antioch. He expired, after a painful illness, at Mopsucrene at the foot of Mount Taurus, Nov. 4, 361 (Soz. ii. 47; Amm. xxi. 15).

Constantius was at least three times married: first in the lifetime of his father at his tricenaria, 336 (Eus. V. C. iv. 49), probably to a daughter of Julius Constantius, and therefore a sister of Julian (*Hist. Arian. ad mon.* 69; cf. Tillemont, iv. p. 264). She must have died before Magnentius sent to offer him his daughter. In 352 or 353, after the successful issue of the civil war, he married Aurelia Eusebia, a very beautiful, accomplished, and gentle lady, but an Arian, who had a great influence over her husband. (For details respecting her see the panegyric of Julian, *Orat.* 3, and Amm. xxi. 6, 4; and cf. Tillemont, pp. 380, 381.) She died some time before the usurpation of Julian. In the last year of his life Constantius married one Faustina, of whom we know very little. He had no children apparently by his first wife, and none by Eusebia, but had a posthumous daughter Flavia Maxima Constantia, who married the emperor Gratian (Amm. xxi. 15, 6; xxvi. 7, 10). Besides his wives, on whom he was accustomed to lean, his chief adviser was the eunuch Eusebius, of whom Ammianus says so sarcastically, "apud quem, si vere dici debet, multum Constantianus potuit." He also trusted much to a detestable man, the notary Paulus, nicknamed Catena, on account of his skill in linking one accusation on to another. Another of the same class was Mercurius, called Comes Somniorum, who turned even the accounts of dreams into suggestions of high treason (Amm. xiv. 5; xv. 3). These men, with an army of spies (*curiosi*), organised a sort of reign of terror for three years after the overthrow of Magnentius, especially in Britain, acting particularly on the laws against sacrifice and magic (cf. Liban. *pro Aristophane*, i. p. 430).

IV. *Legislation and Policy.*—The sons of Constantine effected no such great revolutions as their father had done, but they continued in great measure the same course of legislation, of which it is worth while to give a few details. They may be arranged under the following heads: (1) Laws in favour of Christianity; (2) Relations with heathenism; (3) Laws relating to marriage, &c.

(1) *Laws in favour of Christianity.* These will be found chiefly in the second title of the xvth book of the Theodosian code, headed *de episcopis ecclesiis et clericis*. They shew the tendency to create a clerical caste by extending privileges to the wives and children of the clergy, and even ordaining that their sons should "in ecclesia perseverare" if they were not subject to be made deacons. Clerics engaged in trade were not to be subjected to the usual taxes (particularly, no doubt, the *chrysargyrum*) nor were they to be liable to forced service. An important law was put out in 355 ordering that

no bishop should be tried before a civil judge, but before other bishops (xvi. 2, 12).

In 357 the emperor confirmed all the privileges granted to the church of Rome, at that time under the emperor's nominee, Felix, whilst Liberius was in exile. Another of the same year is addressed to Felix, more explicitly guaranteeing the immunity from taxation and forced service. The next law of 360 refers to the synod of Rimini, and the opinion expressed by various bishops from different parts of Italy, and from Spain and Africa. This law, while it preserved the immunity already granted to church lands, did not concede it to lands held or rented by clerks for their own use, and restricted the freedom from taxes on trade to those in quite a small way of business, commanding that others, especially those who had passed from business into orders should pay like other traders. The last law in the series (in 361) is remarkable as the heading gives Julian the title of Augustus, and makes him party to a general statement that he, who (in the obscure phraseology of the time) "*voto Christianae legis meritum eximiae singularisque virtutis omnibus intinaverit*" is to enjoy perpetual security, and to be considered as working more for the state than one who works with his hands.

(2) *Relations to heathenism.* The state of things that we have seen in the last years of Constantine continued during his son's reign. There was the same disposition on the part of the empire to put down paganism, and the same elements of reaction. In the West, especially in Rome, real heathenism still retained much of its vitality, and still swayed the minds of the aristocracy and the populace; in the East the supporters of the old religion were the philosophers and rhetoricians, men more attached to its literary and artistic associations, than prepared to defend polytheism as a creed. They were of course mixed up with another class, the theurgists, practisers of a higher kind of magic, which, as we shall see, was particularly attractive to Julian.

The following laws from the tenth title of the xvth book of the Theodosian code relate distinctly to heathen sacrifice. Sec. 2, in 341, issued by Constantius, says: "*Cesset superstitio, sacrificiorum aboleatur insania*," and refers to the law of Constantine noticed above. A year or two later (the date is uncertain and wrongly given in the code), Constantius and Constans order the temples in the Roman territory to be kept intact for the pleasure of the Roman people, though all "superstition" is to be eradicated; almost at the same time they issued a law to the praetorian prefect inflicting death and confiscation on persons sacrificing. In 353 Constantius forbids the "*nocturna sacrificia*" permitted by Magnentius: in 356 he and Julian make it capital to sacrifice or worship images. Doubt has been thrown on these laws by La Bastie and Beugnot, partly from the inaccuracies or deficiencies in the dates given in the code, partly from the historical evidence that they were not carried out. They suggest the theory that the most important of them were never issued, but were projects of laws found by the younger Theodosius and inserted in his code. The reply to the first point is merely to shew that there are many similar inaccuracies in the code, in laws of

undoubted genuineness. The theory accounting for these laws is itself very improbable; but the best refutation of it is to give historical authority on the other side. Such is the anecdote of St. Athanasius' warning to the Alexandrians, which made them believe him a prophet (Soz. iv. 10), and the express declarations of Libanius. We may instance his historical review of the policy of preceding emperors in his oration *pro templis* addressed to Theodosius the Great, where he says that Constantius, under the influence of his ministers, enacted among other bad laws "that there should no longer be sacrifices," and a little further on he speaks of his destruction of many temples (ed. Reiske, ii. pp. 163 and 185). Again he says of Aristophanes, "He came to the ruins of the temples, bearing neither incense nor victim, nor fire, nor libation (for it was not allowed) but a heavy heart and a lamentable and tearful voice," &c. (i. p. 438, Reiske, see further in Chastel, pp. 79, 91, &c.) In the West, too, Maternus, who wished for very severe measures, writes in the time of Constans: "Little is wanting to complete the thorough prostration of the devil by your laws, and the extinction of the baleful contagion of idolatry" (*de errore prof. rel.* c. 21). The same author is of course aduced on the other side to prove that in the West heathenism was still very powerful. Constantius was very tolerant on his visit to Rome in 356: though he removed the statue and altar of Victory from the senate, "He respected," says Symmachus, "the privileges of the Vestals, distributed the priestly offices among the nobles, did not refuse allowances for the ceremonies, and accompanying the joyous senate through the streets of the eternal city contemplated its sanctuaries with a tranquil eye, read the inscriptions which they bore in honour of the gods, asked questions as to their origin, praised their founders: in fact, notwithstanding his attachment to another religion, he respected that of the empire." (Symmach. *Epp.* x. 61; cf. Amm. xvi. 10. See Chastel, p. 89; Beugnot, p. 146, who gives a number of pagan monuments of this reign, pp. 150-170, quoting among others a traveller in the year 374, who describes the pagan rites of the city as if Christianity did not exist.) What was true for Rome seems also to have been true for other cities of the East, such particularly as Alexandria, as well as Heliopolis in Phoenicia, and Olympia, Amyclae, Eleusis in Greece (Chastel, p. 90).

On the other hand heathenism was attacked less directly by the laws against magic. The laws *de maleficiis et mathematicis* under Constantine were sufficiently strong, and when a suspicion of high-treason (*maiestas*) could be linked on to the offence by such men as Paulus and Mercurius, they afforded sufficient pretexts for many executions and banishments. In his latter years Constantius (and Julian) issued more stringent laws, by which consultation of an augur or haruspex, a Chaldaean or magician, or private divination of any sort was punished with death (*C. Th.* ix. 16. 4, in 357), and the most dreadful tortures were added in the next year (*ibid.* 6). Persons convicted of magic or *maiestas* were expressly exempted from the right of leaving their estates to their heirs, which was allowed to others who suffered the punishment of death (*C. Th.* ix. 42, *de bonis proscriptorum*,

2, 3, 4, in 356, 357, and 358). It is strange to find the name of Julian prefixed to all these laws, and we can scarcely wonder at the dissimulation he practised.

It may be noticed that gladiators were still allowed in Rome, notwithstanding the law of Constantine. In 357 Constantius forbade the keepers of schools of gladiators to solicit soldiers or palatini to join them under a penalty of six aurei, and also punished soldiers who joined of their own motion (*C. Th.* xv. 12. 2).

(3.) *Laws relating to marriage, &c.* Some of the most important laws with respect to marriage were placed on the statute book by Constantius, no doubt under Christian influence. In 342 he (and Constans) forbade marriage of an uncle and niece, as a capital crime, and in 355 made it unlawful to marry a deceased brother's wife or a deceased wife's sister, and declared the children of such marriages illegitimate (*C. Th.* iii. 12. 1 and 2).

In 349 he mitigated the severity of his father's law *de raptu virginum*, keeping however a capital penalty for freemen and that of burning for slaves (*C. Th.* ix. 24. 2). In 354 he equalised the penalty for violence done to a consecrated virgin and a widow of the church (ix. 25. 1). He also punished unnatural vice with decapitation (ix. 7. 3).

We have already referred to the law of 340 providing for the separation of the sexes in prison (ix. 3. 3). [J. W.]

CONSTANTINUS III. (or CONSTANS I.), and **HERAKLEONAS**, Eastern emperors A.D. 641. Constantinus was son of the emperor Heraklius by his first marriage. Heraklius is known as the author (with the patriarch Sergius of Constantinople) of the *Ekthesis*, or dogmatic edict on the Monothelite controversy. Constantinus was associated in the empire with his half-brother Herakleonas, son of Heraklius by his niece Martina. Soon after his accession Constantinus received a letter from pope John IV., who, under the form of an apology for pope Honorius, condemned the *Ekthesis* and the Monothelite opinion, begging the emperor to remove the scandal. Constantinus survived his father little more than three months. Martina then attempted to rule in the name of her son Herakleonas. But the senate, backed by the army and the inhabitants of Constantinople, deposed Martina and Herakleonas, as guilty of the death of Constantinus III. In their fall was involved Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, successor of Sergius. Being regarded as an accomplice of the empress Martina, he abandoned his patriarchate, and fled to Africa. (Hardouin, iii. p. 610, Paris, 1714; Maximus ap. Baron. xi. 640. 9; Niceph. Constant. cap. xiii. etc.; *Patrol. Graec.* cxxix. p. 531; Ceillier, xi. 649, and xii. 295; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxx. col. 602; Baronius, *Pagi*, xi. 119; Theophan. 508.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS IV. (or CONSTANS II.), Eastern emperor A.D. 641-668. Son of Constantinus III., and grandson of Heraklius, the author of the *Ekthesis*. He was set on the throne after the expulsion of his half-uncle Herakleonas and the empress Martina. In A.D. 648, at the instigation of the patriarch Paul of Constantinople, he put forth a new formulary, composed by the

patriarch, and intended to supersede the *Ekthesis*. This document was called the *Typus*, or Model of Faith. Much complaint had been made by the Western church about the *Ekthesis*, which was still placarded by authority. John IV. and Theodore I., successive popes of Rome, had urged the emperors to withdraw it. At the time of the publication of the *Typus*, there was open enmity between the patriarch Paul and pope Theodore. After an unsatisfactory correspondence on the Monothelite controversy, Theodore had gone so far as to excommunicate Paul, and Paul had retaliated by overthrowing the altar of the papal chapel at Constantinople, and by persecuting the Roman envoys. When the *Type* appeared, it forbade, like the *Ekthesis*, all discussion of the controversy and the use of obnoxious terms. Unlike the *Ekthesis*, it betrays no inclination on either side. The quarrel now raged more fiercely than ever. Maximus, a monk in Africa, of a noble Byzantine family, the ablest of the opponents of Monothelism [MAXIMUS], stirred up opposition. Rome was beset from Africa, Greece, and other parts of the world, with entreaties to defend the faith. In A.D. 649, pope Theodore I. was succeeded by Martin I. The new pope held a council in the basilica of Constantine, near the Lateran Palace, at which it was laid down that in the person of our Lord are two wills and two operations in union. Anathemas were decreed against Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople. Condemnation was pronounced on "the most impious *Ekthesis*," and "the most impious *Typus*." Pope Martin despatched the acts of the council to the emperor with a letter. During the council, the exarch Olympius arrived at Rome with orders to enforce the *Typus*. Whether, as Martin recounts, Olympius had ordered a soldier to murder the pope at communion, who was struck with blindness, or, as seems probable, the exarch meditated a revolt, and abstained from executing his commands in order to court papal influence; at any rate he did nothing, and was soon afterwards killed, fighting against the Saracens. In A.D. 653, however, a new exarch, Theodore Kalliopas, arrived at Rome, seized pope Martin, and carried him with the greatest cruelty to Constantinople. After suffering the utmost barbarities, Martin lingered in exile till A.D. 655. Maximus had also been carried to Constantinople, was no less maltreated, and died in 666. His sentence was changed by Constantinus IV. from death to exile at the request of the ecclesiastics at Constantinople. These savage acts were sanctioned by the emperor. In visiting the dying patriarch Paul, he related the treatment of pope Martin, and was surprised at the remorse of the patriarch. In A.D. 658, we find Constantine IV. renewing the privileges of the church of Rome, and making presents to pope Vitalian. But his execution of his own brother, and other ferocious cruelties, provoked the detestation of his Eastern subjects, and in A.D. 663 he retired to Rome. Pope Vitalian received him with great honour; but the emperor stripped the brazen roof off the Pantheon, which had been a church from the reign of Phocas, and ruthlessly plundered that and other churches. He then passed into Sicily, where he indulged his tyranny and vices without control. He became a terror even to himself from horrible dreams which haunted him. In

A.D. 668, he was murdered by a slave in a bath at Syracuse. For the annals of his reign and his wars with Mavia the Saracen general, see Theophanes, *Chronographia*, *Patrol. Graec.* cviii. p. 698. (Niceph. Constantinopol. cap. 13; *Patrol. Graec.* c. p. 531; *Concilia*, vi. 7, 222; Hardouin, iii. 824, 825, 614, 700, 702, 720, 728, 738, 920, 625, 673; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xxxviii. xxxix. 562; *Maximi Vita*, *Patrol. Graec.* xc. p. 61; Anastas. *Bibliothec. de Gestis S. Maximi*, *Patrol. Lat.* cxxix. p. 681; S. Pap. Martini, *Epist.*, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxvii.; Baronius, *Ann.* 649, 49-51, *Ann.* 663, 3-5, etc.; Hefele, iii. 189; Gibbon, ed. Smith, iv. 402; Neander, v. 207, 266; Ceillier, xi. 749, etc. and xii.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS V., POGONATUS (or CONSTANTINUS IV.), Eastern emperor A.D. 668-685. Son of Constantinus IV. (Constans II.). He appears to have been a peaceable and ecclesiastical prince, and is a hero in the Western church for bringing over the Easterns to unity with Rome on the Monothelite controversy. His sobriquet was given because on returning to Constantinople, after the death of his father in Sicily, he had grown a beard. In A.D. 677 he made a peace of thirty years with the caliph Moavia, and with other peoples of the East. Distressed by the divisions of the church, he resolved to attempt a remedy. Accordingly, in A.D. 678, he wrote to Donus, bishop of Rome, desiring that delegates should be sent to Constantinople for a conference on the existing troubles. Before his letter arrived, pope Agatho had succeeded, by whom it was received. On the receipt of the letter, Agatho assembled a council at Rome, which was attended, amongst others, by Wilfrid of York. Monothelism was condemned by this council. A mission was then despatched to Constantinople. Two bishops and a deacon represented the pope, three bishops the council. The accompanying letter of Agatho regretted that the troubles of Italy interfered with theological study, and professed to lean mainly on strict fidelity to earlier councils. Pogonatus now determined to assemble an "oecumenical council," which appears to have been collected from the empire only. [6th GENERAL COUNCIL, 3rd of CONSTANTINOPLE.] This assembly sat from November, A.D. 680, till December, 681. It met in the Trullus, or palace with a domed roof, whence one of its names. The emperor presided at the first eleven sessions, and at the last; when he was absent, the presidential chair was left empty. Twelve high officers of the empire, and certain monks, were present. The assembly is notable for its decency and impartiality, in contrast with the violence of earlier synods; and the conduct of the emperor was highly creditable. His influence appears to have been great; converted to Latin doctrine himself, he was followed by the patriarch and the whole Eastern church, with the exception of Macarius of Antioch, and the six oriental sects, Nestorians, Jacobites, Maronites, Armenians, Copts or Egyptians, Nubians and Abyssinians. The emperor was now hailed as a new Constantine the Great, a new Theodosius, a new Marcian. Anathemas were pronounced against Macarius, and the Monothelites were condemned. The decrees of the council were confirmed by the emperor with penalties. In A.D. 682 Pogonatus

wrote a letter to pope Leo II., approving the letters of pope Agatho, and saying that all but Macarius had received them "as if Peter had spoken." In A.D. 683, on the succession of pope Benedict II., the emperor wrote to the people and army of Rome saying, that for the future they need not signify the papal elections to Constantinople, but that it would be enough to obtain the consent of the exarch of Ravenna. Following a complimentary custom of those times, he also sent to pope Benedict the hair of his sons Justinian and Heraklius, as signs of their adoption by the pope. He died in A.D. 685. His reign was not undisturbed by the usual fraternal discords of the Constantinopolitan court. His two brothers, Heraklius and Tiberius, conspired against him, and were degraded and deprived of their noses in the presence of the Catholic bishops assembled at the 6th General Council. (Hardouin, iii. 1043-7, 1055, 1056, 1077, 1445, 1457; Theophan. *Chronographia*, *Patrol. Græc.* cviii. p. 717, etc.; *Concil.* vi. 592, 594, 606; Baronius, 680, 41; Anastasius, *de Vit. Pontif. Rom. Agatho*, § 140, *Patrol. Lat.* cxviii.; Ceillier, xii. 945; xi. 743, 783, 784, 785; xii. 945, 946, 954, 955, 956.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS VI. COPRONYMUS (or CONSTANTINUS V.), Eastern emperor A.D. 741-775. Son of the emperor Leo the Isaurian. His sobriquet is supposed to originate from his fouling the font at his baptism as an infant. He was also called Caballinus. His life in some respects is a parallel to that of King Henry VIII. of England. He married a barbarian wife, daughter of the khan of the Khazars. Copronymus, whose disposition must have been naturally ruthless, has the misfortune to be represented by Catholic authorities, who resented beyond measure his violent hostility to images. He is accordingly charged by ecclesiastical writers with monstrous vices and magical arts. His apologists describe him as particularly chaste and temperate. What is certain is, that he was conspicuous for vigour, ability, and cruelty. We read of successes against the Saracens and Bulgarians, and of great internal improvement in home affairs. Among his works were the restoration of an ancient aqueduct, the redemption of 2500 captives, the peopling of Constantinople and the Thracian cities by new colonies; the times were marked by uncommon plenty; he displayed his courage on horseback at the head of his legions; and although not always victorious, he triumphed by sea and land, on the Euphrates and on the Danube, in civil and barbarian war. His memory was long cherished by his armies. During his absence from Constantinople, the popular discontent at his opposition to images, as well as the Saracen war, induced Artavasdus, the husband of his sister Anna, to revolt. It was pretended indeed that Copronymus was dead. Artavasdus was crowned in the cathedral by the patriarch Anastasius, who swore, as he held the cross, that Copronymus had declared to him his belief that Jesus Christ was born as any other man. The people immediately shouted: "Let his body be dug up!" Pope Zacharias acknowledged Artavasdus; but after three years the pretender was put down. The patriarch Anastasius was blinded, and exhibited in the hippodrome at Constantinople on an ass; he was

afterwards restored to his functions, by way, perhaps, of contempt for the clergy. If Constantinus V. did really lean to Nestorius, and disbelieved the intercession of the Virgin and saints, it was at any rate his policy to feel his way. As to images, after conquering the Armenians, he summoned a council for A.D. 754; desiring that in the preceding year the question should be discussed in the provincial assemblies of bishops. By this council, which is repudiated by papal writers, images were denounced. Copronymus immediately ordered their removal. Birds, fruits, decorative scenes from the chase, theatre, and circus (it is said), were to be painted on church walls, instead of pictures of religious subjects. The emperor singled out the more noted monks, and required them to comply with the decrees of the synod. In A.D. 766 he exacted an oath against images from all the inhabitants of the empire. The monks refused with violent obstinacy, and Copronymus appears to have amused himself by treating them with ruthless harshness. The emperor indeed seems to have contemplated the extirpation of monachism. John the Damascene he persuaded his bishops to excommunicate. Monks were forced to appear in the hippodrome at Constantinople hand in hand with harlots, while the populace spat at them. The new patriarch Constantinus, presented by the emperor to the council the last day of its session, was forced to forswear images, to attend banquets, to eat and drink freely against his monastic vows, to wear garlands, to witness the coarse spectacles and hear the coarse language which entertained the emperor. Monasteries were destroyed, made into barracks, or secularised. Lachanodraco, governor of the Thracian Theme, seems to have exceeded Copronymus in his ribaldry and injustice. He collected a number of monks into a plain, clothed them with white, presented them with wives, and forced them to choose between marriage and loss of eyesight. He sold the property of the monasteries, and sent the price to the emperor. Copronymus publicly thanked him, and commended his example to other governors. Amongst the destruction of images and monasteries, still greater discontent was aroused by the loss of popular relics. Brutal as the emperor's conduct must have been according to the ecclesiastical writers, he was certainly provoked by the fanatical fury of the monks. Peter the Calybite broke into his presence, and upbraided him as a modern Valens and Julian. He was scourged and strangled. Stephen, a celebrated anchorite, boldly rebuked the tyrant, stamping on his coin to see how the emperor relished such an application of iconoclasm. Hearing of his unbending resistance in prison, Copronymus exclaimed: "Am I or is this monk emperor of the world?" Some patricians, like the knights of Henry II. of England, caught up his words; the prison was broken open, and Stephen was dragged about by one leg till he was dead. At length the compliant patriarch Constantine himself was suspected and banished, and Niketas, a Slavonic eunuch, enthroned in his place. In A.D. 767, the ex-patriarch was brought back; he was beaten till he could not walk; set in the pulpit in the cathedral at Constantinople while his accusation was read, and then degraded; his hair, eyebrows, and beard, were plucked out, he was

placed on an ass and forced to hold the tail, and was led in the hippodrome by his nephew, whose nose had previously been cut off, while the spectators hooted and spat. He was then thrown to the ground, his neck was trodden under foot, and he lay a laughing-stock to the crowd until the games were over for the day. A few days later he was examined in prison about the emperor's orthodoxy by some patricians. Hoping to soothe his tormentor, he approved of everything. They immediately beheaded him, saying that was all they wished to hear from his impious mouth. In A.D. 775, while Copronymus was on a military expedition, he became ill with boils and burning pains in his legs. He is said to have screamed "that he already felt the pains of hell." He died at sea en route to Constantinople, and was succeeded by his son, Leo IV. Theophanes gives details of the crimes and vices imputed to him; but he wrote about two centuries later. (Theoph. 636, 639, 643, 647, 659, 675, 684, 685, 688, 694, etc.; Hardouin, 4. 437; *Vita Sancti Damasceni*, i. 22; Basnage, 1356, 7; Fleury, books 42 and 43; Gibbon, Smith's ed. vol. vi. 4; Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*; John Damasc. *Adv. Const. Caball. Oratio, Patrol. Graec.* 95, p. 319, etc.; Ceillier, xii. 68; xiii. 619.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS VII., PORPHYROGENITUS (or **CONSTANTINUS VI.**), Eastern emperor A.D. 780-797. Son and successor of the emperor Leo IV. by Irene the Athenian, and grandson of Copronymus. At his father's death he was only ten years old. Irene was appointed sole regent and guardian by the will of Leo IV. She was a devoted adherent of the cause of image-worship. She could not carry at once the measures she desired, as the soldiers were devoted to the memory of the iconoclast Copronymus, who in their eyes was always a brave and successful general. But as a step towards her object she passed, like James II. of England, an edict for toleration. The monks returned, and popular enthusiasm ran high. In A.D. 784 Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, retired; and when the empress visited him, expressed his remorse for having taken vows against image-worship, and declared for a general council against the iconoclastic synod of Copronymus. Shortly afterwards he died. Irene succeeded in getting elected in his place Tarasius, one of her secretaries of state, a man of consular rank and good personal repute. Tarasius consented on the understanding that a general council was to be summoned according to the suggestion of Paul. To this general council [7th GENERAL COUNCIL, 2nd of NICAËA] pope Adrian I. sent a deputation with compliments, accompanied by demands for the restoration of the ornaments taken from Rome by Copronymus, and criticisms of the irregular election of Tarasius. By this council religious paintings on a flat surface were recognised, and by its decision the Greek church still abides. The young emperor Porphyrogenitus (so called, like the next Constantine, from the room in which he was born) grew up in the society of women and eunuchs, entirely subject to Irene. While he was a child, Irene ably and assiduously discharged in her public administration the duties of a faithful mother. The place assigned her in

CHRIST. BIOGR.

the Greek calendar for her zeal in the restoration of religious pictures as objects of reverence has not been obliterated by the atrocity of her subsequent crimes. But as Constantine advanced towards maturity, his mother's will became arbitrary and intolerable. Before the council of Nicaea, Irene had wished to strengthen her cause by marrying her son to a daughter of Charlemagne; but after the favourable result of the council, when the iconoclasts were no longer formidable, she broke off the match, and united Constantine against his will to an Armenian princess, Marina or Mary. Instigated also by the promises of magicians, Irene aimed at making her son detestable to his subjects, and to the powerful monastic party, by encouraging him in every kind of cruelty and debauchery. About the age of twenty, however, the flattery of his comrades persuaded the emperor to rebel. He consented that Irene should be exiled in perpetual banishment to Sicily. Irene discovered the plot, punished the ringleaders, and chastised her son. Henceforward the court was divided by two bitterly hostile factions; and Irene found that she held a captive and an enemy. Her ascendancy was for a time overthrown by an abuse of victory. She insisted that the oath of allegiance should be taken to herself alone. Many of the troops murmured at this, but it was openly refused by the Armenians. Constantinus VII., son of Leo IV., then ascended for a time the throne of the East as sole emperor, dismissing Irene to retirement. But she skilfully dissimulated, flattered the bishops and eunuchs, and regained the confidence of her son. The empire was distracted by revolutions that were stained with all the perfidy and atrocity of the later Greeks. Irene, when readmitted to power, pursued the same execrable policy as before; inciting her son to earn universal loathing by abominable crimes. At length Constantine determined to repudiate his wife Marina, and to marry a lady of that princess's court, named Theodote. When the patriarch, Tarasius of Constantinople, opposed, Constantine threatened to restore paganism. Some monks (among them Theodore the Studite), who ventured to excommunicate him, were treated with great cruelty. Galled to extremities by his mother, Constantine, with his friends, organised a second conspiracy, which remained secret for eight months. But when Irene shewed her suspicions, the emperor escaped with the intention of appealing to the provinces. He was seized, and carried to the porphyry room where he was born. There he was deprived of his eyes with such violence that he nearly lost his life. It was noticed that after this crime, a fog of extraordinary darkness overhung Constantinople seventeen days. Constantine survived many years, oppressed and forgotten. His unnatural mother reigned alone for six years after his deposition. The annals of his reign, his wars with the Bulgarians, and his defeats, are given by Theophanes.

(Pope Paul V. *Concil. Gen.* tom. iii. p. 367; *Anastasii Bibliothec. Praefatio*; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, *Patrol. Graec.* cviii. 375-399; Ceillier, xii. 135, 154, 298; xiii. 619, 628, 641, 642; Gibbon; Robertson's *Hist. of the Christ. Church.*) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS. Tyrant of Gaul in the time of the emperor Honorius, A.D. 407. The

British legions were in revolt. They first placed Marcus on the throne, but hastily murdered him. Their next choice fell on Gratian, who in four months shared the fate of Marcus. Finding in their ranks a private who bore the honoured and popular name of Constantine, they called him to the purple. In spite of his incapacity, alarmed by the fate of his predecessors, he determined to subdue the western provinces. Landing at Boulogne, he quickly rallied Gaul around him. After some empty successes over the Germans, Constantine entrenched himself in Vienna; the army of Honorius precipitately retreated, and the Alps became the frontier between himself and Constantine. In 408 Constantine reduced Spain, which submitted without difficulty. In A.D. 409, although stained with the blood of the kinsmen of Honorius, he obtained a ratification of his claims from the court of Ravenna. But during the absence from Spain of Constans, son of Constantinus, who had been associated with him in the empire, the bravest of his generals, Count Gerontius, revolted in that province, and placed the crown on the head of a friend of his own, Maximus. The son was seized and put to death at Vienne. The father was besieged at Arles. But the approach of the army of Honorius put Gerontius to flight. Arles stood a second siege. Constantine in vain engaged the Franks and Alemanni to assist him. They were routed; he was forced to surrender, on a promise of security, and after receiving the ordination of a Christian presbyter. He was sent with his son, Julian into Italy, where both were put to death, Nov. 28, A.D. 411. Constantine was protector of Lazarus, one of the accusers of Pelagius. Pope Zosimus represents Lazarus as the habitual calumniator of the innocent, notably of St. Britius, bishop of Tours; Proculus of Marseilles had condemned him as such at the council of Turin; and had ordained him some years later to the see of Aix, only to support the command of Constantine. Lazarus is mentioned with respect by other writers, and especially by St. Augustine. (Mercator, p. 82, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. xlviii.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xxx.; Ceillier, vii. 531, n. 3.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS I., pope, succeeded Sisinus, who had been pope for twenty days after the death of John VII., in A.D. 708. He was a native of Syria, the son of one John: and his character is summed up in the single word "mitissimus."

The first strife in which he was involved was one with Felix, archbishop of Ravenna. On his appointment, Felix came to Rome for consecration, but refused to sign the customary act of submission to the Roman church. He was however met by the menaces of the imperial ministers at Rome, which so far prevailed that he offered to subscribe a document of his own drawing up, in which he declared himself to submit under protest. This was accepted, but a few days afterwards was found in the Roman archives blackened and shrivelled as if by fire. But summary vengeance was taken on Felix by the emperor Justinian II., not by the pope. A fleet and army were sent from Sicily to Ravenna, the city was sacked, and the archbishop blinded and banished to the Crimea, A.D. 709 (*Anast. Biblioth.*).

Justinian II., though he had taken his own revenge upon the archbishop of Ravenna, had no intention of leaving the see of Rome independent.

He summoned Constantine to Rome, in order to declare his submission to the canons of the Quinisextan council, against which the three former popes had protested. The time had not yet come when a pope could afford to disobey such a summons. He set out from Rome (Anast. B.) in October, A.D. 710, with a company of two bishops, three priests, and eight others. He was received with all honour in his passage through Sicily and Greece; and upon his arrival in Constantinople the emperor himself came from Nicaea as far as Nicomedia to meet him, and prostrated himself—so we are told—at his feet. We are not told how the matter of submission to the council was settled; but Constantine satisfied the emperor, and returned to Rome after exactly a year's absence with a ratification of the privileges of the Roman church (Anast. B.) Justinian's death brought a change of dynasty; and Philippicus, the new emperor (Dec. A.D. 711), tried to restore Monothelism. But the Romans rose against Peter, the new exarch whom he sent; and before the strife was over, Philippicus himself was succeeded by Anastasius II. on the imperial throne (A.D. 713). In reply to his letters the pope sent Cardinal Michael as ambassador to Constantinople. Constantine died in April, A.D. 715.

[G. H. M.]

CONSTANTINUS II., Usurping Pope, A.D. 767. After the death of pope Paul I., a duke named Toto caused one of his brothers, named Constantine, to be elected by main force. He was a layman at the time, and Toto forced him with the same violence through the subordinate ecclesiastical grades. He remained in possession of the Roman see thirteen months. During this time he wrote to king Pippin, advertising him of his succession, and saying that he sent him all that could be found of the acts of the saints. Pippin paid no attention to this letter. Constantine followed it by another, in which he begged Pippin not to believe malicious reports about him, and speaking of a letter addressed by the patriarch of Jerusalem to his predecessor Paul I., which shewed the zeal of all Eastern Christians for the cultus of images. Pippin paid no more attention to this letter than to the former. At Rome, Christophorus, primicerius and counsellor of the see, with his son Sergius, the treasurer, resolved to risk everything in order to get rid of the usurper. Pretending to start for the monastery of St. Saviour in Lombardy, they left Rome, Christophorus having sworn to Constantine that he would attempt nothing against him. They went to Desiderius, king of the Lombards, who gave them troops. Returning to Rome, they forced Toto and Constantine to abandon the patriarchal palace of the Lateran. Christophorus assembled the bishops, the principal clergy, and military officers, the army and the Roman people; they all agreed to place in the Roman see Stephen the Sicilian. Constantine was immediately deposed, and treated ignominiously with his principal officers and partisans by some worthless opponents. His eyes were torn out, and some of his friends suffered terrible outrages. The council of 769 condemned him, and made arrangements about his episcopal acts. The letters of Constantinus are given in vol. xcvii. of Migne's *Latin Patrology*, pp. 227, 233. (Anastas. *Bibliothec. Hist. de Vit. Rom. Pontif.* xcvi. §§ 263–280, *Patrol. Lat.*

xxviii. 1150; Ceillier, xii. 117; Fleury, *Ecol. Hist.* bk. xliii.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS I. (1), 38th patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded Joannes V., A.D. 674; died A.D. 677, and was followed by Theodorus I. (Theophanes, *Chron.* p. 295, A.M. 6166; p. 295, A.M. 6168; first year of his successor.) [P. O.]

CONSTANTINUS II. (2), 47th patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 754 according to the *Art de Vérifier les Dates*; but 745 according to Theophanes Chronographus, i. 660. He had previously been a monk and bishop of Sylaeum. He assumed the patriarchate under unusual circumstances. The see had remained vacant for six months after the death of Anastasius. During this time Copronymus had summoned a council favourable to Iconoclasm. It dates from Feb. 10 to Aug. 8. On this latter day the emperor attended, and, mounting the ambon, holding the hand of the new patriarch, himself announced the appointment which he had made without any canonical form. A few days afterwards the emperor, accompanied by the new patriarch and some other bishops, publicly announced the decrees of the council, and anathematised Germanus, George of Cyprus, and Johannes Chrysorrhoeas of Damascus, son of Mansour. (Theoph. *Chron.* p. 359, A.M. 6245. Niceph. Constant. *Breviarium de Rebus post Mauricium gestis*, p. 42.)

The following story illustrates the relations between the emperor and his patriarch. It was a period of portents in earth and sky, and great public alarm. The monarch, taking the prelate aside, asked him if there could be any harm in speaking of the Θεοτόκος as Χριστοτόκος? The patriarch, as soon as he heard the question of Copronymus, embraced him, crying, "Mercy, sire! Do you not see how Nestorius is anathematised through the whole Church?" The emperor caught the alarm, said the question was intended only for his own ear, and merely for information (Theoph. *Chron.* p. 366, A.M. 6255). The patriarch appears to have aroused against himself the enmity of the emperor, which shewed itself in various ways. On one occasion he was compelled to mount a pulpit, raising in his hands aloft emblems of peculiar veneration, and publicly abjure the worship of images. He was immediately obliged, in despite of his monastic vows, to sit crowned with nuptial flowers at one of the imperial banquets, and to listen to the forbidden strains of harpers, while he feasted on unlawful dainties (*ibid.* p. 388, A.M. 6257). This may have been merely a part of the emperor's design to bring all monastic institutions into ridicule and disrepute among the populace. What followed indicated fierce personal resentment against the patriarch. In A.D. 764 he was charged with having spoken ill of the emperor, and exiled first to Hieria, a palace of his master, and then to the island Principus (*ibid.* p. 369, A.M. 6257; Niceph. Constant. *Breviarium*, p. 48). The malice of the emperor did not forget him even in his exile. In A.D. 767 he was sent back to Constantinople, beaten till he could not stand, carried on a litter to the great church and forced to sit on the solea (ἐν τῇ σολαῖᾳ). An act of accusation was read, and at every fresh charge the secretary of the emperor struck him on the

face. He was then deposed by Nicetas, who afterwards succeeded him, stripped of his robes, and thrust with contumely out of the church. On the following day he was brought into the hippodrome, with his head, beard, and eyebrows shaven, clothed in a scanty tattered garment, and seated on an ass with his face towards the tail, which he held in his hand. The ass was led by his nephew, whose nose had been previously cut off. He was thrown to the ground and trodden on, and obliged to remain there, exposed to the derision and execrations of the populace, till the games were finished. A few days afterwards some officers of the court were sent to his prison by the emperor, who asked him what were his views concerning their faith and a synod which they had held. The patriarch, thinking in his misery even yet to receive some pity from the emperor, replied that they held the true faith and had done right in holding the synod. The officers replied that this confession was all which they wished to obtain from him, and that he might now depart to the condemnation which he had earned. He was soon afterwards beheaded, ἐν τῷ τῆς πόλεως Κυνηγίῳ (probably the public hunting-ground), his body was dragged by the feet through the public streets; while his head, hanging by the ears, was exposed in public for three days in the place called Μίλων or Millo. This is usually placed in the year 776, after a patriarchate of 12 years. (*ibid.* p. 372, A.M. 6259; Niceph. Constant. *Breviarium*, p. 48.) [P. O.]

CONSTANTINUS (1) Bishop in the Romagna in the 4th century, addressed by St. Ambrose A.D. 379. After giving advice for his sermons, Ambrose exhorts him to attend to the neighbouring church of Forum Cornelii (Imola), where he hopes that soon there will be a bishop. Ambrose is unable to go so far, by reason of the instruction of the catechumens during Lent. He warns him against the Illyrians, as infected to a great extent with Arianism through Valens and other heretical bishops. The Illyrians had been obliged to take refuge in Italy by the ravages of the barbarians. Ambrose concludes by recommending him to be cautious and yet not too difficult in receiving heretics. There is a second letter offering explanation of various points connected with circumcision. (Ambros. *Epist.*, *Patrol. Lat.* xvi. p. 878, 1245; Ceillier, v. 480.) [W. M. S.]

(2) Bishop of Laodicea, originally a "magister militum," consecrated in 510 bishop of Laodicea. He was a leading Monophysite, and as such was deposed by Justin I. in the year 518. Themistius the Agnoetist deacon of Alexandria, attacked him, and he was combined with Anthimus and Severus, and other conspicuous heretical teachers in anathemas contained in letters of pope Vigilius to the emperor Justinian and the patriarch Menas in the year 540 (Labbe, *Concil.* v. 316, 318). Constantinus is reckoned by Dionysius the Jacobite and Barhebraeus as among the chiefs of the Monophysite body. He is commemorated by the Jacobites on the 26th of June (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 327; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*). [E. V.]

(3) Or **CONSTANTIUS**, bishop of Gap (Vapincum). The Sammarthani in *Gallia Christiana* gather from many ancient monuments and documents of that church that probably several

others preceded Constantinus, and that St. Demetrius was the first. It is evidently uncertain whether he was bishop in the time of pope Symmachus and king Clovis or not. It was after the death of each of those potentates that Constantinus subscribed at the celebrated council of Epaonum, in the year A.D. 517, when Sigismundus was king of Burgundy, and Hormisdas pope. There were twenty-four bishops present at the council of Epaonum, and Constantine subscribed eighteenth in order—"Constantinus in Christi nomine episcopus civitatis Vapincensis." Shortly after the year 527, under Athalaricus, king of the Goths, a council was held at Carpentras, to which some Constantine subscribed, and Sirmondus in each index conjectures that it was the bishop of Gap. When at the council of Epaonum he had only been recently ordained bishop. He is commemorated on the 12th of April (*AA. SS. Boll.* April, ii. 90; *Gallia Christiana*, i. 454). [D. R. J.]

CONSTANTINUS (4) Abbat of Monte Cassino after the death of St. Benedict. He was one of his disciples, and ruled the monastery from A.D. 543—circ. 560. He was one of the four whom St. Gregory consulted as witnesses to the life and works of their founder. (*Baron.*, ad an. 420, num. 49; *Greg. Mag. Dialog.* ii. 208; *Ceillier*, xi. 634.) [W. M. S.]

(5) **ST.** Is said in the breviary of Aberdeen to have been the son of Paternus, king of Cornwall, and to have married the daughter of the king of the Lesser Britain. On her death he adopted a religious life in Ireland, and went as a missionary to Scotland, where he was martyred in Cantire, about the end of the sixth century. Gildas, writing in 547, calls him "the tyrannous whelp of the filthy lioness of Damnonia," and says he had murdered two royal children in a church that very year, and had divorced his wife many years before. The various annals place his conversion in 587-9 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 120, 157, and ii. 147). The Irish martyrologies commemorate a St. Constantine on March 18 (Aengus has "March 11," see *Acta Sanctorum*, March 11, ii. 64; Bp. Forbes, *Kalendar of Scottish Saints*, Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 118, 159). The parish feast of the parish named after him in Cornwall (which lies between Budock and Wendron) is on the nearest Sunday to March 9, and that at S. Constantine's Chapel in S. Merryn on the nearest Sunday to March 10; William of Worcester says: "rex et martir, 9 die Martii, E. littera." One of the lives of S. David makes him enter S. David's monastery at Menevia, in Wales. On the close connexion of the kings of Damnonia with Wales at this time, see Dr. Guest in *Arch. Journal* for 1859, p. 126. Some make this Constantine great-grandson of the Cystennyn Gorneu (Constantine of Cornwall), whom the Welsh pedigrees in Rees put at the head of the lists, thus—

CYSTENNYN GORNEU.

Erbin	Digain
Geraint + 530.	
Selyf (= Solomon), king of Cornwall,	
who married Gwen, the sister of	
S. David's mother, Nonna.	
Cybi (Kebius).	

St. Petrock, whose death is placed in 564, is said to have been received by Theodore and Constantine (Leland, *de Script. Brit.* 61), and there was a chapel and holy well of St. Constantine near St. Merryn, on the shore of the estuary of Padstow (Petrockstowe). There is no need to describe how some of the notices given above have been wrought into the legend of Arthur and Mordred. [C. W. B.]

That a Constantine was engaged in the conversion of Scotland seems beyond dispute in the face of the general tradition. That this could not have been Constantine the son of Fergus, who died A.D. 820, a monk at Rahen, under or after St. Carthach, who was driven from that monastery A.D. 630, and also a missionary under St. Columba, and martyr A.D. 590, is undoubted. But the intercourse between Ireland and the south of England was such that a Cornish prince might have found refuge with St. Columba in Ireland, accompanied or followed him to Scotland, and gained the crown of martyrdom in the wildnesses of Kintyre: and that another from the same country might have taken up his abode in or near Rahen, in the interval possibly between the departure of St. Carthach, A.D. 630, and the second foundation of the monastery by Fidhairle Ua Suanagh, who died A.D. 763. [FIDHAIRLE.] In purely Scotch history, a king of this name, Constantine III., abdicated his throne and retired to a monastery in St. Andrew's, but this was in the middle of the 10th century. St. Constantine had many churches in Scotland dedicated to his memory. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 311-4; Bollandists, *Acta SS.*, Mart. tom. ii. 62-3; *Brev. Aberd.*, p. hyem. f. lxxvii.; Boece, *Scot. Hist.* b. ix. c. 13; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, iii. 148-9; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* ec. 14, 15, wks. vi. 59, 60, 237, and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 590; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 193 b, 427, c. 14, 577-9; Fordun, *Scotichr.* iii. c. 26, Petrie, *Round Towers*, 355-6; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 67, 362, 371; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 486, ii. 165; *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 163-4). [J. G.]

CONSTANTINUS (6) Surnamed or perhaps christened SILVANUS, the founder of the Paulicians, was native of Mananalis, a village in Armenia, near Samosata, in the latter half of the 7th century. His history is known only from his enemies, who have overlaid the facts they relate with abundance of vituperations and imputations of evil motives. But this statement, though true, is not quite fair, as the chief of these hostile authorities is Petrus Siculus, who gives the traditions he gathered during a nine months' stay among the disciples of Constantinus two centuries after the events. We shall give his story, which seems to be simple truth, such as neither disciples nor enemies have really perverted. He informs us that Constantinus had been a Manichean, but that he hospitably entertained a deacon who was on his way home after release from captivity in Syria, and who left with him, in requital for his hospitality, a copy of the gospels and another of the epistles of St. Paul. Reading in these, Constantinus was convinced of the absurdity and loathsomeness of the Manichean books, and burnt them all, along with those of Valentinus and others. He taught his followers to read no other book at all beside the gospels and epistles, and to anathematise

the Scythian, Budas, and Manes. He left Mananalis, and went to the fortress, Cibossa, near Colonea, shewed the people the book of epistles he had received, and said, "Ye are the Macedonians; I am Silvanus sent to you by Paul." We must note by the way that the mission of Silvanus, as a faithful brother, to which Petrus Sicilius supposes him to refer, is the act of Peter, not of Paul (1 Pet. v.). For twenty-seven years he continued teaching. Then the emperor—Constantinus Pogonatus is the emperor in whose time he is said to have been—heard of it, and sent one Simeon to have the ringleader of the sect stoned to death, and his adherents brought over to the church. Simeon took a local chieftain named Trypho for an ally, and took captive all the followers of Constantine. He is said to have given them all stones to stone their old teacher, but only one renegade was found willing to cast a stone at him, a man named Justus, whom Petrus Siculus likens to David. A great heap of stones was raised over him, and the place called Soros, or Heap, "unto this day" (Petr. Sic. *Hist. Man.* 23-26).

A thorough investigation of the doctrines of Constantinus will come more appropriately under the title of the sect he founded. But a few observations here seem necessary.

(1) He was the real founder of the Paulician sect. To suppose that they have anything to do with Paul of Samosata, son of a woman named Callinica, and brother of John, is not so much a calumny as a blunder of the Catholics. This Paul is the noted heretic of the time of Aurelian (cf. Petr. Sic. *Hist. Man.* 21, 23, 28).

(2) Their rejection of the Old Testament, and of the epistles of Peter, if it be a fact, which is doubtful, seems to be accidental. The gospels and Pauline epistles, or at any rate the New Testament, constituted the whole of the Bible brought by the missionary to whom their rise is due.

(3) We have here the first striking instance of the living power of the written word, apart from the office of the church, of the voice of the ancient apostles, speaking as from the dead, without the attestation of their successors.

For that Constantinus was converted from his old creed his acts sufficiently testify. Remnants of his former error may have clung about him. But if his followers, when tempted with the good things of this world to renounce their faith and bow down to images, scorned them as the work of the god of this world, not of the Father in heaven, does it prove much against him? That he was ever a Manichee proper must be considered doubtful—the term is used so loosely. That he did not remain a Manichee after his conversion should be placed beyond doubt by the contrast between his doctrines and those of Manes, when both are anathematised side by side (Cotelier, *Patr. Apost.* i. 537). [E. B. B.]

CONSTANTINUS (7) Bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, about A.D. 727, the principal supporter, among other bishops, of the emperor Leo III., the Isaurian, in his polemic against images. Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, tried to recall these bishops to the cultus of images. In a letter to John, bishop of Synnada, in Phrygia, Constantine's metropolitan, Germanus gives an account of his argument with Constantine.

Constantine had cited the text, "Thou shalt not make any graven image to worship it, whether it be of that which is in heaven above or in the earth beneath," and added that the works of men must never be worshipped, while he regarded the holy martyrs as worthy of all honour. Germanus represented himself as replying that pictures were to shew affection and to strengthen faith; and concludes by saying that Constantine had agreed to this. This letter Germanus entrusted to Constantine; but, instead of delivering it to his metropolitan, he kept it secret. Germanus then wrote to Constantine, ordering him to submit in all things to his superior, and forbidding him, in the name of the Trinity, to perform any episcopal function until he should have delivered the letter to his metropolitan. (Hardouin, *Act. Concil.* iv. p. 243 (Paris, 1714); tom. xcvi. *Patrol. Gr.* col. 155; Ceillier, xii. 37.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTINUS (8) Bishop of Ratisbon, otherwise called Constans Sacerdos, towards the end of the 8th century, supposed to be the bishop referred to by Dom Bernard Pez in the 4th vol. of his anecdotes (Pez, *Anec.* t. iv. pars ii. pp. 23-28). But there is no proof that there was a bishop of that name in the church of Ratisbon at that time (*Histoire littéraire de la France*, iv. 199; *Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. p. 1368). [D. R. J.]

(9) and PEREGRINUS, SS., were two bishops whose relics were found in the church at Gemirge in Normandy, but it is not known when or where they lived. They are commemorated in that church June 15. The Bollandists omit them (*AA. SS. Bolland.* June, tom. ii. p. 1010). [D. R. J.]

CONSTANTIUS I. FLAVIUS VALE-RIUS, surnamed CHLORUS (ὁ Χλωρός, "the Pale"), Roman emperor, A.D. 305, 306, the father of Constantine the Great, son of Eutropius, of a noble Dardanian family, by Claudia, daughter of Crispus, brother of the emperors Claudius II. and Quintilius. Born about A.D. 250. Distinguished by ability, valour, and virtue, Constantius became governor of Dalmatia under the emperor Carus, who was prevented by death from making him his successor. Diocletian (emperor, A.D. 284-305), to lighten the cares of empire, associated Maximian with himself; and again arranged that each emperor should appoint a co-regent Caesar. Constantius was thus adopted by Maximian, and Galerius by Diocletian (March 1, A.D. 292). Each being obliged to repudiate his wife, and marry the daughter of his adopted father, Constantius separated from Helena, the daughter of an innkeeper, who was not his full legal wife, but was mother of Constantine the Great, and married Theodora, stepdaughter of Maximian, by whom he had six children. As his share of the empire, Constantius received the provinces Gaul, Spain, and Britain. In A.D. 296, he re-united Britain to the empire, after the rebellion of Carausius, and an independence of ten years. In A.D. 298, Constantius defeated an invasion of the Alemanni at Lingones (Langres). In A.D. 305, after the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, Galerius and Constantius became Augusti, and ruled together. As the health of Constantius began to fail, he sent for his son Constantine,

who was already exceedingly popular, and who was jealously kept by Galerius at his own court. Constantine escaped, and arrived at his father's camp at Gessoriacum (Boulogne-sur-Mer) before embarking on another expedition to Britain. In A.D. 306, Constantius died in the imperial palace at Eboracum (York). He is described as one of the most excellent characters among the later Romans. His subjects found him mild, prudent, and just. He took the keenest interest in the welfare of his people, and limited his personal expenses to the verge of affectation, declaring that "his most valued treasure was in the hearts of his people." The Gauls delighted to contrast his gentleness and moderation with the haughty sternness of Galerius. His internal administration was as honourable as his success in war; he abolished sinecures, protected the people from the rapacity of superfluous officers, and employed his wild German captives in the cultivation of waste lands. The Christians always praised his tolerance and impartiality. Theophanes calls him *Χριστιανόφρων*, a man of Christian principles. He had Christians at his court. On one occasion he adopted a *ruse* to test them, and dismissed those who consented to offer pagan sacrifices, saying that if they betrayed their God they would betray their prince. He often declared his belief in one ruler of the universe; and his peaceful death sustained by this principle, in contrast to the ends of heathen emperors, weighed with his son Constantine towards a Christian profession. Constantius, although a pagan, disapproved of the persecution of Diocletian, and contented himself by closing a few churches and overthrowing some dilapidated buildings, respecting (as the author of the *De Morte Persecutorum* says), the true temple of God. Christianity spread in Gaul under his peaceful rule, and at the end of the 4th century that province had more than twenty bishops. (Eutrop. ix.; Aurel. Vict. *Caes.* 39, etc.; *Epit.* 39; Zosim. ii. 7, etc.; Theoph. pp. 4-8, ed. Paris; *Panegyric. Veter.* iv. 3, vi. 4, 6; Euseb. *Vit. Const.* i. 13-21; *Oratio Const. ad Sanct. Coetum*; Treb. Pollio, *Claudius*, 3, 13; Ael. Spart. *Ael. Verus*, 2; Vopiscus, *Carinus*, 16, 17; *Aurelianus*, 44; *Probus*, 22; *Amm. Marc.* xix. 2; Lactantius, *de Morte Persecutor.* 15; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.*; Ceillier, iii. 48, 140, 579.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTANTIUS II. [CONSTANTINE THE GREAT, p. 651 sq.]

CONSTANTIUS (1) Bishop of Faenza in the Romagna, A.D. 313, present at the council of Rome concerning Caecilian. (Optatus, *de Schism. Don.* i. 23, *Patrol. Lat.* ii. 931; Ceillier, ii. 625.) [W. M. S.]

(2) Bishop of Siscia (now Sissek, on the Save), attended the council of Aquileia, and joined in the condemnation of Palladius and Secundianus (Ambrose, iii. 821-843). [J. L. D.]

(3) Bishop of Arausio (Orange), was legate of the Gauls at the council of Aquileia, and joined in the condemnation of Palladius and Secundianus (Ambrose, iii. 821-843). [J. L. D.]

(4) A presbyter of Antioch, in whom Chrysostom reposed much confidence, and for whom he entertained a very warm regard. We know little of his parentage, but his mother was

resident at Antioch in 404. He had also a married sister, the mother of several children, one of whom, a daughter named Epiphania, was regarded by Constantius with peculiar affection. This sister was far from wealthy, but she allowed no worldly anxieties to be a hindrance to her religious life. Her brother praises her highly for the care she took of her aged mother, and of the education of her children (Chrysost. *Epist.* 238). Constantius was employed in the service of the church of Antioch from his earliest years, first as a bearer and writer of despatches, then successively as reader, deacon, and presbyter (Pallad. 144). He won the love and respect of the people of Antioch by his cheerful disposition, his modesty, and his incorruptible integrity, as well as by his high standard of Christian piety. He was a good man of business, clear in discernment and prompt in action, and proved an able coadjutor in Chrysostom's designs, especially the management of the missions in Phoenicia, of which he was the treasurer. Chrysostom wrote many letters to him on this business, of which only one remains, dated July 4, 404 (Pallad. 145; *Epist.* 221, 54). On the death of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, nearly at the same time with Chrysostom's exile, there was a general desire to elect Constantius as his successor, but this design was frustrated by the ambitious and unscrupulous Porphyry, who had marked the episcopal seat as his own. By flattery, bribery, and other base arts, he gained the favour of the magistrates and chief authorities of the city, which he adroitly used to secure his own elevation. Constantius was driven from Antioch and joined Chrysostom at Cucusus, very soon after his arrival there. [PORPHYRY.] He wrote thence to his mother and sister to console them under the trial of his expulsion from his home, which he assured them was fully compensated for by the privilege of his intercourse with his beloved master (*Epist.* 237, 238). Porphyry having scandalously usurped the episcopate, and exercised its powers with the utmost tyranny towards the friends of Chrysostom, supported by the authority of the court of Constantinople, Constantius would have been glad to remain at the inhospitable Cucusus, as a place of refuge from more formidable evils, but he was compelled to return to Antioch by some judicial proceedings apparently arising from his fidelity to the banished prelate. Chrysostom did what he could for him by letter, but without effect. Porphyry excommunicated him, and procured his expulsion from the city, and he was compelled to seek safety in concealment (*Epist.* 233). Porphyry subsequently obtained an imperial rescript condemning him to banishment to the Libyan Oasis, as a disturber of the public peace. Timely intelligence enabled Constantius, by the assistance of his friends, to escape to Cyprus (Pallad. 145). There are five letters of Constantius in the collection of Chrysostom's epistles (Nos. 237-241). It is possible that he may be the same Constantius by whom Chrysostom's Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews were transcribed from his notes, and published. [E. V.]

CONSTANTIUS (5) A presbyter of Antioch, to whom Chrysostom wrote shortly after his arrival at Cucusus (*Epist.* 225), ex-

pressing his disappointment at not having received any letter from him, though during his journey he had been so near him, and the visit of Libanius had given him an opportunity of sending letters. He commends Constantius very highly for his charitable works towards the widows, orphans, and needy, of whom he had shewn himself the "common father" (Tillemont, xi. pp. 278, 628, note v.). [E. V.]

CONSTANTIUS (6) the Manichean, collected many of his sect at his own house at Rome to observe the precepts of Manes more fully, and afterwards returned to the church and bravely resisted the Pelagians. He is mentioned by Augustine (*de Moribus Manichaeorum*, c. 20; *contra Faust.* v. 5). Compare Beausobre, ii. 786, 795; Basnage, *Thesaur. Monum. Eccl.* vol. i. p. 299). [E. B. C.]

(7) Bishop of Uzès (Ucetia) in Gaul in A.D. 419. In A.D. 462 pope Hilarius wrote to the bishops of Gaul about the disputed succession of Hermes to the bishopric of Narbonne. He was to retain his see, but as long as he lived the power of ordaining bishops which pertained to that church as metropolitan, should be transferred to Constantius, bishop of Uzès, as the oldest in that province. (*Patrol. Lat.* lviii. p. 24; *Hil. Epist.* 8; Ceillier, x. 337; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 645.) [W. M. S.]

(8) Or CONSTANTINUS, deacon and apocrisiarius of Eutyches, summoned with others to the council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, to carry on the accusation against Eutyches. He was also sent by Eutyches to the council of 449. Constantius here asserted that, during the reading of the former sentence, Eutyches had appealed to the councils of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. He also asserted that the sentence was written before the council, and that the acts of the council had been falsified. (*Hard. Act. Concil.* ii. pp. 147-214 (Paris, 1714); Ceillier, x. 674.) [W. M. S.]

(9) A bishop of the 5th century, sent with another bishop, Nectarius, by Hilary, bishop of Arles, to Leo I., bishop of Rome. Hilary had deposed a bishop named Celidonius; Celidonius appealed to Leo; and Leo supported him, in order to increase the jurisdiction of the Roman church. To maintain the independence of the Gallican church, Hilary journeyed on foot to Rome in the depth of winter. His intercourse with Leo being unsatisfactory, he returned to Gaul. Falling sick, he deputed to Rome first the presbyter Ravenna, who afterwards succeeded him, and then the bishops Nectarius and Constantius. Auxiliarius, prefect of Gaul, also supported his cause at Rome. But their overtures were unsuccessful. (*Vit. Hilari.* p. xvii.; *Patrol. Lat.* tom. l.; Ceillier, viii. 437.) [W. M. S.]

(10) A Tuscan, father of pope John I. (*Lib. Pontifical.* tom. iv. *Concil.* p. 1600; Ceillier, xi. 112.) [W. M. S.]

(11) A presbyter of Lyons, the friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, lived in the latter half of the 5th century. He was a native of Lyons, and of a noble family. All our knowledge of Constantius is derived from the letters of Sidonius, four of which (*Epist.* i. 1; iii. 2; vii. 18; ix. 16) are addressed to him. Sidonius uses language of great deference and respect in ad-

ressing Constantius, by whom he was prevailed upon to collect his letters, which after very careful correction he published in eight books, dedicated to Constantius, c. A.D. 477 (*Sidon. Ep.* vii. 18; ix. 16.) In the winter of 473, when Sidonius's episcopal city of Clermont was besieged by the Visigothic king Euric, who was extending his conquests from Spain into Gaul, and the inhabitants of Auvergne were sustaining the miseries of war, pestilence, and famine, Constantius, who was considerably advanced in life, braved all the difficulties and dangers of the journey, and having made his way into the city, which is described as devastated with fire, and rent asunder with civil dissensions, by his influence restored unanimity to the citizens and roused them to repair their fortifications and maintain a successful resistance to their enemies (*Ep.* iii. 2). Constantius was the author of a copy of hexameters, celebrating the erection of a church at Lyons by Patiens the bishop of that city, affixed to the wall near the altar (*Ep.* ii. 10), and of a life of St. Germain l'Auxerrois, dedicated to Patiens and Censorius of Auxerre. (*Cave, Hist. Lit.* i. 434; Tillemont, xvi. 263-268.) [E. V.]

CONSTANTIUS (12) A bishop addressed by Avitus, bishop of Vienne (A.D. 494-517). He is directed not to refuse communion at Easter to persons convicted of light faults. (Avitus, *Ep.* 61, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. lix. 262; Ceillier, x. 562.) [W. M. S.]

(13) Monk of the abbey of Classis. After the death of the abbat Claudius the monks asked Gregory the Great to appoint Constantius. Gregory refused, because Constantius had a taste for property, and shewed by his conduct that he had not the spirit of a monk. Gregory appointed instead Maurus, cellarius of another monastery. (*Greg. Epist.* xii. 24, 1194, *Patrol. Lat.* lxvii. p. 1232; Ceillier, xi. 528.) [W. M. S.]

(14) Bishop of Alby. He attended the council of Rheims in the year 625, and lived at least to the year 647. A joint letter from him and Dado to Desiderius bishop of Cahors is found among the *Epistolae Desiderii*, lib. ii. No. 4 (Migne, *Patrol.* lxxxvii. 217.) [E. V.]

(15) Or CONSTANTINUS, Presbyter of the church of Apamea, metropolis of Syria Secunda. He was introduced to the third council of Constantinople (6th general, A.D. 680) to give an account of his faith. He said he recognised in Jesus Christ two natures and two properties, according to the decision of Chalcedon; but only allowed one will. When asked whether this was divine or human, he replied it was the will of the Divinity. He added that Christ had a human will till the crucifixion, but after His resurrection it was swallowed up in the divine. This doctrine he said he had learnt from Macarius of Antioch. Unable to persuade him to alter his views, the council anathematised him and expelled him from the assembly. (Pope Paul V. *Concil. Gen. Eccl.* iii. 226-232; Ceillier, xii. 954.) [W. M. S.]

CONSTITUTIONS, APOSTOLICAL [*Dict. of Christ. Ant.* s. v. **APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.**]

CONTENTUS, said to have been one of the early bishops of Man (Stubbs, *Regist.* 154.) [C. H.]

CONTEXTUS, ST., bishop of Bayeux, cir. 480-513 (Gams, *Series Episc.*). He is placed as sixth prelate of that see by Sainte-Marthe. His name is otherwise spelt Contestus, Contestius, and Contessus. The account given of him by Sainte-Marthe is that he was born in the neighbourhood of Bayeux, and gave himself wholly to the fear of God from his very cradle. He was far advanced in age when universal consent pointed him out as the successor of Manvaeus. But he preached so constantly against the wickedness of the citizens, that he attracted the hatred of all. Unable to overcome this feeling, he retired to a solitary place. Here he suffered the wiles of the Evil One, but came victorious from the struggle. At length he returned, and governed his flock with unremitting vigour, maintaining his reclusive habits and the austerity of his former retirement. The Bollandists describe the fame of his temptation and victory as bringing many pagans to baptism. Druidism is said to have flourished in some parts of Gaul in his time, especially at Bayeux. They also mention his rescue of many harlots. He died illustrious for his virtues and wonderful works. His body was translated to Fécamp (Fiscannum), where it was preserved above the altar. His day in the Roman calendar is Jan. 19. (*Gallia Christiana*, xi. 348; *AA. SS. Boll. Jan. vol. ii.* 227.) [W. M. S.]

CONTHIGIRNUS (*Annal. Camb. ad an.* 612), bishop of Glasgow. [KENTIGERNA.] [C. H.]

CONTOBABDITAE, a section of the AGNOETAE, so called from the place where they had their head-quarters (Niceph. Call. xviii. 50). [G. S.]

CONTUMELIOSUS, bishop of Riez in Gaul, A.D. 524. He was addressed by Avitus, bishop of Vienne, who sent him one of his works, and asked him to criticise and alter as he should deem fit. Contumeliosus was learned, but his private life was much suspected. About A.D. 534 Caesarius, bishop of Arles, and other prelates of Gaul wrote to pope John II., complaining of Contumeliosus, who by his own avowal had been convicted of several crimes. The pope wrote letters to Caesarius, to the bishops of Gaul, and to the clergy of Riez, saying that he had forbidden Contumeliosus all his functions, and that Caesarius was to see him shut up in a monastery that he might repent. Contumeliosus appealed to pope Agapetus, who accepted his appeal, and wrote to Caesarius wishing that he had delayed the execution of the decree of John II. The appeal seems not to have been determined: meantime Contumeliosus was to remain suspended. (*Patrol. Lat. tom. lvi. p.* 31, lix. 232, *Aviti Vienn. Epist.* 13; lvi. 24, *Johan. Pap. II. Epist.* 4; lvi. 46, *Agap. Pap. I. Epist.* 7; Ceillier, x. 558; xi. 118, 120.)

[W. M. S.]

CONUUALH (Bede, ed. Stevenson, *Vit. Abbat.* c. 4); **CONWALH** (Bede, ed. Giles, *Vit. Abbat.*), king of the West Saxons. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

CONUULFUS (Bede, *H. E. Contin.* ad an. 740, edd. Smith, Moberly); **CONWULFUS** (*ibid.* ed. Giles), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CONVALLANUS, abbat, commemorated Oct. 13. He is said by King to have been abbat in Scotland, and confessor under king Conranus (probably Chalmers's Gauran, son of Domangart, A.D. 535-557), and his obit is placed in A.D. 527. But Dempster and Camerarius (Oct. 5) call him abbat of Iona, and preceptor of king Ferquhard (probably Ferchar, the son of Eogan, A.D. 621-637). Boece (Bellend. transl. lib. ix. c. 6, ed. 1821, vol. ii. p. 73) says he introduced the gang-days (Rogation days) into Scotland, was abbat of Iona, had the gift of prophecy, and lived in the days of king Arthur; but on this we can lay little stress, as depending solely on the authority of some books said to have been seen by Boece, and as being contrary, in the leading points, to ascertained history (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 164, 214, 241, 315; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. 285).

[J. G.]

CONVALLUS (1) (CONWALL), said to have been the 47th king of Scots (A.D. 568-578), celebrated for piety and for assistance rendered to Kentigern and Columba. He induced Brudus king of the Picts and all his subjects to renounce Pelagianism and embrace the Catholic doctrine. He was noted for the great devotion he paid, and obliged his courtiers to pay, to the symbol of the cross. (Camerarius, *Histoire Abrégée*, ff. 68; Cressy, *Church Hist. of Britt.* xiv. 14, 18.)

[C. H.]

(2), confessor, commemorated May 18, Sept. 28. One of the favourite pupils of St. Kentigern at Glasgow was a Convallus, whom the Scotch calendars commemorate, but without uniformity as to details of history or day of observance. He is described as the son of an Irish prince, and is usually associated with St. Kentigern, whom he outlived by about nine years; King places his death in A.D. 612. He is said to lie at Inchinnan, near Glasgow, and Cumnock, Ayrshire, was under his patronage (Fordun, *Scotich.* iii. c. 29; Boece, ix. c. 17; *Brev. Aberd.* p. aestiv. f. cxvii.; *Orig. Par. Scot.* i. 66, 78; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 315, and Kals.; Bolland. *Acta SS. Maii* 18, tom. iv. 183, "De S. Convallo Archidiacono Glascuensi in Scotia," saec. vii.). There is another St. Convallus, a monk, commemorated by Camerarius on Sept. 14, but as he is said to have been brought up in the monastery of Crosraguel, in Carrick, he cannot have been earlier than the 13th century (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 173).

[J. G.]

COPTIC CHURCH.^a This is the name assigned to the church among those descendants of the ancient Egyptians who now bear the name of Copts. Lane prefers to derive this name from "Coptos," a city in Upper Egypt, now "Kuft" or "Guft," to which many Egyptian Christians fled during the Roman persecutions; but others trace in the forms "Kubt," "Gubt," "Kubtee," "Gubtee," resemblances to the Greek name of Egypt (*Αἴγυπτος*). Another, and a very unscientific, derivation was attached to the name by the Catholic patriarch Cyril Lucar (*see infra*).

^a The unique character of the Coptic Church will, we hope, be regarded as a sufficient apology for the usual limits of the Dictionary having been in this instance transgressed, so as to present to the reader a complete sketch of the subject down to the present time. — [EDD.]

I. In dealing with the history of the Coptic Church it will not be necessary to trace it back to the earliest times. It will be sufficient to refer the reader to the articles in this Dictionary on ST. MARK, ORIGEN, ST. ANTONY, ST. ATHANASIUS, ST. CYRIL, and the MONKS OF NITRIA. The history of the Church of Alexandria up to the time of the council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) is also the history of a church which united in one body all Christians. The Copts formed up to that date one of the component elements of a church which traced (traditionally) its origin back to St. Mark. But with that council began a new and sadder state of things.

The council of Chalcedon had deposed and banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, Dioscurus, patriarch of Alexandria. There was no question, from the orthodox point of view, of the justice of the sentence; but the results were such as could certainly never have been anticipated. The schism in the Church of Alexandria, which continues to the present day, owes its origin to that deposition. The Coptic Church, as a separate and heterodox branch of the Church Catholic, dates from the unhappy mistakes and furious party-spirit which transformed the persecutor Dioscurus into a persecuted professor of "the faith;" and which made, and still makes, the bare mention of the decrees of Chalcedon hateful to every Jacobite, Monophysite, and Monothelite. It is only necessary, in this article, to consider the Coptic Church as a separated body.

Proterius, a disciple of Dioscurus, and arch-priest of Alexandria, was elected (A.D. 452) to succeed his master; but his tastes were those of a student, not of a leader; he had neither the tact nor the strength requisite for the crisis in which he found himself placed. Dioscurus died in A.D. 454; but the hope expressed by Leo, pope of Rome, that his heresy would die with him was not fulfilled. Monophysitism (*see* under the name), the name which sums up conveniently—though not always explicitly—the views adopted by Dioscurus and his followers, has ever since been the tenet of Egypt; and it found an immediate supporter after the death of Dioscurus, in one Timothy Ælurus, or the Cat. This man was an Alexandrian presbyter. He collected together monks and bishops, who detested, equally with himself, the decrees of Chalcedon; and, when anathematised by Proterius and expelled by the government, he kept up the courage of his adherents by a cat-like species of ingenuity and activity, which has probably given him his name. He visited the cells by night; and, standing outside and proclaiming himself an angel from heaven, he bade his awe-struck listeners avail themselves of the first opportunity of forsaking Proterius and of electing Timothy (*i.e.* himself) in his place. The opportunity came with the death of the emperor Marcian. Timothy, heading his monks, proceeded to the Caesarea or the great church of Alexandria, and was consecrated by two deposed and but lately exiled bishops, A.D. 457. The governor's first act, on his return, was to forbid re-admission to Timothy, who had left Alexandria. This infuriated the Timotheans, who turned upon Proterius, dragged him from the baptistery of the church in which he was engaged at prayer, murdered him, exposed his body, burnt it, and cast the ashes into the sea.

This infamous act was the first stage of a persecution which permitted Timothy to assume at once patriarchal functions, but which drove many Egyptian bishops to Constantinople. They memorialised the new emperor Leo, who, as soon as possible, submitted the matters of Egypt to the patriarchates and other sees convened, not in oecumenical council, but in their provincial synods. Their condemnation of Timothy was unanimous, and Leo banished him to the Chersonese. For fifteen years Timothy remained in exile. Political events then placed Basiliscus in power at Constantinople, and the Monophysites urged successfully Timothy's recall. He entered Constantinople in triumph, his adherents shouting before him as he rode upon an ass, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Later on Timothy proceeded to Alexandria. Basiliscus, the usurper, had supported what Zeno, the rightful occupant of the throne, had disliked. The former, by the advice of Timothy, had issued a circular letter endorsing approval of the faith laid down in the three first oecumenical councils, but not that of Chalcedon; the latter, always well-disposed to the last-named council, now announced his intention of expelling such nonconformist bishops as had been appointed by his rival. Timothy's age was, however, allowed to stand as an excuse for not interfering with him; and in a few months more he died, leaving behind him a memory which even the writers of his sect are unable to rescue from charges of infamy and violence.

He was succeeded (A.D. 477) by a man equally tyrannical and more double-dealing, Peter, surnamed Mongus or Moggus, the Stammerer. Zeno was naturally indignant at such presumption, and passed sentence of death upon him. This was commuted into banishment upon the intercession of the Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, *Timothy Salophaciolus*;^b but Timothy's death (A.D. 482), and the unfortunate mistakes which are connected with the conduct and election of his successor *John Talaia*, made the restoration of Peter Mongus possible, while his ready acceptance of Zeno's Henoticon dissipated any anger or suspicion which might still have lingered in the emperor's mind. Zeno's famous document, issued by the advice of Acacius of Constantinople, was intended to re-unite the Catholics and Monophysites on the basis of compromise. It was originally addressed to the patriarchate of Egypt, but during the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius, it became the test proposed to all the bishops of the East. There was much in the Henoticon which would make it acceptable to the Egyptians. The creed adopted by the councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus was asserted and confirmed; and the doctrine established at Chalcedon was stated, though certain expressions there used, and the confirmation of that council, were studiously avoided. Peter Mongus accepted this document for himself, and proposed it to the Alexandrians, whether Catholic or Monophysite, as a form of union. At first his offer was largely accepted, but Peter's subsequent acts—one day denouncing the council of Chalcedon, another accepting its decrees—

^b For the sake of convenience, the names of the Catholic or orthodox patriarchs of Alexandria are, when referred to, printed in *italic* type.

alienated alike the consistent Monophysite and the consistent Catholic.

While the patriarch's name was inserted in the diptychs of Constantinople, the church over which he presided was torn into three divisions. The Catholics called themselves Proterians, out of respect to their martyred patriarch; Peter retained a few followers; and the sterner Monophysites and Eutychians were surnamed Acephali, as preferring no chief or head to union with their trimming bishop. It was Peter's policy to let these last alone, and schism after schism racked and split up the Acephali for more than two hundred years. Essianites, Barsanuphites, Anthropomorphites, and Semidalites are mere names now, and it is unnecessary to dwell upon them; but they serve, together with many others even more obscure, to exhibit the distraction and degradation which had befallen the once great church of St. Mark and St. Athanasius. But if Peter ignored and despised the men of his own communion, he turned the more bitterly upon the Catholics who refused it. Their eyes had been opened to the meaning of the compromise as interpreted by Peter, and they were made to suffer for their indignation. Events outside of Egypt, combined with persecution at home, would seem to have made the patriarch indifferent to the convictions or the miseries of the unhappy Alexandrians. An attempt made by Felix, pope of Rome, to procure his banishment, was met by the bold step of arresting the papal legates who appeared at Constantinople; they were imprisoned, threatened with death, and only released when they joined in the public service with Acacius, and—at least tacitly—gave the sanction of Rome to Peter's tenure of office. Rome's disavowal of this act of the legates and her subsequent fulminations against Acacius and Peter were scorned; and during the lifetime of the former Alexandria was at the mercy of the latter. Imperial representations, the protests of the governor, and the cries of the sufferers, were despised or set aside by Mongus, till death came and removed him (A.D. 490).

Peter's immediate successors were not remarkable men. The liberal and virtuous Athanasius II., the conciliatory and gentle John I. (A.D. 497), the recluse John II. (A.D. 507), and Dioscurus II. (A.D. 517), made efforts more or less vigorous to restore communion between the two principal sections of the Alexandrian Church; but the time was a time of triumph for the Jacobites, and communion meant for the Catholics—especially in the days of John the recluse—the surrender of their own tenets and the adoption of Jacobite opinions. About this time the practice of sending synodal letters between Antioch and Alexandria began, a practice which has been continued with but few interruptions up to the present day.

Timothy II. (A.D. 520) was, at the onset of his patriarchal life called upon to deal with the then all-engrossing disputes between the Corrupticolae and the Phantasiasts. Julian of Halicarnassus, and Severus of Antioch, the great champion of the moderate section of the Acephali, had been deprived of their sees by the emperor Justin, and had both found refuge in Egypt. Julian, an Eutychian, taught that the Saviour's body was incorruptible, that His

hunger, thirst, weariness, and rest did not arise from the constitution of His nature, but were mere feelings to which He voluntarily submitted Himself. Hence he and his followers, who were chiefly monks and anchorites, received the nickname of Aphthartodocetae and Phantasiasts. They retorted by surnaming the followers of Severus, Corrupticolae, or worshippers of the corruptible. The Jacobites ranged themselves by the side of one or the other of these leaders; and when Timothy was found inclining by preference to the opinion of Severus, many Alexandrians, headed by a deacon named Themistius, separated from communion with him, and, as Agnoites, added another name to the long catalogue of schismatics.

The historian Eutychius, introduces into the time of the patriarch Timothy II., the attempt of Apollinarius to restore in Alexandria the Catholic succession of bishops, which had been in abeyance since the time of *John Talaiia*. The whole history is beset with difficulties and contradictions, one writer placing the events at the time of Timothy's accession, another at the close of his life; but the possibility, and even probability, of the occurrence is supported by the known facts and sympathies of the day. In the eyes of the emperor Justin, Timothy was a heretic, and to be displaced. The Catholic communion in Alexandria was too feeble to move on its own account; it could do nothing without the support of the government and troops. Apollinarius, a patrician, appeared at Alexandria by the emperor's command and demanded consecration. The Jacobites scorned him. He fixed a day on which to meet the people in the great church, stationed troops at the doors and in the neighbourhood of the sacred building, and surrounded his own person with a body-guard. The people saw him pass through the streets and enter the church dressed in a military cloak, and wearing the insignia of his patrician rank. He mounted the pulpit; the cloak was dropped; Apollinarius was seen vested in the patriarchal robes. He began to read the tome of Leo, or the definition of faith passed at the obnoxious council of Chalcedon. Amazement gave place to indignation; loud and angry protests against the council and the definition drowned the voice of the speaker. Apollinarius gave the signal; the swords of the soldiers pierced that unarmed multitude; and the house of God became the scene of a furious butchery. Apollinarius himself disappeared from the scene, unless he is to be identified with a bishop who became Catholic patriarch of Alexandria some fifteen years after the death of Timothy (A.D. 536).

It was the custom at Alexandria that the successor of a defunct patriarch should watch by the body of the dead, place his right hand upon his head, take the pallium of St. Mark from his neck, and assist in the burial. This constituted legitimate succession. One Theodosius, a member of the Corrupticolae, had the support of the secular clergy and of the court party. He was engaged in these rites when a mob, headed by some monks, burst into the church with their choice, one Gaianus, a Phantasiast, and expelled Theodosius from the city. Imperial officers presently appeared from Constantinople, commissioned by the emperor to

make full investigation into this matter, and to institute the candidate whose ordination should be proved to have been canonical. Theodosius was restored, and, according to the historian Severus, Iulianus became his archdeacon, or, according to other accounts, was banished. The party of Iulianus was implacable, and left Theodosius but little peace. Whether with the object of seeking further remedy against the bickerings and violence of party feeling, or in consequence of an imperial command, Theodosius before long went to Constantinople. Either previously to, or at the time of his arrival at the city, he was expected to repay imperial assistance by conformity to the faith of Chalcedon. An attempt was made, according to Severus, to silence the scruples of his conscience by the bribe of secular as well as patriarchal power, but he turned it from him with a contemptuous comparison of the bribe to the third temptation of his Master (St. Luke iv. 6), and with a fervid denunciation of council and emperor. He was banished; and Justinian, whose theological convictions were at the time Catholic, elevated to the see of Alexandria a monk named *Paul* (A.D. 539). This man's character was not one calculated to inspire respect. The military guard and the imperial favour protected his person, but the biting wit of the Jacobite surnamed him 'the new Judas,' and hardly a Catholic resorted to his communion. Theodosius, from his place of exile, kept up the faith and hopes of his followers, and the church of the Angelium rose in proud defiance of the Caesarea, and as a refuge for Monophysitism. *Paul*, *Zoilus*, and *Apollinaris*, successively Catholic patriarchs of Alexandria, did but little to induce the Jacobites to surrender their faith and seek communion with them. Their age was the age of doctrinal contest, when men's minds were perplexed or refreshed, depressed or elevated, by 'the three chapters,' and by the decisions of the fifth oecumenical council at Constantinople. Justinian, before his death, joined the sect of the Phantasiasts; but his succession, while a great blow to the Catholics, brought but little advantage to the Jacobites generally. Theodosius died in exile (A.D. 567).

His successors Peter III. (A.D. 567), Damianus (A.D. 570), and Anastasius Apozygatius (A.D. 603), were learned men, but they were harassed by the schisms within their own communion; and the lustre of their own life and learning paled before the super-excellent abilities and virtues of the Catholic patriarchs *St. Eulogius* and *St. John the Almoner*. The episcopate of Anastasius, if gratefully remembered by Jacobite writers for the cessation of the schism between the chairs of Alexandria and Antioch, was noted by Catholics as stained by the death of *Theodore* (the immediate successor of *Eulogius*), under circumstances as vindictive and barbarous as those connected with the martyrdom of *Proterius*.

The political events of this time were fierce and exciting. The emperor Phocas was dethroned and beheaded by Heraclius, the son of the exarch of Africa (A.D. 610), and Heraclius was himself called upon to defend his possessions against the conquering hosts of Chosroes II., king of Persia. The tide of fortune did not turn till Syria, Palestine, and parts of Egypt had felt the fury and bigotry of these soldiers; and Christian

refugees from Jerusalem, who had sought and received food and shelter from the Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, found that they had but exchanged one funeral pile for another.

The misery and anguish engendered by these troubles, soon, however, to be forgotten in the horrors of Mahommedan conquest, had hardly past, when the distracted church of Alexandria was called upon to face the newly-broached doctrine of Monothelitism (*see* under the name).

Cyrus was then (A.D. 630) the (so-called) Catholic patriarch. He owed his preferment to his adoption of the Monothelite views of the emperor Heraclius and his imperial adviser, Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople; one acknowledged duty attached to that preferment being the reconciliation, on a Monothelite basis, of the Jacobite and Catholic sections of the Alexandrian Church. The proposals of *Cyrus* were greeted favourably by those whose applause should have made him suspicious, and unfavourably by those whose opposition should have opened his eyes to the perils of compromise. The patriarch drew up a scheme of re-union, which declared, in its seventh article, that the Lord Jesus Christ "wrought the acts appertaining both to God and man by one the-andric (or divinely-human) operation," an expression which was interpreted by the Monothelite to admit of a single, if confused, mode of action. In the spring of A.D. 633, reconciliation was formally ratified by Catholic and Jacobite, in spite of the passionate entreaties of Sophronius, the friend of *St. John the Almoner*, on the one side, and the cold refusal of Benjamin, the Jacobite patriarch, on the other. The Monophysites proclaimed their triumph in stinging words; 'We have not gone over to the council of Chalcedon; the council has come over to us:' and the Catholics were desired to silence their scruples by the welcome sight of union, in comparison with which orthodoxy on abstruse subjects was to be excused. But the truce did not last long: theological and political partisanship united in breaking asunder bands which were rotten from the first.

The rise of Mahommedanism, the details of its creed, progress, and conquests, must be read elsewhere: here it can only be considered as it affected the Coptic Church. In A.D. 640, Alexandria fell into the hands of Amer, the lieutenant of the caliph Omar. From that time the "Ethesis" of Heraclius, the "Type" (or formulary) of Constans II., the decisions of the first Lateran (A.D. 649) and sixth general councils (A.D. 680-1)—successive efforts to stem opposition to the will of the emperor, or define the Catholic faith—were powerless to restore unity to Alexandria. The Copt of Egypt held out the hand of friendship to the Mahommedan, and Monophysite patriarchs and Monophysite creeds received the support and protection of the Crescent.

According to Severus, Cyrus poisoned himself, while Benjamin left his place of refuge in the desert. The passport of safety, accorded to him and to those who had harboured him:—"let every place in which may be Benjamin, the patriarch of the Coptic Christians, enjoy full security, peace, and faith from God; he himself may come, conscious that he will be safe, and freely administer the affairs of his church and people"—was the death-knell to any other Christian establishment.

The pre-eminence which the Monophysite could not obtain from his theological superiors was accorded to him on political grounds. In the eyes of Amer every orthodox Catholic was a Melchite, pledged to support the emperor of Constantinople, the chief and unbending opponent of Mahommed and his successors. A leading Monophysite, Mocaucasus, had, moreover, impressed Amer with the conviction that, provided the religious belief of his party was respected, something more than negative support would be forthcoming. "I desire," he had said, "no communion with the Greeks either in this world or the next. I abjure for ever the Byzantine tyrant, his synod of Chalcedon, and his Melchite slaves. For myself and my brethren, we cannot embrace the revelations of your prophet; we are resolved to live and die in the profession of the Gospel and in the unity of Christ; but we also wish for peace; we will cheerfully submit to paying tribute, and we will render obedience to the prophet's temporal successors;" and the astute Arab ratified a pact which flattered the Monophysite by the suppression of Melchite civil and ecclesiastical supremacy, while it left in his own hands a weapon which could be used against his Coptic adherents should they seek their own independence. To this day the Coptic patriarchs deduce their succession from the patriarch Benjamin in preference to any other, and trace their stringent use of the Coptic language in their ritual and sacraments, to the time when Greek rites, offices, and language, were practically suppressed by the sword of Islam. In their partisan hatred, no Monophysite voice was raised to save from the flames the venerable church in which reposed the relics of St. Mark; and Monophysite selfishness, seeking the celebrated library of Alexandria for a learned grammarian, ended by consigning to the public baths the literary stores of a precious antiquity.

The last years of Benjamin were spent in collecting together his hitherto scattered flock, in building and restoring churches and monasteries, and in teaching and reforming his people. The Church of Ethiopia owed to him the Metropolitan Cyril and Teklahaimanot, the founder of the monastic life in that country.

The new governors of Egypt soon shewed their intention of interfering in all matters ecclesiastical as well as civil. Though responsible to the caliph, they were practically independent; and, provided that tribute and presents were forthcoming for the use of the central government, inquiry as to the mode by which these were raised was not unduly pressed. The name of Abdel-Aziz is connected with many interesting facts appertaining to the first years of Alexandrian life under Mahommedan rule. His passion for building gained for him the title of a second Pharaoh; and Christians toiled at Alexandria, Holwan, and Misra (old Cairo)—building, at his command, baths, aqueducts and public squares, and, by his gracious permission, a church or two. This semblance of concession to their spiritual wants finds further ironical analogy in his treatment of the Coptic patriarchs. John Semnudaus (A.D. 677) was an excellent man; but at the time of the confirmation of his election he made the mistake of forgetting to obtain information about Abdel-Aziz's movements, and omitted to pay his respects to the expectant

governor. Abdel listened immediately to slander against John circulated by his enemies, and the unhappy patriarch suffered inconceivable torture before the mind of Abdel was disabused. Isaac the Just, John's successor, who owed the confirmation of his election (A.D. 686) to Abdel's ruling a disputed point in his favour, was Christian-minded enough to endeavour to bring about peace between the belligerent kings of Ethiopia and Nubia. But his act was represented to the emir as a political interference, and the patriarch nearly lost his life. His fellow-Christians were mocked and beaten; they saw their gold and silver crosses broken up, and were condemned to read on their church-doors such insulting comparisons and sentences as—

(a.) Mahomet, the *Great Apostle of God*; Jesus Christ, the *Apostle of God*.

(b.) God neither begetteth nor is begotten.

On another occasion, when the course of political events at Constantinople had expelled the emperor Justinian, Abdel summoned to his presence the Alexandrian prelates, with Simon the patriarch (A.D. 689) at their head. He wished to amuse himself with their dissensions. He turned to the bishop of the Gaianite sect, and desired him to name the prelate not belonging to his party, who, in his opinion, was most orthodox in his doctrine. The bishop replied, Simon. Abdel put the same question to the Melchite bishop (?), and to the Barsanuphian bishop, and received the same answer. Then came Simon's turn. Simon thoughtless of, or superior to, the amusement his answer would afford the Mahommedan, appropriated this superiority to himself, and anathematised the rest. Yet Simon was *the* one of the patriarchs contemporary with Abdel who received from the emir the highest possible character for excellence and moderation; and the Coptic and Ethiopian Churches are justified in commemorating his virtues. He owed his election to his learning and modesty; his own preference for the election of his teacher the abbat of Mount Nitria, and his Syrian birth, being counted no valid obstacles. And his after-acts proved that the electors had chosen wisely. Legends of his miraculous power and miraculous deliverances are recorded in the pages of Renaudot; but more noteworthy for the edification of his flock were the sterling efforts he made to prevent cruelty in monasteries, to check lawlessness in divorce, and to help forward the propagation of his faith, though each endeavour may be said to have been opposed by theological or political opponents, and in some cases to have brought him great personal suffering.

The patriarchate of Alexander (A.D. 703), Simon's successor, was marked by a series of Mahommedan persecutions, each more fierce than its predecessors. The emirs of Egypt seemed to have vied with each other in acts of cruelty. An apostate monk inflamed Asabah, the son of Abdel-Aziz, against the monasteries; but the capitation tax then first imposed upon the monks was nothing compared with the branding with name and number devised by Asamah. Both these men prohibited the assumption of monastic vows: a third commanded Christians to wear—as a mark of shame as well as of identification—a leaden seal, stamped with a lion, and suspended round their necks; a fourth imposed a passport-tax on travellers; and the touching story is told

of a poor mother seeing her son, in whose care was the passport, devoured by a crocodile, and she herself obliged to sell her robe and beg before she could resume her journey. No wonder that the Christians recognised the hand of God in the miserable death which befell some of their persecutors. It is told of Abdel-Aziz by Elmacinus, and of Asabah by Severus, that having entered a church in which was an icon of the Virgin and Child, the emir spat upon it, and gave vent to his fury in horrible blasphemies. That night he was terrified by a vision of the judgment. He saw One sitting upon the throne clothed with light and majesty, and surrounded by legions of white-robed saints; he saw himself standing before Him; and he heard the command given to transfix the blasphemer through the heart with a spear. He awoke, was attacked by a violent fever, and in a few hours was dead.

Alexander, on the accession of Abdallah, waited upon the new emir to present his congratulations. He was insulted, and dismissed with a fine of 3000 pieces of gold. Unable to raise the money in any other way, the patriarch was taken about the country begging alms from all who would love or pity him. The same tribute was imposed by Korah, Abdallah's successor; and Alexander had to repeat his painful journey. The accidental discovery of some chests of money—the voluntary donation of all but one to the patriarch, by whose officers it was appropriated—was made the cause of a fresh charge against him. The finders of the treasure, who were monks, spent the reserved portion in debauchery. When Alexander pleaded poverty, this gift of the chests was quoted against him, and collusion insinuated between him, his officers, and his monks. In vain did he plead ignorance of the whole transaction; in vain did he prove that he had not received a penny. Korah imprisoned him, threatened him with death, and only released him to permit him to proceed on his mendicant-mission. This prelate's career was, indeed, one long struggle against Mahomedan persecution, a struggle which ended only with his life (A.D. 726): while he had not unfrequently to contend against the grasping selfish habits of his own clergy and co-religionists. One of the few gleams of sunshine which lightened that otherwise troubled life is to be found in the restoration to his communion of many Gaianites, Semidalites, and Barsanuphians, whom he re-baptized when engaged in a patriarchal visitation.

About this time (A.D. 727), and after a lapse of ninety-seven years, the Catholic Church of Alexandria was enabled to restore to its members episcopal authority in the person of *Cosmas*. A direct appeal to the caliph Hisham procured the restoration to the Catholics of the Caesarea and many churches occupied by the Copts, and a vacancy of some years in the Jacobite patriarchate was employed by *Cosmas* to consolidate his party.

In A.D. 743 Chail I. was elected; and his episcopacy is memorable in Coptic annals, not only for the political crisis through which he successfully passed, but also for the part he played in the theological disputes of his age. The caliphs of the house of the Omniadae had been gradually losing the affections of their people, and exciting their hatred by vices,

cruelty, and exactions. Abdallah, the leader of the Abbasidae, who traced their descent and took their name from Abbas, an uncle of Mahomed, at length branded the Omniadae as usurpers, and drove Meruan, the last of the Omniadae caliphs, into Egypt, and beheaded him (A.D. 750). Catholics and Jacobites both suffered, as was to be expected, during these political convulsions, and each in proportion as the governors of Egypt sided with Chail or Cosmas. Under the emir Abdel-Melech there arose a discussion relative to the church of St. Mennas, famous for its miracles, and which both parties wished to possess. The question was referred to Abdel-Melech, who commanded the Catholic and Jacobite patriarchs to come before him and discuss their respective doctrines. The discussion, as reported by Severus, must from the first have been fruitless: the reasons put forward by each party, when reduced to writing, were convincing only to themselves; and when overtures for union fell through, Abdel-Melech decided that the church should be given to the Jacobites on the ground that a Jacobite patriarch had finished the building.

Chail and Cosmas were once again brought together before this same emir and his master, Meruan. The Christians of Egypt, forgetting for a time their theological differences, had thrown in their lot with the Abbasidae, and defeated Abdel-Melech's troops. The patriarchs were taken prisoners, and brought before Meruan. *Cosmas* bought his life by a speedy payment; but Chail, having no money, was commanded to use his influence with the revolted Christians and bring about a peace. Abdallah in the meantime advanced, and Chail was powerless. Summoned to the presence of Meruan, the patriarch pronounced over his kneeling companions the beautiful prayer of Absolution used in the Coptic church, and prepared himself and them for the horrible death, in the presence of their countrymen, which Meruan had commanded. By God's providence they were spared. The caliph's own son pleaded for them, and they were cast into that prison from which Abdallah delivered them.

The firmness as well as piety of Chail is remembered by the Copts in connexion with the discipline required of penitent apostates, fasting-Communion, original sin, the baptism of infants, and the line he took at the council of Misra (A.D. 755), when he refused his assent to the violation of the canons in the case of translation to the see of Antioch. His virtues alone may have suggested to the Arab historians the romantic expedition of Nubian hosts hurrying to his rescue when in prison; but—together with the prayers which pious tradition asserted powerful to influence the rise and fall of the Nile—they secured for him at the hands of Abdallah's emir that respect and peace which were granted to his declining years. He died A.D. 766.

The next patriarch of any distinction was Yuçab (A.D. 837). The history of the Alexandrian Christians in Egypt had been, during the interval, the history of men persecuted or not as the temper of the caliph and his lieutenants was avaricious or indifferent, cruel or lenient, and swayed by Jacobite or Melchite. The Coptic patriarchs, to their credit, did not abandon their flocks when distress came, but relieved them, encouraged them to patience and perseverance, combated earnestly

new forms of heresy, and—as in the case of Mark II. (A.D. 799) and the Barsanuphians—succeeded in bringing back to the fold those who had wandered from it. Yuḡab was abbat of the famous monastery of St. Macarius, and was chosen in preference to Isaac, a wealthy but married man, in whose behalf some of the bishops wished to break the canon, and avail themselves of his promises to restore the churches, pay tribute, and give alms to the poor. The new patriarch employed his first efforts in quelling a revolt among some Christian Eschammyrites; and, though unsuccessful, the favourable impression he produced on the caliph would probably have at once procured security and peace for his people, had not some bishops, deposed by him for their bad conduct, insinuated to the emir Afschin that Yuḡab's conduct was hypocritical. His death was ordered, and Afschin's brother was despatched to assassinate him. Tradition declares that sabre-stroke and dagger-thrust were powerless against the innocent patriarch, and the would-be-murderer led him to the emir. Once there, Yuḡab had no difficulty in exposing the falsehood of his accusers; while he excited the admiration, and even the esteem, of all present, by asking that their lives might be spared. He received his reward when the caliph commanded that no appeal, on the part of the Christians, from the judgment of their patriarch should be entertained. This served him in good stead when the bishop of Misra—wishing to make himself independent of the see of Alexandria, and calling to his aid the interference of the Mahommedan courts—was forced by those same courts to admit the title and authority of his superior. "I have received my authority from God and your princes," said Yuḡab; and, shewing to the cadi the privileges conferred on his see by Almamon, the victorious son of the celebrated Aaron-al-Raschid, the appeal of Misra was rejected.

Yuḡab had set his heart on the accomplishment of three things; personal communion with the patriarch of the Jacobites at Antioch; the obtaining from the caliph sufficient powers to govern adequately his churches; and the opportunity of regulating the affairs of Nubia and Ethiopia. By the providence of God, he was permitted to see the accomplishment of all three. Dionysius of Antioch came in the company of Almamon; and the two patriarchs were enabled to express to each other personally that mutual respect and affection which synodal letters usually conveyed. The fulfilment of his last wish was due, as regards Nubia, to the visit of George the son of the reigning emperor. The prince was warmly received, and returned to his country gratified by the patriarch's instructions, and by the gift of a portable altar suited to the habits of a people who preferred a nomad and camp life to cities with churches and houses. John, the bishop of Ethiopia, was at that time a refugee in Egypt. He had been expelled by his enemies on the authority of the queen during the king's absence on some war expedition. That expedition was attended by disaster and defeat, and the king on discovering John's banishment attributed his ill-success to the Divine anger. At his earnest entreaty John was returned to him; and the Ethiopians insisting that their bishop should be, like themselves, circumcised, it was proved to them that John was this, though

he appears to have been himself ignorant of what had been probably done in his infancy by some Mahommedan. But in addition to these special acts for these countries, Yuḡab ordained bishops and sent them in every direction in his own diocese, affirming in the spirit of a true servant of the propagation of the Gospel, that there was danger lest the flocks should perish if they had not many pastors.

The excellence and gentleness of his nature was such that the historians of his age have noted, as something exceptional, his intimate friendship with the Catholic patriarch; and it might almost be asserted that Yuḡab received kinder treatment from Christians opposed to his communion than from those presumably agreeing with him in matters of faith. He died (A.D. 850) a victim to the tortures which a new and persecuting emir inflicted upon him.

Jews and Christians were now called upon, as a mark of shame, to wear garments of a dark colour with particoloured fringes; the use of the girdle was taken away from the women to whom it was appropriate, and made obligatory on the men who detested it. They were forbidden admission to public offices, or instruction from Mahommedans; their new churches were levelled, their sepulchres destroyed, the use of crosses forbidden, and figures of demons ordered to be placed above the house doors. Another emir went even farther, and forbade religious rites for the dead, prayers except in a low voice, the ringing of bells, and the use of wine for the Eucharist.

Chenouda became patriarch in A.D. 859. To him is traced the custom, still observed in Egypt, of heading letters and documents with abbreviations (IC. XC. TC. OC.) significant of Jesus, Christ, the Son, God. His theological reputation was very great, and he was instrumental in restoring to his Church, by confirmation, a body of Quartodecimans who had appended to their original error various tenets adopted from Barsanuphians, Phantasiasts, Julianists, and Gai-anites. A paschal letter of this patriarch is given by Renaudot, which was considered by many a faithful exposition of the teaching of the great St. Cyril; some however, while approving the distinctive Monophysite phraseology of part, found fault with language which, in their opinion, asserted that the Divine nature had suffered and died. Chenouda silenced the objectors. In the earlier part of his patriarchate, he was successful in obtaining from the caliph at Bagdad the restoration of liberty to his church; but in the time of Ahmed—the first of the Tooloonidae or that house which owned the spiritual authority but rejected the temporal power of the lineal descendants of Mahommed—persecutions of the cruellest kind were undergone by his communion, which the Catholics escaped. As had been so often the case with other patriarchs, the originators of the slanders and insinuations which brought trouble upon Chenouda were men who owed him a spite, and cared very little if the whole community suffered provided that their own personal grudge was satisfied. A deacon and a monk, to both of whom Chenouda had refused ordination, successively accused their patriarch of possessing and concealing vast sums of money; and the sufferings mental and bodily which he endured shortened his life.

Chenouda was succeeded, in A.D. 881, by

Chail III.; a man whose simony led him to term himself Chaia or 'the last,' as being the most unworthy of the sons of the church, or (as others read) Kaial, 'the steward,' in ironical comment upon a stewardship which abused the trust committed to him. Chail's fault arose from the following circumstance. He was invited to be present at the consecration of a church at Denuschar in the diocese of Saca. He went, accompanied by a large body of prelates, clergy, and laity. When the hour of celebrating the liturgy came, all were kept waiting by the absence of the bishop of Saca. On inquiry, this bishop was reported to be engaged in preparing a banquet for his guests. The assembly waited till they would wait no longer, and the patriarch was pressed to proceed with the service. He had hardly offered the oblation (*τὸ δᾶρον*) on the altar when the bishop of Saca appeared; and, mad with rage, asked how any one could dare to act thus in his diocese and without his permission. He leaped upon the altar, took the bread, crumbled it to pieces, threw it on the ground, and left the church. The patriarch took fresh bread, gave the Communion to the people, and finished the service. On the next day, with the full consent of a synod of bishops, he deposed the bishop of Saca. The deposed man immediately proceeded to Cairo. Ahmed was preparing for an expedition to Syria, but wanted money. The bishop represented himself as an injured man, who was ready to give the Mahomedan important information. "We want nothing," he intimated, "but food and raiment: there is plenty of plate, gold and silver work, vestments of silk, and works of art in our churches: make the patriarch give you these, and your coffers will be full." The patriarch was summoned. His disproof of the bishop's charges was useless, his assertions that he and his were penniless were scoffed at. He was imprisoned, and only released at the expiration of a year, on condition that he raised 20,000 pieces of gold, one-half to be paid within a month, the rest in four. No means of procuring this sum were forthcoming, when it was hinted to Chail that ten sees were vacant, and that half the fine might be raised thus. The patriarch yielded. A second fall was easy after the first. Chail went to Alexandria to collect there sums additional to those already procured by the bishops from their respective dioceses, and by himself from the monasteries. He tried to persuade the clergy to give up and sell the church ornaments, but in vain: at last he obtained their consent to the sale of certain house-property attached to the church, on condition that he and his successors should pay them annually 1000 pieces of gold. About half the fine was thus paid, but at a cost to the fair name of a Church, and to the character of its patriarch which were never recovered. Though he lived till A.D. 899, Chail was never able to undo the effects of the degradation he had brought upon his Church and office. He began simony, and his successors continued it. He imposed a heavy impost upon the future patriarchs of his see, which continually brought them into collision with their clergy at Alexandria; and in one case, that of Theophanius (A.D. 954), resulted in passion, frenzy, madness, and death.

The political events of this period, such as the expulsion of the Tooloonidae, and the return

of a caliph of Abbasside descent, were fruitful in misery and suffering to Christians. No men of mark appeared among the Jacobites, except Severus, bishop of Aschmonin, the historian and theologian: while among Catholics the historian and patriarch Eutychius is almost the only man whose name emerges from obscurity.

The Abbassides were in A.D. 968 expelled from Egypt by the successful general of Muazzi the second of the Fatemites, or descendants of Fatema, the only child of Mahommed, and the wife of Ali; and until the time of Saladin, Egypt was lost to the Abbassides, and New Cairo became (A.D. 972) the seat of the Fatemite Caliphate. This change of masters brought with it, for a time, rest and peace to the Christians from without; but it developed only the more flagrantly the corruptions prevalent in their own body, and especially among the clergy. The patriarch Ephraim (A.D. 977) boldly faced the two crying evils of the day, simony and concubinage. He abolished the simoniacal consecrations begun by Chail III.; and in his determination to put down the lax and immoral habits prevalent among the rich, he excommunicated a Jacobite courtier of great wealth and position. This man, angry at the attempt to make him part with his concubines, and irritated at the ecclesiastical censure, caused the patriarch to be poisoned. With the reformer's death ceased the power or wish to reform. Social abuses became worse than ever, and Philotheus (A.D. 981) renewed and developed the hateful practice of simony.

Renaudot attaches to this period the history of Vazah, the son of one of the caliph's councillors. Vazah was a fanatic in his zeal for Mahomedanism, and on one occasion insulted an apostate from that creed, who was being led to the stake. The martyr prophesied that his insulter would one day recognise the verity of the faith he then reviled, and would suffer in its behalf. The dying man's words, like those of another St. Stephen, sank into Vazah's mind. He tried to shake off their impression, and undertook the pilgrimage to Mecca. His journey there was thrice disturbed by visions of a monk who bade him follow him if he valued his soul's salvation; and Vazah left Mecca as depressed and unsatisfied as before. On the return journey, he got separated from his companions. While wandering in the desert, full of fear lest the wild beasts should attack him, he was startled by the sight of a horseman, splendidly dressed, and girt with a golden zone. The mysterious stranger asked him kindly why he was wandering there, bade him seat himself behind him, and in a moment he was translated to the church of St. Macarius at Misra. That, as in the case of the conversion of St. Paul, was the turning point of his life. Vazah was not disobedient to the heavenly vision. He recognised in the portrait of St. Macarius the features of the angelic horseman. He prayed, he studied, he was baptized, and took the name of Paul. After some time he was discovered. Now came his suffering for the faith which once he persecuted. He openly professed his faith on the very spot where he had reviled Christ's martyr: he saw his wife insulted and his child drowned before his eyes, and he heard himself denounced to the caliph. When set free, he retired to a lonely

spot on the canal of the Nile, where he built a church to St. Michael the Archangel, and passed his time in writing theological works and his autobiography. Before he died he was ordained priest. He used to say that, though his life had been full of danger and sadness, but three things had ever distressed him: the execrable treatment of his wife by his own brother; the deliberate murder of his boy; and, last but not least, the bare-faced simony of Philotheus.

Simony among prelates, and ambition among the lower clergy became, in fact, productive, about this time, of external persecution and internal disorder of the most aggravated kind.

The persecution under Hakem the third of the Fatemites, who was himself the son of a Christian mother, and whose uncles were respectively Catholic patriarch of Alexandria and patriarch of Jerusalem,—is counted by historians as the most severe which the Christians had yet had to suffer from their Muslim masters. Makrizi attributes the cause to the arrogance of certain Christians who had attained the rank of vizirs, and used their position to oppress Mussulmans as well as display their wealth and importance; but it is quite as, if not more, probable that scandals among the clergy caused the half-superstitious, half-fanatic Hakem to turn against Christians, Jews, and all who denied to him the title of another Christ so blasphemously assigned to him by his courtiers. John of Abunefer, the parish priest of an obscure village, near the monastery of St. Macarius, observing that others could be made bishops if they paid for it, requested of the patriarch Zacharias (A.D. 1005), to make him a bishop—without payment. The patriarchal council rejected the request, but that request was backed up by the Christians at Cairo. In order to prevent John petitioning Hakem, the patriarch's nephew ordered some Arabs to cast John into a dry well and stone him. John escaped. He was pacified, but again disappointed; and finally he appealed to Hakem. The patriarch was cast into a dungeon, and exposed to lions which refused to touch him; when released, through the intercession of a friendly Arab, Zacharias was compelled by the raging persecution to take refuge in the desert of St. Macarius, where the predatory bands kept at a distance the would-be destroyers of church and monastery, clergy and monks. The annals of the time record the heroic sufferings and Christian martyrdom of the caliph's principal secretary, and of his own uncle St. Jeremiah of Jerusalem. Christians were obliged to wear a wooden cross of 10 lbs. weight, and Jews were compelled to hang bells round their necks. Public processions on the great festivals, and public baptism on the banks of the Nile, were forbidden. Churches were pulled down, and monasteries given to the soldiery to sack: their endowments were confiscated to the public treasury, and their places occupied by mosques. The celebration of the liturgy and of the usual offices had well-nigh ceased in Egypt before those terrible nine years of oppression and cruelty had expired.

Hakem, at last, partly tired of the desolation around him, and partly surprised into mercy by the following circumstance, stopped the persecution, restored churches and property, and removed the distinctive marks of degradation which he had enforced on all who were not

Mahommedans. A monk, who had obtained some influence over him, introduced again Zacharias to him. Hakem was astonished at the reverence paid to an apparently insignificant man, bearing no insignia of authority, and wearing no robe of rank. His astonishment was increased and changed into respect when he was told that that insignificant man's authority extended over Egypt, Ethiopia, Nubia, Pentapolis, and the other provinces, and that his mandate or letter, when signed with the cross, needed no support from money or man to secure for it ready obedience. "If that be so," said the emir, "there is no religion in the world which can compare with the Christian. We shed blood, spend money, and collect troops, and yet not even so are we obeyed. You Christians pay so much respect to one contemptible old man that no one of you opposes his command!" But it had cost the Christians under his dominion 3000 (not 30,000, Neale) churches before Hakem discovered this, and Christianity had received a blow from which it may be said never to have recovered.

The simony which had been distasteful to Zacharias personally, but not to his advisers, was continued by his successor Chenouda II. (A.D. 1032). This man, after binding himself to accept no money for conferring ordination, and after accepting the offer of a good deacon, named Bekir, to pay the demands of the Alexandrian clergy, actually procured the justification of simony by a host of bishops. His conduct had the effect of driving many from his communion to the purer shelter of the Catholic community; and it is significant of the frightfully low estimate of morality prevalent during this century among the Monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria, that Chail IV. (A.D. 1092) bound himself to the performance of these and similar pledges, and, with equal indifference to his own character, unscrupulously broke them.

Political events were now tending rapidly onwards to the fall of the Fatemite dynasty. Rebellion among the Turks of Lower Egypt was followed by war, pestilence, and famine, and the incapacity of the caliphs to quell such seditious movements was only equalled by their incapacity to resist the almost open independence of their imperious vizirs. The state of the Christians was one of comparative peace, or of intense suffering, according as these men ignored or noticed them. For example: that the caliph Moustansir should receive the patriarch Cyril II. (A.D. 1078) with great honour was no solace or compensation for imprisonment and misery endured in A.D. 1057 by Cyril's predecessor, at the hands of the vizir of Egypt. Again, the very fact of an Armenian Christian, Taged-doula, having been raised to the vizirate during the caliphate of Hafeth (A.D. 1131), following, as it did, upon the stern and contemptuous rule of Beder-el-gemal and the twenty years humane government of his son Afdal, may even have been among the causes of renewed insult and depression, to which Christians were exposed so soon as Mahommedan zealots, like the vizirs Rodowan and Talahia, acquired power. The events in Syria, connected with the first and second crusades, could not fail, in their turn, to re-act upon the Christians in Egypt. Whether defeat or victory attended the Mahommedan arms, the result appears to have been the same; it always meant contempt or

persecution; and the hope of relief from the yoke of centuries, which may have flashed across the minds of the Christians of Alexandria, when stragglers came hurrying in to tell how Christian standards waved on the walls of Damietta, must have sunk and died out speedily when Chiracou and Saladin entered their city, and the latter became vizir, and vowed war against the followers of the Cross.

During these political events, the Monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria reckoned in their succession men to whom the Coptic Church owes canons, held in esteem to the present day, and others who were a disgrace to their order through their simoniacal transactions or their absolute ignorance.

Among the most celebrated of the canons were the 'Constitutions' of Christodoulos (A.D. 1047). These forbade the baptism of a male and female child in the same water, and accompanied baptism with administration of communion, the child to be, if possible, fasting. Baptism and ordination were not to take place at Pentecost. The faithful were enjoined to stand reverently in the churches on Sundays and festivals, and not to converse with each other during the service. Modesty and silence were similarly enjoined on women, who had their proper place separate from that assigned to men. The faithful were expected to observe the fast of Lent in continence and humility; matrimony being forbidden during that season, and various rules being laid down for the observance of Holy Week. Fasting on Wednesdays, Fridays, and previous to the feasts of the Nativity and of the Apostles was commanded. Marriage between a Jacobite man and Melchite woman was only allowed if the crowning was performed by a Monophysite priest, and a promise given that the children should be baptized by Monophysite clergy. Strict rules were also laid down in relation to clerical discipline. No strange bishop, priest, or deacon could perform any official duty in Alexandria. Priests and deacons were charged to be earnest and attentive to their duties: quarrelling and disobedience on the part of the lower clergy towards their superiors was reprobated; and, in the case of any dispute, appeal to temporal authority in preference to ecclesiastical, was to be punished, in the case of the clergy, by suspension; in the case of the laity, by excommunication. These 'Constitutions,' founded upon the ancient canons and traditions, were probably drawn up to meet the special circumstances of the day and diocese; and the same is, perhaps, to be said of the canons of Cyril (A.D. 1087), which Renaudot does not give at length, and which were declined by the clergy of the Sahid district, on the ground that they would not change their ancient statutes.

Macarius II. (A.D. 1102), in whose patriarchate Jerusalem was conquered by the crusaders, recalled into existence old rules which, through time or ignorance, had lapsed or been neglected. The Copts were in the habit of first baptizing their children, and then circumcising them. Macarius reversed this order, adopting the more primitive practice. He forbade also betrothals and any part of the wedding service in private houses, and recalled his people to the sense that the church was the best and most fitting place for sacred rites.

Gabriel II. (A.D. 1131), the successor of Macarius, BIOGR.

carius, whose character stands high for piety, learning, and consistent opposition to simony, also issued a set of synodal constitutions, 30 in number, which significantly illustrate the manners and customs of the clergy and laity of his age. The first excommunicated any one who gave, or any one who received, money for ordination. The second exhorted Christians to attend the churches for morning and evening prayers. The third charged the bishops to explain the creed and the Lord's prayer in the 'vulgar tongue,' a proof how completely Arabic had superseded Coptic among the Christians of Alexandria. Other articles concerned ecclesiastics. They were not to attend the games and dances, nor permit the introduction of stage-players and mimes into their churches: they were charged not to appropriate to their own use the oblations offered by the faithful, the practice having crept in of even using as common food that which was intended for consecration at Communion: they were not to celebrate the liturgy in any other manner than that prescribed by authority, and they were to be robed in their distinctive vestments. All, destined by their parents for the life of the ecclesiastic, were to be taught the Scriptures and the discipline of the church from their earliest years: no one was to be admitted to the monastic profession except after a probation of three years. The laity were charged to support the clergy; and not to neglect offering their oblations, first-fruits, and tithes: while the clergy were forbidden to turn the church into a house for themselves and their families; or to have in their house any woman, unless of an age and relationship which would place them beyond suspicion. Other customs, some religious, some social, were dealt with as follows. All who came to Holy Communion were charged to prepare themselves for it by prayer and fasting. Marriages were not to be performed during Lent or at Easter; and such practices as spending the marriage-day in games and dancing, so that the liturgy was deferred till night-time, were forbidden. Baptism was not to be celebrated during the public service, and no child was to be circumcised after baptism. Concubinage was strictly forbidden, as was also burial in churches.

These various and successive constitutions tell almost as much by what they omit as by what they record. They expose follies as well as affirm virtues; they indicate crimes as well as illustrate methods by which crime or folly might be restrained and subdued. They enable the reader to appreciate the efforts made by devout minds to retain their faith and practice in troublous and eventful times; and they equally permit him to understand many fruitful sources of jealousy and opposition, not only between laity and clergy, but between clergy and clergy. It will be sufficient to give one instance of these class-contests respectively, in illustration of a necessarily broad statement.

Among the regulations pressed upon the Monophysites by Christodoulos, was one charging them to prepare, at their own home, the oblations intended for use in the church: these oblations were to be prepared according to the ancient custom; that is, they were to be made of water, flour, and leaven. The Jacobites and Nestorians of Syria were in the habit of adding

to this salt and oil. On one occasion Christodoulos was present in a church, when a Syrian, the principal physician to the caliph Moustansir, brought an oblation made after the manner of his country. The patriarch not only refused the gift, but gravely rebuked the giver, and finally drove him out of the church wounded. The injured layman appealed to his own patriarch, John X. of Antioch, but without any more satisfactory result than a written defence from John of the Syrian practice, and a laudable silence upon the aggressiveness of his brother of Alexandria.

The bitterness, party-spirit, and selfishness, only too common among the clergy, is, in its turn, painfully exhibited in the contest which took place (A.D. 1086) between the patriarch Cyril and his bishops. Cyril, before his elevation, was not a man remarkable for learning; and it would seem that the bishops of Lower Egypt gave their votes in his favour, in the hope that he would turn to them for counsel and advice, and that, practically, the real power would be in their hands. But after his consecration Cyril devoted himself assiduously to study as well as to gaining a practical acquaintance with his diocese. As his practical experience and mental culture expanded, he felt more and more disposed to go alone: and the exercise of his own judgment was eventually the cause of his displeasing his suffragans. Cyril had promised the bishops and some of the principal laymen of Misra, to remove from his company some bishops and monks who were distasteful to them. He declined, however, to fulfil his promise, probably acting upon better and less prejudiced information. The bishops appealed to the vizir, Beder-el-gemal, an act of glaring disobedience to the constitutions of Christodoulos. The vizir summoned them to the suburbs of Misra, and they met to the number of 47. Beder-el-gemal's opening words astonished and confounded the men who had hoped for his assistance. He gravely rebuked them for their want of respect and deference to the authority of their patriarch, and dismissed them with the charge that he and they should submit to him copies of those canons which regulated their discipline and order. Cyril and his opponents prepared respectively their canonical compendiums, and again waited upon the vizir. On meeting them, Beder-el-gemal thanked them for the synopsis each party had given him, and added; that, while he did not want these laws for himself, he certainly thought that those before him, who had now refreshed their memories with a study of their own canons, would do well not only to read them, but to conform to them. He concluded with the sarcastic rebuke: "If you profess the same religion, live harmoniously: render to your superior the obedience due to him: do not think so much as you do of getting rich, but be more liberal in your almsgiving to the poor, as Christ your master has charged you." The humiliation must have been felt to be all the greater, when it was remembered that it was a Mahomedan who was pointing out to Christians their duties.

During the lifetime of this same patriarch, Cyril, much was done towards spreading and confirming the Jacobite faith in Nubia and Ethiopia; bishops in the former country, and the Metropolitan in the latter, united to im-

prove the morals of the people and cement ecclesiastical authority.

The early years of Saladin's sultanate (A.D. 1171) were marked by acts towards the Christians of Egypt which his after conduct explains to have been due to political considerations rather than to theological differences. He found the chief posts at the court of Aded, the last Fata-mite caliph, occupied by Jews and Christians; and, just as he found it good policy to distribute among his rivals and dependants the vast treasures which the caliphs of that dynasty had accumulated, so now he removed from office men employed by them, but hateful to every conscientious Mussulman. He re-enforced the then almost obsolete statutes: Christians and Jews were to wear the girdle and dress which would distinguish them from Mahomedans; they were not to ride on horses or mules; they were not to hold public office—a condition which transformed many a Christian into an apostate from the faith, that he might retain the emoluments of his post. The churches were befouled with mud, the crosses erected over them were thrown down, the use of the church bells was forbidden, the solemn processions customary on Palm Sunday were stopped, and the prayers within the sacred walls were only to be recited in a low voice. But when Saladin felt his power assured, his natural hatred of such petty restrictions prompted the assumption of a more generous line of conduct. He removed these restrictions entirely or in part, the taxes were lightened where they were not altogether abolished; Christians were once more permitted to aspire to posts at court or in the public departments; and so rapidly did they make up for their temporary exclusion, that they were soon found occupying again their former lucrative and honourable offices. It must, however, be noted, that the majority of the Christians thus favoured were Jacobites. The old feeling always strong against the Melchites, that they were more or less in league with the opponents of Mahomed, was stronger than ever at a time when crusaders were striking death-blows at Damietta as well as at Ascalon, at Alexandria as well as at Acre. The Catholics of Egypt did not attempt to disguise their hope that the champions of the Cross would eventually turn their victorious arms to the adopted land of St. Mark: and the frequent and ignoble failures, such as the capture of the Holy Sepulchre by Saladin (A.D. 1187), and the re-conquest of Damietta by Kamel (A.D. 1221), only served to make the orthodox Alexandrians hope against hope, and suggest to the pope of Rome, and all whom he could influence, fresh schemes of conquest and fresh modes of successful inroad upon the Saracen possessions in Egypt.

But, however free the Jacobites were, comparatively speaking, from external and political agitation, the records of this period exhibit the worst features of superstitious irreverence and internal dissension distracting their ecclesiastical communion. The great confessional controversy of the time, and the miserable party spirit, jealousies, and abuses connected with the name of the patriarch David-Cyril cannot be passed over in silence, however painfully they may exhibit theological ignorance and clerical arrogance.

During the lifetime of the patriarch Mark III. (A.D. 1164), a man who, on his elevation,

seems to have abandoned the austerity of his previous monastic life for one of luxury, another Mark, surnamed ben-el-Konbar, and also a monk, preached earnestly and eloquently that men could not obtain remission of sins unless they confessed to their priests, and fulfilled the penitential discipline required by the canon. From the very earliest times the Eastern and Western Churches had agreed in recommending the practice of confession, and had gradually changed it from a voluntary into a compulsory act. But by degrees a habit, partly due to the infamous character of the priests, had grown up which practically dispensed with the obligatory nature of confession. Incense was burnt at the commencement of the celebration of the liturgy while the people were engaged in private confession; and the belief was gradually introduced into the Coptic Church that remission of sins was in some mysterious way connected with that burning. Gradually, says Neale, the rite was considered to convey sacramental absolution; and, by a natural deduction from false premisses, confession in a private house before a lighted censer was elevated to the same dignity; and the office of the priest was disused as superfluous. Penitential discipline, again, however stringent in theory, had become in practice reduced to nothing. The mere profession of regret for apostasy was now sufficient to procure re-admission to full communion. Patriarch-reformers and compilers of canons might sigh for the times when such men as Vazah lived and suffered at the bidding of penitential laws; but the day for enforcing them had passed. The Jacobite-apostate, if irritated and refused absolution, had but to threaten that he would turn Melchite, and one could be more accommodating than his spiritual pastors and masters. It is significant of the powerlessness, if not of the incompetency, of the clerical leaders of the times, that not only was the spiritual power of binding and loosing neglected and denied, but even so good and learned a man as the patriarch John V. (A.D. 1147) actually authorised the abuse of confession previously mentioned.

The fulminations of Mark ben-el-Konbar against such degeneracy, and his earnest efforts for the revival of discipline, were as unwelcome to both John and Mark, as they were welcome to those members of their communion who preferred earnestness to luxury and spiritual activity to ascetic solitude. John listened to insinuations against Mark ben-el-Konbar's private character, and excommunicated him; and the patriarch Mark summoned him to his presence to answer to the charges, not only that he persisted in propagating his views, but also, though excommunicated, gave penance and absolution to the multitudes who flocked to him. Whatever passed at the interview, whether Mark ben-el-Konbar promised to conform to the patriarch's wishes or not, in a very few months the reformer was actively at work again, and with such success that the bishops either synodically, or by letter, demanded his deposition and excommunication. Mark appealed to the civil powers, but nothing issuing from that appeal, patriarch and monk both appealed to Michael the Great, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch. Michael's answer was, in one respect, sensible: he replied that while one exaggerated the other depreciated

the importance of confession; but it was unfair to the personal character and belief of Mark ben-el-Konbar. Michael's mind had been poisoned against Mark by the insinuation that he held Massalian tenets, and he therefore condemned him. The rest of Mark's life was a sad one. He became a Melchite, then he returned to the Jacobites, then he became a Melchite again, and so on, seeking peace first in the one communion, then in the other, anxious to deepen the spiritual life of the Christians by the means which best commended themselves to his mind and belief, and clinging, in order to do so, to that communion in which he had been brought up, but which positively refused the help of so true a son. If he has been called the Egyptian Chillingworth, he deserves also to be called something of an Egyptian Savonarola.

The accession of Cyril to the dignity of patriarch (A.D. 1235) was preceded by twenty years of disputed elections, charges and counter-charges, fraud, bribery, and corruption, in which Cyril himself, then a monk, and known by the name of David ben Laklak, and his friends were chiefly conspicuous. When he finally attained the object of his ambition, it may be readily supposed that he verified the fears always entertained respecting him. He made his entry into Misra, accompanied by vast crowds: the gospels and crosses were carried before him; priests, deacons, and the leading laity, many on horseback, swelled the procession; musicians played their pipes, trumpets, and drums; torch-bearers lit up the darkness. It was evident that Cyril meant to be a great man, and the angry Mahomedans openly resented his pomp. No sooner did Cyril feel his position fairly secure than he began to shew his true colours. He had surprised and pleased both friends and foes by refusing to take any money for ordaining priests and deacons, but this assumption of virtue was soon cast aside. Almost all the episcopal sees were vacant, owing to the long interregnum. These Cyril proceeded to fill up, demanding and receiving sums in proportion to the value of the post. His proceedings were so outrageous, and the alienation of the people so much on the increase, that his brother bishops assembled in the church called Moallaqah, courageously rebuked him, and made him promise that he would cease his simoniacal practices, as soon as he had paid the usual tribute to the sultan. Cyril promised, and not only broke his promise at the first opportunity, but immediately proceeded to do what would prove to the bishops that he would not be called to task by them. He constituted all the monasteries of Egypt patriarchal; that is, he transferred jurisdiction over them to himself; this left to the bishops authority over the churches only in which were no monks, while it considerably increased his own revenues.

This was met by retaliation. Cyril was accused to the Mahomedans of having amassed a large fortune, and he had to pay largely for his liberty. This charge was renewed when Adel became sultan (A.D. 1237), but unsuccessfully, and Cyril himself declined to take any notice of propositions for reform submitted to him while in prison. In A.D. 1239 fourteen bishops met at Misra, and fairly told the patriarch that they would remain in com-

munion with him only on condition of his subscribing certain articles then and there agreed upon. The principal of these articles for the reformation of the Church were as follows:—No one was to be ordained bishop unless he were a learned man, and approved for the post by the united suffrages of bishops, clergy, monks, and laymen. No money was to be taken for ordination to any ecclesiastical rank; and ecclesiastical judges were warned against accepting presents under any pretext. Excommunication was to follow the breach of these statutes. The patriarch was requested, in conjunction with the bishops, to prepare a set of canons dealing principally with things lawful and unlawful, matrimonial and hereditary matters, and the right and due administration of the sacraments. The bishops were to meet once a year synodically, in the third week after Pentecost. The customs of the Coptic Church were not to be changed. Circumcision was to precede baptism unless necessary impediments were alleged. Men of illegitimate birth or of servile condition were not to be ordained, exception being made in the case of Ethiopian and Nubian captives. The practice of giving the nuptial blessing and of celebrating the marriage rite without the liturgy, and in private houses rather than in churches, was prohibited. Other statutes forbade the ordination by patriarch or bishops of any one outside their own dioceses; and the ordination of a bishop was made contingent on the assent of the people of the diocese and of the ordaining bishop; statutes evidently framed to prevent, as far as possible, such acts as Cyril's ordination of a metropolitan at Jerusalem, on the one hand; and, on the other, the command to ordain so frequently urged by Mahomedan secretaries and emirs. Bishops, fairly inducted to their sees, were to enjoy authority over their entire diocese without any deduction of city or authority; a statute intended to prevent the recurrence of such acts as those by which Cyril had constituted "patriarchal" churches. Other provisions had a similar tendency: the patriarch was not to assign to himself the offerings made in the churches on festival days or in accordance with local custom; the bishops might, if they pleased, assign them to him in lieu of the ordinary pension. Patriarchs were not to excommunicate laymen or clerics without legitimate and canonical cause; and they were never to do this in ex-metropolitan dioceses, unless under most exceptional circumstances. Various rules affecting monks and monastic habits, and defining liturgical "decency and order," conclude a document valuable for the light it throws upon the ecclesiastical manners and customs of the time. The patriarch and bishops signed these statutes, and prepared and signed the further collection of canons dealing specially with the points named in the statutes.

But so far as Cyril was concerned, his signature was worthless. Within a very short time he was again accused to the sultan of excessive cruelty and of simony; yet, strangely enough, though the patriarch's practice was everywhere known, no two bishops could be got to witness against him; a fact in itself sufficiently significant of the manner in which the majority had obtained their preferment. Again a meeting was called by bishops and laymen; again they urged Cyril

not to break the ecclesiastical laws; again they threatened to break off communion with him; and again they proposed articles of reformation. Cyril retorted that they should first settle their own differences. A personal friend endeavoured to procure what others had failed to do. At his suggestion the patriarch signed a paper submitted to him. He allotted to a faithful and trustworthy priest the distribution of the fruits of the churches he, Cyril, was accused of misappropriating; a fourth part was to go to the reparation of churches; a fourth to the necessary daily expenses, and two-fourths to the support of the poor. He further promised to ordain bishops for the two important sees of Misra and Khandeka, sees which he had kept vacant in order to enjoy their revenues, and to fill up other vacancies. He agreed to nominate two teachers who should expound the Scriptures and teach the laity their duties, one at Misra, the other at Cairo. He consented that the monasteries which he had reserved to himself should remain under their proper episcopal authority. Whether or not Cyril was in earnest, it is impossible to determine now. If he was, those whom he had offended did not give him an opportunity of proving his earnestness: they rejected his paper as deficient. In A.D. 1240, one of Cyril's own collectors and most intimate friends, disgusted with his patron's avarice and obstinacy, accused him to the emir. Cyril was again imprisoned. Nine bishops, who were consulted by the emir, were compelled to admit that the charges against their patriarch were only too just, and the amount of his extortion was variously computed at 15 to 17,000 pieces of gold. But they agreed to forgive and forget if Cyril would sign a paper similar to that which had been signed by his immediate predecessor, John VI. In substance the paper was similar to what Cyril had already signed. He was quite willing to sign again:—and to break his promise. The following year the emir had to listen to the renewal of the old charges, coupled with a request that Cyril might be deposed: and the sequel to this fresh appeal explains how it was that a man like Cyril could continue his notoriously uncanonical practices with very little fear of ultimate consequences. "Can you depose him?" asked the judge: "do your disciplinary laws permit it?" The plaintiffs were forced to confess that existing laws did not touch the case, and that they could not convene a council with sufficient authority to pass the requisite canons. To the end of his life Cyril continued as he had begun: and when he died, in A.D. 1243, he left behind him the reputation of one who for twenty years had sought to obtain the patriarchal dignity by every means of corruption within his reach; and who, when he had attained it, degraded it for seven years by conduct worse than that of the most worthless enemies of Christianity. However often convicted of simony, and however often he promised amendment under pain of anathema, he always plunged again into the same abyss of avarice and sacrilege: he thought of nothing else but accumulating money.

It is a relief to turn from these black pages in the history of the Coptic Church to a series of events which took place in connexion with the Jacobite communion in Ethiopia about

the years 1209 and 1210. Lalibela, the "lion," and Mascal-Gabrit, "the handmaid of the cross," were king and queen of that country, and the virtues and pious works of the former have secured him a place in the catalogue of Ethiopian saints. A mission came from them to the patriarch John VI. (A.D. 1189) desiring the ordination of a new metropolitan. After some delay, due apparently to the difficulty of making a suitable appointment, Kilus, bishop of Fua, was translated, and probably reconsecrated. The position of "Abuna" of Axum was, with respect to emoluments as well as to peace and security, the most enviable of the time; and Kilus was received with befitting pomp and warm welcome by king and people. But after four years Kilus was back again in Egypt, complaining of ill-treatment and of the usurpation of his authority by the queen's brother, whom he had raised to the episcopate. He asserted that his life had been attempted, that of the hundred followers who had fled with him all had perished from want except the two male servants and one female who were then with him. The story was so strange that John ordered him to remain at Misra, till he had sifted the matter thoroughly. A mission to Ethiopia brought back a very different account of Kilus' conduct. He was stated to have killed the treasurer of the metropolitan church on the supposition of his having committed theft; and to have fled to avoid the just vengeance of the victim's friends. The other statements put forward by Kilus were proved to be groundless, and the patriarch was urged to appoint another metropolitan. John deposed Kilus, and consecrated a monk named Isaac; and under this prelate the work of confirming and preaching the Jacobite faith progressed with the hearty assent of Lalibela and his subjects.

From the time of Cyril to the present day, the history of the Coptic Church may almost be said to be a blank page. Scholars have been unable to discover MSS. dealing with the period in the monasteries of Egypt, or have failed to transcribe them: and a consecutive narrative of events is hardly to be framed from the few allusions to be gleaned here and there from ecclesiastical and historical notices. A few facts and a few names are all that can be dealt with.

After about eight years from the death of Cyril the hitherto vacant patriarchate was filled up by the appointment of Athanasius III. (A.D. 1251). It is impossible now to determine whether this long voidance of the see was due to the unwillingness of the electors to appoint another spiritual head whose character and conduct might prove like that of his predecessor, or to the stirring political events connected with the second capture of Damietta by the crusaders (A.D. 1249), and the subsequent retreat, captivity, and liberation of St. Louis of France (A.D. 1250), or to a combination of the ecclesiastical and political agitations of the time. Athanasius, a good, just, and humble man, did his best to remedy the crimes and follies of Cyril; but violence and party spirit broke out again within a few days of his decease.

A story told by the Arabic annalist Makrizi, and which is probably to be placed about the year A.D. 1290, illustrates painfully the degraded moral condition of the believers of

the day. During the sultanate of El-Melki el-Ashraf, the emirs employed largely the services of Christians as their secretaries; and, as appears to have been almost invariably the result, the Christians shewed themselves overbearing to the Mussulmans, and assumed superiority in dress and demeanour. One day a dispute took place in the street between a Christian secretary and a Mussulman agent with reference to some money due from the latter to their common master. The secretary tied the agent's hands behind him, and bade him walk on. A crowd of Mahomedans rushed to the rescue, freed the agent, and, when driven away by the secretary's servants, flew to the castle and appealed to the sultan. The tumult was so great, and the secretary's conduct so indefensible, that a general sacking of the houses of Jews and Christians followed, churches were plundered, and people murdered. The sultan with difficulty checked these outrages; and, with the comment "I will not have a Christian diwan in my government," gave the secretaries their choice, Islamism or death. The emir assembled them, and told them the sultan's ultimatum: "He who prefers his (Christian) religion is to be put to death; but he who prefers El-Islam shall receive a robe of honour, and it will be well with him." One of the secretaries of state answered him: "O lord, which of us men high in office would choose death for religion? By God, a religion for which we should have to die and go, God hath not written on it His peace. Tell us—you, the sultan and yourself—the religion you wish us to choose—and to follow." The emir burst out laughing, and said: "What religion should we choose but El-Islam?" The notaries came in, and the secretaries were recorded Mussulmans; they received their robes of honour, and made their profession in the presence of the council. In a very short time these men, despised by their fellow-Christians, began in their turn to despise and take their revenge on the Mahomedans; and the state of things was pithily summed up by a correspondent of the emir: "These infidels have adopted El-Islam through the sword and by force; but no sooner have they become free than they have denied the faith. They have embraced El-Islam for mere love of gain and of rest. It is true that they are free, but they are not Mussulmans."

The patriarchate of John VIII. (A.D. 1300) was also agitated by a persecution mainly due to the arrogant behaviour of the Christians employed in civil offices. The vizir, El-Maghrib, came to Cairo while on a pilgrimage. When riding in the street he met a man on horseback, wearing a white turban and a gorgeous cloak, followed by a multitude of petitioners praying him to attend to their requests, a prayer which he answered by blows or by scornful silence. El-Maghrib, naturally indignant, was filled with fury when he discovered that the man was a Christian. He went to the palace. He demanded of the emirs how Christians had acquired power not only to make Mussulmans supplicate before them, but actually serve them; he protested with passionate tears against the indignities he had witnessed; he asked how his fellow-countrymen could ever expect to conquer their foes when they neglected altogether the ancient laws against the Christians; he insisted that the laws passed by

the great Omar, on the first capture of Egypt, should be re-enacted. The principal emirs sided with him. The two patriarchs, according to Makrizi, the chief judge of the Jews, the representatives of the church of Moallaqah and of the leading monastery, were summoned, and commanded to enforce upon their people these obsolete laws:—Christians were to wear turbans of blue and a girdle; they were forbidden to ride on horses; and disobedience to these injunctions was to be followed by excommunication: the Jews were to wear yellow turbans, refusal being followed by a heavy fine, if not by blood: no Christian or Jew was to hold an appointment under government. The news spread, and the Mahomedan population, noting the bent of their emirs, destroyed or closed churches; and it was not till James king of Aragon interfered in behalf of the Christians that the houses of God were again opened.

Apparently, the Christians either could not, or would not, learn wisdom. Fifty years (A.D. 1348) had hardly passed when a fresh and fiercer persecution broke out, originating in the same cause. The ostentation, luxury, arrogance, and even immorality, of so-called Christians employed in every department of court, official, and civil business had reached a pitch which the Mahomedans were determined not to tolerate any longer. The Church lands amounted to 50,000 acres, and the wealth of individuals was notorious. It was but a little spark which set the flame alight; but the conflagration which it originated left marks as disastrous as those which tracked the path of Mahomedan hatred on the first conquest of Egypt. One of the Christian secretaries, escorted by footmen before and by slaves behind, passed a famous mosque. He flaunted before the enraged fanatics the forbidden white turban, and caracolled his steed in defiance of the law which degraded him to a mule. His insolent and contemptuous bearing irritated the mob beyond endurance; they dashed upon him, and with difficulty were induced to spare his life. The tumult and the outcry was such that the emir promised immediate interference. The patriarch and his bishops, the chief ruler of the Jews and his elders, were again commanded to appear before the sultan, attended by his emirs and cadis. In the most formal and solemn manner the private secretary of the sultan read before Christian, Jew, and Mussulman the treaty which all should bind themselves to keep:—

The laws of Omar were to be enforced with the most absolute strictness, and fresh ones, calculated to prevent the recurrence of offences so scandalous to the followers of the Prophet, were introduced. It was decreed that Christians and Jews should be shut out of everything connected with the sultan's court and government and of the courts of the emirs, even if they professed Islamism; and that any who did profess it should never be allowed to return to their house and family unless they also became Mahomedans. Christians were not to be allowed to build monastery, church, or cell anywhere in Mussulman dominions, nor to repair existing edifices. They were to wear the distinctive turbans, and never think of entering the public baths without the prescribed token, made of brass, iron, or lead, hanging round the neck. If they met Mahomedans in the road, they were to make way for

them, and never refuse them food and shelter in church or monastery for three nights. They were forbidden to have or buy Mahomedan male and female servants; they were not allowed to teach the Koran to their own sons, while they were not to hinder them from becoming Mussulmans. They were not to assume Mahomedan names, cognomens, or agnomens, nor to use seals with Arabic characters, nor to allow their women to adopt Mahomedan customs. Burial of the dead was to be conducted without public procession, and their sepulchres were to be of low height. Their houses were not to be built so as to overtop others, and they were forbidden to follow the medical profession. Bells, or rather the wooden clappers in use in churches, were not to be struck loudly, and loud singing was equally prohibited.

The excited populace turned upon men thus handed over to their fury, and for a month life and property were at their mercy. Churches and houses were destroyed in spite of the interference of the emirs. Christians were publicly insulted, beaten, and killed. They did not dare to leave their hiding-places. The terror was so great that a number of Christians in the Sahid, or Upper Egypt, pulled down their churches and erected mosques, embraced Islamism, and studied the Koran. In one village more than 450 Christians are said to have become Mussulmans in one day. Their intermarriages with Mahomedan women perhaps rendered these apostasies more easy; and the hope that, when the storm had passed, they might again creep into public offices, was certainly more potent than attachment to the faith of Jesus Christ.

The patriarchate of Gabriel V. (c. A.D. 1411) is still remembered among the Copts for the emendation, and confirmation by patriarchal authority, of the ritual of the sacraments. His work contained the rules for the administration of the Offices, the prayers being designated by their opening words. In the volume were contained the order for the administration of baptism, for the absolution of penitents, for matrimony, for holy orders, for unction of the sick, the special ritual for the celebration of the liturgy, prayers to be used when conferring the monastic habit, &c.

Some thirty years later, the decrees of reunion between the Eastern and Western churches, passed at the council of Florence, induced the Coptic patriarch, John XI., to send an embassy to that city. He professed himself desirous, on behalf of the Jacobite Church, of a nominal union with Rome, and a decree to that effect appears to have been made, but no result came from it.

Similar wishes, followed eventually by similar results, recur in the history of the Portuguese interferences with the Coptic Church in Ethiopia and Abyssinia. David (A.D. 1503–1540), king of these territories, was himself personally favourable to the Roman faith, and letters from him to pope Clement VII. are extant. When the Abuna Mark became too infirm to manage the affairs of his church, David persuaded him to consecrate as his successor a Portuguese named Bermudez. Mark did so. Bermudez proceeded to Rome to obtain the pope's ratification, and to Lisbon to urge again the terms of an alliance between Abyssinia and Portugal against the Mahomedans which had

been proposed many years before. When Bermudez returned David was dead, war was raging everywhere, and the new king, Claudius, a Jacobite, resented the subjection of Ethiopia to Rome. Disputes between Claudius and Bermudez waxed so warm that the king at length wrote to the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria; a new Abuna, Joseph, was sent, and Bermudez retired to Goa, and eventually to Lisbon. The court of Rome made another effort to retain their hold on Ethiopia, and failed. A Jesuit was sent to the Jacobite patriarch, Gabriel VII. (c. A.D. 1560), who treated him courteously, but sent him away as empty as he came.

For about 60 years (c. A.D. 1560—A.D. 1625) correspondence and negotiations were more or less frequent between the Coptic patriarchs and the popes of Rome on the subject of re-admission to the Roman communion; but the results were invariably unsatisfactory. This alliance appears to have been especially hateful to the great *Cyril Lucar*, successively (Catholic) patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 1602) and of Constantinople (A.D. 1621). In a letter he addressed to M. Uytendogaert, minister at the Hague, and in answer to that minister's questions, he proceeds to give him information respecting "the heretics in the East;" and that information is so curious in itself that the paragraphs relative to the Copts are well worth extracting. The intense bitterness and (often) ignorance displayed in them, while it has made some critics question the genuineness of the letter, is perhaps to be explained by that similar ignorance more or less found in every partisan who does not care to know too much about his next-door neighbour's scheme.

"There are four sects," says Cyril, "with whom our church does not communicate, the Armenian, the Coptic, the Maronite, and the Jacobite, whose mode of worship is unsightly, and their ceremonies worse than brutish. In matters of faith, they are heretics; in habits and other circumstances of an ecclesiastical nature, you would say that they differed nothing from beasts. They are so sunk in darkness as scarcely to know if they believe, or what they believe; but each of them is obstinately attached to its own superstitions and errors. . . . The Copts follow the doctrine of Dioscurus and Eutyches, a filthy and barbarous race. They are called Copts, because they used to circumcise themselves; but this they do no longer: not, however, as they state it, because circumcision is vain and against the law (for our Lord Christ Himself was circumcised), but because they thereby gave other Christians, who do not practise circumcision, an occasion of laughing at them. I have abundant acquaintance with these pests in the city of Grand Cairo; for as this was formerly an archbishopric of the patriarchate of Alexandria, I have for the most part taken up my residence there, on account of the salubrity of the air, seldom visiting Alexandria. These Copts are so numerous there, that if the Greeks were counted against them, as Homer wrote of the Greeks and Trojans, the Copts would be ten times as many as the Greeks, and many a dozen would lack a cup-bearer. My predecessors in the patriarchate, and especially Meletius, my last predecessor, have made many efforts to bring them back to the way of truth, but without success.

"Pope Clement VIII. of Rome both did and bore many things to come to an arrangement with them; and you would laugh, sir, if you knew what arts the Copts used in that business, and how much the pope was imposed upon; although Baronius, the new historian, before he became acquainted with the real state of things, and perhaps with a view to flatter Clement, after the fashion of the court of Rome, was in a hurry to give him the credit of having accomplished by his newly-acquired industry the conversion of the Copts to the Church of Rome, and chose to give an account of it in his annals, which proved, not long after, to be entirely false. In fact, Paul, the present pope, for that very cause banished several Copts from Rome.

"They have a superior, who is called in their own language Jabuna, which means, my Lord. He came several times to visit me in Egypt; but every time he came, he came in silence and went in silence. One of his people spoke for him, and he signified his assent to, or dissent from, the speaker by the inclination or holding back of his head; but he never opened his mouth, because, as he says, it is not allowed. For my part, I am a talkative and chatty person, who think that I ought to speak with my own mouth and not with that of others. But the thing which more displeases me in that good lord is, that he never shewed me any part of his face except his eyes. His whole head, whether he raises it or inclines it, is covered with a cloth, so that he will never give you a glimpse of his face. I am unwilling to trouble a person of your sagacity any further about such absurdities."

In another letter, addressed to the archbishop of Spalatro in A.D. 1618, he alludes again to the so-called Copt embassy to Clement VIII., and calls it "an imposture," "a trick," "a farce;" and in a third letter to a M. de Wilhelm, when speaking of the troubles which had apparently lately come upon the Copts through the death of their patriarch, he has the heartlessness to write: "The poor wretches go on from bad to worse, and one can expect no other end but their total ruin, because they will not place themselves under our government; which, as my predecessors tried for many years with loss, and in vain, I have determined not to undertake." This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the character of one who has been called a martyr by some and a fiend by others; but humility and patience with the Copts were certainly not amongst his virtues.

Rome did not cease her efforts to bring Abyssinia into her communion. In A.D. 1558 the pope, at the instance of the great Ignatius Loyola, actually consecrated a patriarch and sent him with two bishops on a fresh mission; and followed it up in a few years (c. A.D. 1560) by those direct overtures to the Coptic patriarch at Alexandria, to which allusion has been made. When Melec Segued, the nephew of Claudius, became king (A.D. 1563), he permitted the patriarch, intruded by Rome, to live in peace; but it soon became evident that the mission was making no progress; and the lamentable belief, imitated from the Mahomedans, took possession of the Portuguese that the true faith was to be propagated by the sword. Eventually that faith and its propagators perished by the sword.

In A.D. 1604, and in the reign of Za Denghel,

Segued's nephew, a Jesuit, Pedro Paez, arrived at the Abyssinian court. His piety, learning, and eloquence were rewarded by the most unexpected results. The king and many of the courtiers abjured the Monophysite creed and embraced the Roman. But this arrayed against Za Denghel both those who hated this change of religious belief and those who fretted under his powerful yoke. The king appealed to the pope and to the king of Spain and Portugal for help; the Monophysite Abuna fulminated his excommunication against the king, absolved his people from their allegiance, and the rebels flew to arms. Za Denghel was slain; and eventually one Socinius became emperor. The hopes anticipated of him by the adherents of the old religion were soon disappointed. The preaching of Paez, and the public discomfiture in controversy of the Abuna Simon, were followed by an embassy to Rome, intimating the adhesion of Socinius to the Roman faith. Again the standard of revolt was raised, and again the Abuna excommunicated the king; but this time the royal troops reversed their previous defeat. The leader of the rebels and Simon were both left dead upon the field. Socinius became more and more angry with these religious dissentients; he issued proclamations forbidding practices common among them, such as the Jewish observance of the Saturday, which only served to exasperate them and foment further rebellion. A kinder and more conciliatory policy might have been successful, but he chose to crush where he might have led; and when the influence of Paez was removed by death, the king threw away restraint, and yielded himself to the wishes of Mendez the new patriarch. This man had been consecrated at Lisbon, and arrived at court A.D. 1626. The reconciliation of the emperor to Rome and his vow of allegiance to the pope, Urban VIII., was publicly performed, and with—to the Abyssinian—offensive acts of public humiliation. It was followed by proclamations commanding all, under pain of death, to become Roman Catholics. Circumcision and polygamy were abolished; existing churches, clergy, and converts were treated like heathen; re-consecration, re-ordination, re-baptism were insisted upon; the Roman calendar replaced the Ethiopic, and the Ethiopic liturgy was only allowed to retain its place after undergoing such alterations as Mendez considered necessary. It will be readily supposed that these and similar high-handed measures not only gave great offence, but irritated into open defiance all who could not or would not surrender their belief and customs. Socinius' lifetime was spent in checking or putting down rebellion after rebellion. On one dreadful day, when he stood surveying the carnage which the Portuguese beside him called a victory, his son Facilidas (or Basilides) spoke out the horror and distress which his soldiers felt. "This is not," he urged, "a success against Mahomedans or pagans, but against men of our own flesh and blood, fellow-subjects, fellow-Christians. By thus destroying ourselves we are putting a sword into the hands of our enemies. They will not want to slay us, they will leave the work of extermination to ourselves." Socinius, sick at heart, and conscious how miserable had been the failure of his test, "Be a Roman Catholic or die," a mere parody of the Mahomedan formula—issued an edict of toleration.

Men might hold, as they pleased, the old or new faith.

Facilidas became emperor in A.D. 1632. He took, if not cruel, yet fearful reprisals for the miseries he had been compelled to witness. An angry correspondence passed between the patriarch and the king. Mendez and the Jesuit Fathers were banished from the kingdom; an Abuna was asked for, and sent by, the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria; a treaty was made between the emperor and the Turks, which prevented the missionaries passing into the country; and Ethiopia celebrated the expulsion of the Jesuits by an epigram given in Ludolf:

"The sheep of Ethiopia have been delivered from the hyenas of the West by the doctrine of the Apostles St. Mark and St. Cyril, the pillars of the Alexandrian Church. Sing, rejoice, and be glad, ye sheep of Ethiopia."

The history of the church in Abyssinia is from that day the history of a church which has, to all intents and purposes, resisted foreign missions. Efforts have been made, men have been forthcoming, but the results have not been and are not very encouraging. They may be found recorded in the pages of Pichler, Marshall (Roman Catholic), Stern, and Flad.

At this distance of time, and in the absence of definite information, it is impossible to tell how far, if at all, the Coptic Church was affected by the Calvinism which attached itself to the teaching of the orthodox patriarch, *Cyril Lucar*. The councils of Constantinople (A.D. 1638), of Jassy (A.D. 1642), and of Bethlehem (A.D. 1672), dealt exhaustively with the innovating doctrines, and the Catholic patriarchs of Alexandria were directly concerned with them; but it is more than probable that the Coptic Church, as a whole, disregarded altogether movements emanating solely from religious bodies which they despised. One Coptic patriarch, Matthew IV. (A.D. 1660), wrote on the real presence in the Holy Eucharist, and his work was probably suggested by a personal interest in one of the most frequently discussed points of his day. It would, almost unquestionably, adopt such essentially Oriental language, as would preserve it from Roman scholasticism on the one hand, or Calvinistic terminology on the other; but any facts connected with Matthew's predecessors and successors are so scanty that it is unadvisable to deduce any but the most general deductions as to the condition and learning of these men and the Church over which they presided. Facts, such as the restoration of the office of the consecration of Christ by John XVI. (A.D. 1675), attempts at re-union with Rome, or the propagation of the Roman faith in Abyssinia, intimate that the old questions of restoration of discipline, purer doctrine, and missionary enterprise, were revived from time to time, and pushed with more or less vigour. It would be interesting to know how the Coptic patriarchs, John XVI. and Peter V. (A.D. 1718), viewed the attitude of the English Nonjurors whose wish to be admitted into the Oriental church was negatived by the orthodox patriarch *Samuel* (A.D. 1710); or what effect was produced upon them by the gift of Syriac testaments to *Samuel* by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. That a kindly feeling existed in the minds of the Copts towards the English is proved by the fact

that the patriarch Peter VI. furnished the traveller Bruce with letters of introduction to the Abuna of Abyssinia.

The French invasion of Egypt took place when Mark VIII. (c. A.D. 1791) was patriarch of the Copts. Bonaparte's magnificent language to the population of Egypt; "I am not come to destroy your religion; Frenchmen are true Mussulmans," must have been more satisfactory to the Copts than to the orthodox. The latter would only count such a proclamation as increasing instead of diminishing their enemies. It was, however, Bonaparte's policy to conciliate all; and questions of a theological and abstruse kind can hardly have been discussed when war, sorrow, and misery were at the gates. Orthodox and Copt alike must have been glad to see the last French soldier leave Egypt, and the three years' (A.D. 1798-1801) anxiety and suffering come to an end.

In 1856 the Copts made application to the Roman apostolic delegate resident in Egypt to choose a patriarch. He was willing to do so on the understanding that it might lead to a reconciliation between Alexandria and Rome. But the negotiations fell through, possibly, as has been affirmed, through the interference of the English Methodists, but more probably through the unwillingness of the Viceroy of Egypt to allow the nomination to such a post to pass out of his hands.

Under the present (A.D. 1876) patriarch, Demetrius, the Coptic Church retains its normal condition. It is still the most remarkable monument of Christian antiquity, as it is also "the only living representative of the most venerable nation of all antiquity" (Stanley).

Roman Catholic writers (e. g. Marshall-Waziers) affirm the number of Monophysite Copts to be diminishing, the priests to be very ignorant, and all inclining towards Islam. Whether this be strictly accurate or not, the field for work among the Copts is unquestionably open. The Roman Catholics are busy; and, according to their own accounts, successful. The Church of England has hardly yet taken that interest in the present of this "monumental" Church which has been shewn by English philologists and savants in the past of her history and literature.

II. The religious customs of the Copts are, in many respects, in keeping with the character of their Church. There is a mixture of Hebrew, Christian, and Muslim features, which mark "variations in doctrine" with as much significance as the social and political habits indicate the influence of Egyptian, Greek, and Arab masters. The number of genuine and Christian Copts is placed by Lane at about 150,000. To make up the larger number of 500,000 adopted by others, the Muslim, and (probably) the Greek and Roman Copts must be added. In this article the Jacobite Copts are alone considered. From their ranks, principally, the government draws secretaries, accountants, clerks, and even Bays; the Copt tradesmen of Cairo have attained a degree of skill and enterprise peculiar to themselves; the Copt villagers of the Feiyoom and Upper Egypt are more to be depended upon for agricultural purposes than their Muslim brothers; and among these classes are still to be witnessed those religious practices and ceremonies which are so suggestive of primitive times.

The "fence of religion" hedges in the Copt child from the day of its birth. That a child should die unbaptized is especially avoided; the parents believe that, if such should be the case, their little one will be blind in the next life. Hence the Coptic Church recommends that if new-born children are in danger they should be brought to the church and baptized at once; but, if strong and healthy, that male children should be brought to be baptized when forty days old, and females when eighty days old. Baptism is performed by triple immersion, by a priest, and in consecrated water; the child being kept fasting till after Communion; the exceptions to these rules mentioned by Denzinger serving to shew how reluctantly any infringement or omission of them is admitted, though the validity of the sacrament is rightly not made dependent upon absolute obedience to the letter. The baptismal formula used by the Copts, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Amen; I baptize thee in the name of the Son, Amen; I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Ghost, Amen," is peculiar to them and to the Armenians; but it is unjust to accuse it of Tritheism, or to condemn it as most dangerous. It has been sufficiently vindicated from such charges by Sollerius and Renaudot. The baptistery is placed on the left side of the church, and decorated with a picture of St. John baptizing the Lord Jesus Christ. The sign of the cross is made on the forehead of the child; three kinds of oils are used and poured into the baptismal water. The child is held by the god-parent, one for each sex, who in the name of the child renounces the devil and professes the Christian faith.

Confirmation and the Eucharist are both regarded by the Copts as necessary for infants, and are administered, in accordance with ancient usage, immediately after baptism, and by the priest. The Coptic ritual enjoins the anointing with the holy oil or chrism the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, ears, hands (within and without), heart, knees, soles of the feet, back, arms, and shoulders of the baptized person, and in the order given. Imposition of hands follows, with a blessing. Then the priest breathes upon the forehead in the form of the cross, and says, "Receive the Holy Ghost, and be a pure vessel, through Jesus Christ our Lord," &c.; an act which is peculiar to the Coptic Church, and which would seem to indicate that the unction requires, to ensure efficacy, the insufflation of the priest; or, in other words, that "the proper matter of confirmation in the Coptic Church is the breath of the priest; and its form the words, Receive the Holy Ghost." (Neale.) The administration of the Eucharist follows; and inasmuch as infants are unable to consume the particles of the consecrated bread, the priest dips his finger in the chalice and drops the consecrated wine into the mouth.

Other customs connected with these events in the child's life are the giving to the baptized milk and honey, or wine and honey, as symbolical of their entrance into the spiritual land "flowing with milk and honey"—a practice still existing in the Alexandrian as well as Ethiopian Church; the putting tapers into the hands as significant of the lamp ready for the Bridegroom's coming, a custom, however, said to be confined to the

Armenians; the divesting the child of its robes and ornaments before immersion, and the vesting it after confirmation with the white robe, girdle, and crown, acts symbolical of the putting off the old man and the putting on the new, the loins girded to run the Christian race, and the crown of victory promised to those who have fought the fight of faith.

Iteration of baptism is not permitted among the Copts; but for many years a curious custom existed, and possibly still exists, among the Ethiopians, while something of the kind still lingers among the Copts (*see below*). On the great feast of the Epiphany, all the Ethiopians, from the king to his lowest subject, went down naked into the lake and were baptized by the attendant priests. This was done yearly; but the explanation given by Harris (*see Denzinger, p. 46*) would rather leave the impression that the imperfectly educated natives considered their act not so much one of re-baptism as one which removed from them the burden of any sins committed during the previous twelve months.

Circumcision, in spite of the canons, still prevails among the Abyssinians and Copts, especially in Upper Egypt; but it is regarded by the latter as a pious custom, to which our Lord submitted, rather than as a distinctly religious rite. Among the Copts it is always performed in private, and at ages varying from two to twenty.

Copt boys are taught to read the Psalms, Gospels and Epistles, in Arabic, the "vulgar tongue," and the Gospels and Epistles in Coptic.* The latter language they do not now learn grammatically. Though one of the oldest languages in the world, the language which is written on the monumental walls of old Egypt, and which has furnished the key to the hieroglyphic inscriptions, Coptic is practically a "dead" language. Alexander's conquest of Egypt, the spread of the Greek language, the introduction of Christianity, the Mahommedan conquest and adoption of Muslim ways and words, all have had their share in bringing about this result. It appears to be a fact that though the prayers in public and private are said in Coptic, and the Scriptures read in that language, the priests and the people too often repeat their prayers as a mere matter of memory, and an explanation in Arabic is added to the reading of holy Scripture. Hence Coptic books are frequently written in Arabic characters. In the time of Cyril, the explanation was oral rather than from book.

The practice of private prayer is most strictly observed among the Copts. Like the Jews and Muslims they pray "seven times a day," and often repeat their prayers while walking, riding, or engaged in business. The more devout and literate Copts wash their hands, face, and feet, before prayer, and are said to repeat the whole book of Psalms during these "seven times;" the illiterate, while they observe the stated times, confine themselves to frequent repetitions of the Lord's Prayer and the Kyrie Eleison.

Allusion has been already made to the fasts ordered by the canons. These are most strictly observed. The churches are open daily during the season of Lent, which lasts now for fifty-five days; entire abstinence from animal food being enjoined. The fast of the Nativity, or the twenty-eight days before Christmas-day, a period corresponding to the Advent season of the Church of England; the fast of the Apostles, a period observed in commemoration of the fasting of the Apostles after the Ascension of Christ; and the fast of the Virgin, or the fifteen days before the festival of the Assumption (Aug. 9), are other seasons of penitential self-abasement observed with the same strict regard to the rules laid down. These fasts are followed by festivals, such as those of the Nativity, the Baptism of Christ (or Epiphany), the Annunciation, Palm Sunday, Easter-day (the great festival), the Ascension, and Whitsun-day; those of the Nativity, Epiphany, and Easter beginning on the eve preceding. On these occasions the Copts give alms, feast, and assume their most festive attire. Lane states that on the festival of the Baptism of Christ, the Copts, men and boys, still keep up the practice of plunging into water which has been previously blessed, whether it be the river near or the large tanks in the church; and at the same festival the priests wash or wet the feet of the congregation present in the church. The symbolism of this latter act recalls St. John xiii. 10; and the act itself is repeated on Maundy Thursday and on the festival of the Apostles. Bathing in the Jordan is also accounted a most meritorious act; but the pilgrimage there and to Jerusalem is performed by but comparatively few.

Penitential discipline is, theoretically, very strict in the Coptic Church; and confession to a priest, to be followed by penance and absolution, is required of all who propose receiving the Holy Eucharist. The efforts made by Mark ben-el-Konbar to stem the tide of lax and superstitious ideas which were current in his time (*see above*) brought forth their fruit in due season; and the result might be at the present time more real were not the practice clogged by curious customs. A baptized person is considered a minor, if he remain unmarried, until twenty-five. During minority, baptismal innocence is presumed, and confession is not required; hence even deacons who are under that age, communicate without confession. When a marriage takes place, minority terminates, and confession is required before the marriage is celebrated. The office generally used for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist is the liturgy of St. Basil of Caesarea in Cappadocia, though it has suffered severely at the hands of translators and compilers. The Coptic copies differ from each other and from the Greek liturgy of St. Basil given by Renaudot and Denzinger, while they have nothing whatever to do with the liturgy of St. Basil the Great, as used by the Greek Church. Two other liturgies—that of St. Gregory and that of St. Mark, also called the liturgy of St. Cyril, because he is said to have arranged and settled it—take their share, with that of St. Basil, in the religious services of the Coptic Church. The liturgy of St. Gregory is used on the feasts of the Saviour and on other solemn festivals; that of St. Mark during Lent and in the month Kihak (Nov.–Dec.). Fasting and

* On the Coptic versions of the Scriptures and Church lessons, see Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 319, &c.; and Malan, *The Holy Gospel and Versicles for every Sunday, &c., as used in the Coptic Church*.

continence are required of all who wish to receive the Eucharist; the laity receive in both kinds, the wafer being moistened from the mixed chalice; and the utmost care is taken to protect the elements from profanation. The transmutation of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ is distinctly taught and held.

The liturgy, whether read in the pages of Renaudot in the longer form of St. Basil, or in the pages of Malan in the shorter form of St. Mark, is exceedingly beautiful. The prayers are marked by dignity and earnestness, "by a high theological view of the doctrine of the Trinity, combined with an absence of any precision of statement in regard to mediation or redemption" (Stanley). Direct addresses to Christ are the rule, instead of, as in the Western liturgies, the exception; yet the Western Christian will but rarely find in Eastern liturgies that close "through Jesus Christ" so familiar and so dear to him. In some instances—notably, the *Confessio "Corpus Sanctum,"* or confession of faith before Communion, and the addition to the "Trisagion"—these prayers represent a position won after struggles or explanations which take their place in the history of the Coptic Church.

The celebrating priest is bound by the canons to prepare himself by special prayer and fasting for his holy office, and to vest himself in the proper vestments, which are seven, in accordance with the number of orders in the church, and pure white, as symbolically reproducing the "raiment white as light" of the transfigured Christ.

The altar is now usually of stone, and square in shape; in more perilous times when no church was safe from the sudden and fanatical intrusion of a Mahomedan mob, the altars were frequently of wood, and moveable. The preparation, vesting, adorning, &c., of the altar; the use of incense, now freed from the superstitious ignorance which had once attributed to it a divine power; the employment of crosses and lights, are matters defined by rules, and explained at length in the usual books.

Marriage among the Copts is invested with two distinctly religious ceremonies, the betrothal and the coronation, which may or may not take place at the same time. The betrothal often takes place at the house of the relation of one or other of the parties to be married; the presence of the priest and of witnesses being considered indispensable, except under very peculiar circumstances: the coronation ought to take place at the church. Care is taken to prevent or discountenance clandestine marriages and marriages within forbidden degrees; the Coptic canons including within those degrees spiritual and foster-relationships, such as those of god-parents and god-children, foster-parents and foster-brothers and sisters, as well as natural. The evening preceding Sunday is the usual time of celebrating a marriage; the previous days, varying from a week to one or two days, according as the contracting parties are wealthy or poor, being spent in festivities. These, however, are always omitted at the marriage of a widow, and some changes are made in the marriage-service.

At the betrothal two rings are blessed and exchanged: the bridegroom gives to his bride a little golden cross which she wears round her

neck at the coronation, and which has, in her case, the same significance of attachment to Christ as the girdle in the case of the man.

At the coronation, the vestments are blessed, a white veil is held over the kneeling pair, they are anointed with oil, crowns are placed upon the head of each, and the cross laid upon both their heads: prayers and blessings accompany and follow each act. According to the canon, the celebration of the Eucharist should follow, and the married parties should receive: hence the custom, arising from reverence for the sacrament, that the newly-married pair should abstain from each other that night. The crowns are now taken off before the marriage-party leaves the church: formerly this used to be done after eight days or more, and the act was accompanied by a short religious service.

In theory, divorce is only to be obtained in the case of adultery on the part of the wife, but in practice the Mahomedan influence has sanctioned separation on much less strong grounds; and laxity, in this respect, is even more offensive among the Ethiopians than among the Copts.

When a Christian Copt is sick and desires unction he is, if able, brought to the church; if unable, he is represented by a friend. Of "extreme unction," as the phrase is understood by Roman Catholics, the Copts know nothing: they have a service which is framed upon the precept of St. James v. 14. In strict conformity with the instruction there given, not one priest but more ("elders") take part in this, when possible. Seven is the "orthodox" number, and the office is so divided that there are seven lessons from the Apostolic Epistles, seven from the Gospels, seven Psalms, and seven prayers. The Copts understand sickness in a very wide sense; and speak of the sickness of the body, the sickness of the soul, *i. e.* sins, and the sickness of the spirit, *i. e.* afflictions. They anoint in every case, not only the bodily sick but penitents, and even the dead. The sick man, either personally or by his representative, is supported before the altar by three priests on each side: the senior priest lays the Gospels on his head, the priests their hands on his, and he is anointed on the forehead.

The funeral ceremonies of the Copts are, in externals, very like those of the Muslims, and are described by Lane. In this, as in so much else, the clergy are obliged to overlook what they cannot remove from the habits of a people so deeply ingrained with Mahomedan customs.

The religious orders existing in the Coptic Church consist of monks, readers, subdeacons, deacons (presided over by an archdeacon), priests (presided over by an archpriest), bishops, and patriarch. The last named consecrates the bishops and the metropolitan of the Abyssinians. Orders below the diaconate are not conferred by imposition of hands; but the bishop touches with each hand the temples of the person before him as if calling him to his office. Symbols of office are not usually given in the Coptic Church to those ordained to the minor orders; though this practice prevails among other bodies. The curious practice, mentioned before, of placing the hand of the defunct patriarch on the head of his successor could only take place when an election was uncontested. Those who take monastic orders

are subjected to the three rules of celibacy, poverty, and obedience; they are only admitted after specific probation, and their admission is celebrated by the recital over them of the Office of the dead in allusion to their death to the world. "It is this Oriental seclusion which, whether from character, or climate, or contagion, has to the Christian world been far more forcibly represented in the Oriental than in the Latin Church. The solitary and contemplative devotion of the Eastern monks, whether in Egypt or Greece, though broken by the manual labour necessary for their subsistence, has been very slightly modified either by literary or agricultural activity. Active life is, on the strict Eastern theory, an abuse of the system" (Stanley). The traveller and the student alike fail to discover among the homes and the pursuits of Coptic monks and nuns beneficence, learning, and preaching like to that of the Benedictines, Franciscans, and Dominicans, statecraft, energy, and policy, like to that of the Jesuits, or charitable orders, like the Sisters of Mercy, ready to carry light and peace into haunts darkened by sin and misery. Yet the monk's (Râhib) life is much sought after: from their ranks alone are the bishops and the patriarch elected. The monastery of St. Anthony, the spiritual father of the monastic brotherhood, near the Western Gulf of the Red Sea, has now (according to Lane^d) the exclusive right of submitting candidates to the highest dignity of the Coptic Church; and to the monastery of St. Macarius in Alexandria, consecrated in the days of the patriarch Benjamin, does every newly-ordained patriarch go immediately after his ordination. The deacon (Shemmâs) and the priest (Kasees) may, or may not, have been monks; if not a monk, a candidate must be, to obtain the orders of the diaconate, either unmarried, or one who has been only once married, and that to a virgin bride. He loses his office, should he marry when ordained. The priest is taken from the deacons, if he has reached the age of thirty-three, and is found to satisfy the conditions named as required of deacons. The bishops (Uskuf) are now chosen from the monks, though the canons only require that candidates should be widowers or unmarried men. The present stringent custom is an evidence of the preference for celibacy. The patriarch, when ordained, retains his monastic rules, and is compelled to add to them certain regulations calculated to preserve bodily purity. The mode of election of the patriarch is described at full length by Renaudot, and with greater regard to brevity by Wansleb, Neale, and Lane; but the subject is of sufficient interest to permit here a brief summary of the proceedings.

Previously to the separation between Jacobite and Melchite, the election was in accordance with the recognised precedent. The patriarch was chosen from the "presbyters," elected by bishops, clergy and people, and consecrated by episcopal hands. But after that separation, and especially after the Mahommedan conquest of Egypt, the mode of election became affected by various party and political considerations. The place of

election was originally Alexandria; but, from the time of Christodoulus (A.D. 1045), Cairo, and sometimes the monastery of St. Macarius, seem to have shared the honours with the greater city. Cairo has now, as the residence of the Coptic patriarch, superseded all other places. The electors were the bishops, clergy, and principal laity of Alexandria, and the clergy and chief laymen of Cairo, presided over by the senior bishop; there being no archbishop or metropolitan in the Egyptian section of the Coptic Church. The decease of the patriarch having been communicated by letters to all concerned, the assembled electors prepared for their responsible duty by prayer, fasting, and solemn celebrations of the Holy Communion; licence to elect having been obtained from the Mahommedan powers. The ecclesiastical court met in the church (now in the Moallaqah at Cairo): the bishops, each attended by a priest, seated themselves according to seniority of ordination; in the midst were the priests of Alexandria headed by their proto-pope, a position assigned to them in virtue of their ancient dignity. The senior bishop explained and defined the order of proceedings; and some name was proposed. If all were unanimous, the name was greeted with cries of "worthy." This was, unfortunately, not always the case. Unanimity was impossible when the Alexandrian or the Cairite insisted upon the election of their particular candidate, to the exclusion of all others; or when political influence—often secured by bribery—was obstinately used to obtain the post for an undeserving person, a mode of proceeding violently resisted by the electors; or when the bishops united against the rest in opposing an otherwise well-recommended brother. From these and similar causes elections were frequently deferred for months and even years.

Should the ordinary means for settling these differences fail, recourse was had to the ceremony of the Heikeliet, or casting lots. A hundred monks most fitted for the high dignity were, in the first place, selected; and these hundred were, by gradual elimination, reduced to three. At this stage, it sometimes happened that a sudden acclamation, as it were by inspiration, selected specially one of the three, and the votes of all were centred upon him; but if this did not occur, the casting of lots began. The Heikeliet took its name from the Heikel, the sanctuary or altar upon which the names were laid, in order that God Himself might decide the election, as He had vouchsafed to do in the election of St. Matthias. The names were written on slips of parchment, and a fourth was added inscribed with the name "Jesus Christ, the good shepherd." These were dropped into an urn, and the urn was placed under the altar. The liturgy was celebrated at that altar, sometimes once, sometimes for three days; prayer being offered night and day for divine help. A little child, of an age too tender to permit any collusion or knowledge of fraud, was then instructed to draw out one of the slips. If that slip bore the name of a candidate, that candidate was immediately elected; if however the slip bore the name of Jesus Christ, the electors considered this a proof that God chose no one of the three. The same process was then repeated with fresh names till a favourable result was attained. The 48th

^d Neale, *Hist. of Eastern Church*, Gener. Intro. i. 118, gives four convents as having the privilege of nominating.

and 71st patriarchs, John and Chail, owed their election to the Heikeliet; and it is significant of Divine interposition at a time of comparative peace to the Church from within, that the first-named stands out conspicuous (like his great namesake John the Almoner) for his benevolence to his famine-struck fellow-countrymen; and the latter, though illiterate to a degree, devoted himself to that reformation of the discipline of the monastic body from which he sprang, which eventually proved fatal to him.

The elected patriarch had, in the next place, to satisfy certain canonical requirements. He was to be himself free, free-born, and of a virgin-mother; of good bodily health; not less than fifty years of age; of good moral character, such as was described by St. Paul to St. Timothy and Titus; and not in episcopal orders, translation being inadmissible in the Coptic Church. He was not to owe his election to secular and political interference; he must have never married; and never, if a priest, have slaughtered an animal with his own hand, nor shed blood. He was bound to be familiar with the vernacular language of the country and people over whom he was called to preside: and, he must be decidedly orthodox (*k. e.* Jacobite) in his belief and doctrine. There was not much learning, as the word is understood by moderns, required of the patriarch. Provided he could recite the sacred offices in Coptic, his ignorance of letters was not deemed an impediment. In fact, the consecration of the 71st patriarch, Chail, was deferred till he was able to repeat by heart that Coptic liturgy which he could not read. But if learning was dispensed with, the proposed patriarch's orthodoxy was to be unquestionable; and the refusal of Gabriel, the 57th patriarch, to write out and subscribe a public document declaratory of his faith, though grounded upon the plausible answer that he adhered to the creed established at the council of Nicaea, was resented as evasive and subversive of a well-established custom.

In former times, the refusal of the elected patriarch to accept a dignity which was encompassed by political difficulties and ecclesiastical jealousies was so frequent, that the custom arose of binding the elected person with chains to prevent his escape; and these chains were not loosed till the performance of the ordination service. And as time passed on, and the necessity for this compulsion ceased, the practice nevertheless remained in force as a pious and symbolical custom.

The assent to the election having been given by the people, the patriarch elect was introduced to the assembled multitude by the senior bishop. The *Tazkiet* or *Psephisma*, *i.e.* the document of election, was prepared and subscribed by the bishops according to seniority of consecration, by the clerical representatives of Alexandria, by the archimandrite of the monastery of St. Macarius, and by the laity of Alexandria and Cairo. There appears to be no mention of subscription on the part of the clergy of Cairo.

The patriarch-designate was then taken to Cairo, if the election was not held there, that his election might be confirmed, and the necessary permission for his ordination be obtained from the civil power.

The ordination was to take place on a Sunday,

and the Sunday was fixed after the return of the procession from the palace of the caliph. In times of peace, this procession was made the occasion of great rejoicing and pomp. The sacred books, crosses, censers, and tapers were brought out; the singers sang the Psalms as they marched through the streets; deacons, priests, and bishops preceded the patriarch-elect, who rode upon an ass in imitation of the "meek and lowly king," and in order not to offend that Mahomedan law which forbade Christians to ride upon horses; the laity followed. Sometimes, in true Oriental fashion, the sultan presented his visitor with a robe of honour, and sent him back to the church with a body-guard of soldiers. If the new patriarch were a komos, or hegumen, *i.e.* of the rank of an archpresbyter, there was no delay in his consecration; if he were not in orders, but a monk, as in the case of Chail the 71st patriarch, he was ordained deacon one day, priest the second, and komos the third. The prayers given in the pontifical (*see* the service in Renaudot) are pregnant with devotion and dignity, and the ceremonies are of a kind suitable to the ancient Oriental Church.

The patriarch's abode was called "The Cell," and was near to the principal church. The name recalled to him his monastic life, the duties, and the high aims proposed to him in the prayer of Ordination: "*Sit tibi, Deus, Pontifex fidelis super domum tuam quae est ecclesia, ut serviat tibi inculpat omnibus diebus vitae suae, in pontificali dignitate, nocte ac die incessanter per sacrificia sancta et orationes in corde puro et anima splendida; per jejunia et actiones pias, per caritatem et humilitatem, per fidem absque hypocrisi, per prophetias et elevationes spiritus: et offerat tibi sacrificium purum et sanctum diebus omnibus,*" &c.—duties and aims best attained, so far as externals were concerned, by the preservation of the simple rule of life learnt at the monastery of St. Macarius.

The patriarch's duties were not, however, all spiritual, or of a kind to be performed by himself alone. Hence he had usually in attendance certain Syncelli or Katibi, confidential secretaries, who helped him to write Paschal letters, and to settle questions of canonical law and of ecclesiastical discipline; and who conducted his correspondence with the court or on points of business. These men were too often the cause of much of the misery and bitterness which marked the patriarch's relations with his own clergy, as well as with the Mahomedans.

The authority of the patriarch was, in ancient times, most extensive. It included, at one time, both Nubia and Ethiopia; and the patriarch still appoints the Ethiopian metropolitan of Axum. That authority has, indeed, become in some quarters little more than a shadow, and the geographical and local limits given in Renaudot and Neale are, of themselves, suggestive of great loss of power and territory; but the man in whom alone is vested the approval and consecration of the bishops, whose jurisdiction over the monasteries is unquestioned, and whose property is "very considerable" (*see* Lane), does and must always exercise over the clergy and laity of his communion that authority which is so readily conceded to a good man, and felt to be so galling when in the hands of a bad or avaricious one.

The churches are mostly situated in the "Days" or monasteries, fortress-like buildings, which often contain a small town within their walls. Internally they are usually divided into various compartments by wooden screens. In the most western is the well or tank for water, blessed at the Feast of the Epiphany. The other compartments are for women and men; and that within the screen (the Iconostasis of the Greek Church) is for the clergy when celebrating the liturgy. This compartment, called the "Heikel," occupies the central and chief portion of the east end of the church. The screen is usually of close wood-work, with a door, before which is suspended a curtain, embroidered with a cross. The Copt who enters the church takes off his shoes, walks up to the curtain, kisses the hem, and prostrates himself before the sanctuary. Standing during the service is usual; hence all are supplied with crutches of a height to enable the worshippers to lean upon them. There are no organs, but musical accompaniments are made by cymbals, triangles, and small brass bells struck with a little rod. There are no images permitted, but paintings adorn the walls on every side: the principal of which is one of Christ blessing His Church.

It is a painting suggestive of the thought which should linger last and longest in every Christian heart when the history and traditions of the Coptic Church have been studied. The very barbarism and degradation, from an artistic point of view, of the painting, is no unjust representation of the barbarism and degradation of the Church. But as the artist of Europe would not give up the one, so the Christian of Europe must not surrender what reminds him in every feature of the ancient customs of the East, and of the primitive age of Christianity, long after they have died out elsewhere. The denial of the title of "orthodox," not only to all the Churches of the West but also of the East, except to Monophysite bodies, may excite a smile, or raise feelings of scorn; yet it must not be forgotten that such an assumption was originally due not to arrogance but to the protest of a national Church against the innovations of Constantinople, not to presumption but to fidelity to the belief and customs of their forefathers.

The literature connected with this subject is to be found in the following works, the majority of which contain cross-references to other books interesting to the student. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*; Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, 'Alexandria,' vol. ii., and 'General Introduction' i. 111-119; Stanley, *Eastern Church*, lecture i.; Malan, *Original Documents of the Coptic Church*; Pichler, *Geschichte d. Kirchl. Trennung zwischen d. Orient u. Occident*, ii. 498-532; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, ii. 273, &c. (5th ed. edited by E. S. Poole); Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium collectio*; Denzinger (H. J. D.), *Ritus Orientalium*; Marshall (T. W. M.), *Les Missions Chrétiennes* (ed. L. de Waziers; Paris, 1865); Niedner (C. W.), *Lehrbuch d. Christl. Kirchengeschichte*, p. 825. Compare also for special historical and philological points, Revillout's articles on the Coptic account of the council of Nicaea, in *Journal Asiatique* for 1873, &c., and Abel's *Koptische Untersuchungen*, 1876.

[J. M. F.]

CORACION, chief of the Millenarians of Arsinoe, in Egypt, about the middle of the 3rd century. Dionysius, patriarch of Alexandria, held a conference with them which lasted for three days from morning till night, in which the Chiliast work of bishop Nepos was carefully examined; the result being that Coracion declared himself convinced, and came over with his party. (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. cap. 24.) [W. M. S.]

CORBANUS. [CERBAN.]

CORBICUS. [MANES.]

CORBINIANUS, ST., the first bishop of Freysingen, in Bavaria, was the son of Waldenikus and Corbiniana, and was born at Chartres, near Paris, in the 7th century, Clotharius III. being king of the Franks, and Gregory II. pope of Rome. He lived at first in solitude, then had disciples, and founded a religious community, which he quitted to go to Rome under the pontificate of Gregory II. That pope forced him from the retreat which he had chosen, made him a bishop against his will, and sent him to convert Bavaria. Corbinianus took up his abode at Freysingen, but having brought upon himself the hatred of Duke Grimoald by his boldness in reproaching the prince for his vices, especially his incestuous marriage with Biltrude, he was forced to fly to the Tyrol, whence he returned, after the death of Grimoald, in 726. Corbinianus travelled through a large portion of Germany, preaching the gospel, and built a church at Freysingen. He died in the year 730, on the 8th of September, on which day he is commemorated. He was succeeded by his brother Erimbert. [CYRINUS (2).]

(Le P. Meikhelbeck, *Histoire de Freisingen*, Augsburg, 1724, 2 vols. in fol.; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*; AA. SS. *Boll.* September, iii. pp. 261-296; Le Cointe, *Annal. Eccles. Franc.* tom. iv. pp. 54, 385, 565, 667, 685, 722, 723, 777, &c.) [D. R. J.]

CORBMAC [CORMAC] is a common name in Irish hagiologies, and chiefly prevails from the 8th to the 10th century. In a long list of saints of the name Cormac, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 360, c. 1) gives the names and dates of 48, and the days of dedication of 12; the dates range from A.D. 496 to 1170, but there is none between A.D. 496 and 741.

(1) Priest in Achadh-finnich, May 11. He and Critan or Criotan are on this day venerated at Achadh-finnich or Achadh-finnagh, on the banks of the river Dodder, co. Dublin (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 125). Colgan (*Acta SS.* 354 n. ¹⁹) says he is perhaps Cormac, son of Diarmaid, who ruled for a long time over South Leinster, and abdicated in his old age, becoming a monk under St. Comgall (May 10) of Bangor, but it is scarcely likely that the old king would become a priest, and Colgan says in the *Life of St. Fintan* (*ibid.* 352, c. 18) that he died in sanctity, and thus probably was merely a laymonk. He gives, however, in his lists of Corbmacs, two of this name as belonging to May 11, namely, "St. Cormac, presbyter de Achadh-finnigh juxta fluvium Dothra, in Lagenia 11 Maii," who, according to the *Calendar of Cashel*, lies in Iniskeel, near the mouth of Gweebarra Bay, co. Donegal; and again, "S. Cormac Abbas cog-

nomento Cruimther," venerated on the same day; but both probably refer to the same person. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 360, col. 1; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. iii. 288.)

CORBMAC (2) Of Armagh, B. Feb. 17. There is much confusion caused by two Corbmacs being commemorated on Feb. 17, the one living in the 5th century, and the other in the 8th. The histories of the two are usually, but erroneously, mixed up together in the account of a Corbmac who is represented as bishop of Athtruim (Trim) and afterwards as of Armagh. St. Corbmac of Armagh was born near Mount Usneach, and baptized by St. Patrick. His father is said to have been Enna, Ennius, or Enda, youngest son of Niall the Great, and brother of Laeghaire, who resisted St. Patrick's preaching; but Lanigan doubts this paternity, as Corbmac is never called "son of Enna," though often "of Chrioch-in-Ernaidhe," from the district of Ernaidhe, to which probably he belonged. But whatever amount of truth there may be in the reputed paternity and the large endowments given by Enna, there seems less doubt or difficulty in accepting his succeeding St. Iarlath at Armagh, A.D. 482: he is called coarb, or successor of St. Patrick at Armagh, and continued there till his death, A.D. 497. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 358-361; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 160 n. 1, 161; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 8; Ussher, *Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 437, and *Index Chron.* A.D. 497.)

(3) Of Ath-truim (Trim), Feb. 17. As said regarding the last, there is great confusion in the lives of the bishops Corbmac, of Armagh and Trim, as they are often considered as one person, though in reality they lived at distant dates. Colgan gives first a memoir of the imaginary bishop of Ath-truim and Armagh, and then of the bishop of Ath-truim, calling the latter Corbmac Jun., but this Corbmac is in reality the only one of this name, bishop of Ath-truim (now Trim, the county town of Meath). This St. Corbmac is said, like the preceding, to have been descended from Niall of the Nine Hostages, but by his son Conall. His mother was Fuinecta or Fuineacht, daughter of Moelfitrig, as said by St. Aengus in his treatise on the mothers of the Irish saints, and his brothers were Boitallach or Baethallach, abbat or bishop of Ath-truim (Oct. 5), Ossan bishop of Rathossan (Feb. 17), and Rumondi, perhaps the Rumoldus (July 1) who was bishop of Dublin. His father was Colman Ua-Suibhne, descended from Suibhne king of Meath, who died A.D. 596. He died A.D. 742, and was buried at Trim (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 361-2; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 8, ii. c. 19; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 51).

(4) Ua Liathain, abbat of Dermagh (now Durrow), June 21. According to the pedigrees in the *Book of Lecan*, he was son of Dima, son of Conan, son of Cudumaig, of the race of Oilíoll Flannbeg, who was descended from Oilíoll Olum. He bore the clan name of Ua Liathain, as being descended from Eochaidh Liathain or Liathanach, who was sixth in descent from Oilíoll Olum, and has given the name Olehan or Olethan to a district and deanery in the diocese of Cloyne and county of Cork. He is called abbat of Durrow, and probably on this account has the title of "successor of Columcille," but whether he was a disciple of St. Columba, or only a friend

and contemporary, is uncertain. His best known designation is "Corbmac the Navigator," as he thrice sailed into the northern ocean in search of some desert island where he might devote himself to an eremitic life, and thrice failed through some inadvertence, as it was supposed, or breach of monastic rule. (An account of his voyages is given by St. Adamnan, *Vit. St. Col.* i. c. 6, ii. c. 42, and by O'Donell, *Vit. St. Col.* ii. cc. 61-64.) It is probable that after failing in his search for the "desertum in eremo," he settled down in his own country and founded his monastery somewhere possibly in Mayo, near the Moy: at any rate he is named as one of the four founders of monasteries who came to St. Columba at Hinba, when St. Brendan saw the ball of fire above St. Columba's head (Adamnan, *Vit. St. Col.* iii. c. 17). There are two ancient Irish poems upon him ascribed to St. Columba: they are at least of an ancient date, and mentioned among St. Columba's writings. They are preserved in one of O'Clery's MSS. at Brussels, and are given in full by Dr. Reeves. O'Donell (*Vit. St. Col.* ii. c. 64) mentions his death, but gives no clue to the year, which remains to this day unknown (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 166, 264 sq.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaurm.* 374 n. 34, 472 nn. 15-16, 489 n. 37 et al.; Grub, *Ecol. Hist. Scot.* i. 55-6; Ussher, *Ant.* c. 17 (Works vi. 528-9), and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 580; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 12; Bp. Forbes, *Kel. Scot. Saints*, 315-6). There is another "Corbmac Ua Liathain, bishop, abbat, and anchorite," whose obit is given by the *Four Mast.* in A.D. 865, but nothing else is known of him.

CORBMAC (5) Mar. 26; Dec. 14. At the former date the *Mart. Doneg.* has "Corbmac," and at the latter "Cruimther Corbmac, of Telach Indenn." His true dedication seems to be Dec. 14; but Colgan, finding a Corbmac otherwise unaccounted for at March 26, has attached a memoir of this saint to it. He has taken it from an ancient Irish MS. (Codice Leccanensi), with some omissions and rearrangements. This Corbmac flourished in Munster, and was son of Eugenius, son of Murchad, son of Muredach, descended from Oilíoll Olum. His brothers were Becan (May 26), Culan (Mar. 13), Eminus, Evinus, or Eimhin (Dec. 22), Diarmaid (Jan. 15 or Oct. 12), and Baithen (Mar. 23). He was inferior to none of his brothers in self-discipline and contempt of the world, removing to the north of Ireland, away from all friends and acquaintances, except his brother Baithen, who alone followed and lived with him. He went first to the nearer, and then to the more remote parts of Connaught to meet the vicissitudes of fortune from the opposition of bad princes or the kindness of the good. His chief foundations at this time were one on Inishmaine in Lough Mask, co. Mayo, one at the mouth of the river Moy, and another attempted in the barony of Carra, near Raymunterdoney. From Connaught he turned eastward into Meath, and then returned to the Moy, where he appears to have remained, but was sadly tried to the end of his days by the jealousy of the neighbouring clerics. He must have lived about the middle of the 6th century, but the chronology in Colgan's memoir is far from being easily reconciled. There is a curious Life of St. Corbmac in the *Book of Lecan*, fol. 63. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 751-6; Petrie,

Round Towers, 180; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 215; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 89, 336-7; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 3 ser. i. 136; Hardiman's O'Flaherty, *Iar-Connaught*, 185.) [J. G.]

CORCAN (**CURCNEUS**, **CORCUNUTAN**). There are three named Corcan in the calendars, two being given at Jan. 7, and one at Sept. 30. Colgan suggests that one of the Corcans of Jan. 7 may be identified with the disciple of St. Patrick, called Curcneus, who was left with three companions at Kilfiacle ("the church of the tooth") in Muscraide Breoghain (now Kilfeakle parish, in the barony of Clanwilliam, co. Tipperary). He would also identify him with "Corcunutan (Nov. 3), of Doire-Eidhneach, i.e. of Doire-na-flann, in Eoghanacht Chaisil" (now Derryniflyn or Derrynavlan, near Killenaule, co. Tipperary). But these suggestions and identifications must be received with great caution, and hesitancy (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 156, c. 32, 186 n. ⁵⁸⁻⁵⁹; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 404 n. ²; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 18; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 99.) [J. G.]

CORCARIA, CORCAIR. [CURCACH.]

CORCODEMUS, **ST.**, deacon, of Auxerre; called also Corcodomus, Curcodemus, Curcodomus, Corcodonus, Corcodonius, Corcodinus, Cocordanus, Corobomus. He was ordained deacon (Archisubdiaconus et Levita) by Pope Sixtus, and sent by him, in the 3rd century, with St. Peregrinus when that bishop went on his mission into France. Corcodemus preached the gospel, and died after the martyrdom of St. Peregrinus. His relics were translated to the basilica of St. Amator, and he is commemorated on the 4th May. (*AA. SS. Boll.* May, i. 452.) [D. R. J.]

CORCUNUTAN. [CORCAN.]

CORDIUS, in the Latin version **CONCORDIUS**, a presbyter who buries the body of the martyr Sabinius in the same tomb with **CHRYSE**. [G. S.]

CORENTINUS, **ST.**, born in Brittany, is said to have been consecrated bishop for Cornwall by St. Martin of Tours (San Martin occurs in the Domesday account of Cornwall, and St. Martin was revered in the Celtic churches, e.g., at Canterbury and at Whithern in Galloway), who died at the end of the 4th century. Corentinus therefore would be, perhaps, the first of the missionaries sent to Cornwall. Melorus, the son of a Cornish king, is said to have been educated "in Coenobio S. Corentini." The parish named after him is now called Cury, but Corantin in the old documents, and is north of Mullion, in Mount's Bay. The parish feast is now on the nearest Sunday to All Souls' Day, Nov. 2; but the saint's feast day is on May 1, in the *Additions to Bede's Martyrology* and in the Exeter Martyrology; other days mentioned are Sept. 5 and Dec. 12. He is invoked in the Breton liturgy of the tenth century, and is also called bishop of Quimper, in Brittany (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. 82, 87). The fact is that the Celtic churches were clustered round certain centres of missionary enterprise, that the fixed dioceses are of later origin, and that the Celtic saints seldom confined their sphere of activity to one tribe. The intercommunion between the

various branches of the Cymric race in South Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany, is clear from many instances. [C. W. B.]

See further under **CHORENTINUS**.

CORINEUS, **CORINIUS**, **CORINNIVS**, supposed bishop of Anglesey. (Stubbs, *Registr.* 157.) [CYBI.] [C. H.]

CORIPPUS, FLAVIUS CRESCONIVS

A Latin poet who flourished in the 6th century; identical, if the evidence of a 10th century MS. in the Vallicellian Library at Rome may be trusted, with Cresconius an African bishop, the author of a *Concordia Canonum*, or collection of the laws of the church, to which is appended a summary of the same, entitled *Canonum Breviarium*. For 240 years the only known work of Corippus was his *Panegyric* in honour of the younger Justin, an hexameter poem in four books, prefaced by two shorter poems, the one a fragment in praise of the same emperor, the other an epistle dedicatory addressed to Anastasius his treasurer and chamberlain. This work was published at Antwerp in 1581 by Michael Ruiz, a Spaniard, from a MS. more than 700 years old, the genuineness of which however rests upon his bare statement, as he gives no account of it, nor is it known how it came into his possession, or what became of it.

Corippus speaks in the preface to his *Panegyric* of a work he had previously composed upon a war in Africa:—

"Quid Libycas gentes, quid Syrtica proelia dicam
Jam libris completa meis?"

but although there was not wanting testimony to the existence of such a work, Cuspinianus having quoted in his *History of the Caesars* (p. 176, ed. Basil. 1562) from a poem in eight books entitled *Johannis*, by Flavius Cresconius Corippus, which he professed to have seen in the royal library at Buda (destroyed by Soliman II. in 1527); it was not till the year 1814 that the lost poem of Corippus was discovered by Cardinal Mazzuchelli in the library of the Marquis Trivulzi at Milan.

The subject of the *Johannis* was found to be a war carried on against the Moors and Vandals in Africa in the reign of Justinian, about A.D. 550, by a certain Johannes, the hero of the lay, who is styled 'Magister Militiae.' The campaign in question, which is noticed by Procopius and Paulus Diaconus, has been erroneously confounded with another, mentioned by Cedrenus (*Histor. Compend.* 443 D.), which took place in A.D. 697, under the emperor Leontius; but the poet's address to Justinian (*Johann.* i. 15) fixes both the subject of the *Johannis* and his own date to the previous century.

With regard to the hero of the *Johannis* we know nothing but what we are told by Procopius and by the poet himself. He was the brother of Pappus (i. 400), and served along with him in Africa on two previous occasions, under Belisarius, A.D. 533 (Procop. *B.* V. ii. 3), and four years later under Germanus (*ibid.* ii. 17). His father's name was Evantus (*Johann.* vii. 576), his wife was the daughter of a king (i. 202), he had a son called Petrus (i. 197). He had been employed in the East against the Persians and the Parthians (i. 58), and was recalled by Jus-

tinian to head the third expedition of his reign against the rebellious Moors in Africa. After defeating their leader Antálas in one battle, he seems to have suffered a reverse in the district of Byzacium, but finally crushed the rebels near Carthage, and drove them beyond the Roman borders (Procop. *B. V.* ii. 38; *B. G.* iv. 17; Paul. Diac. *Gest. Lang.* i. 85). Subsequently we find him sending a fleet from Africa to the defence of Sardinia against Totila and the Goths (Procop. *B. G.* iv. 24).

The poet seems to have taken Lucan and Claudian as his chief models in the *Johannis*, though his obligations to the *Aeneid* are at times considerable. His language is singularly pure for the 6th century, and his style, though vitiated by the declamation common to all writers of the Byzantine period, by no means wanting in spirit. The text of the poem is in a most unsatisfactory state, and the last of the eight books mentioned by Cuspinianus, as well as the closing lines of the seventh, have yet to be discovered. Corippus dedicates his *Johannis* in a short elegiac poem to the nobles (*proceres*) of Carthage.

With reference to the *Panegyric*, the work of the poet's declining years (*Praef.* 37), Baillet's censure that he was "grand flatteur et petit poète," is not altogether unjust, especially when the character of the younger Justin is taken into account; but when the critic proceeds to condemn "ses méchants vers, sa dureté, son obscurité, sa prosodie vicieuse et sa mauvaise Latinité," it becomes evident that he had not read his author. Barth, on the contrary, with more truth, designates his verses as "ultima eloquentiae Romanae conatus." Considerable light is thrown by Corippus upon a period of history for which the authorities are singularly imperfect and obscure, and the manners of the Byzantine court are illustrated by him with considerable vigour; witness the striking account of Justin's elevation (lib. i.), and of the embassy of the Avars (lib. iii.), which Gibbon has transferred to his pages (*Decl. and Fall*, ch. 45) "in simple and concise prose."

In the Editio Princeps of Ruiz Corippus is distinguished by the epithets 'Africanus' and 'Grammaticus.' His African extraction is clearly indicated by his use of African words (e.g. *Gurzil* = Jupiter, *Mastimon* = Pluto). The latter designation is no doubt a complimentary epithet, the equivalent of 'literatus' (Sueton. *de Grammat.* c. 4). There is no certain evidence to show that the poet and the bishop Cresconius are identical; neither, on the other hand, is there anything to set against the inscription of the Vallicellian MS. of the Canons above referred to, which is as follows:—"Concordia Canonum a Cresconio Africano Episcopo digesta sub capitulis trecentis: Iste nimirum Cresconius bella et victorias quas Johannes Des, Patricius apud Africam de Saracenis gessit hexametris versibus descripsit," &c. (Mabillon, *Itin. Ital.* p. 69.) The Cresconian collection of canons is prefaced by an epistle to a certain bishop Liberius, in which mention is made of the *Breviarium* of Ferrandus, who was the disciple of Fulgentius Ruspensis, and who wrote his life after his death, A.D. 534. Thus at any rate an identity of date is established. The author of the poems is manifestly animated by a Christian spirit; his phraseology seems occasionally to be suggested by the lan-

guage of Scripture, and his orthodoxy is proved by his quotation of the Creed as determined by the Councils of Nice and Constantinople (*De laud. Just.* iv. 290). The canons are distributed under 300 titles, and arranged, not chronologically, according to the date of the several councils, but systematically according to the nature of the subjects. It is the earliest collection in which the decretals of the popes are reckoned among the laws of the church, those of all popes being included, from Siricius to Gelasius.

There have been five editions of the *Panegyric* since the Editio Princeps of Ruiz, which was published at Antwerp in 1581: that of Foggini, 4to, Rome, 1777, being the most complete. The *Johannis* was first published at Milan, 4to, 1820, with the preface and notes of Mazzuchelli. Both works are contained in the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, published at Bonn, 1836. The *Concordia Canonum* and *Canonum Breviarium* were first edited by Pithou at Paris in 1588, from a MS. belonging to the church of Troyes. They are to be found in vol. lxxviii. of Migne's *Patrologia*. [E. M. Y.]

CORMAN. Boece is the only authority for giving the name of Corman to the austere cleric who about A.D. 635 endeavoured, before St. Aidan, to convert the Northumbrians. Burton calls him Paulinus. Dempster has the commemoration of bishop Corman, apostle of Anglia, on Mar. 12, and Camerarius on Mar. 20. On the strength of the Scotch authorities Colgan numbers him among the disciples of St. Columba. (Bellenden's *Boece*, b. ix. c. 20, vol. ii. 105; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 489 nn. ^{30, 38}; J. H. Burton, *Hist. Scot.* i. 295-6; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 316.) [J. G.]

CORNELIA, Christian at Rome (Cyp. *Ep.* 20, 21). Pamelius conjecturally altered Collecta into Cornelia in *Ep.* 21. (See MACARIUS.) [G. S.]

CORNELIUS (1) the fourth patriarch of Antioch, who succeeded Heron on his martyrdom in A.D. 129, and occupied the episcopal chair fourteen years, being followed by Eros in 143. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 20; *Chron. Armen.* Hieron. sub ann. 2144; Clinton, *Fast. Roman.*) [E. V.]

(2) Bishop of Rome, successor of Fabianus, said to have been son of Castinus. After the martyrdom of Fabianus in January A.D. 250, in the Decian persecution, the see remained vacant for a year and a half, possibly because no one was willing to undertake a post of such perilous dignity. But in June, A.D. 251, Cornelius was elected to the vacant post; and it speaks well for his courage that, although very reluctantly, he accepted an election which was almost unanimously made by both orders, during the life of a tyrant who had declared that he would rather see a new pretender to the empire than a new bishop of Rome (Cyprian, *Ep.* lii.). It was perhaps well for him that Decius was at that time absent from Rome, prosecuting that Gothic war which ended in his defeat and death in the winter of the same year. With his death the persecution of the Christians came to an end; but then arose the difficult question of how to treat the *libellatici*, or wavering Christians who had bought their life by the acceptance of false certificates of having sacrificed to heathen gods.

Cornelius from the first took a decided line upon this point, but one which placed him at variance with Cyprian and the church of Carthage, which required rigorous penance as the price of readmission to the Christian body, while Rome prescribed milder terms. The difference was not more than such as would surely arise from the independent action of the two churches; but it was kept alive by the discontent of the minority within both the churches. This was represented at Carthage by one Novatus, who separated from the church when he was unable to obtain less harsh terms: in Rome, by a man of strangely similar name, Novatian [NOVATIANUS], who headed the party which was in favour of greater rigour than the Roman church would allow. Stranger still, Novatus crossed the sea to aid Novatian in designs at Rome, which must have been directly opposed to his own at Carthage. It was mainly by his influence that Novatian was consecrated a bishop, and thus constituted himself the head of a schismatic body in Rome. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 43) quotes from a letter of bishop Cornelius to bishop Fabius of Antioch, in which he gives an account of his rival, and in the course of which he gives statistics as to the number of the Roman clergy in his day. These were 46 priests, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, 52 exorcists, 52 readers and ostiarii; and 1500 widows and orphans were provided for by the church.

The Novatianist heresy gave rise to a correspondence between Cyprian and Cornelius, of which eight of Cyprian's letters are extant. But the persecution from which they had just escaped was revived in Rome by Gallus, and Cornelius, followed by almost the whole church (among whom were many restored libellatics), took refuge at Centumcellae in Etruria. There Cornelius died, and another bishop, Lucius, was at the head of the church when it returned. It is doubtful whether he died a violent death or not. Cyprian and Jerome both speak of him as a martyr, and an inscription found in the Catacombs likewise styles him so. Anastasius gives an account of his decapitation, but discredits himself by adding that it was Decius who sent for him from Centumcellae. We may fairly question whether the word 'martyr' was always used in its modern sense; or whether the confession which Cornelius was undergoing at Centumcellae with the whole church was not regarded as itself a species of martyrdom. He died September 14, A.D. 252—the same month and the same day, it was observed, on which his great contemporary Cyprian suffered six years later.

His name has been found in the Catacombs at some little distance from those of other popes, and in a cemetery apparently devoted almost exclusively to the gens Cornelia, whence De Rossi argues with great likelihood that he probably belonged to that patrician gens. His grave was dug in a crypt, which was afterwards restored with an inscription to record the fact by Damasus: and two large figures of bishops, inscribed S. Cornelius and S. Cyprian, were painted on the wall by the side of the grave in the Byzantine style, probably by pope Leo III. A.D. 795–815. (*Roma Sotterranea*, by Northcote and Brownlow, pp. 177–183.)

[G. H. M.]

CORNELIUS (3), head of a monastery called Mochanses, to whom one of the letters of Pachomius, translated by St. Jerome (ii. 86, ed. Vall.), is addressed. [W. H. F.]

(4) To whom Augustine writes (*Ep.* 259 (126), vol. ii. 1073), had been a fellow-Manichean with Augustine, and as a Manichean had taught himself chastity; afterwards he joined the church, was baptized in seeming peril of death, married and lost his wife Cypriana, and wrote to Augustine to beg for a panegyric on her from the saint. [E. B. B.]

(5) Monk and bishop of Forum Corneli, in the 5th century. He educated at his episcopal court Petrus Chrysologus, archbishop of Ravenna, A.D. 433–449. Chrysologus describes Cornelius as having introduced him to the practices of a monastic life; and characterises him as a man illustrious for his conduct, in whom all the virtues shone, and who was everywhere famous for his great actions; his spiritual father, his instructor in the gospel, which he practised himself to perfection. Cornelius afterwards ordained his pupil. (Chrysologus, in *Patrol. Lat.* tom. lii, p. 31; Ceillier, x. 6.) [W. M. S.]

CORNUTUS, presbyter of Iconium, who when persecution arose and all others fled, alone faced the governor and confessed himself a Christian, and was beheaded by order of the governor, Sept. 12 (*Men. Basil.*). No epoch is there assigned; the manner of the martyrdom would incline us to refer it to the Decian persecution. [E. B. B.]

COROTICUS, to whom St. Patrick addressed his epistle, is supposed to have been Caredig or Ceredig of Cardigan, son of Cunedda Wledig, and a chieftain or petty sovereign of Cardiganshire. In Colgan he is called Caradocus, Coreticus, Cortice, and Chairtice, and that writer upholds the silly story of Coroticus being changed into a fox or fox's cub by the malediction of St. Patrick. (For his genealogy, see Meyrick, *Hist. and Ant. Co. Cardigan*, Introd. p. 18.) He was at least nominally a Christian, but having followed up his successes over the Irish from South Wales into Ireland, he acted there with the grossest barbarity, slaying some, and carrying others into captivity. A letter, which is now lost, St. Patrick sent to him by one of his priests and other clerics, asking him to give back some of the plunder and the Christian captives, but the messengers were only laughed at. St. Patrick then wrote his famous *Epistola ad Coroticum*, which is extremely rude in its Latinity, but full of righteous indignation against a Christian, who could murder the neophytes while yet they were in their white baptismal robes and the chrism was fresh on their brows, and could carry off the members of Christ's body, and sell them to the heathen as slaves. Coroticus was solemnly excommunicated for his flagrant outrages, and the letter directed to be read to all the people and before Coroticus himself. (For the editions of the epistle by Ware, the Bollandists, Villeneuve, and O'Connor, see Todd, *St. Patrick*, 311 n. 2; for general reference to Coroticus, see Todd, *ib.* cc. 1–2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 6, §§ 9, 10; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 44 n.; Rees, *Welsh Saints* 135; Colgan, *Ir. Thaum.* 27, c. 72, 34 n. 70, 59 c. 27, 98 c. 150.) [J. G.]

CORPIANUS, according to the majority of the MSS. of Optatus (*De Schism. Don. iv. p. 74*), the name of a heretic who opposed martyrdom. But it seems likely that the true reading is Scorpionus, and that the name originated in a confused recollection of the Scorpice of Tertullian. [G. S.]

CORPREUS. [CAÏRPRE.]

CORRUPTICOLAE. [APHTHARTODOCE-
TAE.]

CORTYNIUS, a captive redeemed by Marcellus (Disputation of Archelaus and Manes, Routh, *Rel. Sac. v. 38*). [G. S.]

COSMAS (1) and DAMIANUS, brothers, physicians, "silverless" martyrs. These four facts are all that can be said to be known about them, and though they supply little to amuse the mind, they afforded much to feed the heart of Christendom. They became types of a class, the *ἀργύριοι*, "silverless" martyrs, i.e. physicians who took no fees, but went about curing people gratis and claiming as their reward that those whom they benefited should believe in Christ. They were certainly not earlier than the last quarter of the third century, and the legendary martyrs of that time, those whose fame is known only by popular tradition, seem in many cases to succeed naturally to the place usurped by those heathen myths that were slowest to die out. For Hercules, Christopher; for Apollo, Sebastian; for Diana, Ursula; for Proserpine, Agnes; and Cosmas and Damian take the place of Aesculapius, in whose story heathenism made the nearest approach to Christianity.

The Greeks distinguish three pairs of these brothers. (1) July 1, in the time of Carinus; (2) Oct. 27, Arabs, with their brothers, Anthimus, Leontius, and Euprepus, martyred under Diocletian; (3) Nov. 1, sons of Theodote.

(1) For Carinus we should certainly substitute Carus. Not only does Abulpharagius put them under that emperor, but all who put them under Carinus make him lead his army into the East to avenge his father on the Persians. Now, he could not have done this with Diocletian in his rear. The error had arisen as early as the time of Synesius, who in his oration *de Regno*, A.D. 399, c. 18, tells a story of Carinus in the East that belongs to Carus; for in that story the emperor is bald, a peculiarity ascribed to Carinus by Malela, but appearing on the coins of Carus.

To Carus, then, in Cyrrhestice, Cosmas and Damian were accused of magic arts. But they effected a cure of a twist in the emperor's own neck, which called from him an admiring cry and caused him to hold them in honour. When he had left the place, their old teacher, moved with envy, enticed them out as though to gather herbs, then stoned them or flung them down a precipice.

The story soon became overlaid with miracles, but this simple form of it may be extracted from comparison of the *Menology* and Malela.

(2) It is possible that the fame of these two brothers caused their name to be given to a pair of twins, who followed their example, and were put to death between twenty and thirty years later under Lysias in Cilicia. It is only to this

second pair and their brothers that distichs are given in the *Menaea*.

ἐκ τοῦ γένους Ἀράβας ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἑξίφους
θεοῖν ἀρίστεϊς οἶδα τοὺς ἀναργύρους.
Λεοντίου πηθέντος ὤλετο πλάνος
λεοντομήρυξ, ὥς ἰὼν βίβλος λέγει.
Ἀνθῆμος Εὐπρέπειος ἐκτετημένον
ἀνθούσι λαμπρὸν καὶ πανευπρέπες μάλα.

From these distichs it appears probable that Leontius, Anthemius, and Euprepus, or Eutropius, were punished with castration. Their kinship to the *ἀναργύροι* cannot be regarded as certain.

(3) The third pair, if they ever existed, were not martyrs at all, but only doctors and veterinarians, of a much later date. A woman named Palladia once gave Damian three eggs, and Cosmas was so angry that he forbade them to bury his brother in the same tomb with him. But when the people were debating what to do with the corpse, a camel which the saints had healed spoke and told them it was all right, they might lay Damian with his brother, for he had been compelled by an oath to take the eggs.

We must observe that only the second pair are recognised by the Latins, though the first pair seem to be more widely celebrated in the East. The Latins assign the martyrdom to Sept. 27, on which day various acts, all miraculous and untrustworthy, and long lists of modern miracles are given in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Sept. vii. 400. The most curious trait in these acts is that the prefect when bidden to follow the saints in the name of the Lord, exclaims, "In the name of Adrian, my God, I follow," and two devils immediately come and box his ears. The worship of the saints belongs rather to archaeology than to biography. According to the *Paris Breviary*, Theodoret bears witness to the celebrity of their basilica at Cyrus in the 5th century, Procopius to the adornment of that city in their honour by Justinian, who recovered health at their intercession, and to the existence of a church of the saints at Constantinople from the days of Theodosius the younger, while Marcellinus tells of the restoration to health by their intercession of Lawrence, bishop of Lychinis. The names were early inserted in the *Canon of the Mass*. [E. B. B.]

COSMAS (2), bishop of Scythopolis and Metropolitan, succeeded Olympius in 466. He was a native of Cappadocia, but with his two brothers, Chrysippus and Gabriel, was brought up in Syria under the famous abbat St. Euthymius, who on their first application for admission to his convent rejected them on account of their youth, but afterwards being warned in a dream, admitted them. He was ordained deacon by Juvenal of Jerusalem about the time of the council of Ephesus, and afterwards raised by him to the presbyterate, and made Keeper of the Holy Cross. He was ordained bishop of Scythopolis by Anastasius, Juvenal's successor; he held the see for thirty years, and died in 496. The third brother Gabriel was ordained priest, and was twenty-four years abbat of the monastery of St. Stephen. He founded a small monastery in honour of the Ascension in a valley of Olivet, and died at the age of eighty years (Cyrill. Scythopol. *Vit. S. Euthem.* 40, 54, etc.; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*). [CHRYSIPPUS.] [E. V.]

COSMAS (3), surnamed INDICOPLEUSTES (Indian navigator) from his Indian voyages. A native of Egypt, probably of Alexandria (lib. ii. 114, vi. 264), originally a merchant (lib. ii. 132, iii. 178, xi. 336), and subsequently a monk, and a somewhat voluminous writer on cosmography and the exposition of Scripture, who flourished in the reign of Justinian, about the middle of the 6th century. In pursuit of his mercantile speculations he navigated the Mediterranean, Red Sea, and Persian Gulf, and made himself acquainted with the productions, inhabitants, and remarkable objects in the adjacent countries. He also visited the Indian peninsula, and the island of Ceylon. Gifted with an inquisitive mind, acute observation, and a retentive memory, his travels in the East enabled Cosmas to collect a large store of curious and valuable information, not only with respect to the countries he visited, but also concerning the more remote lands whose merchants he fell in with at the great centres of Oriental commerce. When at last, weary of the world and its gains and employments, he resigned his occupation as a merchant and embracing a monastic life devoted his leisure to authorship, he enriched his writings with vivid descriptions of the countries he had visited and the remarkable facts he had observed himself or had learned from others. These are characterised with all the evidence of truth that simplicity can afford. He was no retailer of travellers' wonders, and, although Photius characterises him as *μυθικώτερος μάλλον ἢ ἀληθέστερος*, later researches have confirmed the veracity of his statements, and have proved that his descriptions are as faithful as his philosophy is absurd.

The only one of his works which has survived to our times is that which is dignified by the name of *Χριστιανικὴ Τοπογραφία παντὸς κοσμοῦ*, *Christian Topography*. This work consists of twelve books, of which the last is deficient in the Vatican MS., and is imperfect in the Medicean. It was not all published at one time, nor indeed originally planned by the author in its present extent; but it gradually grew under his hand, and book after book was added to gratify the requests of his friends, or to meet the objections and refute the arguments of the opponents of his theory. The first six books are dedicated to a friend named Pamphilus, whose importunity had induced him to undertake the task notwithstanding his consciousness of his serious literary deficiencies. The seventh book is dedicated to Anastasius; the eighth, to Peter; the remaining four are without dedication.

The proximate date, A.D. 547, for the earlier books is afforded by the statement (lib. ii. 140), that when he wrote twenty-five years had elapsed since the expedition of Elesbaan, king of the Axumitæ, against the Homeritæ, which according to Pagi *ad ann.* occurred in A.D. 522. It appears that the later works were written about thirteen years subsequently. Near the end of lib. x. he speaks of the recent death of Timotheus, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 536, and he mentions Theodosius his heretical successor, A.D. 537.

The chief design of the *Christian Topography* is "to confute the impious heresy of those who maintain that the earth is a globe, and not a flat oblong table, as is represented in the Scriptures." (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xlvii. § i. note i.)

The old objections of the Epicureans are revived, and the earth once more becomes a plane surface. This is not circular as with Thales, but a parallelogram twice as long as it is broad, surrounded by the ocean. Its length from E. to W. is 12,000 miles; its breadth from N. to S. is 6000. The parallelogram is symmetrically divided by four gulfs; the Caspian (which joins the Ocean), the Arabian (Red Sea), the Persian, and that of the Romans (Mediterranean). Beyond the ocean, on each side of the interior continent, lies another land, in which the Paradise of our first parents is situated. Here men lived till the Deluge, when Noah and his family crossed the intervening flood in the Ark, and peopled the present world. The rivers of Paradise he supposes to run under the sea, Alpheus-like, and to reappear in our earth. The Nile is the Gihon of Eden. The whole area is surrounded by lofty perpendicular walls, from the summit of which the sky stretches from N. to S. in a cylindrical vault, meeting similar vaults at either extremity (lib. iv. 186-187). Like Noah's Ark, which he asserts to have been an image of the world, our author divides this huge vaulted chamber into lower, second and third stories. The dead occupy the nethermost division; the middle compartment is the home of the living; the uppermost, that of the blessed. Heaven is divided from the lower regions by a solid firmament, through which Christ penetrated—and that is the Kingdom of Heaven (lib. iv. 186-188). The vicissitudes of day and night he asserts to be caused by a mountain of enormous bulk, rising at the northern extremity of the oblong area. Behind this the sun passes in the evening, and reappears on the other side in the morning. The conical shape of the mountain produces the variation in the length of the night; as the sun rises higher above, or sinks down towards the level of the earth. Eclipses are due to the same cause. The round shadow on the moon's disk is cast by the domical summit of the mountain (lib. iv. 188).

The views on cosmography thus propounded by Cosmas, absurd and irrational as they appear to us, were those generally entertained by the fathers of the Church. Pining their faith on the literal meaning of the words of Scripture according to its traditional interpretation, they deduced a system which had for them all the authority of a divine revelation, any departure from which was regarded as impious and heretical. The arguments by which Cosmas supports his theory are chiefly built on isolated passages of Scripture, as interpreted by the early fathers. Some however are drawn from reason and the nature of the case; e.g. the absurdity of the supposition of the existence of antipodean regions, inasmuch as the beings on the other side of the world must drop off, and the rain would fall upwards instead of downwards; while the supposed rotatory motion of the universe is disproved by the disturbance that would be caused to the repose of the blessed in heaven by their being perpetually whirled through space. It is not unconstructive to find Cosmas denouncing as heretics those who, following the false lights of science, venture to maintain the opposite views, and speaking in terms of strongest condemnation of "men who assume the name of Christians, and yet in contempt of Holy Scripture join with the pagans in asserting that the heavens are

spherical. Such assertions are among the weapons hurled at the church. Inflamed by pride as if they were wiser than others, they profess to explain the movements of the heavens by geometrical and astronomical calculations" (lib. i. Prolog.) One of his strongest arguments in support of his plan of the universe is drawn from the form of the Tabernacle of Witness, which the words *ἄγιον κοσμικόν* (Heb. ix. 1) warrant him in considering to have been like Noah's Ark, expressly constructed as an image of the world.

The subjects of the twelve books into which his work is divided, are as follows:—I. Against those who claim to be Christians, and assert with pagans that the earth is spherical. II. The Christian hypothesis as to the figure and position of the universe proved from Scripture. III. The agreement on these points of the Old and New Testament. IV. A brief recapitulation, and a description of the figure of the universe according to Scripture, and a confutation of the sphere. V. A description of the Tabernacle and the agreement of the Prophets and Apostles. VI. The magnitude of the sun. VII. The duration of the heavens. VIII. Hezekiah's song, and the retrogression of the sun. IX. The course of the stars. X. *Testimonies of the Fathers*, including eleven citations from the *Festal Epistles of Athanasius*, and other important Patristic fragments. XI. A description of the animals of India, and of the island of Ceylon. XII. Testimonies of heathen writers to the antiquity of Holy Scripture.

Setting aside the absurdities of his cosmographical system, Cosmas is one of the most valuable geographical writers of antiquity. His errors were those of his age, and rest chiefly on his reverence for the traditional interpretation of the Bible. But he was an acute observer and vivid describer, and his good faith is unquestionable. He appears to have been well acquainted with the Indian peninsula, and names several places on its coast. He describes it as the chief seat of the pepper trade, of which he gives a very rational account, and mentions *Mali*, in which Montfaucon recognises the origin of *Malabar*, as much frequented by the traffickers in that spice. He furnishes us with a detailed account of the island of *Taprobana* (Ceylon), which he calls by the name *Sieli-diba*, which was then the principal centre of trade between China (he calls the Chinese *Tsit'ai*) and the Persian Gulf, and Red Sea, where the merchants exchanged their costly wares, and the nations of the east obtained the advantages of commercial intercourse, which rapidly increased and had in Cosmas's time assumed considerable importance. The connexion between Persia and India was at that time evidenced by the existence of a large number of Christian churches, both on the coast of India and the islands of Socotra and Ceylon, which were served by priests and deacons ordained by the Persian archbishop of Seleucia, and subject to his jurisdiction, and which had produced multitudes of faithful martyrs and monks (lib. iii. 179). These congregations appear to be identical with the Malabar Christians of St. Thomas. His eleventh book also contains a very graphic and faithful description of the more remarkable animal and vegetable productions of India and Ceylon, the rhinoceros, elephant, giraffe, hippopotamus, &c., the cocoa-nut tree, pepper tree, &c.

His remarks on Scripture manifest a not altogether uncommon mixture of credulity and good sense. He mentions that, to the discomfiture of unbelievers, the marks of the chariot wheels of the Egyptians were still visible at Clysma, where the Israelites crossed the Red Sea (v. 194); but he explains the supposed miraculous preservation of the garments of the Israelites (Deut. xxix. 5), as meaning nothing more than that they were in want of nothing, in consequence of the number of merchants who visited them with those commodities from adjacent countries, to whom also they were indebted for the wheat of which the shew-bread was made (v. p. 205). The catholic epistles he plainly relegates to the "*Amphilegomena*," making the erroneous statement that such was the universal ancient tradition, and that none of the early expositors comment upon them. The epistle to the Hebrews he ascribes to St. Paul, and asserts that it, as well as the gospel of St. Matthew, was rendered into Greek by St. Luke or St. Clement.

Cosmas preserves a monument of very considerable historical value, consisting of two inscriptions relating to Ptolemy Euergetes, B.C. 247–222, and an unnamed king of the Axumitæ, of later date. These were copied by him from the originals at the entrance of the city of Adule, an Aethiopian port on the Red Sea; the former from a wedge-shaped block of basanite or touch-stone, standing behind a white marble chair, dedicated to Mars and ornamented with the figures of Hercules and Mercury, on which the latter was engraved. Notwithstanding the different localities of the inscriptions, and the fact that the third person is used in the former, the first in the latter, the two have been carelessly printed continuously, and regarded as both relating to the conquests of Ptolemy, who has been thus accredited with fabulous Aethiopian conquests. They are thus printed by Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* lib. iii. 25 (cf. Vincent, *Commerce*, ii. 533–89). They were first distinguished from each other by Mr. Salt (*Voyages and Travels to India, &c.*, 1809, vol. iii. 192; *Travels in Abyssinia*, 1814, p. 412), and are printed with full comments by Böckh (*Corpus Inscript. Græc.* 1848, vol. iii. fasc. ii. 508–514). The inscription relating to Ptolemy describes his conquest of nearly the whole of the empire of the Seleucidæ, in Asia, which, says dean Vincent (*Ancient Commerce*, ii. 531), "was scarcely discovered in history till this monument prompted the enquiry, and was then established on proofs undeniable." (Cf. Chishull, *Antiq. Asiat.* p. 76; Niebuhr, *Vermischte Schriften*, p. 401; Letronne, *Matériaux pour l'histoire du Christianisme en Egypte, &c.*, 1832, p. 401; Buttmann, *Mus. der Alterthumsw.* i. 1, p. 105.)

A full account of this work is given by Photius (cod. xxxvi.), under the inappropriate title *Ἐμπύκτα εἰς Ὀκτάτευχον*, but without the author's name. From this, Fabricius very needlessly questions whether the author was really named Cosmas, and whether that was not an appellation coined to suit the subject of the work, like that of Joannes Climacus. Photius censures the homeliness of the style, which he considers hardly to approach mediocrity. But elegance or refinement of diction is not to be expected from a writer, who in his own words (lib. ii. 124), destitute of literary training and

entangled in business, had devoted his whole life to mercantile pursuits, and who had to contend against the disadvantages of very infirm health and weak eyesight, incapacitating him for lengthened study. We learn from his own writings that Cosmas was also the author of the following works:—

(1) A *Cosmographia Universalis*, dedicated to a certain Constantine (lib. i. 113), the loss of which is lamented with tears by Montfaucon.

(2) A work on the motions of the universe and the heavenly bodies, dedicated to the deacon Homologus (lib. i. 114, vii. 274).

(3) *Ἕκφυστατα* on the *Canticles*, dedicated to Theophilus (lib. vii. 300).

(4) Exposition of the more difficult parts of the Psalms. (Du Cange, *Gloss. Graec.* s. v. *Ἰνδικοπλευστής*; *Bibl. Coisl.* p. 244.)

(Montfaucon, *Collect. Nov. Pat. Graec.* Paris, 1706, vol. ii. 113–346; Gallandi, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* Ven. 1765, vol. ix.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 515; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* lib. iii. 25; Vincent, *Commerce*, ii. 505–511, 533–537, 567; Bredow, *Strabo*, ii. 786–797; Thevenot, *Coll. des Voyages*, vol. i.; Gosselin, *Géogr. Syst. des Grecs*, iii. 274; Mannert, *Einleit. in der Geogr. d. Alten*, 188–192; Charton, *Voyages*, vol. ii.) [E. V.]

COSMAS (4), a deacon at Thebes, deposed A.D. 592 by his bishop, Adrian, for malversation of the goods of the church. Cosmas and another deposed deacon accused Adrian, by way of revenge, to the emperor Maurice. Maurice, according to the canons, sent the case to John, bishop of Larissa, Adrian's metropolitan, who condemned him. Adrian appealed to Maurice, and was acquitted. The case finally came before Gregory the Great. (Gregory, *Epp.* lib. iii. 7, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. p. 609, § 629; Ceillier, xi. 490.) [W. M. S.]

(5) Deacon at Alexandria. Maximus, abbat of Chrysopolis (A.D. 662), mentions in a letter to a nobleman named Petrus, a treatise on the union and distinction of two natures in Jesus Christ, which he had addressed to Cosmas. Cosmas had been engaged in Severian opinions, but had returned to the Catholic church. In a second letter to Cosmas, Maximus professes his sorrow at the calumnies spread abroad against Gregory, prefect of Africa. (*Patrol. Graec.* xcl., Maximus, §§ 307, 308, 309, 313, 334; Ceillier, xi. 768, 769.) [W. M. S.]

(6) THE ELDER, monk of St. Saba. After a youth devoted to the study of the liberal arts, philosophy, and theology, when already a presbyter, he was captured and enslaved by the Saracens in a journey from Italy to Damascus, but was redeemed by the father of Joannes Damascenus, who entrusted to his care the education of his son, with his companion Cosmas (the younger). After he had completed the instruction of his pupils he retired to the monastery of St. Saba, where he remained till his death, c. A.D. 750. (Joann. Hierosol. *in vita Joann. Damasc.*; Moschus, *Prat. Spirit.* c. 40.) The greater part of the hymns that pass under the name of Cosmas ὁ Μελοδός are attributed to him, but in the confusion that exists between the elder and younger Cosmas, it is impossible to assign them to their respective authors with any accuracy. [E. V.]

COSMAS (7) THE YOUNGER, HAGIOPOLITES, or HIEROSOLYMITANUS, was born at Jerusalem, and having lost his father was brought up there, together with Joannes Damascenus, by Cosmas the elder. He became bishop of Maiuma, in Palestine, c. A.D. 743. A warm regard existed between him and Joannes Damascenus, who, as we learn from the dedication to Cosmas prefixed to his dialectics, composed several works at his friend's request. His name is chiefly known in connexion with the composition of hymns, canons, triodia, etc., still in use in the Greek church. But which of these were written by him and which by the elder Cosmas, is uncertain. Suidas speaks of him as *ἀνὴρ εὐφύστατος καὶ πνέων μουσικὴν ὁλως τῆς ἀρμονίου*, and asserts that the canons composed by him and Joannes Damascenus surpass all that ever had been or ever could be written. The two friends and their tutor are considered the inventors of Greek sacred poetry. The majority of Cosmas's hymns are acrostichal. Among them are hymns for Christmas Day, Palm Sunday, Whitsunday, the Exaltation of the Cross, and other festivals. The triodion used by the Greek church from Septagesima to the octave of Pentecost is attributed to him. His hymns were first printed by Aldus, Ven. 1501, and they are to be found in La Bigne's *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 727 sq., and Migne, *Patrol.* xviii. According to Allatius (*de Georgiis*, p. 418) they have been expounded by Joannes Zonaras, Theodorus Prodromus, George of Corinth and others.* (Suidas *sub voc.* *Ἰωανν. Δαμασκ.*; Joann. Hieros. *in vita Joann. Dam.* Oudin, i. 1785, *Bibl. Patr.* La Bigne, xii. 727; Gallandi, xiii. p. viii. Miraeus, *Auctar. de Scr. Eccl.*; Vossius, *de Poet. Graec.* c. 9; Saxius *in Onom.* *Lit.* ii. 85; Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 41; Le Quien, *Vit. J. Dam.* p. 20.) [E. V.]

(8) Patriarch of Alexandria. [COPTIC CHURCH.]

COSMOCRATOR; in the system of Valentinus, an appellation given to the Devil, who was represented as having his dwelling in this world, while the Demiurgus, whose creature he was, dwelt in the lowest of the regions above the world (Irenaeus, i. 5, p. 26). The name Cosmocrator we may believe to have been derived from Eph. vi. 12, reference also being had to St. John xii. 31, whose phrase, "prince of this world," occurs instead of Cosmocrator in the parallel passage of Hippolytus (p. 192). Harvey (*Iren. l. c.*) gives proof that in the Rabbinical demonology this Greek word was employed written in Hebrew characters, and thence infers that the Gnostic use of this word was derived from a Jewish use of it. On the other hand Massuet (p. xliii.) refers to a use of the word by the later Platonists, who employed it to denote the rulers of the seven planetary orbs. But the occurrence of the word in the Epistle to the Ephesians renders any other explanation of the Gnostic use of it unnecessary.

In the system of Marcion (Irenaeus, i. 27, p. 106), into which the name Cosmocrator probably passed from the Valentinian, it was applied to the God who made the world. [G. S.]

* A metrical version (*ἑκφρασις*) of the Psalms, attributed to Cosmas, exists in MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna.

COTOPITAE, or COTHOPITHAE. [CUT-ZUPITAE.]

COTTA, abbat, attests a charter of Suaebræd, king of the East Saxons, June 13, 704 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 52; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57). [C. H.]

COUNCILS. For a general account of Councils, see the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, edited by Dr. Smith and Professor Cheetham, s. v. For particular councils, see the same Dictionary under the names of the places where the councils were held: e.g. CONSTANTINOPLE, EPHESUS, &c.

CRALLO, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Llangrallo, otherwise Coychurch in Glamorganshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 222). [C. H.]

CRATO, a probably imaginary "bishop of the Syrians," asserted by Prædestinatus (i. 33) to have been a successful antagonist of the heresy of Theodotus. [G. S.]

CREDA, CREDAN, abbat, witnessing a charter of Offa king of Mercia, dated A.D. 777 by Kemble, but A.D. 775 by Hickes (*Thesaur.* i. 171), and a charter of Aldred subregulus of the Wiccii between A.D. 778 and 781 (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 131, 146; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 435; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57). [C. H.]

CREDANUS (1) Abbat of Evesham, in a MS. list preserved by Dugdale (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. 2), standing between Almund, who was abbat in A.D. 783 or 787, and Tintferth, abbat in A.D. 803 (Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57). [C. H.]

(2) [CREDA.]

CRISTULA. Mart. Carthag. A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

CREED, from the Latin *credo*; a summary of the chief tenets of the Christian faith. The word is generally limited in its application to the three great formulae, the so-called Apostles' creed, the Nicene or Constantinopolitan, and the Athanasian creed, although it may be also used of any either of the older or more modern summaries which have been put forward from time to time as representing the beliefs either of any great portion or of any smaller section of the Christian church.

1. Leibnitz, in the preface to his *Essais de Théodicée*, remarks that the nations which filled the earth before the establishment of Christianity had ceremonies of devotion, sacrifices, libations and a priesthood, but they had no articles of faith, no dogmatic theology. They were not taught whether the beings whom they worshipped were personifications of the wondrous powers of nature, or true persons: and even their mysteries consisted in the performance of certain rites and practices, and not in the delivery and acceptance of any teaching or doctrine.

2. With the people of Israel it was different. They had a distinct creed, the fundamental articles of which were these: that Jehovah their God was one Jehovah: that He was the Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things therein: that He had given them the laws by which they were governed, and would protect their nation if it obeyed those laws, and would punish it if it neglected them. From this clear and definite teaching as to the being and nature of God, the duty of serving Him and Him only, in the way which He had appointed, necessarily ensued.

3. Christianity has inherited this peculiarity of the Jewish nation. It has a clear and definite teaching. More clearly than any of the Jewish Rabbis had done, did its Founder hold up to His followers our heavenly Father as our example and our guide: and, in addition, He declared that He had Himself come down from heaven to give His soul a ransom for many. After His Death and Resurrection and Ascension, we read that His apostles wandered about teaching men to turn from the vanities which they worshipped to serve the one true and living God; they spoke not only of the duties of righteousness and self-restraint, but also of a coming judgment of both just and unjust: they taught the necessity of repentance towards God and of faith towards their Lord Jesus Christ, and they proclaimed everywhere that Christ had (in some mysterious way) died for the sins of mankind, in accordance with the Scriptures of old: that He had been buried, and had risen again from the dead, and would come hereafter to render to every man according to his works. And what they taught, they charged their disciples to commit to faithful men, that they might be able to teach others also.

4. The substance of this teaching, either as delivered to him, or as passed on to his immediate followers, St. Paul called "a deposit" (*παράθηκη* or *παρακαταθήκη*; the MSS. vary both in 1 Tim. vi. 20, and 2 Tim. i. 14). Elsewhere, in speaking of his office as a teacher, the same apostle says, "I have been entrusted with a stewardship" (1 Cor. ix. 7), and describes himself as "a steward of God's mysteries." St. Peter represented the essence of his teaching as "the truth," "the present truth;" partly, no doubt, in contrast with "the cunningly devised myths" by which it was surrounded. Other titles and designations are applied to the teaching of the apostles, and amongst them we find a word with which we shall often meet in later centuries, the word *πίστις*, *fides*, *faith*; "a word, which, from faith as a subjective action, was passed on to comprehend the object of that action: the truths which the disciples were called upon to receive" (Gal. i. 23; iii. 23, 25; and elsewhere).

5. But the teaching of the first apostles was so extensive and covered so large a space, embracing (as it did) a narrative of all the events of our Redeemer's life, that at a very early period it was considered desirable to collect together statements of some of the chief facts which were either revealed or substantiated by Christ, and to regard them as essential parts of the teaching of the church, the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.* The administration of the rite in which the believer "was by the one Spirit baptized into the one body," furnished one occasion on which such a summary was required. For, as the convert was "baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," so the acceptance of this baptism implied on his part some belief as to the character of that Name into which he was baptized. Such baptisms took place after the great day of Pentecost, long before the writings of the New Testament were collected, indeed long before

* The *κίρυγμα* or "preaching" of 1 Cor. i. 21, and elsewhere.

any of them were penned. What were the newly baptized, what were the candidates for baptism to be taught, as the essential points of Christianity? It became necessary to have some outline or summary to guide the evangelist or teacher in the instruction of his hearers, and some such outlines or summaries were speedily prepared. The words of St. Paul to Timothy which are found in his second letter—introducing the command “keep the deposit,” to which attention has already been drawn—seem most clearly to direct his pupil to prepare such a formula, if he had not one already in hand. “Have (or draw up) a sketch of the wholesome words which thou heardest from me in faith and love in Christ Jesus.” [The words are *ἡποτίσωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων*, *Formam habe sanorum verborum*. See Mr. Wratishaw's *Notes and Dissertations*, No. LV.]

6. This direction appears so reasonable, that we may expect to find indications of such summaries in the writings of the apostles themselves. Without quoting at length the facts which St. Paul delivered to the Corinthians “among the first things” (1 Cor. xv. 3), we may appeal to an important notice in the same apostle's first letter to Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 16). He describes the church as “pillar and basis of the truth,” and then proceeds as follows: “and confessedly great is the mystery of religion, who was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the heathen, was believed in the world, was received up in glory.” In the letter to the Hebrews we read of “the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith in God, of the resurrection of [the] dead and of the eternal doom.” Once more, in St. John's warning against the false prophets (“every spirit that acknowledgeth Jesus Christ as having come in the flesh is from God, and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus, is not from God”) we find distinct mention of fundamental articles of the Christian faith. Nor can we overlook the importance assigned by St. Paul to the outward confession of the heart's belief (*Rom. x. 10*), whilst in the partial commendation of the church of Pergamos (in *Apoc. ii. 13*), “thou didst not deny my faith,” we note that the commendation implies that there was “a faith” which might have been orally denied.

7. But when we read of the whirl which ensued when the belief of the gospel came into contact with the teachings of the oriental philosophies, the necessity of such outlines or formulae as were commanded by St. Paul becomes most manifest. When the marvellous tenets (called heresies) of Valentinus and Marcion and the like became mixed up with the teachings of the gospels, these earlier summaries which we have noticed would serve not only as buoys to guide the voyager after truth, but as moorings too to prevent him from drifting away amidst the violence of the stream. The question then becomes important; “Have we in the writings of sub-apostolic times further notes on the character of the summaries in use?” and the answer must be given in the affirmative.

8. For summaries of this description may be seen in the Greek recensions of the Ignatian epistles to the churches at Tralles and at Smyrna. For if these recensions are not to be regarded as presenting the original forms of such epistles,

they are still considered by competent judges to belong to the second century, and if so “will hold their place among the most important of early Christian documents.”^b In the letter to the *Trallians*, § 9, we find the writer urging his readers “to stop their ears if any one would talk to them without referring to Jesus Christ, who was of the family of David, who was of Mary, who was truly born, did eat and drink, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died . . . who also was truly raised from the dead, His Father raising Him: and, after the same likeness, His Father will, in Him, raise us who believe in Christ Jesus—apart from whom we have not true life.” Another summary of the facts of our Saviour's life, not unlike this, may be seen in the letter to the *Smyrnaeans*, § 1, 2, 3. In a well-known passage in the Apology of Justin Martyr (§ 61, p. 93), the writer relates how they “who are persuaded and believe that the things are true which are taught by us . . . are taken to some place where there is water, and are there baptized (*λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται*), in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit;” the words implying some declaration of belief, in a longer or a shorter form. The writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen, give us clearer indications of the character of the formulae used in their days to embody the tenets of the faith.

9. The work of Irenaeus first calls for our attention. This great bishop of Lyons in writing “against all heretics,” speaks again and again of the faith of the church as sufficient to protect her members against the wild extravagancies of the gnostic teachers. In five passages (i. 3, 6; i. 10, 1, &c.; iii. 4, 2; iii. 24, 1; iv. 23, 7) he seems to quote portions of this faith. In one he gives it substantially at length. In the first passage referred to, he speaks of the danger of those “who do not guard firmly (*ροῦς μὴ διαφυλάσσοντας*) the faith in one God the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God;” and having in iii. 21, &c., given many interesting notes as to the teaching of the church on important subjects, the bishop in § 24 calls this teaching “our faith which we have received from the church, and which it is our business to guard (*quam custodimus*).” But as the statement of Christian doctrine on which this passage follows is far too long to be quoted here, we must be content with drawing attention to another which is perhaps more to our point, the well-known summary of i. 10, 1.

10. Having shewn, with a certain amount of humour, the absurdity of those who, having heaped together a number of names and phrases collected out of every book of Scripture, fancied that on such a foundation as this, they might erect a superstructure of “Christian” teaching; Irenaeus states that any one “who holds without wavering the canon of the truth which he received at his baptism,” will know at once whence these names and phrases are brought, and will reject the doctrine founded upon them. And, accordingly, he takes the opportunity to exhibit the truth as maintained in the church. “For the church” (he proceeds), “although now scattered

^b Dr. Lightfoot on *Philippians*, p. 232 n. and IGNATIUS.

over the face of the world, still guards the faith which it received from the apostles and their immediate disciples—the faith in one God, the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth and the sea and all things in them: and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation: and in the Holy Spirit, who by the prophets had proclaimed the dispensations and the advents and the birth from the Virgin, and the suffering and the resurrection from the dead, and the bodily assumption into the heavens of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, and His coming from the heavens in the glory of the Father to gather again together in one all things, and to raise up all flesh of all humanity, in order that to Christ Jesus our Lord and God and Saviour and King, by the good pleasure of the Father invisible, every knee should bow of things in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess to Him, and [He] should do right judgment in all things: that He should send the spiritual powers of darkness, and the angels who transgressed and remained in disobedience, and the impious of men, and the unjust and lawless and blasphemers to the eternal fire: whilst to the just and holy, and such as keep His commandments and abide in His love, whether from the first or after repentance, He would give life and then incorruptibility and eternal glory. This teaching and this faith the church having so received, although now dispersed over the whole world, guards as carefully as if she still occupied one house: and in the same degree she believes all these tenets, as having one soul and one heart, and as it were with one harmonious voice she proclaims and teaches them, and passes them on as if she had only one mouth. For the dialects throughout the world may be unlike, but the tradition is virtually one and the same: and neither do the churches settled in the Germanies believe differently or teach differently, nor those in the Iberias, nor those among the Celts, nor in the parts of the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor those settled in the central parts of the inhabited world: but as the sun, the creation of God is in the whole world one and the same, so too the preaching of the truth (τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας) shines everywhere, and enlightens all men who are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth. And neither will the most able of those who preside in the churches teach things alien from these (for the disciple is not above his master), nor will the weak in the word withdraw aught from the tradition. For as there is [but] one and the same faith, so neither does he who is able to say much have anything over, nor he who can say little have any lack.”

11. The question at once arises, does the passage which Irenaeus here gives contain the precise form of the creed of his day, the precise words of “the canon of the truth which he received at his baptism”? The last sentence which we have translated seems to imply that it does; but before we can give a decisive answer in the affirmative, we must look to other passages in the writings of this early bishop.

12. In iii. 4, 2, he speaks again of the belief of the orthodox “in one God, the Creator of heaven and earth and of all things in them by Jesus Christ,” of whose incarnation, sufferings, resurrection, ascension and future glorious coming to

judgment, he speaks at length. In iii. 16, 6 he complains of the inconsistencies of heretics:—and his complaint is interesting because it shews that these confessions of belief were heard in the churches at other times besides the celebration of baptism. “The heretics” he says “acknowledge one Jesus Christ with their tongue but still expose themselves to ridicule, for they think one thing and state another:” and in order to contrast their belief with that of the church, he adds the church’s creed as to the work of the Saviour, and then repeats once more “there is one God the Father, and one Christ Jesus our Lord.” Again in iii. 24, 1, he writes of the “constant and continuous teaching of the church;” and in iv. 33, 7 “of the faith in one God Almighty of whom are all things; of the belief (πίστις) in the Son of God Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom are all things, and in His dispensations by which the Son of God became man; and in the Spirit of God who revealed the dispensations of the Father and the Son.”

13. From these various quotations it seems to be proved beyond dispute, that, whilst we cannot adduce any one passage from his work as containing all that the bishop of Lyons regarded as fundamental in the teaching of the church, yet the *Canon of the Truth* which he had received at baptism and which was heard at times in the assemblies of the faithful, was founded on a belief in the three Persons into whose Name he had been baptized, and contained the following articles: that the one God the Father Almighty is Maker of heaven and earth and all things therein: that the one Lord Jesus Christ is the only Son of God, our Lord; that He submitted to be born of a virgin, so uniting God and man: that He suffered under Pontius Pilate, rose again from the dead, ascended up to heaven and from heaven will come again to judge mankind, and take His own to Himself. The Holy Spirit is spoken of once as having foretold these things of old (as having spoken by the prophets), once again as revealing to man these dispensations now. Nor must we omit to notice that “the forgiveness of sins” is included in the promise of life to those who repent: the *κοινωνία* and *ἐννοια* in another passage (iii. 16. 6) may carry with them some intimation as to the communion of saints and the one church united in Christ its Head: we have again distinct mention of the resurrection of the body, and of eternal glory.

14. But the “Canon of the Truth” as Irenaeus laid it down in i. 10. 1 &c., must not be regarded as the *symbolum* or watchword, by the repeating of which the true believer was to be recognised; it can only be viewed as containing the teaching of the Christian minister, and as the *rule* by which the belief of the individual could be measured. Irenaeus says “the church believes”: he does not give us the form “I believe.” We may regard his various descriptions of the faith as equivalent to each other: we cannot regard them as identical. If we may use the figure, the various spaces marked out on the different *canons* might follow each other in different order whilst the sum or total length might be the same. But if a document was to answer either truly or figuratively the purpose of a password, not only must the order of the thoughts be fixed, but the expressions and phrases must be fixed also: and fixed the phrases certainly were not,

in the time of Irenaeus, in any form which he has given us—at all events in the church of Lyons.

15. Tertullian, "the younger contemporary of Irenaeus," furnishes us with corresponding evidence as to the church of Carthage. Three of this great writer's treatises contain approximations to formal rules of faith, viz.: *De praescript. c. 14*; *Adversus Praxeum c. 2*; *De Virgin. velandis c. 1*. These summaries are easily accessible in the originals, and they may be found collected in Dr. August Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln*, or Dr. Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica* or the same Professor's volume *de Fide et Symbolo*. It were superfluous therefore to print them here. All three contain, although not in the language of the present "Apostles' creed," the substance of the first seven articles of that creed, i.e. up to the "return to judgment;" and the two former make specific mention of the Holy Spirit, although not (in this connexion) as an object of belief. But we must not leave the subject here: in the treatise against Praxeas Tertullian states that "Christ after His ascension sent from the Father according to His own promise, the Holy Spirit the Comforter, to sanctify the faith of those who believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

16. Thus the words of Tertullian lead us to the same conviction as do the expressions of Irenaeus, viz.: that the primary baptismal confession corresponded to the baptismal formula: that as the convert was baptized "into the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," so might he be described as one who "believed in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." And the echo of such a baptismal confession survives this period by many years. It may be heard in the early and (as some think) genuine portion of "the faith" of the *Apostolic Constitutions* as given by Archdeacon Tattam from an Aethiopic manuscript.^c It may be heard in the treatise *de Sacramentis* ascribed though perhaps falsely to St. Ambrose.^d It may be heard in the formula for baptism found in an old Gallican missal.^e It may be heard in the ritual adopted by Boniface for use amongst his German converts.^f

^c *Constitutiones Copticae*, ed. H. Tattam, 1848, § 46: "I believe in the only true God the Father, the Almighty, and in His only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, and in the Holy Spirit the Giver of life." The subsequent clauses ("the consubstantial Trinity, one Lordship, one kingdom, one faith, one baptism, in the Catholic Apostolic Church, and one life everlasting") bear the marks of being a later addition.

^d Pseudo-Ambrose *de Sacramentis*, book ii. c. 7 (Migne, vol. xvi. p. 429): "Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem? Dixisti, Credo; et mersisti, hoc est sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, Credis et in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et in crucem ejus? Dixisti, Credo; et mersisti: ideo et Christo es conscriptus. Tertio interrogatus es, Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum? Dixisti Credo; tertio mersisti ut multiplicem lapsum superioris aetatis absolveret trina confessio."

^e Martene, *de Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritiibus*, i. p. 51: "Baptizo te credentem in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti ut habeas vitam aeternam in saecula saeculorum."

^f Migne, vol. 89, p. 810; Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, i. p. 186: "Gelobistu in got almehtigen fadaer? Ec gelobu in got almehtigen fadaer. Gelobistu in Crist godes suno? ec gelobo in Crist godes suno. Gelobistu in halogen gast? ec gelobo in halogen gast." See too the old Roman ritual as given by Daniel, i. p. 173, from Assemani.

17. But this short creed was, even in the time of Tertullian, either confined to a narrow range of country or modified according to circumstances. From the tract *de Corona Militis* § 3 we find that the catechumen was thrice immersed "answering something more than the Lord commanded in his gospel," and from the treatise *de Baptismo* § 11 we may surmise what this "something" was. It included certainly mention of the church; probably mention of repentance and remission of sins. Yea, more than this, the passages given in the note § contain evidence that the *regula fidei* in use made mention of the incarnation of Christ, His birth of the Virgin Mary, His crucifixion and resurrection and our resurrection also; and they are the more interesting, because, in the same treatise, Tertullian declares that in matters of teaching the church at Rome *cum Africanis ecclesiis contesserat*.

18. Thus as yet we have been unable to prove anything as to the confessions of faith used at this time in the church-services and in baptism, save that they contained an expression of belief in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: probably of belief in the resurrection, certainly of belief in the church, possibly also in the remission of sins. But that the words "Creator of heaven and earth" (which we have found in the creed of Irenaeus, and of which mention is made in two of the passages just quoted) was not as yet added to the baptismal creed of the churches of Africa, seems manifest after a careful examination of the writings of Cyprian, who followed Tertullian by a generation. He was bishop of Carthage from A.D. 248 to 258, and his correspondence contains several letters on the subject of rebaptizing those who had been baptized by heretical teachers. From these letters extracts will be found in the article CREEDS in the DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES. We will give additional information here.^h

^g After referring to the dispute between St. Peter and St. Paul at Antioch, Tertullian proceeds: "Utique conversationis fuit vitium non praedicationis. Non enim ex hoc alius Deus quam Creator: alius Christus quam ex Maria: et alia spes quam resurrectio adnuntiabitur" (*de Praescriptione Haeret.* § 23). "Etsi quaedam inter domesticos, ut ita dixerim, disserebant, non tamen ea fuisse credendum est, quae aliam fidei regulam superducerent diversam et contrariam illi quam catholice in medium proferebant, ut alium Deum in ecclesia dicerent, alium in hospitio; et aliam Christi substantiam designarent in aperto, aliam in secreto; et aliam spem resurrectionis apud omnes adnuntiarent, aliam apud paucos" (§ 26). Then of the Valentinians and others: "Si alium deum praedicant, quomodo ejus dei rebus et literis et nominibus utuntur adversus quem praedicant? Si eundem, quomodo aliter? Probat se novos apostolos esse: dicant Christum iterum descendisse, iterum Ipsum docuisse, iterum crucifixum, iterum resuscitatum" (§ 30). Of the church in Rome: "Unum Deum Dominum novit, creatorem universitatis, et Christum Jesum ex Virgine Maria filium Dei creatoris, et carnis resurrectionem" (§ 36). And in his irony Tertullian represents the Saviour as revoking part of His teaching to suit the spirit of the age: "Resurrectionem promiseram, etiam carnis, sed recogitavi, ne implere non possem: natum me ostenderam ex virgine, sed postea turpe mihi visum est: patrem dixeram qui solem et pluvias facit, sed alius me pater melius adoptavit" (§ 44).

^h We have given (l. c.) a passage from Cyprian *ad Magnum, Epist.* 69, § vii. A similar passage is found in Cyprian's letter to the bishops of Numidia (70, § ii.), except that the order of the two clauses is changed, and,

19. From the passages of Cyprian quoted here and in the note, the following facts may be inferred (i.) that the "law of Novatian's faith" was the same as that of the Church Catholic: the subjects on which he was in error had not as yet been specifically mentioned in any creed of the church, or in any rule of the faith: (ii.) that the form of interrogation at baptism was considered to be fixed and legalised: (iii.) that Novatian used this form; (iv.) and, if we consider that the "symbol" was different from this, he used the same symbol also: and we conclude that the accustomed form of interrogation contained at least the clauses "Dost thou believe in God the Father, in [His] Son Christ, in the Holy Spirit? dost thou believe remission of sins and eternal life through the church?" But we must add that there *may* have been, and probably was, an assertion that God was the Creator: and the baptismal creed may also have contained some mention of the birth and death and resurrection of the Saviour.

20. With this account of Cyprian's creed we should of course compare such fragments of the creed of Novatian himself as can be collected from his treatise *de Trinitate* (Migne, vol. iii. p. 886 &c., compare Hahn, *Bibliothek*, p. 74, and Dr. Heurtley, *Harmonia*, p. 21). Novatian says that the rule of faith requires us to believe "in Deum Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum conditorem" (c. i.); it requires us to believe "post Patrem in Filium Dei Christum Jesum, Dominum nostrum, sed Dei Filium" (cc. ix.-xxviii.); it requires us to believe "post hæc in Spiritum Sanctum olim Ecclesiæ repromissum sed statutis temporum opportunatibus redditum." He says nothing (but his subject did not require him to say anything) of the latter articles of Cyprian's creed. But in c. xxx. Novatian notices one word which is interesting, for it forms a link of connexion with the creeds of the Eastern church. "Nos scimus et legimus et credimus et tenemus *unam* esse Deum qui fecit coelum pariter ac terram."

21. We have now collected the chief notices that have come down to us of the creeds and rules of faith of the churches of Rome, of Africa, and of Lyons, in the first two hundred and fifty years of the Christian era. Of the Oriental canons and symbols we have discovered little,

instead of the simpler "credis," we have "credis in": thus, "credis in vitam æternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam." Compare again *Subitiano*, *Ep.* 73, § iv.: "Si fides una est nobis et hæreticis, potest esse et gratia una. Si eundem Patrem, eundem Filium, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, eandem Ecclesiam, confitentur nobiscum Patripassiani, Anthropiani.... Marcionitæ, et cæteræ hæreticorum pestes et gladii et venena subvertendæ veritatis, potest illic et baptismum unum esse, si est et fides una." In § v., after quoting the words of our Saviour on the institution of baptism, Cyprian remarks: "Insinuat Trinitatem cujus sacramento gentes baptizarentur. Numquid hanc Trinitatem Marcon tenet? Numquid eundem asserit quem et nos Patrem creatorem? Numquid eundem novit Filium Christum de Maria Virgine natum, qui sermo caro factus sit, qui peccata nostra portaverit, qui mortem moriendo vicerit, qui resurrectionem carnis per semet ipsum primus initiaverit et discipulis suis quod in eadem carne resurrexisset, ostenderit? Longe alia est apud Marcionem, sed et apud cæteros hæreticos fides." And again, §§ xii. and xviii. In the letter of Firmilian to Cyprian (*Ep.* 75, § 10) we hear of the "usitata et legitima verba interrogationis" at baptism.

unless we connect the rule of the church of Lyons with that of some of the churches of the East. But of the church of Alexandria we have further knowledge. From the first book of Origen's work *De Principiis* (written between 212 and 215), we learn that that eminent thinker considered that by the apostolic preaching it was handed down that we must believe that "there is one God who created all things: and that this God did in these last days send our Lord Jesus Christ: that Jesus Christ who came was born of the Father before all creation: that by Him were all things made. Emptying Himself He became man, was incarnate. He took a body similar to our body, differing only in this, that it was born of a Virgin and the Holy Spirit. This Jesus Christ was born and suffered of a truth: He truly died, and He truly rose again from the dead, and having after His resurrection lived with His disciples was taken up. Then they delivered [that] the Holy Spirit [was] associated with the Father and the Son in honour and dignity." These clauses are found in Origen's work, not strung together as we have repeated them, but severed by long discussions: and after another interval we find him stating that "there will be a time of the resurrection of the dead," and once more that "by the Spirit of God the Scriptures were composed." This may be taken as Origen's account of the apostolic preaching: this as his summary of the points which the original disciples wished their converts to believe.

22. Of the creeds of the next century we have abundant evidence. Indeed the epoch from A.D. 313 to 451 may be called the age of creeds. But it will be more convenient now to divide the subject, and to examine separately the further history of what are called the Nicene and Apostles' creeds, *i. e.*, the symbols of Eastern and Western Christendom; reserving for a later division the consideration of the so-called Athanasian creed, the hymn "Quicumque vult."

Nicene Creed.

23. From the earliest years of Christian history, the churches of Greece and of the East were more harassed by strange teachings than were those of the Latin races. It was the boast of Rufinus that no heresy took its rise within the church of Rome, and of Ambrose that the church of Rome had ever preserved undefiled the creed of the apostles. Tertullian's apostrophe to the "Felix Ecclesia" need not be quoted at length.¹ The key notes of the Eastern and the Western symbols (from the time when we can regard the Western symbol as that of a Latin church), may be learnt from the opening clauses. The former invariably begin, "I (or we) believe in one God;" the latter almost as invariably, "I believe in God." Of the growth of the latter form we must speak below, for the present we confine ourselves to the former. The creed in the seventh book of the *Apostolica Constitutions* is well-known, but other confessions of faith of scarcely less importance and interest have been collected and compared together. We may especially refer to one found amongst the few writings of Gregory of Neo-

¹ Rufinus, *de Symbolo*, § 2; Ambrose, *ad Syricum* (Letter 42, § 6); Tertullian, *de Præscript.* § 36.

Caesarea, who died about the year 270; and to another given by Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. 5, and Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 10, and ascribed to Lucian the martyr (†312). This latter (if genuine), can only be regarded as a declaration of personal belief, and thus whilst it would shew that the general line of such professions of the orthodox faith, the "regula fidei," was fixed, it would also shew that the words in which it was conveyed, the confessions in use in the churches at large, had not as yet assumed a defined and unchangeable form.^k

24. We are thus drawn onward to the creed which Eusebius of Caesarea laid before the council of Nicaea. After its last session he wrote to his flock an account of some of the incidents which had occurred at the synod, perhaps to defend himself for the part which he had taken in it. "He will give them" (he says), "first the writing concerning the faith which he had put forward, and next that which the fathers had published, *making additions to the words which he had submitted.*" "His own faith he had claimed to have received from the bishops who had gone before him; it was used when he was a catechumen, and again when he was baptized; the truth of the articles contained in it he had learnt from the Holy Scriptures, and during the whole of his ministerial life, both when he had been presbyter, and also whilst he had been bishop, he had believed it and had taught it." It could scarcely have been very widely spread, if Eusebius's account of its production at Nicaea is strictly accurate. However, according to his narrative, it formed the basis of

the proceedings of the council, it was the "rough draft;" and by introducing amendments and additions into it the fathers of the council produced the creed that has come down to us. Hence its interest and importance.

25. The writing of Eusebius was this. "We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, begotten before all creation, having been begotten of God the Father before all the ages: by whom too all things were made: who for our salvation was incarnate and lived among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day and ascended to the Father and will come again in glory to judge living and dead. We believe too in one Holy Spirit," and to this was added an expression of the belief of the church that each of these had a true subsistence: "the Father being truly Father, the Son truly Son, the Holy Spirit truly Holy Spirit, even as our Lord when He sent forth His disciples to preach said, 'Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.'" Against this creed (he had urged on the assembled bishops), no one could bring objections; Constantine had pressed them to accept it. But it did not answer the purpose of the bishops assembled: "they were determined to introduce the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and under the pretext of the *ὁμοούσιος* they put forward this writing."^l

26. The Nicene creed proper may be taken from the letter of Eusebius referred to above. It is printed among the works of Athanasius, of Theodoret, Socrates, and Gelasius, as may be seen in Mansi, ii. 916, and Hahn, p. 105. Later versions, to which we must refer as we pass on, modified it to suit later difficulties. But because of its importance we will print a translation of it at length, as it is found in the letter of Eusebius, putting into italics the words in which it differs (except in order), from the creed of the bishop of Caesarea (the asterisks mark omissions). "We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things both visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, **the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the essence (substance) of the Father, God of God, Light of Light,* very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both which are in heaven and which are on earth: who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate and was made man (ἐνανθρωπήσας)** suffered, and rose again on the third day and ascended *into the heavens and is coming to judge living and dead: and in the Holy Spirit*": and the council added the further declaration, "those who say that there was when the Son of God was not, or that before He was begotten He was not, or that He came into existence out of things which were not, or that He was of a different essence or substance (ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας), or was

^k Gregory's confession may be seen in Migne, *Graeco-Latin Collection*, vol. iii. p. 933, or in Mr. W. W. Harvey, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Vindex Catholicus*. Both are printed in Dr. Hahn's collection, pp. 97, 100. Dr. Hahn has printed two other formulae of interest; the one (p. 44) the declaration of the presbyters who assembled at Smyrna against Noetus (A.D. 220), terminating with the important words ταῦτα λέγομεν μετὰ ἀλλήλους ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν, ἃ καὶ ἐπιστάμεθα: the other (pp. 44-46) extracted from the long letter of Alexander of Alexandria to his namesake of Constantinople (the letter itself is in Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 4). Walch had overlooked the former, which Dr. Hahn considers to be the oldest extant witness to the creed of the Oriental church. Noetus had asked, "What evil have I done? One God I glorify, one I know and none other but Him, begotten, suffered, died." The presbyters replied, "One God we too glorify, but as we know how rightly to glorify Him—and one Christ we have, but, as we know, one Christ *Son of God*, suffered as He suffered, died as He died, rose again, ascended into heaven, is on the right hand of the Father, is coming to judge the quick and the dead." The case before them did not require the presbyters to enter on any later articles of their creed. (Notice the "one God.") But the letter of Alexander embraces clauses on the Holy Spirit, on the one and only Catholic Apostolic Church, on the resurrection from the dead, and (it is mentioned in connexion with the first coming of our Lord) on the putting away of sin. He begins πιστεύομεν ὡς τῇ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δοκεῖ, and towards the close (§ 13), he exclaims, ταῦτα διδάσκουμεν, ταῦτα κηρύττομεν, ταῦτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ ἀποστολικά δόγματα ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ ἀποθνήσκομεν. Thus both in its extent and language (although the order of the clauses is different) we see here a further progress towards the creed of Eusebius, and the creed of the council of Nicaea. We may note that this bishop also refers to the authority of Scripture as upholding the creed: "In addition to this pious opinion in regard to the Father and the Son, even as the Divine Scriptures teach us, we acknowledge one Holy Spirit."

^l It is unnecessary to print the original of this creed. Eusebius's letter may be seen in Mr. Harvey's *Vindex Catholicus*, vol. i., and among the works of Athanasius, Montfaucon, i. p. 238, and elsewhere; and the creed itself in Socrates, *H. E.* i. 8, in Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 12, and in Dr. Hahn, p. 46.

created, or was changed (ἡ κτιστὸν, τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν) the Catholic church anathematizes."

27. We must refer to the article on the NICENE COUNCIL for a history of this assembly. Eusebius, in his letter, states that Constantine was easily persuaded to accept the words "begotten, not made:" against the phrase *ὑποούσιον* he struggled longer. (With dean Stanley's *Eastern Church*, chapters ii. iii. iv. v., may be compared Professor Bright's *History* pp. 21-26: and the church historians generally.) The next fifty or sixty years furnished almost innumerable efforts on the part of Arian or Semi-arian bodies to evade or reject the word *ὑποούσιον*. Many of the creeds suggested may be seen in Athanasius's tract *de Synodis* written in 359 (compare the histories of Theodoret and the others). At Sardica in Illyria a council was held in the year 347 which was attended by numerous bishops from the West (some say 94, others 300) as well as by 76 from the East. The encyclical letter of this council is reproduced by Athanasius (*Apol. against Arians*) and by Theodoret (*H. E.* ii. 6): but we have in addition a letter concerning it addressed by Hosius, who presided, to the pope, Julius, which states that the fathers assembled accepted the Nicene faith (Mansi, vi. 1209). Thus the creed became in a sense, in which no other document rivals it, the Symbol of the universal church.

28. Fifty-six years later than the Nicene assembly, another council was held to consider the dangers arising from the spread of the Macedonian and Apollinarian heresies. In the year 381 one hundred and fifty bishops met at Constantinople, with the sanction of the emperor Theodosius. Before they separated they addressed a letter to the emperor begging him to receive the canons they had agreed upon, and stating that their first work had been to exchange kind offices with each other, and their next to lay down concise definitions,^a confirming the faith of the fathers who had met at Nicaea and anathematizing the heresies which had arisen opposed to that faith. They had also entered on some points concerning the good order of the churches, on which they had made canons, which they attached to their letter, and begged the emperor who had convoked them to set his seal to the work they had effected. Their first canon was this: "that the faith of the 318 fathers who had met at Nicaea in Bithynia was not to be put on one side, but it remained valid: and every heresy was anathematized, and especially the heresy of the Eunomians or Anomoeans, that of the Arians or Eudoxians, that of the Semi-arians or Pneumatomachi, that of the Sabellians, that of the Marcellians, that of the Photinians, and that of the Apollinarians." The other canons related to questions of church order, except those numbered v. and vii. (if we may call either one or both of these canons of this council) of which the former was considered by Zonaras to refer to the action of the council of Sardica. But, if we must believe much later accounts, (of which more hereafter,) the assembled bishops did not separate before they had agreed to a formula, which resembled the Nicene creed, and was held to be in thorough accordance with it; the authorship of

which was attributed by some to Gregory of Nyssa, by others to Gregory of Nazianzus (whose oration to the brethren assembled is printed in all collections of the councils): by others it is thought that the influence of Epiphanius of Constantia was such that he induced the fathers to accept his church's modification of the Nicene symbol. But this formula (if we may call it so) was neither mentioned in the canons of the council, nor connected with it by any contemporaneous writer. If it was ever seen by the assembly at all, it was read, and then simply deposited among the archives of the church at Constantinople.

29. We must therefore still follow the history of the Nicene symbol proper. Coming to the troubled gatherings at Ephesus (431) we remark that on the first day of the meeting of the more numerous party, (the oecumenical council as we designate it,) the Nicene creed was recited,^a and then the letter of Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius with its twelve anathemas—in reference to which the writer said that he considered that "he had not transgressed the correct word of the faith, nor the symbol which had been put forth at Nicaea." The fathers one and all took up the thought and repeated the sentiment in language slightly varying: and then they declared with the same unanimity that the letter of Nestorius to Cyril was not concordant (*σύμφωνος*) with the creed, and the cry arose "He that will not anathematise Nestorius, let him be anathema himself."^b We need not proceed with the history of the rival gatherings under Cyril and John of Antioch: our interest now concentrates on this, that each party claimed that it alone stood by the Nicene creed: the Nestorian body excommunicating Cyril and Memnon and the rest until "recognising their offence they should repent, and receive the faith of the holy fathers who had assembled at Nicaea, without any new or strange additions," and declaring that Cyril's "anathemas" (or "chapters" as we shall find them now called) "were full of the wrong notions of Apollinarius and Eunomius, and Arius:"^c whilst the friends of Cyril denied the accusation, and maintained that his letter was consentient with the Holy Scriptures and with the faith which had been handed down by tradition and expounded in the great synod of Nicaea.^d

At the sixth session of the council another incident occurred. Charisius a presbyter from Philadelphia appeared, to complain that he had met with erroneous teaching amongst the Lydians, coming (as he alleged) from friends of Nestorius, who had reduced their sentiments to the form of a creed, and had led their adherents to subscribe to it. By way, I suppose, of proving his own orthodoxy, he seems to have recited the confession of his own faith (*τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς πίστεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ*)—which differed in some respects from the Nicene symbol, the reading of which had been once again repeated at the opening of the session.^e He then read out the copy of the

^a Mansi, iv. 1137.

^b *Ib.* 1177.

^c *Ib.* 1278.

^d *Ib.* 1137.

^e The confession of Charisius may be seen in Mansi (iv. 1347), Labbe and Cossart (iii. 676 and iv. 293). Fleury calls it the Nicene creed erroneously (book xxv. ch. lvi.), for, although in accordance with that symbol, it is identical neither with it nor with any other symbol with which I am acquainted. It omits the following clauses: γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα: δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ

^a Mansi, iii. 557, and others.

"depraved creed" of which he had spoken, with the subscriptions of those who had acceded to it," and this reading was immediately followed up by the adoption of the decree which in many accounts appears as the seventh canon of the Ephesine council. This decree therefore was expressly made with reference to the teaching of which Charisius had complained, the "impious creed," as it is called in some documents,¹ of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

30. Thus both the contending parties at Ephesus appealed to the Nicene creed: John of Antioch claiming that his friends alone were the followers of the 318, because they repudiated the anathemas of Cyril, and stating (Mansi, iv. 1415) that the Arians were now boasting that the advocates of the "homousion" were coming round to their views by making a confusion of the natures; whilst the party of Cyril maintained that the twelve anathemas were legitimate deductions from the creed, being in no way dissonant from it. And this we must remember when we read that well-known decree, to which I have alluded as having been passed at the sixth session of the council. The decree was this: "The Holy Synod declares that no one is permitted to put forth or compose a faith different from that which has been settled by the holy fathers who with the Holy Spirit met together at Nicaea," and directs that those who dare either to compose a different creed (*συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν ἢ ἡοὺν προκομίζειν ἢ προφέρειν . . .*) or to offer or exhibit such a creed to any that may be willing to turn to the knowledge of the truth from Hellenism or Judaism, are, if bishops to be deposed from their bishoprics, if clerics from their office, if laics to be excommunicated. And "if any, whether bishops or clerics or laics, are detected as holding or teaching the things contained in the exposition that has been read by Charisius the presbyter, they are to be treated in the same way." Thus as yet we meet with no mention of the creed or exposition of Constantinople.²

οὐρανῶ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ; and the word *ἀνθρώπους* in the clause *δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπων*. Then it adds *ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν*: It adds *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου, and στανρωθέντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἀποθνήσκοντα* (omitting *παθόντα*), and concludes as follows, *καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ παράκλητον, ὁμοούσιον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, καὶ εἰς ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. The existence of this confession of faith would shew that the Nicene symbol had not superseded all others even in Lydia in the year 431.

¹ Mansi, iv. 1347; Labbe and Cossart, iii. 678. There is no difficulty here in picking out the heretical teaching. The document is long, an exposition of a creed rather than a creed itself, and amongst other things it declares, "The Lord God, the Word, took perfect man, of reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting: which man, being like us in nature, having been formed by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin, He in an inexplicable manner united to Himself." It is subscribed by about twenty persons (many of whom availed themselves of the pen of a senator or of the son of a deacon, either because they could not write at all, or because they wrote only slowly): all of them repudiate the heresy of the Quartodecimans, but none make mention of the creed either of Nicaea or of Constantinople.

² See Routh's *Opuscula*, vol. ii. p. 8.

³ Mansi, iv. 1361. This decision has often been referred to as if it prevented all future councils from altering or adding to the Nicene creed. Expressions of Eutyches to this effect were quoted at the council of Chalcedon. It

31. A few years later we come to the so-called "robber synod," which was held at Ephesus in the year 449. The history of it, as well as of the earlier gathering at Constantinople in 448, is to be found mixed up in the acts of Chalcedon, on the first of whose sessions the proceedings at both synods were read out from the minutes of the notaries present. This reading was continually interrupted by the comments and remonstrances of those who maintained that the proceedings at the synod were incorrectly reported. The scenes at times were scarcely less tumultuous than the scenes at the robber synod (except that no soldiers were brought in to coerce the bishops) as the accounts in Fleury and the church historians only too plainly shew. A synod at Constantinople (448) had condemned Eutyches (EUTYCHES) although he had expressed himself as prepared "to agree with the expositions of the fathers assembled at Nicaea and Ephesus and to subscribe to their interpretation" (Labbe, iv. 191, 208; Mansi, v. p. 699, 715); although as he afterwards wrote to Leo, "he declared his assent to the very words of the creed propounded by the council of Nicaea and confirmed at Ephesus." Leo had been moved by his entreaties, and permitted his envoys to appear at this "robber synod" (A.D. 449), where (though now against the wishes of the pope) the sentence against Eutyches was reversed, and Flavian was so maltreated that he died in consequence.² But before this Flavian had written to Theodosius, and in this letter we find this passage. He maintained that "he had followed the Divine scriptures and the expositions of the holy fathers

was explained then that it was "a decision, not a canon," and the reference to Charisius (which I have quoted above) seems to make it of a temporary character. But surely a general or even an oecumenical council could not expect to bind all similar assemblies to the end of time. I am not aware that any claim had as yet been put forward, that in expositions of the faith the council had provided for every difficulty which might arise; whilst in points of ritual and discipline early canons have been generally superseded. In point of fact the canon that we should not kneel on the Lord's day, or between Easter and Pentecost, stood on the same authority, originally, as the canon that three bishops at least should join in the consecration of a newly elected brother. But if it is still deemed worthy of inquiry whether the council of Chalcedon, or any other, whether national or provincial synod has contravened the definition or canon of Ephesus in regard to a creed, the answer is twofold. First, that the council clearly prohibited bishops, clerics, or laymen from putting forth private creeds of their own composition, for it said nothing about synodical action: and next, that the creeds prohibited were *ἐτέραι πίστες*, "creeds different in kind" (the fathers seem to have had in their minds the *ἐτέρον εὐαγγέλιον* of Gal. i. 6); and our explanation is confirmed by the fact, that we have no record that the fathers raised any objection to the confession of Charisius, although it varied in form from the Nicene symbol; and they had themselves adopted, though not as a symbol, the twelve *capitula* or *anathemas* of Cyril.

² In Leo's famous treatise on the Incarnation, issued now in the form of a letter to Flavian, we have the words twice quoted as from his creed, "qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine." These words form no part of the Nicene symbol; they are parts of the Roman creed. I quote them to shew that the decree of the general council of Ephesus had not been considered at Rome as sufficient to annul the creeds of the Western churches, (The letter is given in the *Councils* and in Migne, liv. p. 757.)

who had met at Nicaea, and of the 150 who had assembled here (at Constantinople) and of those who had gathered at Ephesus under Cyril of pious memory:" and he asserted that he preached the one our Lord Jesus Christ who was begotten of the Father before all ages as to His Deity, and in these last days, for us and for our salvation, of the Virgin Mary as to His humanity. Of course a question arises whether the "exposition of the 150," here referred to, is identical with or additional to the exposition of the council of Nicaea.

32. For when at Chalcedon, in 451, the portion of the minutes of the "robber synod" was read which contained the confession of Eutyches: when it was stated that he had recited the genuine Nicene symbol, and declared that "in it he had been baptized and in it he hoped to be perfected," and had reminded his hearers of the definition of the council under Cyril prohibiting either additions to or diminutions from it, Diogenes [DIOGENES] of Cyzicus (of the Asiatic party) cried out "He has adduced the synod falsely. The creed received additions from the holy fathers, because of the perversities of Apollinarius and Valentinus and Macedonius and men like them: and there have been added to the symbol of the holy fathers the words *Who came down and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*. This (he proceeds) Eutyches has passed over as being an Apollinarian: for even Apollinarius receives the synod of Nicaea, understanding the letter of the creed in accordance with his own perversities. The holy fathers at Nicaea had only the words *He was incarnate*, but those that followed them explained (*ἐσθφισαν*) it by saying of the *Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*." This statement was immediately contradicted by the Egyptian bishops, who cried out "No one admits of any addition: no one admits of any diminution. Let the decree of Nicaea stand good: the orthodox emperor has ordered it." (Labbe, iv. 134, 135; Mansi, vi. 632.) Thus of the two parties at the council, we find the Asiatic ready to accept some additions, the Egyptian anxious to exclude them: and as the latter became gradually weaker as the violence which Dioscorus had shewn at Ephesus became more and more exposed, we are prepared for the issue of the deliberations.

33. The first day's session was of a prolonged duration. It seems almost incredible that the council could have listened to all that is reported to have taken place; nor could they have gone through the work they did if they had not been repeatedly called to order by the lay magistrates who presided. At the close of the day these magistrates advised that each bishop present should hasten to put in writing his belief on the points at issue, "knowing that our divine and pious sovereign believes in accordance with the exposition of the 318 fathers who met at Nicaea, and the exposition of the 150 who met at a later period, and the canonical epistles and expositions of the holy fathers Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, and the two canonical epistles of Cyril, which were confirmed and published at the first synod of Ephesus." The council adjourned two days for the purpose.

34. Thus prepared we read the proceedings of the second session. In their opening address the magistrates repeated the words with which they

had dismissed the assembly two days before, referring again to the exposition of the 150. Their allusions to this exposition the bishops seem to have disliked, and they declined to give off hand any new account of the faith. It had "been well defined by the 318 and by the holy fathers, Athanasius," and so on. "Let their writings be read." The magistrates assented; and first EUNOMIUS, bishop of Nicomedia, read from a book the exposition of the synod which met at Nicaea; and then AETIUS, the deacon of Constantinople, read thus from a book, *The holy faith which the holy fathers, in number 150 put forth, agreeing with the holy and great synod of Nicaea*; and now at last we meet with a copy of this version of the Nicene creed. The two expositions were received by the bishops in a different manner. To both they cried, "This is the faith of the Catholics: this is the faith of all. We all believe like this." In regard to the Nicene creed they added, "In this we have been baptized: in this we baptize. This is the true faith. This is the holy faith: this is the eternal faith: into this we were baptized; into this we baptize." But there was no such cry of response when the exposition of the 150 was recited (Mansi, vi. 957; Labbe, iv. 342); of it they only asserted, "This is the faith of the orthodox: this we all believe." It was not regarded as a symbol.

35. We may now note the points of difference. In the first clause we read now "maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible." The next article runs, "and in one Lord Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds," and the words, "God of God," are omitted. After the participle "came down," are added the words from heaven: after "incarnate," the words, of the *Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*: the clause, *crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate*, was inserted before "He suffered," and the word *buried* added: His resurrection was declared to be according to the Scriptures: the expression was inserted, *He sitteth at the right hand of the Father*, so the words, *with glory*, were applied to His return; and the important addition made, "of whose kingdom there shall be no end." Of the true origin of all the earlier phrases,—whether they were really found amongst any documents of the council of the 150,—we may be permitted at first to feel some doubts. The character of Aetius, who seems to be the only channel through which they come to us, is not above suspicion: but we may have less hesitation in ascribing to the assembly at Constantinople the great additions made at the end of the document. After the words, "and in the Holy Spirit," were introduced the well-known phrases: *the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified together: who spake by the prophets: in one Holy Catholic and apostolic church: we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins: we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen*. The subjects of these were not now in controversy; there was no motive now to modify the creed in respect to them.

36. I have expressed some doubt as to the confidence we may place in the character of Aetius, and as to the question whether this creed, in the phrases which refer to the Incarnation,—

the two natures meeting in the one person of the Blessed Redeemer.—could truly have proceeded from the 150 who met at Constantinople in the year 381. We have seen how the friends both of Nestorius and Eutyches clung to the Nicene creed proper; and how the Egyptian bishops in 451 cried out that the words “of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary” were not to be accepted. Can we in any degree trace out the history of these additions, so as to assign them to their various authors? Of the clauses with which the creed concludes (“the Holy Catholic Church” to the end) many are found in the letter which Arius and Euzoios addressed to the emperor after the Nicene council, in which they stated the faith which they were willing to adopt (Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 27; Socrat. *H. E.* i. 26). They are also found expounded in the catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, to which we must assign a date not lower than 350. Again, the clauses referring to the Holy Spirit are clearly directed against the heresy of the Macedonians; they may therefore be safely assigned (without further evidence) to the era of the council of Constantinople. But we have other evidence: we find that not only these clauses, but those also which speak of the incarnation “of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary” are contained in the treatise of EPIPHANIUS (bishop of Constantia in Cyprus) called *Ancoratus*; a treatise which is stated by the author to have been written in a year corresponding to our 374, *i. e.* seven years before the council of Constantinople. It does not appear that Epiphanius was present at the council, but M. Caspari considers that his influence at the time was such that he was able to induce the fathers assembled there to accept the words which he had exhibited in his treatise.

37. The words of Epiphanius are these: παρέλαβον οἱ ταύτης (τῆς ἐκκλησίας) παῖδες παρὰ ἁγίων πατέρων, τοῦτέστιν τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, πίστιν φυλάττειν . . . ταῦτα οὕτως λέγοντες καὶ τὰ τοῦτοις ὅμοια ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν βεβαιῶσαι αὐτοὺς τε καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἑαυτῶν . . . μὴ διαλεῖπτε ταύτην τὴν ἁγίαν πίστιν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὥς παρέλαβεν ἡ ἁγία καὶ μονὴ πάρθενος τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων φυλάττειν, καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστον τῶν κατηχομένων τῶν μελλόντων τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσεῖναι οὐ μόνον ἀπαγγέλλειν ὀφείλετε τὸ πιστεύειν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν υἱοῖς ἐν κυρίῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ διδάσκειν ῥητῶς ὡς πάντων ἡ αὐτὴ μήτηρ ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν τὸ λέγειν, πιστεύομεν.—and he gives almost verbatim the creed of Constantinople, concluding with the anathemas of Nicaea. And then he proceeds to state how, “in our generation, that is, in the times of Valentinian and Valens, and the 90th year from the accession of Diocletian the tyrant (*i. e.* in the year 374) you and we and all the orthodox bishops and the whole Catholic church together make this address to those who come to baptism, in order that they may proclaim and say as follows.” Then, strangely enough, he gives another creed, or rather an exposition of a creed, which contains many interesting passages. We have here the phrase, *γεννηθέντ᾽ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, which (and not the more authentic document) suggested to Dionysius Exiguus (Mansi, iii. 567) the translation “*incarnatus de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine*,” since adopted by the church of Rome (as in the council of Trent, session iii.)

and by the church of England. Besides this we must note the words *τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον*. The Nicene anathema, extended to condemn errors regarding the Holy Spirit, was added to the form, and another anathema on those who deny the resurrection of the dead (Migne, *Patrolog.* xliii. 231, &c.) Archbishop Ussher was inclined to believe that, after the council of Nicaea had separated, the bishops who had been commissioned to edit its acts had of themselves circulated the creed with these additions. This explanation would satisfy the conditions of the problem so far as the words of Epiphanius are concerned, but the outcry of the Egyptians and the MSS. adduced by Eutyches and others are inconsistent with it.

38. But we must not pass over the notices of the creed of the church of Antioch which we find in the writings of JOHN CASSIAN, one of the early upholders of the monastic system in the West. About the year 430, when residing at Marseilles, he wrote at the request of Leo, then archdeacon, subsequently the great bishop of Rome, a work, *De Incarnatione Christi*. In book vi. c. 9 of this work (Migne, l. pp. 142–149) after claiming to have refuted Nestorius by arguments from Scripture, he appeals to the faith of the creed of Antioch (*fides Antiocheni symboli*) as alone sufficient to convict him, and he says, “*textus ac fides Antiocheni symboli haec est.*” (The text may be seen in Hahn, p. 34, or Nicolas, p. 345: it bears some similarity to the creed of Eusebius, but it contains the Nicene test word “*homousion Patri*,” and it includes the phrase “*qui natus est ex Maria Virgine.*”) The object of Cassian did not lead him to quote the latter part of the creed. But M. Caspari (p. 83) conceives that he has discovered from the writings of Chrysostom, that this latter part embraced the clauses, “and in remission of sins, and in the resurrection of the dead, and in life everlasting.” (Chrysostom, *Hom.* 40 in *Epist. ad Corinth.*) This creed must be considered as of earlier date than Cassian himself; he calls it the property of all the churches, but especially of the church and city of Antioch: he says, “*collata est ab apostolis Domini;*” yea God himself “*symbolum constituit.*” But all this shews that the creed of Nicaea had not superseded other symbols, even in the East, in the year 431.

39. Turning again to the “*Credo in unum Deum,*” we have seen that the assembled fathers at Chalcedon accepted the exposition which Aetius read out, as exhibiting their faith, although no one stated that into it he had been baptized. Our course is now simpler as the history unfolds itself. The emperor wished the fathers (there were 630 assembled) to issue a new creed, such as would exclude both Nestorians and Eutychians, but this they declined to do. So at their fifth session they “renewed and confirmed the faith of the fathers, and proclaimed to all the symbol of the 318: they acknowledged as friends and as of the same household all who had received this composition of religion (*τοῦτο τὸ σύνθεμα τῆς εὐσεβείας*), and such were the 150 who had subsequently met in the great city of Constantine.” They quoted at length and

γ The suggestion is a further comment on the meaning of the canon of Ephesus.

adopted both summaries: "both the exposition of the 318" and "the things which had been defined by the 150 for the uprooting of the heresies which had then sprung up and for the confirming of the same our catholic and apostolic faith." They decreed that the faith of "the 318 should remain without being meddled with (*ἀπαρχαλήπτου*)," and yet "confirmed the teaching in regard to the Holy Spirit which had been handed down by the 150;" and finally, after hearing once more the canon of the council of Ephesus under Cyril, "all the most religious bishops cried out, This is our faith: let our metropolitans subscribe: let them subscribe at once in the presence of the magistrates: things well defined admit of no delay: this is the faith of the apostles: by this we all walk: we all thus think."

40. With our modern notions of accuracy and precision in legal or deliberative proceedings, there is much in this which may cause us perplexity. It seems to be left in doubt, whether the exposition or teaching (as they called it) of the 150 was to be regarded as a creed, which might replace the Nicene symbol, or only as an authorised commentary or explanation of it. We must, however, note that the fathers of the council of Chalcedon in no synodical act called it a symbolum. Still, as in other cases, we may look to the subsequent history as giving to us the contemporary interpretation of their meaning, and most certainly the exposition of the 150, now sanctioned and adopted by the 630, was ere long largely substituted for the symbol of the 318, even though, in effecting the substitution, the church never lost sight of the definition of the council of Ephesus. Thus it becomes clear that the "catholics" did not regard the creed as the composition of a bishop, of a cleric, or of a layman, nor did they look upon it as being *ἐκ τῆς πλειότητος*, a different faith from the faith of the Nicene council; they viewed it rather as having the sanction of the whole church, East and West, assembled at Chalcedon, and as a legitimate and concordant exposition of the original symbol.

41. The liturgical history of the Nicene or Constantinopolitan creed has been treated in the other department of this Dictionary. But there are two important additions to its language in the versions used over Western Europe, to which our attention must now be drawn. At some time or other the words "Deum de Deo" were added in the Latin to the Constantinopolitan creed (their equivalent had been in the original Nicene). More momentous has been the addition in the clause *qui ex Patre Filioque* (or *et Filio*) *procedit*. The former was probably added in error; a scribe's accuracy being affected by his memory of the Nicene formula:^a with the latter

a long history is connected, and as it comes partly within the limits of our Dictionary, we are required to say something on the interpolation.

42. The fifth and sixth general councils (as they are called) held at Constantinople, A.D. 533 and 681, adopted in their integrity the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople together with the canon of Ephesus, as they were all embodied in the acts of the council of Chalcedon (Mansi, ix. 186; xi. 295, 633). But in the year 589 (Mansi, ix. 977, etc.; see Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. iii. p. 46, etc.) a synod was held at Toledo, called by Reccared, king of the Goths, and attended by 68 Spanish bishops. At this synod, in order to testify their renunciation of the Arian errors, Reccared and the bishops first recited the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople as containing the belief of the universal church, and then subscribed the definition of the council of Chalcedon.^a The Nicene creed is still the *fides*, the Constantinopolitan the *doctrina*. But in their copy of this *doctrina* we find one or two words (*Filioque* or *et Filio*, the copies vary) inserted in the clause relating to the procession of the Holy Spirit. Was this done intentionally, or in error? Mr. Ffoulkes (*Christ. Divisions*, ii. pp. 358, 431) conceives that we must answer, "in error." There is no evidence that the Spanish council proposed to make any addition: they seem to have thought that they were simply adopting the definition of the great council of Chalcedon, and using the creed after the form of the Oriental churches. The origin of the addition remains therefore in obscurity. Not so the reason for its continuance. It was the same national synod which directed that the creed should be recited at the time of the sacrifice, before the communion of the body and blood of Christ;^b

p. 536), but not in the *Prisca Can. Translatio* (Mansi, vi. 1125; Hahn, p. 107); it is not found in the translation made by Dionysius Exiguus (Hahn, p. 113); nor in the Gelasian Sacramentary (Heurtley, p. 158; Muratori, i. 540); but it is found in the translations put forth by Isidorus Mercator (Mansi, iii. 574), and in the acts of the council of Toledo, A.D. 589 (Mansi, ix. 277). These data seem to warrant the conclusion that the words "Deum de Deo," as well as the addition "et Filio" or "Filioque," worked their way into the use of the Western church from the Spanish communion.

^a There are two subscriptions (Mansi, ix. 983 and 1000). The form of the latter may be noted. "I, king Flavius Reccared, in confirmation of these matters, which with the Holy Synod we have defined, have subscribed." The eight leading bishops sign thus: "I have subscribed, assenting to these constitutions." The rest simply subscribe. I am much indebted here to the labours of Mr. Edmund S. Ffoulkes (*Christendom's Divisions*, vol. ii.), although my results do not always agree with his.

^b The words of the order of Reccared to the bishops are interesting: "Ut propter roborandam gentis nostrae novellam conversionem omnes Hispaniarum et Galliae [Galliciae] ecclesiae hanc regulam servant, ut omni sacrificii tempore ante communionem corporis Christi vel [or et] sanguinis, juxta orientalium patrum morem, unanimiter clara voce sanctissimum fidel recenseant symbolum: ut primum populi quam credulitate teneant fateantur, et sic corda fide purificata ad Christi corpus et sanguinem percipiendum exhibeant" (Mansi, ix. 990). This is the position which the creed occupies in the Mozarabic liturgy (Daniel, *Codex Liturg.* p. 91) which once prevailed over all Spain, but is now confined to the chapel of Corpus Christi attached to the metropolitan church of Toledo. This same synod put forth some canons. The third is (Mansi, ix. 985): "Quicumque Spiritum Sanctum

^a Dr. Routh (*Opuscula*, i. p. 426) notes that the words "Deum de Deo" are not found in the old MS. translation edited by Pithaeus, which he has printed on p. 399; nor does the interpolation appear in the version submitted to the sixth general council, A.D. 681; nor in a copy sent by Jeremias, patriarch of Constantinople, to Tübingen, a MS. of which was in the possession of Sir Thomas Phillipps in 1840. All the Latin MSS. of the acts of the council of Chalcedon omit the phrase (Steph. Baluzii *Nova Collectio Canonum*, 1256). It is, however, found in the second form given by Epiphanius: in the translation of the creed given by Hilary of Poitiers, *de Synodis*, § 84 (Migne, x. CHRIST. BIOGR.

and thus the additional clause became the property of the laity as well as the clergy, and the natural result followed in an increasing unwillingness to resign the words. There were other councils at Toledo, in the years 653 and 681, and at these the creed was again recited with the words *et Filio* (Mansi, xi. 1027), "as we have received it, and (as the fathers said), sicut etiam in missarum solenniis patulis confessionum vocibus proclamamus."

43. From Spain the interpolated symbol spread into France: it seems to have reached even England in 680. In that year there was a synod at "Heathfield" (see Ussher, *de Symbolo*, p. 24), and the words *ex Patre et Filio* are found in one of the canons of the synod. Our authority is Bede, who wrote his history in 734 and died in 735; and we can scarcely deem them to be a modern interpolation, because they appear in their place in Alfred's translation. After the death of Bede we find the clause warmly adopted by Charlemagne, who pressed the successive popes, Adrian and Leo III., to accept it. The second council of Nicaea (regarded by the Roman church as the seventh general council) was held in A.D. 787; and at this council TARASIVS, patriarch of Constantinople, delivered a long exposition of his belief, in which the words occurred, that he believed in "the Holy Spirit who proceedeth from the Father by the Son" (*τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Ἰοῦ ἐκπορεύμενον*, Mansi, xii. 1121). The papal legate accepted the account of the faith of Tarasius (*ib.* 1145), and then Charlemagne wrote to Adrian, objecting to the words. He said (Mansi, xiii. 760) that "Tarasius was wrong in that in the recitation of his belief he had professed not that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son, according to the faith of the Nicene symbol, but that he proceedeth from the Father by the Son."^c Adrian did not object to the version of Charlemagne, nor did he inform him that in the true version of the creed neither *et Filio* nor *per Filium* occurred. He contented himself by shewing by quotations from Athanasius, Hilary, and others, that in his belief Tarasius was not heretical. Yet in the Latin version of the creed given by Mansi (xiii. 729) as having been recited or adopted by this "seventh council," the words are "qui ex Patre Filioque procedit." If these words were genuine, the argument of Mr. Ffoulkes would fall to the ground, for the addition must then have been accepted at a general council of the church. But the subsequent history shews that this Latin version is incorrect, possibly intentionally so.

44. The motive for Charlemagne's remonstrance with Adrian may be learnt from the very brief record which we have of the synod at Gentilly A.D. 767 (Mansi, xii. 677). Almost all we know of it is found in the writings of Ado of Vienne. He says that there was "a question here between the Greeks and the Romans in regard to the Trinity, and whether the Spirit, as He proceeds from the Father, so proceeds from the Son, and also in regard to figures of the saints, whe-

ther they are to be fixed or painted in our churches." Then came the council of Frankfurt, attended, it is said, by 300 bishops of Germany, Spain, France, and Britain, which declared its belief in the Spirit "a Patre et Filio procedentem" (Mansi, xiii. 905; Hefele, iii. p. 646, note). But still more important in this respect is the council of Friuli (Forum Julii) which met under PAULINUS patriarch of Aquileia, in the year 796. (Mansi, xiii. 827, gives the date as 791 in his text, but it is now generally believed that it was held five years later.) The subject of the creed again came under discussion, and the council adopted the interpolated form, directing that all should learn it by heart. More important still is it that the patriarch Paulinus confessed the truth as to the origin of the addition. "Just as (he writes) the 150 fathers who met at Constantinople by way of exposition supplemented the meaning of the 318, and confessed that they believed in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, so afterwards, because of those heretics who whispered about that the Holy Spirit is of the Father alone and proceedeth from the Father only, the word was added, *who proceedeth from the Father and the Son*. Yet are they not to be blamed who did this, as if they had added to or diminished aught of the creed of the 318; for they held no opinion differing from theirs, they sought only to fill up their meaning, which in other respects they left untouched" (Mansi, xiii. 856). But ere long the addition produced other troubles. Some monks of a Frank convent on Mount Olivet complained to Leo III. (who had succeeded Adrian in the papacy in December 795) that they had been accused of heresy, and partially excluded from the church of the Nativity on Christmas Day, because they held that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son; yea, they were charged with reciting more than was held in the Roman church.^d But yet one of their number had so heard it sung in the West, in the chapel of the emperor. What were they to do? They requested the pope to give them instruction and direction. Leo had adopted the belief of the West, but he objected to the dogma being introduced into the creeds of the church universal; nor was his line of action altered by a synod which Charlemagne once more summoned to consider the matter. The question was becoming important, for the emperor would not give way. His bishops met at Aix-la-Chapelle in the winter of 809 (see Eginhard in Migne, *Patrolog.* civ. p. 472), and BERNHARD bishop of Worms, and ADELARD abbat of Corby, were dispatched to Rome to ask for the authorisation of the Roman see to the interpolation on which Charlemagne had resolved. An account of the interview has been preserved, and is translated at some length by Dr. Neale in his *History*

non crediderit a Patre et Filio procedere, eumque non dixerit coaeternum esse Patri et Filio et coaequalem, anathema sit."

^c *Obiectio*—Quod Tarasius non recte sentiat qui Spiritum Sanctum non ex Patre et Filio secundum *Nicaeni symboli fidem*, sed ex Patre per Filium procedentem in suae credulitatis lectione profiteatur."

^d The letter was brought to light by Baluzius, and is published in his *Miscellanea*, lib. vii. p. 14, or vol. ii. p. 84, ed. Mansi. It is quoted by Binterim, 358, and Mr. Ffoulkes, p. 71. The charge was that, "in symbolo nos dicimus plus quam vos (i. e. Romani) *qui ex Patre Filioque procedit*." Binterim, who ignored the difficulty as to the *Filioque*, considered that the passage shews that the Roman church still used the Nicene creed proper. It does prove that the addition in the creed printed by Mansi under the second Nicene council is spurious; and perhaps it leaves us with the conviction that the Roman church still used the Roman creed

of the Holy Eastern Church (General Introduction, part ii. pp. 1164-1166). It concluded by one of the deputies asking his Holiness whether he directed that the word in question should be expunged from the creed; and the pope replied that such was his wish: "there were other things equally true which were not contained in the creed; they were taught in another manner, so must be taught this truth of the Procession: if difficulty arose, let them give up the custom of singing the creed in the palace of the emperor: it was not sung in our holy church in Rome: thus the cause of contention would be removed, and peace would be restored." (The mention of singing indicates that the *laity* would miss the word, if it were omitted.) And he begged again that the churches of Germany would say the symbolum in the mysteries in accordance with the Roman ritual (see Martene, p. 138; Binterim, p. 357). This was followed by a synod at Rome, A.D. 810, which protested against the addition (Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 702).

45. But neither the advice of Leo nor the protest of his council produced any effect. If the pope would not give way, neither would the emperor. The latter died in 814, the creed which he patronised being still *sung* in his chapel. The former suspended in the basilica of St. Peter two silver shields or tablets, "each weighing one hundred pounds," on which were engraved, in its uninterpolated form, the creed of the council of Constantinople in Greek and its Latin translation. The successors of Charlemagne were as obstinate as their ancestor, and whilst in the church of Rome (as we learn from Photius, *de Spiritus Mystagogia*; Migne, *Græco-L.* vol. cii. p. 395) directions were given that the creed should be recited in Greek *ἵνα μὴ τὸ στενὸν τῆς διαλέκτου βλασφημίας παρασχῇ πρόφασιν*,^e the Spanish form was still spreading. It was of no avail that John VII. condemned the addition in 879 (Mr. Ffoulkes, *u. s.* pp. 74, 399, 413), or that in the spring of the succeeding year his legates approved the act of the synod of Constantinople which re-affirmed the creeds of the 318 and the 150, and rejected all interpolations (Mosheim, i. 150, ed. Stubbs). The custom introduced by Reccard still prevailed. The churches of the West maintained their independence. Aeneas, bishop of Paris, informs us (circ. 863) "that the whole Gallican church chanted the creed at the mass every Sunday," with the interpolated clause, and Walafrid Strabo states that the same custom prevailed wider and more frequently in the churches of Germany.^f At length these churches prevailed over the pope, and when the emperor Henry persuaded Benedict to use the creed of Constantinople at the mass, we can have little doubt that the pope accepted the Western form with the Western rite.^g The

subsequent controversies on the subject (as that during the council of Florence) fall below our chronological limit; but the histories of the controversies and the council undoubtedly suggest to us what was the (unacknowledged) motive, why at the opening sessions of the council of Trent the Latin bishops there assembled put as the purport of their dogmatic statements not the Roman creed, not the hymn "Quicumque vult," but the symbol of Constantinople in its interpolated form.^h

The Apostles' or Roman Creed.

46. We may now turn to the consideration of the further development of the Roman creed, "that which is commonly called the Apostles' creed." The history of this symbol differs essentially from the history of the creed of Constantinople: as a symbol, a doctrine, a teaching, an exposition of the faith of the church Catholic, that creed was (with the exceptions to which we have devoted so much attention) first framed and subsequently adopted by large synods of the bishops of the church universal; and the successive stages of its growth are so far distinctly recognisable. With the exception of the words referred to, it is even now acknowledged by almost all the churches throughout the world. But the so-called Apostles' creed has grown to its present dimensions almost as it were in the dark. The modes how and the authorities by whose influence the successive accretions were made are almost entirely unknown; and its use is confined to churches now or once belonging to the Roman patriarchate. We are told that, at the council of Florence, Ephesius, one of the legates of the Eastern churches, declared that this creed was not used in their services; moreover, that "they had it not, nor had they seen it before."ⁱ The Greek forms which now occasionally appear in print are comparatively modern translations from

have been often quoted. (See Binterim, p. 359, or Daniel's *Codex Liturg.* i. 126.) "Si ideo, ut saepe dictum, illum angelicum hymnum (the *Gloria in excelsis*) problemur in festivis diebus cantare eo quod Romanorum presbyteri non solent eum canere, possumus simili modo post evangelium, symbolum reticere, quod Romani usque ad haec tempora divinae memoriae Henrici imperatoris nullo modo cecinerunt: sed ab eodem interrogati cur ita agerent; me coram assistente," they returned the answer quoted above, § 43: "At Dominus imperator non ante desit, quam omnium consensu a Domino Benedicto apostolico persuasit ut ad publicam missam illud decantarent. Sed utrum hanc consuetudinem servent adhuc, affirmare non possumus, quia certum non tenemus." With reference to this concession Mr. Ffoulkes in his pamphlet *Church's Creed or Crown's Creed* (pp. 5, 6), states that before the 11th century the oath which the pope took at his election was, that he would preserve unmutated the decrees of the first five councils and of the sixth as well, *usque ad unum apicem*. This was now cancelled, and, nearly simultaneously, the addition, "and from the Son," was accepted through all the churches of the West.

^h This session, the third, was held on Feb. 4, 1546. "Following the example of the fathers in the early councils the oecumenical and general synod resolves, that the symbol of the faith which the Holy Roman church uses shall be expressed in the words in which it is recited in all the churches.

ⁱ *Vera Historia unionis non verae inter Graecos et Latinos*, per Sylvestrem Guropolum. I have not seen the work. I quote the passage from M. Nicolas, *Le Symbole des Apôtres*, p. 270. *ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐτε ἔχομεν οὐτε εἶδομεν σύμβολον τῶν ἀποστόλων*. See too Waterland, iii. p. 196, note.

^e These are said to be the words of Photius, although we have a various reading *ῥαθυμίας* for *βλασφημίας*. I am inclined to see here a satiric allusion on the part of the Greek patriarch to the ignorance of Greek now prevailing in the West. The order of the popes was afterwards executed by exhibiting the Greek creed in Latin letters, as we shall see below.

^f Aeneas bishop of Paris, ap. Dacherii *Spicilegium*, tom. i. p. 113, ch. xciii. (referred to by Caspari, p. 218); Walafrid Strabo, *de Reb. Eccles.* cap. 22 (see Martene, p. 138; Binterim, vol. iv. part 3, § 9, &c.).

^g Portions of the following passage from Berno Augustensis, *de quibusdam rebus ad Missam spectantibus*, c. 2,

the Latin, and have no independent authority. The version published by archbishop Ussher, from a MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and referred to as of value by bishop Pearson in his remarks on the word *Almighty*, is now considered to belong to the 15th century.¹

47. In regard to the name, "Apostles' Creed," we must note that it is only of late years that it has been confined to the symbol before us. Archbishop Ussher brings forward many proofs that the Nicene creed was at times so designated, and we know that as late as the 10th or 11th century the title was applied in the same MS. and within a few pages, to the Nicene and what we call the Apostles' creed. Thus, when we meet with this title in the first ten centuries we must be on our guard not to assume at once that the symbol meant is that to which we now confine the name.¹

48. We must refer to Dr. Heurtley's valuable collection of creeds of the Western church as superseding the necessity of any lengthened dissertation on our part. It has been supplemented by two "University Programmes" published by Dr. C. J. Caspari, professor of theology at the Norwegian university, which were published at Christiania in 1866 and 1869. Dr. Heurtley traces the growth of the creed (as far as it can be traced) through Tertullian and Cyprian: then we must take a leap from Novatian (A.D. 260) to Rufinus bishop of Aquileia (A.D. 390), the intermediate space of 130 years affording only one stepping-stone, furnished by the notes of the belief of Marcellus of Ancyra, which he delivered on his departure from Rome. The date of this is A.D. 341. We might have expected Marcellus to have exhibited his belief in the words of the creed of Nicaea; the fact that he used another symbol is interesting for more

reasons than one.^m It comes to us in Greek and with the assurance that he had received it from the Scriptures, and been taught it by his forefathers in the Lord; by which he must have meant that he regarded it as in entire accordance with the Scriptures. The creed of Ancyra then must in substance have accorded nearly with the creed of Rome as we learn it from Rufinus, differing from it only in the following points, viz.: it omits the name *Father* in the first article: it reads "born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary": and at the end there is added the clause "eternal life."

49. We are thus prepared to accept the general statement of Rufinus in regard to the creeds of his own church of Aquileia and the church of Rome, about the year 390, when it is considered that he wrote his interesting exposition de *Symbolo*. In this exposition we meet, for the first time, with the suggestion (not entirely adopted by the author) that *σύμβολον* may have been a corruption of *συμβολή*: that the creed may have been called a *symbol*, as being a *contribution*, because the apostles, before they parted for their work, *contributed* the various clauses of which it is composed. It is more probable, historically, that the error as to the meaning of the word gave birth to the tale; if *symbol* meant *collation*, the apostles alone could have been the collators. But when Rufinus makes remarks on the difference between his and the Roman creed, it becomes evident that he cannot have attached any great value to the legend: it becomes clear that he was aware that the symbols had varied in some degree since the apostles' times.

50. We will put the two creeds in parallel columns, the better to exhibit their differences and their agreements; in the third column we will place the modern Roman creed.

AQUILEIAN CREED.

Credo in Deo Patre
omnipotente, invisibili
et impassibili
et in Christo Jesu unico Filio ejus,
Domino nostro
Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto
ex Maria Virgine
crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus

descendit in inferna
tertia die resurrexit a mortuis
ascendit in caelos
sedet ad dexteram Patris
inde venturus est judicare vivos et
mortuos
et in Spiritu Sancto
sanctam ecclesiam

remissionem peccatorum
hujus carnis resurrectionem.

OLD ROMAN CREED.

Credo in Deum Patrem
omnipotentem

et in Christum Jesum unicum Filium
ejus Dominum nostrum
Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto
ex Maria Virgine
crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus

tertia die resurrexit a mortuis
ascendit in caelos
sedet ad dexteram Patris
inde venturus est judicare vivos et
mortuos
et in Spiritum Sanctum
sanctam ecclesiam

remissionem peccatorum
carnis resurrectionem.

MODERN ROMAN CREED.

Credo in Deum Patrem
omnipotentem, creatorem caeli et
terrae
et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus
unicum Dominum nostrum
qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto
natus ex Maria Virgine
Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus
mortuus et sepultus
descendit ad inferna
tertia die resurrexit a mortuis
ascendit ad caelos [tantis
sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipo-
inde venturus est judicare vivos et
mortuos
Credo in Spiritum Sanctum
sanctam ecclesiam Catholicam
sanctorum communionem
remissionem peccatorum
carnis resurrectionem
vitam aeternam.

We have printed in italics the passages where-
in any one creed differs from both of the others,

and it will be seen that the two contemporary
symbols differ from each other scarcely less

¹ Dr. Caspari has printed two such translations in the *Theol. Zeitsch.* of Johnson and Nissen, but I have not been able to see them. See his *Ungedruckte Quellen*, i. p. viii. and 227.

¹ Thus the canon of Irenaeus claimed to be "apostolic:" the *Apostolic Constitutions* speak of the ἐξήγησις ἀποστολικῶ καὶ κηρύγματος; Lucian of ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις; Cyprian of the *praedicatio apostolica*.

^m The words of Marcellus, as recorded by Epiphanius

(*Haeres.* lxxii.; Migne, xlii. p. 385), are these: ἀναγ-
καῖον ἡγήσασθαι, μέλλον [ἐκ ρώμης] ἐξέλαι, ἐγγραφόν
σοι τὴν ἐμάντοῦ πίστιν μετὰ πάσης ἀληθείας τῇ ἐμάντοῦ
χερὶ γράψας ἐπιδοῦναι, ἣν ἐμαθον ἐκ τε τῶν θεῶν γρα-
φῶν ἐδιδάχθαι.

ⁿ In his third Programme, published since this article
was written, Dr. Caspari adduces strong arguments in
support of the view that this creed is not that of the
church of Ancyra, but that of the church of Rome.—Epp

than the two together from the modern form; the words or phrases of the modern form which appear in none of the other two being:

<i>creatorem caeli et terrae</i>	in art. i.
<i>conceptus de Spiritu Sancto, natus</i> }	in art. iii.
<i>ex Maria Virgine</i>	

The additional words:

<i>passus, mortuus</i>	in art. iv.
<i>Dei omnipotentis</i>	in art. vi.
<i>Catholicam sanctorum</i> }	in art. ix.
<i>communione</i> }	

and *vitam aeternam* in the last clause.

It seems only to remain to us to trace these words to their origin.

51. But, before we do so, we may remark that Rufinus states that this creed had never been put into writing in a continuous form, and that it thus became probable that the church of Rome had preserved the purest type of it; because (i.) that church had been of all most free from heresy, and (ii.) because the practice had there prevailed of the catechumen reciting the creed in the hearing of the faithful. Jerome and Augustine refer to the same practice of keeping the creed unwritten. This custom gives strength to the opinion that the true meaning of the word *symbolum* is *watchword*; the watchword which the candidates for baptism repeated before they became "initiated" into the privileges of Christianity, before they were admitted fully to share in the "mysteries" of the Christian faith and Christian life.*

Rufinus thinks that in other churches additions may have been made to oppose the growth of heresies.

52. Ambrose, in his letter to pope Siricius on the *Perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord* (Ep. 42, § 5; Migne, xvi. 1125) makes the same remark as to the Roman creed: "Sed si doctrinis non credatur sacerdotum, credatur oraculis Christi, credatur monitis angelorum, dicentium *Quia non est impossibile Deo omne verbum*: credatur symbolo apostolorum, quod ecclesia Romana intemeratum semper custodit et servat." This must have been written between 384 and 398, at least fifty years before the Egyptian bishops at the council of Chalcedon repudiated the words as belonging to the Nicene faith. [We must note also that Ambrose called the creed of the Roman church the *Apostles' Creed*.] We have referred elsewhere to the passage where Ambrose narrates that he was delivering the creed to some "competentes" when he was called out to rescue an Arian. The treatise of Jerome addressed to Pammachius (vol. ii. p. 435, ed. Vallar.; Migne, xxiii. 380) contains the following: "In symbolo fidei et spei nostrae, quod ab apostolis traditum non scribitur in charta et atramento sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus, post confessionem Trinitatis et unitatem ecclesiae omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur." On the reserving of the creed see other instances in Dr. Heurtley, p. 52 n., and Caspari, ii. 57.

53. And thus we are brought to the treatises and sermons of St. Augustine which furnish us with full information as to the creed of the churches in his neighbourhood at the beginning

of the 5th century. The treatises are *De Fide et Symbolo* (vol. 6), *De Genesi ad Literam* (vol. 3), *Enchiridion ad Laurentium* (vol. 6); and the sermons, Nos. 212 and 214, *In Traditione Symboli* (the sermons 2, 3, 4 *De Symbolo* are given up as spurious, 213 as of very dubious authority; 215 must also be rejected). Like others, Augustine does not place the articles of the creed together: "it was not to be committed to writing;" we are therefore compelled to cull it, as the creed of Aquileia was culled, from the body of his commentaries. But this process of gathering the creed from treatises on the creed has its difficulties; we cannot be always certain whether we must regard a phrase as text or as comment. For example, in sermon 212, we meet with the words: "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem invisibilem immortalem, regem saeculorum, visibilium et invisibilium creatorem": how much of the sentence are we to consider as belonging to the creed? We met with the words *invisible*, *immortal* in the Aquileian symbol; and "maker of all things visible and invisible" occur in the Nicene creed: how much belonged to the creed of St. Augustine? His hearers knew, though we must continue in doubt on the subject. We are compelled, however, to notice that his words oscillate between "qui natus est de (or ex) S. S. et Maria Virgine" and "qui natus est per S. S. ex Maria Virgine": the phrase "passus est sub P. P. crucifixus et sepultus" is found in both the sermons. No. 212 has the clause "in vitam aeternam," and the *Enchiridion* may possibly be quoted by some as expounding it also. Thus it appears on the whole that the church of Hippo, about the year 400, differed from ours in this: that its creed did not contain the phrase "creatorem caeli et terrae," nor the clause "descendit in inferna," nor yet "sanctorum communione." The language as to the incarnation was not settled; the words "omnipotentis" in art. vii., and "Catholicam" in art. ix. were not yet inserted, and our final article, "in vitam aeternam," was unnoticed in three of Augustine's treatises. (The various forms of Augustine's creeds may be seen in Dr. Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*. But in M. Nicolas's *Symbole des Apôtres* the author has complicated the subject by treating, as genuine works of the great father, some of the questioned sermons.)

54. It will be sufficient to notice now the epochs at which the remaining clauses were introduced into the creed. It would go beyond the object of this article to discuss the motives for the various additions which M. Nicolas assigns; we may trace some of them doubtless to the influence of the Nicene creed in its remodelled condition; some to the wants of various times, when the Roman church could no longer claim its older privilege of being untouched with error, and when, in consequence, it felt compelled to modify its symbol slightly, just as the council of the 150 is said to have modified the symbol of the 318. The words *creatorem caeli et terrae* are found in two baptismal creeds of the ancient Gallican church, the one a *symbolum traditum*, delivered to the competentes, the other an interrogatory form used at baptism. Both creeds are printed by Mabillon in his *Museum Italicum*, and may be seen in Dr. Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 110 and p. 68. (The same MS., a *Codex Bobiensis*, supposed to date from the middle of

* Rufinus, *de Symbolo*, § 3: "In ecclesia Romae—mos servatur antiquus eos qui gratiam baptismi suscepturi sunt, publice, id est fidelium populo audiente, symbolum reddere."

the 7th century, contains a third creed in which the words do not occur.) The clause, no doubt, found its way from the Eastern creeds. The now accepted phrase, "qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Virgine Maria," appears in the creed ascribed by Dr. Heurtley to Eusebius Gallus (say about A.D. 600), by Oudin and Dr. Caspari to Faustus of Riez (A.D. 475). It is more accurately worded than the corresponding phrase in the creed of Constantinople; but we are not compelled by such internal evidence to give it a much lower date than the year assigned by Oudin. The motive for the insertion of the contemporaneous "communion of saints" may be more obscure, but the following is a probable account.

55. The clause is found, as we have said, in this creed of Faustus or of Eusebius Gallus. It is found also in the sermon 181, *De Tempore*, printed in the appendix to vol. vi. (p. 1733) of the works of Augustine, a sermon which we may assign to the school of the great father, although not to the father himself. The phrase is there explained to mean: "We are bound in fellowship and in the communion of hope, with those saints who have departed this life in the faith which we have received." M. Nicolas (p. 321) quotes the words of Magnus, archbishop of Sens in the 9th century, "communione omnium sanctorum, i.e. congregationem omnium fidelium in Christo" (Martene, *de Ritibus*, etc. i. p. 61). Thus it would seem as if, the opinion of one age having limited the application of the clause "the Holy Catholic church" to the church militant, some teachers of eminence deemed it desirable to remind believers of their interest in the "spirits of just men made perfect," and possibly to the same desire to realise our communion with the saints of old, "those who died in the faith not having received the promises," we must ascribe the introduction of the words "descendit in (or ad) inferna." They are found first in the exposition of Rufinus, and Rufinus explains them: "He descended into death, not that like mortals he should be detained by death, but that in rising again he should open the gates of death: just as if a king should proceed to a prison, and having entered it should throw the doors open, loose the fetters, destroy the chains, the locks, the bars: should bring out those that were bound, and those who were sitting in the darkness and the shadow of death should restore to light and life. So is the King said indeed to have been in the prison, not however in the condition in which the others had been who were confined in the prison: they were there to suffer punishment, He to remit the punishment." Still many years elapsed before the words worked their way into the generally accepted professions of faith. Few appear to have agreed with Rufinus that the thought was contained in the "buried" of the Roman creed. The clause is not in the exposition of Magnus to which we have just referred: it is not in the Mozarabic liturgy (*Traditio Symboli*, Caspari, ii. 291), although it is found in another Spanish creed which Dr. Caspari assigns to Justinian, bishop of Valentinia, circ. 550. In the form *descendit ad inferos*, it is in an old creed which came from the north of Ireland, and is dated before 690: it is contained in all the three creeds of the *Codex Bobbiensis*; and it is contained in the Spanish

creed which Etherius, bishop of Osma, and Beatus presbyter of Astorga, exhibited in 785, as sufficient protection against the errors of Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo.

56. We have now only to note the word "Catholicam." This cannot be assigned to any earlier formula than the creed ascribed (§ 56) to Eusebius Gallus or to Faustus. We must remember that it appeared at an earlier date in the exposition of Constantinople.

57. The first copy which has been found verbally identical with the Roman creed of the present day, is contained in a treatise published by Mabillon (*Analecta*, tom. iv. 575) from a MS. entitled *Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus* (sic, p. Heurtley, p. 71). The date of this is said to be about 750. In this *Libellus* it is repeated twice: once in the direct form in the baptismal service: once as distributed among the apostles, according to the late invention as to its authorship. But we must pass on to a much later date before we find that the words of the creed were considered as finally settled; indeed, in England, we meet with the phrase "holie cherche" in the 14th century, and there are some differences still to be noted between the baptismal and declaratory creed.

58. We have spoken above, in § 47, of Greek copies of the Nicene creed being handed down in Latin letters for use at some of the services of the church; the same was done with Greek translations of the Apostles' creed. The St. Gall MS., from which Dr. Caspari published the Nicene creed, contained also a copy of the "Apostles' creed" in Greek, with Latin letters; and Dr. Heurtley (p. 76, &c.) reprints two similar copies which had been noticed in archbishop Ussher's tract, the earlier one in facsimile (p. 80). This last is found in a MS. in the British Museum, called *King Athelstane's Psalter*, which contains in one place the (present) Apostles' creed and the Athanasian creed: in another this Greek creed in Anglo-Saxon letters. The Greek agrees (almost verbatim) with the text of Marcellus of Ancyra, except that it omits the words, "life everlasting." The other creed is found in a MS. at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and is interesting because it affected the exposition of bishop Pearson, who formed an erroneous opinion of its authority. It really belongs to the 15th century. Martene (vol. i. p. 43) prints an order of the church of Vienna wherein the Apostles' creed in Greek was used at baptism.

The Athanasian Creed.

59. "The confession of our Christian faith, which is commonly called the creed of St. Athanasius," stands on ground very different from that occupied either by the Constantinopolitan or the so-called Apostles' creed; unlike both in this, that it has never been made a baptismal confession—and thus it is in no true sense a *symbolum*: unlike both again in this, that it never received the sanction either of any known father of the church, or of any general or even provincial synod before the epoch of the Reformation. Thus its origin is wrapped in mystery: there is little external evidence producible either as to the time or the place of its appearance, or as to the position or name of its composer. We must be content with examining it by the light

of the internal evidence which it brings with it, and of the few and scanty notices which late accounts of it adduce.

60. When we bring then the history of the first five centuries in comparison with the statements of this "creed," it would appear that it must have been composed after the Arian controversy had arisen (*the Son is God: God of the substance of the Father*): and after the Macedonian and Apollinarian heresies (*the Holy Ghost is God: almighty, eternal: the Son is perfect man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting*). The Nestorian opinions seem to be hinted at in the phrase that the Lord Jesus Christ is *one by unity of Person*: the Eutychian, that He is *Perfect God and perfect man: one altogether not by confusion of substance*. The words in which the fathers at Chalcedon summed up the truth in regard to the nature of the Lord incarnate, all seem to be embodied in the exposition before us. "Following the holy fathers we acknowledge One and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ: and we all in accord teach that He was perfect in Godhead, perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man: of a reasonable soul and body, of the same substance with the Father as to His Deity, of the same substance with us as to His humanity: in all points like us without sin: begotten indeed before all worlds of the Father as to His Deity, but in these last days for the sake of us and our salvation of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, as to His humanity; being one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation."^a On comparing the two formulæ together it is difficult to resist the conclusion from this internal evidence, that this exposition was in date posterior to the council of Chalcedon, and that it was the result of an attempt to put in a somewhat rhythmical form, so as to be better remembered by the people, the general teaching of the church on the subjects concerned, after it was settled at that council. But there is this further evidence to shew that we must place the creed below 451. The verse, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son," could not have been put so boldly forward before the council of Toledo, 589,—possibly not much before the end of the 8th century, when the doctrine as to the double procession had spread from Spain into France and Britain; for the verse seems, in its present form, to be an integral part of the creed.

61. Turning now to external evidence, we find that, with the exception of a kind of treatise found in two forms (the one by Muratori at Milan, entitled *Expositio Fidei Catholicae Fortunati*, the other at Oxford, *Expositio in Fide Catholica*), we have no satisfactory proof of its existence before the middle or end of the 8th century.

62. The following seems to be the origin of

^a Council of Chalcedon, actio v.; Mansi, vol. vii. p. 115; or Dr. Routh, *Opuscula*, ii. 79. It is well known that Dr. Waterland (vol. iii.) considered that the creed preceded the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and attributed it, though not in a confident tone, to Hilary bishop of Arles, about 431. Dr. Waterland does not seem to have attached adequate importance to the clause "Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio," which words occur in every known Latin copy of the document.

the creed. We meet with numerous instances of private expositions of the faith both in the acts of councils and in the early liturgies. We have had occasion to speak of the creed of Tarasius accepted at the second council of Nicaea; another exposition was submitted at the same time from the patriarch of Jerusalem. Dr. August Hahn's volume furnishes others, such as the formulæ of Antioch, pp. 148–158; of the synod of Philipopolis, p. 158; of Sirmium, p. 160; or, again, the creed of Athanasius himself, p. 174; of Basil, p. 176; of Adamantius, p. 178, in the earlier parts of the epoch we are considering; or of Caelestius, and Julian, a little later. Hilary of Arles is known to have composed an exposition; and the sermons addressed to the competentes by Augustine, and the sermons of the school which are ascribed to him, furnish almost parallel instances. So of the liturgies; Martene's first volume furnishes many examples: e.g. an old Gallican missal, pp. 32 and 35; and others, as at Liège, p. 43. Our Athanasian creed may have originated in such an exposition. For the words at the commencement, "Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia," &c. refer not to the final salvation (*that is the subject of verse 39; they that have done good shall go into life everlasting*), but to the salvation, or state of salvation, into which we are admitted by baptism: so do the words in verse 26: "Qui vult ergo salvus esse," and verse 40: "salvus esse non poterit." The words "ante omnia," before all things (as Dr. Waterland, iii. 230, has noted, mean in the first place, first in order: and as to *nisi quis integram inviolatamque servaverit* (as bishop Cotton of Calcutta has remarked), the idea comes from the words of St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 7, "I have kept the faith." We are thus led to suppose that this exposition may have been composed as a preparation for baptism, analogous to the other expositions of which I have spoken. It is called *Sermo Athanasii de Fide* in some of the earliest notices of it.

63. The exposition attributed in the MS. of the Ambrosian Library to FORTUNATUS suggests that we have not the creed in its original shape. The Oxford MS. gives this exposition in a somewhat curtailed form; but they both agree in omitting reference to the verses 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, the last clause of 24, 25, 26, 27. With these omissions our creed would be more easy to commit to memory. But all the extant MSS. of the document itself contain the verses.

64. The question remains, who was its author? We need not say that, until the date of its appearance is decided, it is premature to discuss the question of its authorship. We will only add here, that the opinion of Gieseler that it originated in Spain seems to be inconsistent with the fact that the discourse of Beatus and Etherius, above referred to, has no verbal similarity with it; and the theory of Waterland, that Hilary of Arles was its author, is refuted by the fact that the council of Arles, in 817, preferred to it the rule of faith set forth at Toledo about 130 years before. But all the evidence points to France as its birthplace, and the period between 750 and 850 as its date. [See QUICUNQUE VULT.]

* For the arguments in favour of an earlier date being assigned to this creed, the reader may consult with advantage the Rev. G. D. W. Ommanney's *Athanasian Creed: An Examination of Recent Theories respecting its Date and Origin*. London, 1875.—[Edd.]

Interrogatory Creeds.

65. Before we conclude we ought to make a few remarks on the interrogatory creeds of the early rituals; but we can add none to those which the care and diligence of Dr. Heurtley has collected. The questions are generally addressed to the person or child to be baptized, and the creed is broken into three or more divisions, to each of which the answer should be *Credo*. In some instances the words are much abbreviated: in some they pass away entirely from both Apostles' and Nicene creeds,—as in a form contained in an ancient Gallican missal (Heurtley, p. 11) in which there are three questions of a character similar to this: "Credis Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unius esse virtutis? *Credo*." In one, the words are addressed to the sponsor on behalf of the child: "Credit in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem caeli et terrae?" and the answer is in the future, "Credet"—the more interesting as indicating the hope of the composer that the child would thereafter believe the "articles of the Christian faith."^a

66. *Books*.—Voss, *de Tribus Symbolis*; Ussher, *de Symbolo Romano*; Suicer, *de Symbolo Nicaeno-Constantinopolitano*; Martene, Tentzel, Waterland, and others. Of modern writers I am chiefly indebted to Drs. Hahn, Heurtley, and Caspari; M. Nicolas, *Le Symbole des Apôtres*. I did not see Mr. Lumby's work until after this article was written. The subject is further discussed in the writer's volume on the *Creeds*. [C. A. S.]

CREMENTIUS (v. l. Clementius) (Cyp. *Ep.* viii. ix. xx.), subdeacon, took to Rome the announcement of Cyprian's retirement; and brought back to Carthage the news of the martyrdom of Fabianus, and the covert reproof (*Ep.* viii.) of the Roman clergy as to the retirement. [E. W. B.]

(2) A canonised martyr of Saragossa, about A.D. 304, mentioned by Prudentius in connexion with the "eighteen martyrs of Saragossa," together with St. Euergetis and St. Caius, in the persecution of Diocletian, at the time when Dacian was governor of Spain. Caius and Crementius fought twice in the arena, and retired without staining it by their blood. (Prudentius, *Peristeph. Hymn v.*, *Patrol. Lat.* ix. 982; Ruinart, *Acta Sincera Martyrum*, p. 468; Ceillier, iii. 44.) [W. M. S.]

CRESCENS (1) The Cynic. [JUSTIN MARTYR.]

(2) Bishop of Cirta in Numidia, now Constantine. It is a particularly common name on monuments of Cirta; 8th Suffragan in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. A.D. 256. [E. W. B.]

(3) PAULUS, and DIOSCORIDES, three boy martyrs of Rome, May 28 (*Men. Basil.*).

CRESCENTIA, ST., Virgin, Paris. The history of this saint is very obscure. Her tumu-

lus was near Paris, in a place where a stone bears the inscription:

HIC REQUIESCIT CRESCENTIA SACRATA DEO
PUELLA.

She is commemorated on the 19th of August, but without any reason being assigned, as nothing is known of her for certain except her epitaph. All that is known of the tumulus, and of the wonders connected with it, is taken from Gregory of Tours (*De Gloria Confess.* cap. 105, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. p. 904). [D. R. J.]

CRESCENTIUS, a controversialist of the 4th century, mentioned by Epiphanius. Alexander, canonised archbishop of Alexandria (A.D. circ. 312-326), had a great dispute and correspondence with him on the time of celebrating Easter. (Epiph. *Haeres.* 70, 9, *Patrol. Graec.* xlii. 555, § 821; Ceillier, iii. 105.) [W. M. S.]

CRESCONIUS (1) Bishop of Villa Regia in Numidia, at the end of the 4th century. He deserted his see and seized on that of Tubia, or Tubuna. The third council of Carthage, A.D. 397, passed a decree ordering his return to his own see (Can. 38), which he entirely disregarded. The secular arm was called in with as little effect. At the council of Carthage A.D. 401, the primate of Numidia was ordered to summon Cresconius before the next general council, and to depose him if he failed to appear. (*Cod. Canon. Ecol. Afric.* can. 77.) But no mention is made of him at the council of Milevum, A.D. 402, and if he is the same who appears as bishop of Tubuna at the conference of Carthage in 411 (*Prim. Cognit.* c. xxi.), he must have carried the day (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 1072, 1096, 1172, 1377; Tillemont, xiii. 305). [E. V.]

(2) Tribune, to whom Augustine writes (*Ep.* 213 [229]).

(3) Grammarian, Donatist, against whom Augustine writes four books. [DONATISM.]

(4) Monk of Adrumetum, with Felix, came to find Augustine at Hippo, and hastened back to Adrumetum by Easter, so that they gave him no time to get the pieces against Pelagianism he meant to send by them copied (*Aug. Epp.* 214, 215). [E. B. B.]

(5) or CRISCONIUS, an African bishop, who about 690, at the request of the "pontifex" Liberinus or Liberius, published a systematised collection of the *Apostolic Canons* and those of the early councils, and the decretals of the popes from Siricius to Gelasius. A previous collection of this kind, under the title of *Breviatio Canonum*, had been drawn up by Fulgentius Ferrandus, a deacon of the church of Carthage, about 547, containing in 232 articles the heads and titles of the Greek canons, and of the decrees of the African councils down to 427. We learn from the letter of Cresconius prefixed to his *Breviarium*, that Liberinus, considering this index insufficient, desired Cresconius to compile a more complete collection. In obedience to this injunction he drew up a *Concordia Canonum* giving the canons in extenso, arranged according to subjects, *sub titulorum serie*, in 300 articles. The so-called *Breviarium*, which stands as a distinct work in many MSS., is nothing more than a sort of index or table of contents, *titulorum*

^a This is from the *Codex Bobiensis*; Heurtley, p. 110; Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, i. p. 324. But Dr. Caspari has found a MS. in the library of the Academy of History at Madrid, where in the form of baptism in a Mozarabic office (generally similar to the above) the answers are distinctly "credet" (ii. pp. 294, 299). He adds that, in Africa the question was *Credit?* and the answer *Credit*. (p. 3. 0).

praenotatio, to the *Concordia Canonum*, which is printed by Migne (*Patrol.* vol. lxxxviii), preceded by the *Breviatio Canonum* of Ferrandus. Both works are found in the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, of Voellus and Justellus, Paris 1661, in the appendix to which the *Concordia* was printed for the first time from a MS. in the Vallicellian Library at Rome. The *Breviarius* was first published at Paris by Pithou in 1588.

The author of the *Concordia Canonum* has been usually identified on the insufficient evidence of the superscription of the MS. of the *Johannis*, with the poet Flavius Cresconius Corippus, the author of the "Laudes Justini Minoris," and the "Johannis," recording the African campaigns of a certain Johannes "magister militum" in Justinian's reign, c. 550, published in the seventeenth volume of Niebuhr's collection of the Byzantine Historians (see *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biogr.*, s.v. Corippus). But there is absolutely nothing but the sameness of the name to support this identification, which may be regarded as the mere hypothesis of the scribe. The name Cresconius was one of the commonest in North Africa (as many as thirty-two bishops of that name are found in the index to Baluzius's *Nov. Concil. Collect.*), and there is little doubt that the bishop and the poet were different persons. Cresconius may probably be placed towards the end of the 6th century, a little later than Fulgentius Ferrandus (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 690; Migne, *Patrolog.* lxxxviii. 815; Mazzuchelli, *Praefat. in Corippum*.) [E. V.]

CREWENNA, ST., one of the companions of St. Breaca, who came from Ireland to Cornwall in the fifth century. The parish of Crowan is just east of St. Erth and Breage, both named from Irish founders. The parish feast is on the Sunday nearest to Feb. 1. Owing to the ravages of the Northmen, almost all the records of this part of the country have perished, the bishopric of Cornwall was itself destroyed, and a new see founded by the Confessor within the strongly-walled city of Exeter. Hence we have only the traditional names of the parishes to rely on, which are certainly old, and a few homilies for saints' days which were composed at a much later time, and can only be looked on as edifying religious narratives, with very slight traces of real history in them, as the Bollandist editors often point out. They were, in fact, for religious people what the tales of chivalry were for the world in general. We have many such religious tales written now, with historical persons introduced into them, and worded as if they were real histories, but no one is deceived by them; nor should we apply a different test to the works of the celebrated writers of lives of early saints in the middle ages. St. Bernard gave a warning against the use of modern unauthenticated hagiologies (*Ep.* 312, al. 398), which was very little attended to (see Brewer's remarks in the preface to Giraldu Cambrensis, iii. p. xlii.): in fact the 12th century was the flourishing age of these biographies. Besides Anglo-Saxon writers and Giraldu (and Geoffrey of Monmouth), the Cotton MS. Vesp. A. 14, which contains lives of Celtic saints, is of this date, as well as the *Liber Landavensis*, which is due to the revival of literature in Wales during this century. Similarly a cer-

tain number of the biographies were composed in the reign of Edward the Confessor in the previous age, to whose encouragement the revival of this kind of composition is partly due. The Irish Lives were composed or rewritten to a great extent after the conquest by Henry II. [C. W. B.]

CRIDA, ST., gives name to a Cornish parish on the river Fal, east of St. Probus and west of St. Mewan. It is mentioned in the curious will of Reginald Mertherderwa (given in Anstey, *Mumimenta Academica*, p. 559), together with its subordinate chapel of St. Naunter or St. Nonna (the mother of St. David). Crida was probably one of the Welsh devotees who settled in Cornwall. Some however would refer the name to Credanus, one of the companions of St. Petrock (Leland, *Script.* 61), who was buried at Bodmin. A parish near the Land's End is called Sancreed, which perhaps contains the same name, as the names Sanguinas and Sanwinnee in Domesday are St. Gennys and St. Winnow. [C. W. B.]

CRISENIUS, in the legend of St. Andrews in Scotland, is said to have been from the island of Nola and one of the companions of St. Regulus, but his existence is purely legendary and probably a fiction. [REGULUS.] (Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 187; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 316.) [J. G.]

CRISPINA of Thagara, martyr at Thebeste, Dec. 5, A.D. 304, under Anulinus, proconsul of Africa (whose examination of her, as officially registered, is given by Ruinart, p. 494), said by Augustine (*in Psalm.* cx. 13; cxxxvii. 3, 7), to have been a rich, illustrious, delicate lady, put to the torture and rejoicing in it, and unmoved by the tears of her sons. The same father twice cites her as an example that matrons may be as glorious as virgins (*Serm.* 354, *ad Continentes*, c. 5; *de Virginitate*, c. 44). The acts are not quite perfect. [E. B. B.]

CRISPINUS (1), a presbyter of Lampsacus, which was his native city, who about A.D. 337 wrote a life of Parthenius, bishop of that see, under whom he had been brought up. This memoir is to be found in Surius and the Bollandists, under Feb. 7; Baronius gives some passages from it sub ann. 337, § 38. Tillemont commends the simplicity and serious character of the memoir, as in perfect harmony with its reputed date. The biography narrates a large number of miracles performed by Parthenius, but with such perfect good faith, that it is evident that the writer accepted them without the least question. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 204; Tillemont, vi. 288.) [E. V.]

(2) Donatist bishop of Calama, to whom Augustine wrote, *Ep.* 51 (172), c. A.D. 399, and *Ep.* 66 (173), c. A.D. 402. The purpose of the former letter is as follows: the Donatists, after using the civil power to persecute the Maximianists, received them again into communion, and admitted their baptism as valid. Augustine sought to have a public conference at Carthage, at which to urge this argument against them. They professed to be pleased, but put difficulties in the way. Therefore he requests Crispinus to conduct the controversy in writing. He points out that Korah was punished more terribly than the calf-worshippers. Possidius made a fresh

attempt at public conference at Carthage, but Crispinus shirked it, requiring time for consultation with his own party, and afterwards putting it off with the bravado: "Thou shalt not fear the words of a man that is a sinner" (1 Macc. ii. 62). This was, perhaps, at the time of Augustine's letter, in which he finds fault with Crispinus for rebaptizing eighty Catholic slaves on an estate that he had bought. This was before A.D. 402. He demands that his own letter, which shows that Donatism is illegal and punishable, should be translated into Punic and read to them, with anything Crispinus might have to say; that they might not fear the words of man, but act of their own free will. Another Crispinus, presbyter under this bishop, made a riotous attack upon Possidius, broke into the villa where he took refuge, and beat him severely. Bishop Crispinus refused even to degrade his presbyter, and when the Catholics were compelled to appeal to the law courts, he denied that he was a heretic, but was convicted and fined; and though at Possidius's intercession he was excused from paying, he appealed to the emperors, and thus occasioned a new and severer rescript against the Donatists, which the Catholics still suffered to remain a dead letter. (Aug. *contra Cresconium*, iii. 46, 47; *contra Litteras Petilian*, ii. 83; Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, 12.) [E. B. B.]

CRISPION, archdeacon to Epiphanius, canonised archbishop of Salamis, circ. A.D. 368-9-403. (Sozom. viii. 15; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 1555, § 345; Ceillier, vi. 380.) [W. M. S.]

CRISPUS. [CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.]

CRISTIOLUS, Welsh saint of the 6th century, reputed founder of Llangristiolus in Anglesey, and Eglwys Wrw, and Penrydd in Pembrokeshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 220). [C. H.]

CRITAN (1) Son of Illadhon, commemorated May 11. He and Cruimther Corbmac are on this day venerated at Achadh-finnich, on the river Dodder, co. Dublin [CORBMAC (1)], where they are probably interred. Colgan affirms that he was the Credan, Cridan, or Critan who was one of the many pupils whom St. Petroc had during his residence in Ireland. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 125; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 585, c. 4, 586 n. 11.)

(2) Of Aendruim (Nendrum), bishop, commemorated May 17. The death of St. Critan, bishop of Aendruim or Nendrum (now called Mahee Island, in Strangford Lough), is given at A.D. 638 by the Irish Annalists (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 256 n. 257; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 148).

(3) Of Móin-Miolan, Feb. 7. Lonan, Critan, and Miolan or Mellan, the three sons of Daire, are placed together in the calendars on this day; they were buried at Cluain-feart-Molua (now Clonfertmulloe or Kyle, in the barony of Upper Ossory, Queen's County), and venerated on Feb. 7 (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 58 n. 8; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 207 n. 8).

(4) Certronnach, of Bennechar (Bangor), Sept. 16. In *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, p. 251) he is called Cellarer of St. Comgall of Bangor, and is said to have got the name Certronnach because he used to divide fairly. His mother was Eithne, daughter of Saran, son of

Colgan, and sister of Ronan. He died A.D. 669 (*Ann. Tigh.*; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 280, n. 281). [J. G.]

CRITICISM, BIBLICAL. [INTERPRETATION, BIBLICAL.]

CROINE (CRONE). (1) Of Cill-croine, virgin, commemorated Jan. 27. She was of the race of Maine, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, and was venerated at Cill-croine (Kilcron) in Ui-Maine, county of Galway; but beyond this we have no information. There were others of the same name, and the ruins of the church of St. Croine, virgin, of Kill-Crony or Kileroney, in the parish of Kilmacanogue, bar. Rathdown, co. Wicklow, still exist in the disused churchyard. At Jan. 27 the *Mart. Tallaght* has the feast of "Croni Innse Locha Crone." (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 29; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 267 n. 13; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 455-6; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, p. xiii.)

(2) Beg (Little), of Tempull-Croine, V. July 7. She was daughter of Diarmaid, son of Garvan, of the race of Conall Gulban, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages. She is given as Cronia by Colgan, among the saints descended from Conall Gulban, the parent-stem of St. Columba, and her church was situated in Tyrconnel. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 189; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 480 n. 14). [J. G.]

CROMACIUS, author of a *Cursus Orientalis*, according to an ancient authority printed in Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, i. 140); probably the same as CHROMATIUS. [C. H.]

CRONAN, CROMAN, CHRONAN. Cronan is a very frequent name in Irish hagiologies, and has several synonyms which make the work of identification more difficult and perplexing. It not only appears as Chroman, Croman, and Chronan, but also as Cuaran, Mochuaro, and frequently as Mochua. The account that Colgan suggests for the interchange of Cronan and Mochua is that *Cron* and *Cua* have in Irish the same meaning, so that to the one we may add the diminutive, and Cron becomes Cronan, or to the other the title of affection and reverence, and then *Cua* becomes Mochua. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 302 n. 3, 303, c. 1, 304, nn. 1-2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 134.)

(1) Son of Cummain, of Sliabh Eibhlinne, in Munster, May 4. He is sometimes called Cronan, sometimes Mochua, in the Irish Martyrologies, and Aenghus associates him with Siollan the deacon. His church was among the Slieve-Phelim mountains, co. Tipperary (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 120 n., 121).

(2) Son of Nethseman, Feb. 9. [CUARAN.]

(3) Son of Sinell, Nov. 11. He probably was Cronan, son of Sinell, of the race of Coinnri, son of Fergus, of the clanna Rudhraidhe. Colgan calls him the brother of St. Beodan, Baitan, or Mobaí (Dec. 13) [BAITHEN (8)], Carnan, &c., and says that St. Aengus, in his account of the mothers of the Irish saints, calls St. Cronan's mother Sina, and his father Sinell of Munster. He died of the Buidhe Connail or Yellow Plague in A.D. 664. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 219 n. 38, 598, c. 3; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 277.)

(4) Son of Ualach, abbat of Clonmacnois, July 18. *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves

197) calls him simply "Son of Ualach," and *Mart. Tallaght* (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xxix.) has "mac h. Lugada." According to the *Four Masters* (by O'Donovan, i. 255) "S. Cronan Mac-Ua-Loegde, abbat of Clon-mic-Nois, died on the 18th of July, A.D. 637 (recte 638)." As abbat of Clonmacnois he was succeeded by St. Aedlugh, son of Coman. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* p. 417, in the Memoir of St. Aedlugh, and also p. 792, n. 20; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 60.)

CRONAN (5) Of Airdne (Aran Isles in Galway Bay), March 8. He is mentioned by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 715, col. 1) among those who had dedications or churches in Inishmore, which however Colgan misplaces and erroneously calls Inis Airthir, the true Inis Airthir being now Inisher or South Island. Colgan (*ibid.* 564) gives a memoir on this day of St. Cronan, bishop and confessor, yet deems it best to consider him merely an abbat of some monastery in Aran, having perhaps his episcopal see elsewhere. But episcopal sees, at the early period when he must have lived, which however Colgan cannot accurately determine, were not in all likelihood regarded in Ireland, and his history is lost among the many saints of the same name.

In Dempster's *Menol. Scotticum* (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 194) there is a Scotie saint, "Cronan the Monk," on the same day, March 8.

(6) Abbat of Bennchar (Bangor), Nov. 6. He succeeded Colman in the abbacy of Bangor in A.D. 680 (*Ann. Tigh.*), and is called "filius Cucalnei," and "Mac Cuchuilne." His obit is given in A.D. 691, and O'Connor is of opinion that it was during his rule the Antiphony of Bangor was written. This precious Irish document was carried by some Irish monk to the continent at the time, probably, of the incursions of the Danes: it long belonged to the library at Bobbio [COLUMBANUS], and was removed to the Ambrosian library at Milan by Federigo Borromeo, in the beginning of the 17th century: it was published by Muratori in his *Anecd. Ambros.* iv. 127-59, and again in his *Opera*, tom. xi. pt. iii. 217-51. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 59, 60; *Uist Journ. Arch.* i. 168-79, ii. 55; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script. Epist.* Nuncup. p. 167.)

(7) Of Cluain-dolcain, Aug. 6. He is frequently called Mochua of Cluain-Dolcain (now Clondalkin, in the barony of Newcastle and county of Dublin), and he was descended from Cathaer Mór, monarch of Erin. His father was Lughaidh, and his mother Cainer of Cluain-dasaileach: his brothers were Lasrain, Baedán, Garbhán, Baoithén, Senchán and Ruadhán (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 213). He probably lived in the 8th century [BAEDAN (1)].

(8) Of Glais-mór (Clashmore), Feb. 10. Colgan at Feb. 10 gives a memoir of St. Cronan, abbat and martyr, who was also called Mochua and Mochuan. Nothing more is known of his birthplace or parentage than that his father was Mellan, and that he lived among the Desii in Munster about the end of the 6th century: Lanigan calculates that his birth was probably about the year 570, and his profession as a monk in or about 590. He is said to have been the first who accepted the monastic garb at Rahen under St. Carthach the younger (May 14) at the foundation of Rahen in King's County, which

took place about the year 590 or 591 [CARTHACH (2)], and he was so exemplary in his conduct, and proficient in learning and virtue, that St. Carthach placed him over another house in the neighbourhood, called Cluain-dachran in the south of Meath, but St. Carthach at the same time prophesied that his resurrection would not be in that place. He then became abbat of Glais-mór (now Clashmore, in the barony of Decies-within-Drum, in the county of Waterford, and close to the river Blackwater, where the ruins of an abbey are still visible): to this place St. Carthach seems to have resorted with his monks, when driven from Rahen in A.D. 631, and before he founded Lismore. But Colgan, without definitely asserting it as the truth, yet prefers to think, though Lanigan is of a contrary opinion, that St. Cronan was abbat of another Glaismor near Swords, in the county of Dublin, to which the Northmen came up from the port of Inbear Domnann, near Dublin, pillaged the monastery, and martyred St. Cronan with his monks. In what year the saint died we do not know; but he probably outlived St. Carthach, who died in the year 636 or 637. Colgan puts his monastic profession in A.D. 570 or 571, and the time when he flourished A.D. 632. Lanigan considers the Cronan, who was abbat of Glais-mór, in the county of Dublin, as an entirely different person, and as living at a later period, on account of the reputed connexion with the Danes, whose infesting the Irish coasts began about the end of the 8th century: he also treats Colgan's supposition that St. Cronan (Feb. 10) of Glais-mór was the same as Cuanchair, disciple of St. Pulcherius, as a mere fancy built on a fabulous foundation. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 303-4, 595, c. 35, 598 n. 40 and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 570, 632; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 357 sq.)

CRONAN (9) Of Lismore, June 1. This saint is of unknown parentage and descent, and has to be carefully distinguished from Cronan or Cuaran, the son of Nethsemon, who is venerated on Feb. 9th, and with whom he has been confounded. [CUARAN.] In the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 143) he is called "Abbat of Lismor-Mochuda," but by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 303 n. 1, and § 1), "Episcopus Lismorensis." Lanigan puts his death in the year 718, and the Irish *Annals*, about this year, called him Ua Eoan, h Ua Eoain, and O'Hecan. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 163 sq.; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* ii. 259, iv. 75; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 314 n. 4, 315.)

(10) Of Luachair, abbat of Fearná (Ferns), June 22. He is called Mochua and Dachu or Dachua. He first appears as a youth in the *Life of St. Maidoc* (Jan. 31) of Ferns, which gives a pretty monastic legend regarding his introduction to St. Maidoc, whom he succeeded in the abbacy at Ferns; it gives another regarding the building of a church, which shews us, as many other legends do, the intense consciousness which the ancient or mediæval church had of the presence of the spiritual world; but for historical purposes, the *Life* gives little material, especially as it confounds St. Cronan with St. Moling Luachra (May 13), who was also connected with Ferns. St. Cronan was abbat, and may also have been a bishop: *Ann. Tigh.* give the obit of "Dachua abbas Fernensis," in A.D. 653. (Colgan, *Acta SS.*

212, c. 37, 214, c. 53, 219 n. ³⁶; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* iii. 33, 133-4.)

CRONAN (11) Of Maghbile (Moville, near Newtown Ards, in co. Down), Aug. 7. This is the one who is addressed first in the list of priests by John IV., when he was only pope-elect, in A.D. 640, in the famous letter upon the Paschal question and Pelagian heresy, which this pope sent to the bishops and clergy of the north of Ireland. He is there called Cromanus (see the letter preserved in Bede, *Ecol. Hist.* ii. c. 19, and copied into Ussher, *Sylogæ*, Ep. ix.; and on the individuals there addressed see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 17 n. ¹¹; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 149 n.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 409 sq.). St. Cronan, abbat of Moville, died in A.D. 650 (*Ann. Tigh.*).

(12) Of Roscrea, April 28. He was a native of Ely O'Carrol in Munster, his father being Odran of that sept, and his mother Coemri of the sept of Corcobaschin, a district in the west of the present county of Clare. Taking with him his maternal cousin St. Mobai, he spent some years traversing Connaught, and then, returning to his native province, built a cell near Loch Crea, at a place called Seanross, now Corbally (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 412 n. ⁴). At Seanross he was visited by St. Molua of Clonfert-mulloe (Aug. 4), who asked of him the Holy Sacrifice to take away with him, probably as the token and ratification of love and unity between the saints; this St. Molua received with the charge to defend the church of Seanross. As this place was so secluded (desertus et avius) St. Cronan afterwards left it, and built his great church by the highway at Roscrea, in the county of Tipperary, where he had one of the most famous schools in Ireland. There, in piety and works that make for peace with God and man, he spent the remainder of his days, the honoured friend of Fingen king of Munster, and the willing advocate of the oppressed. It is said that on one occasion he asked St. Dimma Dubh (Jan. 6), or perhaps some other Dimma, a "scriptor peritus," to transcribe the Four Gospels for him; this was undertaken on the condition that it could be done in only one day, and the work was performed by the sun never setting upon St. Dimma, and by no food being required by him for forty days and forty nights, till the transcription was made, through the merits of St. Cronan. At last, on April 28, but in what year is not known, "post multa miracula sanctus senex Cronanus in Christo requiuit." Colgan says he flourished in A.D. 625; the Bollandists think he might have lived till A.D. 640, but Lanigan puts the date of his death not later than A.D. 619, or at the lowest, A.D. 626. (For an account of St. Cronan of Roscrea, see his Life "ex nostro MS. Salmanticensi" in the Bollandists, *Acta SS.* April 28, tom. iii. 585-9; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 6-10; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 541; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, iv. 356; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 16, c. 4, 17 n. ⁹, 303 n. ¹¹, 565, col. 1; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* iii. 356 n.; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* ii. 76; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 164.)

(13) Of Tuaim-greine (now Tomgraney, in the barony of Upper Tulla, co. Clare), Oct. 19. This saint appears twice in the *Mart. Doneg.*, first in the original hand at Oct. 19; and next in the second hand, on the authority of Mar.

O'Gorman, at Nov. 1. Among the saints of the family of St. Colman of Kilmaeduaich (Feb. 3), or house of the Hy-Fiachrach, Colgan gives "St. Cronan, son of Aengus, son of Corbmac, &c., Feb. 20 or Oct. 19;" and *Mart. Doneg.* at Feb. 20 also mentions that there is a Cronan with this pedigree (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 55, 279, 293; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 248, c. 2).

CRONAN (14) Beg of Aendruim (Nendrum), bishop. Jan. 7. His name appears third among the bishops of the Scots in the north of Ireland to whom, with priests and others, pope John IV., when yet but pope-elect, A.D. 640, addressed the famous letter on the Paschal question and Pelagian heresy [CRONAN (11)]. The Irish *Annals* generally place his death in A.D. 642, and the *Ann. Tigh.*, perhaps more accurately, in A.D. 643; but Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 412) is mistaken in calling him "bishop of Antrim," as the Irish *ḡlenopoma* or *ḡlonopum* is always Nendrum, now Mahee Island in Strangford Lough (Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 10 n., 63 n., 148-50, 187-97; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 95-6). There is another Cronan Beg, who, however, is usually known as Cronbeg [CRONBEG].

(15) Clairenech, Jan. 29. In *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 31) he is simply Cronan, but under Seighin (eod. die) is, "The three Clairenechs were Cronán, Baeithin, and Seighin." (On the name Clairenech, or "flat-faced," see an exhaustive note in *Mart. Doneg.* 354; Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. lxxii. n.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 503-4.) [CLAIRENECH.] [J. G.]

CRONANUS. (*Acta SS.* Jan. i. 47; Hardy, *Descr. Cat.* i. 366.) [MOCHUA.] [C. H.]

CRONBEG, abbat of Cluain-mic-nois (Clonmacnoise), April 6. According to Tighernach he succeeded Forcraen as "abbat of Clonmacnoise or the Seven Churches," in the barony of Garrycastle, King's County, in the year 686, and died A.D. 694, but the other *Annals* place the dates rather earlier. It is curious to find him designated also by the double diminutive Cron-an-beg (Cronan-beg). (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 97; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* ii. 214, 217, iv. 65; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 291, 297.) [J. G.]

CRONE. [CROINE.]

CRONIUS (1) accompanied Athanasius to Tyre, and signed his letter to the church of that place (Athan. *ad Constant.* i. 797). Perhaps the same as the bishop of Metole in the list given by Meletius to ALEXANDER (*ibid.* 789). [E. B. B.]

(2) Presbyter and solitary, visited by Palladius A.D. 394 (who was afterwards bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia). About the same time he was visited by Petronius (afterwards bishop of Boulogne, and canonised). He was disciple and interpreter to St. Anthony, and lived in the deserts of Egypt. He was canonised. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* cap. 7, § 713; *De Vitis Patrum*, vii. cap. 19, ap. *Patrol. Lat.* lxxiii. 1041, 1126, 1122; Ceillier, vii. 485; x. 161.) [W. M. S.]

CRUAIDH COS-FHADA (or Long-legs), of Balana (now probably Ballina, a village in the parish of Templeachally, barony of Ownay and Arra, co. Tipperary), Oct. 26. He is represented by O'Clery as having been appealed to for help by

St. Moling, when danger threatened the latter on account of the remitting of the Borumha at his request (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 285). On the Borumha, see the *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 298, 299 n. x. [MOLING-LUACHRA.] [J. G.]

CRUIMTHER. This is the Irish word for presbyter or priest, and often occurs in the calendars prefixed to proper names, and even as in the case of "Cruimther, mac Ua Nesse, June 9," seems at times to stand as a proper name itself. For such saints as Cruimther Cael of Kilmore, May 25, Cruimther Colum of Domnach-mor, June 4, &c., see CAEL, COLUM, &c. Cruimtheran is the diminutive, and probably does not appear as a separate name, though Cruimtheran (June 13) of Cluain-tioprat (Clontibret) stands in the calendars. [J. G.]

CRUIMTHERIS was a daughter of king Longobardus, and St. Patrick put her into a cell on Mount Kenogobha, to the east of Armagh (the "Head or Hill of Grief," now Ballyboley Hill in the parish of Ballynure, co. Antrim), and there she was given in charge to St. Benen. She, Lupita, and Ligrida were the "textrices et sacrorum linteorum confectrices" of St. Patrick's household, as Evinus calls them in the *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, or the "three embroiderers, not despicable," as they are referred to by the *Four Mast.* (by O'Donovan, i. 138 n. b, 139; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 163, c. 74, 167, c. 167; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 266-9). [J. G.]

CRUIMMIN, son of Corbmac, of Lecain (Leckin), bishop, commemorated June 28. He was son of Corbmac, son of Baedan, of the race of Tadhg, son of Cian, son of Oilíoll Olum, and Darerca, the sister of St. Patrick, was his mother (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 181). When St. Patrick came to Lecain (now Leckin, an old church near Bunbrusna, in the barony of Corkaree, and county of Westmeath: for its position and history see *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 349 n. e) he left some relics of the saints under the charge of his nephew, St. Crommanius or Cruimminius, whom he placed over the church there, and who lived "threescore years thrice over," according to the quatrain given in ancient Irish, by St. Aengus the Culdee (*Opuscula*, lib. iv. c. 6), and often quoted. He is sometimes identified with the Cruemus, who is said to have prophesied of St. Fechin's future greatness, as it is related in the *Life of St. Fechin* (Jan. 20); but this is more likely to have been done by Cruimther Nathi (Aug. 9), St. Fechin's institutor (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 181; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 132, c. 20, 175 n. e, 231, col. 1, and *Acta SS.* 130, c. 3, 140 n. e). [J. G.]

CRUITHNECHAN. On March 7 in the calendars stands Caritan or Cariotan, of Drum-lara, with whom Colgan identifies this Cruithnechan, but, as Dr. Reeves says, their connexion extends no farther than their initials. Colgan gives a memoir of Cruithnechanus or Caritanus Presbyter chiefly from O'Donell's *Life of St. Columba*. The name is the diminutive of Cruithnech, Pict, and occurs in the Irish Nennius. He flourished about the beginning of the 6th century, and his father's name was Cellachan. After he was married and had children born to him, he renounced the world for a closer following of Christ, and was ordained to the presbyterate, "to

which honour," says Colgan, "one was seldom promoted in that age and country, whose fitness for the office had not been pointed out beforehand by special signs and the popular applause." His three daughters also embraced the monastic life. His fame in the world arises from his connexion with St. Columcille, whom he baptized in the church of Tulach-Dubglaisse (now Temple-Douglas in the parish of Conwall, co. Donegal), and fostered in the church of Kilmicenenain (now Kilmacrenan, a neighbouring parish). In his connexion with St. Columba the legend is embellished with many wonders, and, as in others of the same class, real points of history find little place. The year of his death is unknown, and he has no day of commemoration. Colgan thinks he must have flourished about A.D. 520. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 510-1, or, as pagged, 600-1, and *Tr. Thaum.* 364, c. 2, 393-4, cc. 31-4; Reeves, *Adamnan*, lxxi. 191-2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 106, 114.) Dr. Reeves says the parish of Kilmacnaghan, in the barony of Loughinissholin, co. Derry, derives its name from a Cruithnechan. [J. G.]

CRUNNMAEL (1) Erbuilg, June 22. Crunnmael or Cruindmael Erbuilg, son of Ronan, of the sept of the Hy-Cennsealach, ruled for three years as chief of the clan, and then became a monk at Clonard, co. Meath. He was a special friend of St. Lasrean, bishop of Leighlinn, and died A.D. 650 (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 265, and notes).

(2) Of Druim-Inesglainn, abbat of Cluain-Iraid (Clonard), co. Meath. He succeeded Dubhdabhoireann at Clonard A.D. 787, and died A.D. 793; but the chief part of his designation is derived from a house he probably had at Druim-Inesglainn (now Dromiskin or Druminiskin, a village and parish near Castle Bellingham, in the barony and county of Louth). He has no special day of commemoration. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 141, n. 17, 173 n. s; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 52; Petrie, *Round Towers*, 428; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 394 n. r, 395.)

(3) Dec. 17. In the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 339) there is the dedication of "Crunnmael, abbat of Ia Coluimcille," but as he is nowhere else mentioned, it is probably another festival of Conamhail (Sept. 11), who was abbat A.D. 704-710. [CONAMHAIL.] [J. G.]

CTESIPHON, a Roman (probably) to whom St. Jerome writes from Bethlehem (*Ep.* 133, ed. Vall.) on the question of Pelagianism, on which Ctesiphon had written to ask his opinion. [W. H. F.]

CTISTOLATRAE, κτιστολάτραι, called also from their founder, *Gajanitæ*, a subdivision of the *Aphthartodocetæ*, themselves a sect of the Monophysites, who, in opposition to the *Akistitæ*, taught that the body of Christ was created. [APHTHARTODOCETÆ.] (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* i. 281, Clark's translation; Dorner, *Pers. of Christ*, div. ii. vol. i. 131; Herzog, *Real. Encycl.* ix. 749.) [E. V.]

CUACH. [COCCA.]

CUAN. This name assumes various forms, which are more or less uniformly applied to individual saints, and thus must be treated as separate names. It is changed to Cuanus,

Cuanna, Cuannache, Cuanan, and the word itself is the diminutive of *Cu*, a dog or hound. (For an account of the name and a list of those bearing it, see Colgan, *Acta SS.* 251 n. 2, 338 n. 9; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 370 n.)

CUAN (1) Of Airbhre, in Hy-Cennsealach, Leinster, July 10. He is supposed by Ware to have succeeded St. Brogan (July 8) in the abbacy at Mothel, co. Waterford [BROGAN (1)], and hence is called "Cuan of Maethail-Brogain." He has given his name to Kilquan, co. Wexford, but Airbhre is unidentified (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 192 n., 193; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 251 n. 2; Ware, *Ir. Ant. c.* 76). In the *Kal. Drummond.* he is styled "holy confessor" (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 18).

(2) Of Cluain-mór, Oct. 15. O'Clery thinks this is the Cuan of Cluain-mór, who went along with Moling to request the remission of the Borumha, and that his place was at Cluain-mór-Maethog (now Clonmore, in the barony of Rathvilly, co. Carlow, see *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 277; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 298-9 n. 2, 379 n. 2; MOLING, surnamed Luachra). In the *Four Masters*, at A.D. 788 (recte 793), is given the obit of Cuan of Ath-eascrach, which O'Donovan says is now Ahascragh in the east of the county of Galway, but he must be different from the preceding Cuan, though his commemoration is also celebrated on the 15th of October (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 395).

(3) Casin, March 2. He was son of Tighernach, son of Fergus, of the race of Conall Gulban, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages; his brothers were SS. Begbile (Oct. 12), Colman (Jan. 13), and Conna or Conandil (March 8). As he must have lived about the close of the 6th century, he is to be distinguished from Cuan Cam and Cuan the anchorite of Lilcach (not identified), who both died A.D. 743 (*Four Mast.*), from Cuan of Imleach-Iubhair (Emly), who died A.D. 787, and from Cuana of Louth, who died A.D. 823. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. 61; Colgan, *Ir. Thaum.*; and *Acta SS.* 251 n. 2, 480 n. 16; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. 347, 389, 435; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 233, 266.) [J. G.]

CUANAN GLINNE, abbat of Maghbile (Moville), Feb. 3. Among the saints and illustrious men of Maghbile in Colgan's Appendix to the Memoir of St. Fridian (March 18), stands "St. Cuananus Glinne, abbas de Maghbile" (Moville in co. Down, near Newtown Ards), quoted from the *Four Masters*; but the latter and Colgan in another place refer the dedication of this saint to April 3, which is evidently a mistake of the *Four Masters*, accepted by Colgan in one place and not in another. Tighernach gives his death in the year 747 (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 338 n. 9, 650, cc. 8, 9; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 343; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* ii. 247, iv. 91). [J. G.]

CUANGHAS MAC DALL, March 13. Colgan gives a very short memoir of "St. Cuangussius, abb. Liet-mor." His father was Alillus (or as it appears in *Mart. Tallaght Aililla*), and he was called Mac Dall ("blind boy"), because he was born blind and afterwards received his sight. He succeeded St. Mochoemocus or Pulcherius (March 13) in the abbacy at Liathmore (now Liath-Mochaemhóg, *anglicè* Leamokevoe, in the parish

of Two-Mile-Burris, in the barony of Elygarty, co. Tipperary). He died in the year 747 (*Ann. Tigh.*), and his feast was held on the same day as that of the founder of the church. Colgan quotes from the Metrical Festilog or Felire of St. Aengus: "S. Mochoemocus nos defendat ab hoc saeculo, et S. Cuangussius, vir candidus et doctrinā clarus, ambo in Monasterio Lethmorensi." (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 607; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 75; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 266 n. b, 343; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 191.) [J. G.]

CUANNA (CUANDA), (1) Abbat of Killchuanna and Lismore, Feb. 4. Of this saint Colgan (*Acta SS.* 249-52) gathers all the traditions into a memoir. At the close of the 6th century St. Cuanna was born. His mother was Meda, Finmeda or Conmania, daughter of Fingen, of the sept and district of Corca-duibhne (now Corcaguiny, in Kerry), and his uterine brother was St. Carthach Mochuda (May 14), but Colgan seems to be mistaken in calling his father Midarnus, as Cuanna, son of Midarnus or Miodarn (April 10), seems to be a different person, and so allowed in another place even by Colgan. He probably was some time under his brother St. Carthach at Rahen before founding his church of Killchuanna (now Kilcoona, in the barony of Clare, co. Galway, on the east shore of Lough Corrib), and his holding rule at Lismore must have been after St. Carthach's death in A.D. 637; but of this we have no particular information (Hardiman's O'Flaherty, *Iar-Connaught*, 370 n. 1). In the fragment of his life given by Colgan from the *Codex Salmanticensis*, he is represented as living on the banks of Loch-orbsen (now Lough Corrib, in the county of Galway), where many wonders were wrought, as the plucking out of his eyes lest he should be vain of his beauty, and the having them replaced, the prophesying regarding St. Fursey, who was then at Peronne, &c. At last, full of grace and Christian merit, he died about the year 650, and his feast is on Feb. 4. He is said to have written the Irish Annals up to A.D. 628, and is so quoted by Ware (*De Scrip. Hib.* lib. i. c. 3); but Lanigan considers this very uncertain, as also the thinking him abbat or bishop at Lismore, while he may have been called "of Lismore" or Lismorensis only from his having resided there. His other church of Killchuanna, somewhere in the Hy-briuinn country (Tir-briuinn), likewise in Connaught, and mentioned in *Cal. Cassel*, was probably nothing more than a dedication (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 138, 357 sq.). In *Kal. Drummond.* he is commemorated as "sancta virgo Cuanna" (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 4).

(2) Son of Miodharn of Ros-eo, and at Maghlacha in the east of Magh Breagh, April 10. This is the designation in the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 99, and note), and the writer continues, "He was of the seed of Enna, son of Niall, and he was a noble virgin in body and soul, as the gloss in the *Felire* of Aenghus states." This idea of virginity the *Kal. Drummond.* carries farther, calling him "sancta virgo Cuanda." *Mart. Tallaght* has "Cuanna, vir i Maigh locha i m Breghaib. i Rus Eo," and thus suggests that Ros-eo is "at Maghlacha," and is now Rush in the county of Dublin. In Colgan's notes there is much confusion and difficulty, as

his dates oscillate between the years 570 and 717, and his Cuanna, son of Miodharn, is reckoned as the brother of St. Carthach Mochuda or some other person. [CUANNA (1).] In the half-fabulous life of St. Forannan (Feb. 15), Cuanna was the contemporary of St. Columba; and if this be true, he flourished about A.D. 570. But if we accept O'Clery's entry in the *Mart. Doneg.* and identify the son of Miodharn with Cuanna of Ros-eo, then the *Four Masters* give the death of St. Cuanna of Ros-eo in A.D. 717, but the true year is probably 721 (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 251 n. 2, 336, c. 5, 338 n. 9; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 138, 359; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 315; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 10; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. Saints*, xxi.).

CUANNA (3), the Blind, March 11. Among the wonders done by St. Patrick, "by his merits and benediction," was the teaching Cuana, and other two, "cymbala et campanas miraculose ludere et fabricare." This Cuana Colgan thinks is the Cuanna or Cuanda Caecus, son of Tulanus, whose feast is on March 11 (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 167, c. 100, 188 n. 147, and *Acta SS.* 251 n. 2).

[J. G.]

CUANUS LAEGSIENSIS. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. 45; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 366. [MOCHUA.] [C. H.]

CUARAN (CURVINUS, KORAN), The Wise, son of Nethseman, commemorated Feb. 9. He appears in the calendars as Cronan, Cuaran, and, with the prefix of affection and reverence attached to the other form of the diminutive, as Mochuaroc, "my little Cuar." (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 42 n., 43; *Mart. Tallaght*, in Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* xv. 71.) In the *Felire of Aengus* he is called *meus parvulus corvinus*, "my little humpy." According to Colgan, Cronan, Cuaran, Cuarnan, or Mochuaroc, "natus vel saltem denatus" in Munster in the region of the Decies in co. Waterford, and there venerated, was son of Nethseman or Nethus, from the old and noble family of Ferlacta, son of Fergus, son of Ross, son of Rudhraighe, from whom St. Ailbhe (Sept. 12) and St. Sguithin or Scutinus (Jan. 2) were descended. He was so renowned for knowledge and piety as to be called "The Wise," and made a bishop; but where he exercised his office is unknown. Colgan, however, identifies him with the Cronan who came to Iona concealing his episcopal rank, and was discovered by St. Columba (Adamnan, *St. Columba*, i. c. 44, and O'Donnell's *St. Columba*, ii. c. 103; see Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 348, c. 44, 379 n. 94, 428, c. 103; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 85 n.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 178-9; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* i. 289; *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, p. lx.). He is called Mochuaroc de Noná on account of a reformation he enforced in the saying of the service at Nones, so as to secure its due completion before the commencement of the service of mass. The time when he flourished is uncertain, but Ware places his death in the year 717 (Harris's Ware, *Ir. Bps.* i. 559), which, however, on every account seems too late.

He flourished about A.D. 570, and is to be distinguished from such as Cronan of Lismore, with whom Ware, Harris, and others have confounded him. Colgan, *Acta SS.* 302-3; Lanigan, *ut supra*, ii. 179, iii. 164; Harris's Ware, i. 549; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* i. 289; *Book of Obits*, C.

C. Dublin, p. lx.) The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. 9, tom. ii. 339-40) give a memoir of St. Cronan, bishop in Ireland, and refer to his coming to Iona and concealing his episcopal rank. [J. G.]

CUBA, presbyter, attesting a charter of archbishop Ethelheard, A.D. 805 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 189; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 555). [C. H.]

CUBERT (*Brut y Tywysogion*, ad an. 775), abbat. [CUDBERTH.] [C. H.]

CUBRICUS. [MANES.]

CUBOIRNE (CONBRAN, CUBRAN), Nov. 10. The *Four Mast.* (by O'Donov. i. 365) have at A.D. 762 the obit of "Cubran, abbat of Cillachaidh" (now Killeigh, near Geshill, in the King's County). According to the same Annals he had succeeded Maelanfadh, A.D. 741, but the true dates are probably five years later. [J. G.]

CUCHUIMNE (CUCUMINE), literally "the hound of memory," has no place in the Irish calendars, but is known as the author of a hymn in praise of the Virgin Mary, which has been published by Mone in his *Hymni Latini Medii Aevi*, from a collation of three MSS., and is given in the *Book of Hymns* (fasc. ii. 137 sq.), edited by Dr. Todd, who for the first time prints it with its scholium or preface, and adds also notes and various readings. Of Cuchuimne (called also by mistake Cucumine and Cumineus), little is known. In the *Annals* he is called "the Wise," and the "select scribe." If we may believe the stanzas attributed to St. Adamnan, he was allured from his studies into irregular habits, but during the latter part of his life repented. He lived in the reign of Loingseach, son of Aengus, and Tighernach correctly places his obit in A.D. 747, but in the other *Annals* it is put rather earlier. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 218, col. 2; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 343-5; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* ii. 247, iv. 92; Harris's Ware, *Ir. Writ.* 46.) [J. G.]

CUCOJO, a heretic known only from some obscure references in the Syriac Hymns of Ephraim *Against the Heretics* (vol. ii. Assem.). After speaking of the completeness of Christian truth, suffering neither addition nor diminution, Ephraim mentions certain persons from whom it had received injury (xxii. p. 485 B): "Because Marcion added [to the truth] adulteration, the Church expelled and banished him; [as it did also] Valentinus, because he apostatised: Cucujo also lacerated [the truth]: Bardaisan decked out his adulteration [of it]: Mani raved wildly in everything." And a few lines further on he adds (485 c): "Valentinus stole a flock from the church, and named it after his own name; Cucujo named it after his own name; the crafty Bardaisan stole it; and they made it like one common flock." It may be reasonably inferred from these passages (which are given after Zingerle's translation [Kempten, 1850], p. 55 f., with corrections, kindly supplied by Mr. Bensly), that Cucujo was intermediate in date between Valentinus and Bardaisan, that is, belonged to the latter part of the second century; and that he was probably the head of a Syrian sect of Valentinians. In two other places (440 E, 493 F) Ephraim refers to a sect of 'Cucites.' His hymns contain so few names, and those well known, that the Cucites

must have been more conspicuous in Syria than might be inferred from the silence of Greek and Latin writers. [H.]

CUCULUS, a pet name given by Alcuin, according to his wont, to one of his disciples, who has not been identified. He occurs in Alcuin's letter to archbishop Eanbald, circ. A.D. 796 (*Ep.* 171, ed. Froben.; 65 in *Patrol.* t. ci.). In another letter, Alcuin addresses him and Calvinus jointly (*Ep.* 175, Froben.; 116, *Patrolog.*). Alcuin also composed a poetical lament for him, beginning:—

Plangamus Cuculum, Daphnin dulcissime, nostrum.

(*Opp.* t. ii. 237, Carm. 277, ed. Froben.; *Patrol.* Lat. t. ci. 804.) [C. H.]

CUDAMAN, abbat, attesting a charter of Ethelred, archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 805 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 189; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 555; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58). [C. H.]

CUDARUS (Κουδάρος), a Saracen, to whom a letter of Manes is addressed, of which we have a fragment in Fabric. (*Bibl. Graec.* vii. 316), trying to prove that Christ's body was immaterial because he passed through the crowd unseen, μέσος αὐτῶν διελθὼν οὐχ ὥρατο. [E. B. C.]

CUDAS, error for **BUDAS** or **BUDDAS**. [MANES.]

CUDBERT, -**TUS** (Bede, edd. Smith, M. H. B., Stevenson, *H. E. Praef.*: iv. 26-32; v. 1; *Vit. Cudberti* passim); **CUDBERT**, -**TUS** (Nennius, in M. H. B. 76; Gaimar, *Estorie*, M. H. B. 780), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CUTHBERT.] [C. H.]

CUDBERTH (CUBERT), abbat, died A.D. 777 (*Annal. Camb.* ad an.), or A.D. 775. (*Brut y Tywysog.* ad an.) [C. H.]

CUDBERTUS (Bede, *H. E.* Contin. ad an. 740, M. H. B.), archbishop of Canterbury. [CUTHBERT.] [C. H.]

CUDBRICHTUS (Henr. Hunt. *Hist.*, M. H. B. 730), archbishop of Canterbury. [CUTHBERT.] [C. H.]

CUDBURG (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1668, M. H. B. 704); **CUDBURH** (Henr. Hunt. *Hist.*, M. H. B. 724), foundress. [CUTHBURG.] [C. H.]

CUDD, abbat, attests a charter of Offa king of Mercia, A.D. 772, and another between 775 and 778 (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 120, 134; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 57). [C. H.]

CUDDA (1) a nobleman at the court of Oswy king of Northumbria, "ex sodalibus regis valde sibi amabilis et fidelis" (Edd.), "senator et regis cubicularis" (Malm.). Being afflicted with paralysis, he sought to end his days in a monastic life at Lindisfarne. The queen commended to him for an attendant the youthful Wilfrid, whom she had begun to patronise, and who had discovered strong inclinations for the ecclesiastical vocation. Cudda accordingly received Wilfrid under his protection, and the youth conducted himself towards him and all the seniors of the monastery so dutifully that he became a general favourite (Eddius, *Vit. Wilfrid.* cap. 2; Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 213). [C. H.]

(2) Abbat. When Cuthbert bishop of Lindisfarne felt his end approaching (A.D. 687), he expressed a desire to be buried in a certain sar-

cophagus which "the venerable abbat Cudda" had formerly given him (Bede, *Vit. Cudb.* c. 37). The name Cudda occurs, but without a date, in the list of abbats in the *Liber Vitae* of the church of Durham (ed. Surtees Soc. 1841, p. 8). Cudda is mentioned also in Birch's *Fasti Monast.* 57. Might he have been the same as the abbat Cotta who was then living? [C. H.]

CUDRADUS, presbyter of the church of Lindisfarne, addressed as "venerandus pater," by Alcuin in or after A.D. 793, when Lindisfarne had been attacked by pirates (Alc. *Ep.* 5, *Patrol.* tom. c. 144, *Ep.* 63, ed. Froben.). [C. H.]

CUDRED (1) -**DUS** (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, vol. i. 55; Henr. Hunt., *Hist.* in M. H. B. 727-735); **CUDRETUS** (Bede, *H. E.* Contin. ad an. 750), king of the West Saxons. [CUTHRED.] [C. H.]

(2) (Henr. Hunt. *Hist. Angl.* in M. H. B. 733, 734); **CUDRET** (Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 2223, M. H. B. 791), king of Kent. [CUTHRED.] [C. H.]

CUDSUIDA, abbess. [CUTSUIDA.]

CUDUALD, abbat of the monastery of Oundle [Undalum], Northants, in A.D. 709, at the time of bishop Wilfrid's death (Bede, *H. E.* v. 19). Eddius does not mention him. [J. R.]

CUE— See also **QUE**—

CUENBURH (CENBURG, CNEBURH, CWENBURH, QUENBURGA, QUINBURGA), sister of Ina king of Wessex and Cuthburga foundress of Wimburn Abbey. She is said by John of Tine-mouth (*Historia Aurea*, quoted in *Monast. Angli.*) to have been co-foundress with her sister. A list of saints buried in England, extant in Anglo-Saxon (Hickes, *Thesaur.* iii. 120; see also Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 666) mentions both the sisters as interred in this monastery. She is, perhaps, the abbess Cneuburga, who, with the abbess Coenburga and the abbat Aldhun, addressed an interesting letter to the heads of other houses agreeing to a proposal of mutual intercessory prayer, and if so she was probably (Hadd. and St.) abbess of Wimburn (*A. S. C.* and Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad ann. 718; Henr. Hunt. in M. H. B. 724; Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1677, in M. H. B. 784; *Monast. Angli.* ii. 88, 89; Hutchins, *Hist. Dorset.* 2nd ed. ii. 532; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 342; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58). [C. H.]

CUFA, one of four abbats of the diocese of Winchester who attested an act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803, another of them being Cuthbert of Malmesbury (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546, and notes; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58). [C. H.]

CUGANAEICH, abbat, is found in the Dunkeld Litany in the list of holy abbots, and is probably St. Congan (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, pp. lix. 241, 316). [J. G.]

CUI— See also **QUI**—

CUICHELM. Seventh bishop of Rochester. He was consecrated by archbishop Theodore, as successor to Putta, who had forsaken his see, when Kent was ravaged by the Mercians in 676; but shortly after, deterred by the poverty of his church, he followed the example of his predecessor, and deserted it; Gebmund was appointed by Theodore to succeed him (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 12). [S.]

CUICHELM, the son of Cynegils king of the West Saxons, shared his father's throne and successes from 614 to 636. He was baptized, like his father, by Birinus in 636, and died the year after. [CYNEGILS.] William of Malmesbury calls him the son of Ceolric and brother of Cynegils (*G. R. i.* § 18). Whether Cuicelm'slea, or Cuckhamsley, in Berkshire, preserves the memory of his name is uncertain, but it is not improbable. [S.]

CUIRBIN. [CERBAN.]

COLAN (COLAN, DACHUALEN), B., has a memoir devoted to him by Colgan on Feb. 18, upon the authority of Ferrarius, Canisius, and others, yet it is undecided who he is or what is the proper form of his name. Colgan suggests that he may be Dachualen, son of Guaire, who is descended from Niall of the Nine Hostages, and is commemorated on March 12; or Culanus, one of the five brothers of St. Corbmac (March 26), who had his church at Glanchaoín in Neagh, co. Tipperary: or the Culeneus, whom Tirechan mentions in his list of the disciples of St. Patrick. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 368-9, 741, c. 3, and *Tr. Thaum.* 268, col. 1, 2, 488, col. 2; Ussher, *Ant. c.* 17, wks. vi. 518.) [J. G.]

CULCIANUS, a prefect of the Thebais, who exercised severities on the Christians in the persecution under Maximin (Eusebius, *H. E.* ix. 11; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68, p. 717). [G. S.]

CULDEES. [DICT. OF CHRIST. ANTI. s. v. COLIDEL.]

CUMAN, abbat of Glastonbury for two years (A.D. 800-802), after which he was succeeded by Muchan (Malm. *de Antiq. Glast. Eccles.* in Gale, xv. Scriptt. 316). The text of Malmesbury gives the two years in Roman numerals "ii," which Dugdale read "eleven;" but Malmesbury's dates also being in numerals (DCCC. and DCCCII.), the error is obvious (*Monast. Anglic.* i. 2; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58). [C. H.]

CUMANUS (CONANUS), second abbat of Abingdon, succeeding Heane the founder. Cumnor, i.e. "Cumani ora," is said to have taken its name from him. Manuscript authority for his death in A.D. 784 is adduced by White Kennett. (*Monast. Anglic.* i. 505; *Chron. Monast. de Abingd.* ed. Stevenson, ii. 272, 273; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58.) [CUMMA.] [C. H.]

CUMBERTUS (TUMBERTUS), abbat of Glastonbury, A.D. 744-753, next to Cengillus. He is said to have received lands from a certain Lulla or Hilla (*Mon. Ang.* i. 2, 47), but her charter of bestowal Kemble (*C. D.* No. 92) considers spurious or doubtful. He attests an undated charter of Coínred, recited in another of Cynewulf A.D. 759 (*C. D.* No. 104), and probably he is the Cyneberhtus, abbat, attesting a charter between A.D. 755-757 (*C. D.* No. 100). See also Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58, 60, 99. [C. H.]

CUMIN, **CUMIAN**, **CUMEANUS**, **CUMENEUS**, **CUMMEIN**, are some of the forms that this name assumes. In *Mart. Doneg.* the name is generally Cuimmein, and in *Mart. Tallaght Cummine*. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 59, n. 6) gives a list of twenty-one named Cuminus, Cumineus, or Cumianus, and *Mart. Doneg.* gives one of eighteen named Cuimin, Cuimmein, CHRIST. BIOGR.

Cuimmin, but most of them are little more than names and days, as given by these authorities.

CUMIN (1) (Cummein), son of Dubh, of Druim-druith, Jan. 12. On this day Colgan (*Acta SS.* 58) gives a memoir of Cumian, who died at Bobbio (Aug. 19), but he has no connexion with the son of Dubh, and is merely placed there by Colgan because there is no one of the name in the Irish calendars at Aug. 19. [CUMIN (2).] According to *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 15) and Colgan (*ib.* 59, n. 6, 248, c. 2) Cumín or Cuimmein was son of Dima Dubh, son of Diarmuid, of the race of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh Muighmhedhoin (O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 181-2).

(2) (Cumian to Cumine) of Bobbio, Aug. 19. He appears to have been a bishop in Ireland for many years, and in his old age laid aside his episcopal charge and dignity to join the brotherhood of Columbanus at Bobbio. There for seventeen years he lived in piety, and died on the 19th of August, aged ninety-five years and four months; he was buried there during the thirty-one years of the Lombard king Luitprand's reign, which ended A.D. 744, and was so esteemed by that king that he adorned his tomb with a precious monument (pretioso lapide), on which was probably written the epitaph which is preserved by Colgan and Lanigan, and from which we learn all that is really known of the saint (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 58-9; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 171, 174). Butler (*Lives of the Saints*, viii. 277) supposes that this St. Cumín is the same as St. Cumín Foda (Nov. 12), and the writer of the letter to St. Seghine on the Paschal controversy, but evidently he is mistaken. The Bollandists (*Acta SS. Junii*, tom. ii. 244) have a "Sylloge Historica, ex monumentis Bobiensibus apud Ughellum," which treats "De Sancto Cumiano Episcopo Scoto Bobii in Italia," at June 9.

(3) Cuimin or Cumín of Connor is frequently quoted by O'Clery in his *Mart. Doneg.* as the author of a poem in Irish verse upon the characteristic virtues of the Irish saints. He extols the merits of thirty-five saints in as many stanzas, closing with his own attestation and desire for prayerful remembrance. Of himself there appears to be nothing known: he is believed to have lived in the middle of the 7th century. His poem is given in Irish and English by Dr. Kelly (*Cal. Ir. Saints*, 160 sq.; see O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. p. xi.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, p. xix.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 5, no. vii.)

(4) (Cuimmein), Cadhan, (June 1). O'Clery in *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 148) thinks the Cuimmein on that day in the calendars is the same as Cuimmen Cadhan, son of Cronchu, son of Ronan, . . . of the race of Corbmac Cas, son of Oilíoll Olum. Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 509, c. 8) in treating of the church of Reachrainn (now Lambay, off the coast of Dublin), cites from the *Four Mast.* A.D. 738, and as venerated on June 1, "S. Cumineus Hua Kierain, Ab. Recranniensis."

(5) (Cumine, Cummene, Cumian) surnamed Finn, Ailbhe, Albus, the Fair, Feb. 24. It may be remarked at the outset that regarding this person and his history there is great scope for controversy, and probably no means of clearly ending the dispute. The chief point on which

there is the difference of opinion is, as to whether he is the same person as Cumman, the author of the well-known Paschal epistle to Segineus, Segineus, or Seghine, abbat of Hy (A.D. 623-652). Colgan, with O'Connor, O'Donovan, and others, regards them as one and the same, but Lanigan, with Reeves, Grub, and others, is rather to be followed in looking upon them as different persons, living at the same time, but taking entirely different sides in ecclesiastical controversy. It seems incredible that the romanising Cumman could have been chosen abbat at that period in the principal Columbian monastery. [CUMMAN.] At Feb. 24 Colgan has a memoir with most of the facts and traditions regarding the two persons, but runs into confusion by attaching them to a single individual, and in this Bp. Forbes (*Kal. Scott. Saints*, 316-17) follows him.

St. Cumineus or Cumine, surnamed Finn or Albus, the Fair, was son of Ernan, son of Fiachna, of the race of Conall Gulban, and district of Tyrconnell. Despising the pleasures of the world he retired into voluntary exile, and betook himself to the monastery of Hy. He probably went there to be under his uncle Segineus or Seghine, and on the death of Suibhne he succeeded in A.D. 657 as the seventh abbat. He died A.D. 669, and his name is famous as that of the earliest biographer of St. Columba. Colgan supposes that what he publishes as the Second Life in his *Tr. Thaum.* is the work of St. Cumineus, which is referred to and quoted by St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Col.* iii. c. 5), but in this he errs: S. Cumineus's treatise is really the First Life in Colgan's collection (*Tr. Thaum.* 321-24), though he has given it as anonymous. It was afterwards published, with some minute differences, by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ben. Ord.* i. 321-24), and again by Pinkerton (*Vit. Ant.* 27-45). It forms the basis of St. Adamnan's *Life of St. Columba*. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 107 sq., iii. 36; Grub, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 45, 86, 98; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 408-11, and *Tr. Thaum.* 324 n.¹, 331 n.¹; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 199, 260, 375; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 57; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iv. 151; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 279; Ussher, *Ant.* c. 15, wks. vi. 229, 245.)

CUMIN (6) Foda or Fada, the Tall, of Cluain-ferta-Brennainn (now Clonfert, co. Longford), B. Nov. 12. He was son of Fiachna, son of Fiachre, king of West Munster, and of the race of Corc, son of Lughaidh, descended from Oilíoll Olum, king of Munster. Rinh, daughter of Fiachna, was his mother, and his preceptor was Colman Ua Cluasaigh. [COLMAN (36).] Guaire Aidne, son of Colman, king of Connaught, was a brother. O'Donovan says St. Cumín was of the tribe of Eoghanaacht Locha Lein in Kerry. But in the *Book of Lecan*, Guaire becomes a distant relative, St. Cumín is represented as son of Conaing or Conall, son of Fergus, son of Amhagaidh, son of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh Muighmheadoin king of Ireland, and the saint founds Cill Chuimín, now Kilcummin, in the ancestral barony of Tirawley on Killala Bay, co. Mayo (*Gen. &c. of Hy-Fiachrach*, by O'Donov. 9, 45, 61). He was born about A.D. 590, yet Colgan makes him a disciple of St. Ita or Mida, who died A.D. 570. Aedh was his first proper name, and Drum-dá-liter the name of his place. He appears to have been a

man of great learning, and as such was recommended by one of the abbots of Hy to be the director and spiritual adviser of king Domhnall. Lanigan and Butler identify him with St. Cumman, who took such a prominent part in the Paschal controversy [CUMMAN], but their suppositions appear to be groundless. He wrote a hymn in praise of the Apostles and Evangelists, which is published for the first time in the *Book of Hymns* (fasc. i. 72-80), edited with many learned notes by Dr. Todd, who also gives a critical summary of the accounts of his parentage and life. He died A.D. 662. (Todd, *Book of Hymns*, fasc. i. 81 sq.; Ussher, *Ant.* c. 17, works, vi. 544; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* Ir. ii. 398 sq.; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, viii. 275-7 at Aug. 19; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 52 n., 55 n.; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 305; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 59 n.⁶, 145, c. 3, 146 c. 7, 149 n.⁷; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* iii. 33; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 259.) [J. G.]

CUMMA, abbat of Abingdon, attesting a charter marked by Kemble doubtful or spurious (*C. D.* No. 81; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58). It bears the signatures of bishops Daniel, Wor, Walestod, Forthere, who sat between A.D. 705 and 737, and is dated by Kemble A.D. 725-737; but it is printed in the *Chron. Monast. de Abingd.* ed. Stevenson, i. 38, under the marginal date A.D. 857-860. [CUMANUS.] [C. H.]

CUMMAN (1), V. July 6. On this day *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 189) has Ethne and Cumman, and Dr. Todd adds in a note, "Ethne and Cumman were both virgins and sisters, daughters of Cormac, son of Ailill, of the race of Cathair Mór, king of Ireland, *Sanct. Gen. B. of Lecan*." It is related by Evinus in the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick (iii. c. 2), that St. Patrick came to a place afterwards called Tulach-maine, where the chief man of the district, named Manius, received him and his teaching gladly: on this account he received a blessing, and twin-daughters were born to him. In his note on this, Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 149, c. 2, 184 n.⁶) says July 6 was the feast of the three daughters of Manius of Asriodh-bainne, according to Mar. O'Gorman, Maguire, *Mart. Doneg.* and *Mart. Tullaght*: the latter (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* xxviii.) has "Tri ingena Maine in Airdí Boinne 1 Dermor ocus Étne ocus Cummán." And thus they stand in Colgan's list (*ibid.* 270, col. 1) of those whom St. Patrick veiled, as Dermoria, Ethnea, and Cummán. In his Index Chron. at A.D. 560 (*Acta SS.* 831) he says Ethnea, Pulcheria, and Cumania, virgins, daughters of Aidh, or, according to others, daughters or grand-daughters of Corpreus, king of Leinster, flourished (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. 327). But in so many different notices of St. Cummán and her sisters there is evidently very much obscurity and confusion.

(2) Of Doire-inghen-aillen, in Ard Uladh (now the Ards, in co. Down); or in Dal-Buinne, V. May 29. *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 141) says further that she is of the race of Fiatach Finn, monarch of Erin. In his *Fóire*, St. Aengus speaks of "Cumain of the Fair town—Dear daughter of Allen," and on this there is a gloss possibly, as Colgan imagines, by St. Aengus himself interpreting and applying it. At Daire-inghen-aillen (now Derry, in the Ards of Ulster,

there are the ruins of two very ancient chapels, which Dr. Reeves conjectures, from the *Felire* and its gloss, may have been built before the year 800 (Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 24 n., 234.) [J. G.]

CUMMIAN has been identified with St. Cumine, abbat of Iona, to the historical injury of both [CUMIN (5)]. He has also been identified, to as little purpose, with St. Cumin Foda [CUMIN (6)]. There is no account of his parentage or race. He was probably educated at the Columbian monastery at Durrow, and had his church at Kil-cummin (now Kilcomin, in the barony of Clonlisk, King's County). In the Paschal controversy, in which his name has a very prominent place, he strongly espoused the Roman side as against the national or Scotie. In the synods which were held on the subject, as in those at Magh-Lena, near Tullamore, and at the White-Field, near Carlow, Cummián took a leading part, but the only result of the synods seems to have been a deepening of the lines of demarcation between the parties, and a closer attachment of St. Cummián to the usages of the south of Ireland and Rome. His zeal on the Paschal question brought him into collision with his Columbian brethren at Hy, who rebuked him for becoming a schismatic and a forsaker of his country's traditions. His reply was given in a letter, A.D. 634. This letter is interesting and of great value, not only as shewing the position taken up by the advocates of the more modern and astronomically more correct calculation of Easter, but as proving the solid foundation of learning which Ireland could then lay in the minds of her priests (see the letter in Ussher, *Sylloge*, Ep. xi. works, iv. 432-44). Besides this letter, he is also believed to have been the author of an abridgment of the penitential canons, called *Liber de Penitentiarum mensurâ*, which is published by Fleming (*Collect. Sacra.* 197-210), and afterwards in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, f. xii. There is no account of his death. Becan Ruim was probably "Becan the solitary," his brother [BECAN (3)]. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 15; Reeves, *Adannan*, 27, 260, 366; O'Connor, *Rev. Hib. Script.* ii. 168, 202; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 4; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 408-11; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. c. 6; *Dubl. Penny Journ.* i. 391, A.D. 1832-3; see COLMAN (23).) [J. G.]

CUN-. See also CYN-.

CUNGALLUS (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 191), abbat of Bangor. [COMGALL.] [C. H.]

CUNGAR, anchorite, said to have been the son of a prince at Constantinople, and to have come into Britain about A.D. 711 to live as a recluse. The story proceeds that he received from Ina king of Wessex a grant of land, afterwards named from him Congresbury, in Somersetshire; that here he built an oratory, and established a monastic society, and that he afterwards passed the Severn and founded a similar community in the north of Wales. Rees states him to have been patron of Badgworth and Congresbury in Somersetshire, of Hope in Flintshire, and of Llangefni in Anglesey. (Cressy, *Church Hist. of Brit.* iv. 11, xxi. 13; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* wks. v. 87, 540; Capgrave, *N. L. A. f.* 80; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 232; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 764; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 150, 158.) Congresbury is in the north-west of Somersetshire, on the

river Yeo, northward of the Mendip Hills. For the supposed bishopric there see DANIEL.

[C. H.]

CUNIBERT, bishop of Winchester. [CYNEBERT.]

CUNIBERT, bishop and confessor. April 25. He was given by his parents to be educated by the monks of Bammirini (Balmerino, Fifeshire), near the estuary of the Tay. There he so profited by their teaching that, against his will, he was carried off "ad sacras insulas." But he so loved solitude that, forsaking his episcopate, he betook himself to the desert, where, after evoking water from the stony rock, he died about the year 690. This is the account given by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 134-5) who adds "De eo agitur brevier in Theatro Vitae humanae, lib. i." The Bollandists refer to him among the prætermisii of this day, giving Camerarius as their authority, and adding, "ubi fuerit episcopus siletur" (*Acta SS.* April, tom. iii. 345; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 317). [J. G.]

CUNBED, abbat of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul (afterwards called St. Augustine's) at Canterbury; he succeeded Gutard, A.D. 803, and died A.D. 823 (*Monast. Anglic.* i. 121). His name appears in a charter of Coenwulf king of Mercia, A.D. 804, which is considered spurious or doubtful (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 187; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58). [C. H.]

CUNUBERTUS, abbat, attesting a charter of Aug. 26, 675, of Leutherius, bishop of the West Saxons, "actum publicè juxta flumen Bladon," but marked doubtful or spurious in Kemble (*C. D.* No. 11). The charter is also printed, but without the attestations by Malmesbury (*G. R.* ed. Hardy, vol. i. 43). On the identification of Bladon (which occurs again in *C. D.* No. 69), with the Lower Avon in Wiltshire, see Camden, ed. Gough, vol. i. 96. We can safely identify this abbat with the abbat and presbyter of Bede's touching story (*H. E.* iv. 16), Cyniberctus, having his monastery at "Hreutford, id est vadum arundinis." Camden's identification (i. 115) of this spot with Redbridge (the reedy ford having been succeeded by a bridge), in the neighbourhood of Southampton, especially when combined with his second identification of Ad Lapidem of the narrative with Stoneham, also near Southampton, is ingenious and convincing. It is adopted by Smith (Beda, i. c. note) and others (*Monast. Anglic.* vi. 1619; Leland, *Collect.* i. 76, ed. Hearne). See also Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58, 60. [CYNIBERT (2).] [C. H.]

CUNUULFUS (Bede, *H. E.* Contin, ad an. 740, in M. H. B. 288), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CUOENBURG, abbess, attests a charter of Kenulf, king of Mercia, at a Witenagemot in London, Aug. 1, 811. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 196; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 571, and note; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58.) [C. H.]

CUP, IN THE COMMUNION. [EUCCHARIST.]

CURCACH. (CORCAIR, QUORRAIR.) Some female saints of these names occur, but their history is in no small degree conjectural.

(1) V., Mar. 8, Aug. 8. In his memoir of St. Corcaria or Cucagia, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 563-4) says Quorrait, or more properly Corcarr or Curcach, was sister of St. Finnian (Sept. 10) of Maghbile (Moville), whom however he erroneously identifies with St. Frigidian of Lucca. Her father was Corpreus, of the princely house of Dalriatach in Ulster, and her mother's name was Lassara. Won by the life and exhortations of her brother, she refused earthly marriage, and was living in virginity about the middle of the 6th century. But now comes in the chief confusion or difficulty. Maguire and *Mart. Tallaght* commemorate on March 8, Curcach of Cluain Luthair, and *Mart. Doneg.* has the same dedication on Aug. 8: hence these feasts may belong to the same person. But Colgan (*ibid.* 339 n. 32, 564 n. 6, and *Tr. Thaum.* 463, c. 55) thinks that Corcaria Keann and Corcaria Caoin, who are said to have been daughters of Eugenius, and sisters of St. Sgire or Schiria (March 24) of Killskire in Meath, were, if not really only one person, yet perhaps the one Curcach of Gregraihe, Nov. 16, and the other Curcach of Cluain-luthair at Lea, in Ulster, March 8 and Aug. 8. O'Clery at March 8 (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 71) says there is a Curcach, daughter of Enna, son of Corbmac, of the race of Collá-da-chrioch, and Colgan (*Acta SS.* 713, c. 4) places her feast on July 21 or Aug. 8.

(2) V. July 21. This is the patron saint of Cill-curaighe (now Kilcorkey, a parish in the barony of Castlereagh, county Roscommon), but only her name appears to remain in the calendars (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 89). [J. G.]

CURCNEUS. [CORCAN.]

CURIG (1), latinised Cyricius, is the name of a Welsh bishop, whose memory is to be distinguished from that of Curig, Cyrique, or Cyricus, the martyr of Tarsus, who is also much honoured in Wales. Giraldus tells of his baculus being preserved in the church of St. German or Harmon, in the province of Warthrenniau, and lent out for working cures at the charge of one penny (unius denarii oblatione); he is supposed to have been bishop of Llanbadarn (Girald. Cambr. vi. 18; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 146). [J. G.]

(2) (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307), infant martyr. [CYRICUS.] [C. H.]

CURITAN (1) Abbat and bishop of Rosmeinn, commemorated March 16. The Cain Adamnan states that Curitan the bishop was one of the saints who went security to free the women of Erinn from the bondage in which they were (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 77). He is possibly mixed up with the life of St. Bonifacius of Rosemarkie [BONIFACIUS QUERETINUS]. *Mart. Tallaght* (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xviii.) has the feast of "Curitani Eps. oculus Abb. Ruis mic Bairend," which seems to identify him with the Curitan of Ros-mec-baercon who attended St. Adamnan's synod of Birr.

CURITAN (2) Of Cill-mór-dithruibh, Aug. 9. He is numbered among the nineteen saints of Kilmore, who are venerated on this day. Cill-mór-dithruibh is now Kilmore, a parish in the barony of North Balintober, county Roscommon (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 214;

Reeves, *Adamnan*, 99 n.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 381, n. 100). [J. G.]

CURNAN BEG, of Cill-Churnain (Kilcornan), Jan. 6. Of the particulars of his life we have nothing beyond his genealogy. He was son of Sinell, of the race of Coindri, descended from the Clanna-Rudhraighe, in Ulster. His church was at the present Kilcornan, in the barony of Caenraighe or Kenry, in the county and diocese of Limerick. There is another place called Kilcornan in the barony of Clanwilliam, co. Tipperary; but there is no mention of Curnan Beg's having any connexion with it (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 9; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 81-3). [J. G.]

CURTCHEW (CUTCHOU) is probably a form of Constantine (the Saint), and thus a St. Cowslan or St. Cutchou is found at Garbost in the western islands of Scotland. (Martin, *Western Isles*, 27; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 314.) [J. G.]

CURVINUS. [CUARAN.]

CUSA, CUSAN, -ANUS, attests a charter of Eanbert of the Wiccii, A.D. 757, marked spurious or doubtful by Kemble; another of Uhtred, king of the Wiccii, belonging to the period A.D. 778-785 (*C. D.* Nos. 102, 148; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58); another by Offa and Aldred, dated by Kemble A.D. 777 (*C. D.* No. 131), and by Hickes A.D. 775 (*Thes.* i. 171). Cusa, without the "abbat," attests a charter of Aldred, A.D. 775. (*C. D.* No. 125.) [C. H.]

CUTHBALD, monk, and afterwards abbat, of Medeshamstede (subsequently called Peterborough), succeeding Saxulf and preceding Egbald. He is described as a man of so great piety and wisdom that the monks of other houses desired to have superiors of his appointment. His name is attached to a charter of A.D. 680, marked doubtful or spurious by Kemble. He is mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Thorpe's transl., 29, 33; Ingram's transl., 46, 50; Willis, *Mit. Abb.* i. 143; *Monast. Angliæ.* i. 345; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 990; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 58. [C. H.]

CUTHBALD (Wend. *F. H.*, ed. Coxe, i. 187), abbat of Undalum. [CUDUALDUS.] [C. H.]

CUTHBERHT, one of the five presbyters of the diocese of Lichfield who attest an act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 546). [C. H.]

CUTHBERT (1), the great northern saint and bishop, was born, in the first half of the 7th century, in that district of ancient Northumbria which lies beyond the Tweed. He seems to have been the child of humble parents. We hear of him first at the little monastery of Tiningham, near Dunbar; and subsequently he appears as a shepherd watching over his flocks in the hill country upon the banks of the Leader. In the year 651, Cuthbert, a religiously-disposed youth already, received, according to Beda, a call to a straiter walk, whilst he was shepherding his charge by night. (*Vita Anonymi. S. Cuthberti*, ed. Stevenson, and *Vita ejusdem, auctore Beda*, the authorities used in this biography where no other reference is given.) He seemed to hear and see a vision of angels bearing heavenwards in triumph some newly-departed soul. He

awoke his comrades, but they laughed at his tale; and so he deserted them when daylight came, and he had learned that bishop Aidan had passed away during the preceding night. He rode down the hills towards the monastery of Melrose, which was distant more than a day's journey from his sheepwalk. This is not the religious house which we know so well, but an earlier monastic settlement, a short distance below it, on the same bank of the Tweed. The site of it, still called Old Melrose, is on a green sheltered slope, a little below the point where the Tweed receives the scanty waters of the Leader, and then takes a bold semicircular sweep under the woods and rocks of Bemerside.

Melrose was an offshoot from Lindisfarne, and in the absence of Eata the abbat, the provost Boisil received Cuthbert into the brotherhood, in which he was soon conspicuous for his devotion and energy. After a few years' sojourn at Melrose, Cuthbert accompanied his abbat, and went to Ripon, to plant a monastery on a plot of ground which had been given to them by Alchfrith, son of the king of Deira. In this establishment Cuthbert was the hostillar. In 661 the party returned to Melrose. Alchfrith, their patron, had adopted the new views with regard to Easter, in opposition to those of the Columbites, which Eata and Cuthbert observed; and, refusing to change their practice, the little brotherhood was sent back to its old home. In the same year, a pestilential epidemic, a precursor of the great mortality of 664, attacked the monks of Melrose. Cuthbert recovered, but he lost his old friend, Boisil, into whose office of provost he was elevated. In this position he was for some years a most active worker. Outside the walls of the house he was a very successful missionary. He was frequently absent for weeks together, ministering to the spiritual wants of the rural population. He found the people addicted to magic, and sunk in ignorance and superstition. We hear of Cuthbert at Coldingham and in Pictland, and wherever the calls of duty led him, he was assiduous and welcome.

In 664 Eata, Cuthbert's abbat at Melrose, removed him to Lindisfarne, to be the prior or provost of that already famous house. Melrose was on the river, Lindisfarne on the sea; it might be called an island, as "it was twice a day insulated by the tide, and it was therefore twice a day protected by a broad moat of living water" (Raine's *North Durham*, p. 52). Thirty years before, Aidan had chosen this sequestered spot for his home, reminding him as it did of his old residence at Iona; and here guarded by the sea, and in the vicinity of the royal castle of Bamborough, the colony of monks had lived in peace. Up to this time they retained the tenets of the Scottish church (Irish school), but the victory which Wilfrid had won at Whitby was felt throughout the province. Eata, as well as Cuthbert, seems to have adopted the Catholic views on the Easter question, and it became Cuthbert's duty, as prior of Lindisfarne, to induce his brethren to desert the traditions of their fathers. He had a most difficult task, but he succeeded at last. It was impossible for the monks to withstand the patient pleading of their superior, and to be unmoved by the devout self-denial of his life. Twelve years seem to have passed away, and then the old Celtic spirit of asceticism grew upon

Cuthbert. He had indulged it hitherto within the narrow compass of the island; now he retired to the mainland, and secluded himself in a place which Bede does not mention by name, but which we may probably identify with a little recess in the ridge near the village of Howburn, that is still known as Cuthbert's cave. (*North Durham*, p. 2, and Raine's *S. Cuthbert*, p. 21.) After a while he selected a wilder spot, one of the little islands of Farne, which lie in that dangerous sea, a few miles to the south of Lindisfarne. He chose the one that is nearest to the mainland, on which in after years the great monastery of Durham established a cell in commemoration of Cuthbert. The island "consists of a few acres of ground partially covered with grass, and hemmed around with an abrupt border of basaltic rock" (Raine's *S. Cuthbert*, p. 21). To the landward, this border rises eighty feet above the level of the water; to the seaward, there is a gentle slope, on which Cuthbert built his home. He upreared, first of all, with the aid of his brethren, a wall of turf and stone, so high that he could see over it neither land nor sea. Within this enclosure he erected an oratory, and a residence of turf roofed with thatch and wreck from the beach. These were for himself. At the place of anchorage he set up another building, to shelter the brethren from Lindisfarne when they paid him a visit. To these visitors he seldom shewed himself. His cell had but one window, and this, after a while, he closed, never opening it except to give his blessing when it was urgently sought. In this religious solitude the ascetic passed nine long years.

In 684 Cuthbert was called for a while out of his retirement. In that year a synod was held at a place called Twyford, on the river Alne, at which Egfrith, king of Northumbria, and archbishop Theodore were present, and Cuthbert was selected by them to fill the vacant see of Hexham. The difficulty was to prevail upon him to accept the office. He was sent for in vain. At last the king himself, attended by bishop Trunwine and a large party, sailed to Farne, and only after the most earnest entreaties brought Cuthbert back with them to the synod. And there his old friend Eata made the proffered honour more welcome by surrendering to Cuthbert his own see of Lindisfarne in exchange for Hexham. Cuthbert was thus placed in charge of a district where he was known and beloved, and for two years he was an active and earnest bishop. He then resigned his post, and retired to his old hermitage, to die in peace. As he was getting into the boat which was to convey him from Lindisfarne to his cell, a monk asked him when they should see him again. "When you bring back my dead body," was Cuthbert's answer.

Cuthbert returned to Farne soon after Christmas, 686. On one of the last days in the following February, he was seized with his death-sickness. From his earliest years he had been subject to abscesses, a tendency which was aggravated by the attack of the plague which attacked him so severely in 661; but the disease which carried him off appears to have been dysentery. On the morning of the commencement of the seizure, Herefrith, abbat of Lindisfarne, paid Cuthbert a visit, and found him excessively

weak. The dying man made the arrangements for his burial. On the north side of his oratory, concealed beneath the turf, was a stone coffin, the gift of abbat Cudda, in which his body was to be laid, wrapped in a shroud which Verca, abess of Tynemouth, had bestowed on him. The coffin was to be re-interred near the oratory, to the east of the cross. Herefrith then went home at Cuthbert's bidding, to return, as he was desired, on some future day. A storm leapt up after his departure, and five days elapsed before the sea permitted the passage of a boat. All the while the monks at Lindisfarne were praying for their imprisoned bishop. On the sixth day Herefrith came back to Farne, and found Cuthbert sitting in the little guest-chamber at the landing place, with the glare of hunger in his eye. For five long days and nights he had never moved from that spot, longing and looking out for his return. Herefrith ministered to his wants, and when he went back to Lindisfarne, was allowed to leave several of his brethren behind. He came back to Farne immediately and prevailed upon Cuthbert to allow his remains to be taken to Lindisfarne for interment. Cuthbert, when he gave his assent, said that it was from fear of the evils which might result to Lindisfarne through the abuse of the privilege of sanctuary, that he had chosen at first a more retired resting-place. He now desired to lie within the monastery which he had ruled. After this, the monks carried the dying man into his oratory, where one of them watched with him for a while. Then Herefrith was called in to receive Cuthbert's last words, among which was the request, so dutifully and wonderfully obeyed, that should they ever be obliged to desert their home, his remains should accompany them wherever they went. Cuthbert lingered until midnight, and then died, having received the last office of religion at the hands of Herefrith. No sooner was he dead, than Herefrith lighted a couple of torches, and, holding one in either hand, waved them in the air, to carry to the monks at Lindisfarne in a preconcerted way the melancholy news. The brother who was looking out on the watch-tower at Lindisfarne, marked the fire-signal across the dark sea, and ran into the church with the tidings, where the monks were soon upon their knees. In the morning the dead body of Cuthbert was brought over the sea, and was interred in a stone coffin on the right side of the altar.

Cuthbert died on the 20th of March, 687. He can scarcely have been sixty at the time of his decease, when we remember that he was a youth in 651. In stature he was somewhat above the middle size (Raine's *St. Cuthbert*, p. 218).

The life thus narrated was uneventful; but Cuthbert's posthumous fame was so great, that the record must be continued long after his decease by tracing the fortunes of his spiritual descendants. Cuthbert became the patron saint of the monks of Lindisfarne. During his life he was accredited with the power of working miracles; after his death, his fame, in this respect, spread far and wide. In 698, eleven years after his decease, the first translation of his remains was made by the monks of Lindisfarne. The body was raised from the earth for the purposes of reverence. A little preparation would give it the appearance of incorruptibility which it is said at that time to have manifested, and for which it was after-

wards renowned. At the disinterment of the saint's remains in 1827, it was evident that such a preparation had been made. (*St. Cuthbert*, pp. 213-14.) In 793 and 794 the monastery of Lindisfarne was ravaged by the Danes. The monks were taken by surprise, and those who escaped were unable to fulfil Cuthbert's dying injunction by removing his body. On their return they found it untouched, but their brethren who remained behind had been slain by the marauders, and the church was plundered and destroyed. (Symeon, *Historia Regum*, i. 31-2; *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.*, ed. Bedford, 86-8; *Alcuin*, ed. 1777, i. 11, 19-20.)

In 875 there was another Danish inroad of a more serious and permanent kind. Bishop Eardulf and his clergy took with them the body of their saint and fled from Lindisfarne before the face of the foe. The wandering was of seven years' duration. Seven men were set apart to carry the bier on which the remains were laid, an office which was long remembered as an honour by their posterity and the northern church. (For the history of these wanderings, see the two works of Symeon, quoted above; the *Historia de S. Cuthberto*, and the *Historia Translationum*; see, also, *Reginald*.) The fugitives visited many places in Northumbria and Cumbria, and there was a mediæval tradition that wherever a halt of any duration was made, a church was erected which bears St. Cuthbert's name. (Raine's *St. Cuthbert*, 44.) The times were so perilous, that at last in utter weariness and despair, the monks resolved to take up their abode in Ireland. They actually started from the Cumbrian coast, but were driven back to it by a storm. After this they went as far north as Whithorne, but their restlessness was such that in 882 we find the party at Crayke, near York, which had been given to Cuthbert in his lifetime by Egfrith, king of Northumbria. Whilst they were there the monks used the name and influence of their saint so adroitly in politics, that they were the happy means of placing Guthred on the throne of the northern kingdom. The new monarch was not slow to manifest his gratitude. The bishopric of Lindisfarne had wandered about with the party; Guthred, in 883, fixed it at Chester-le-Street. More than this, he gifted it with all the land between the Wear and Tyne, together with the right of sanctuary, thus originating those peculiar and noble franchises of the see which in after years were so largely developed. Chester is a village pleasantly situated on the banks of the Wear, and lying on the street, or Roman road, which leads to Newcastle. At Chester there was a peaceful succession of nine prelates coming down to 990, and there, perhaps, the monks would have remained, had not another Danish invasion, which occurred in that year, made their position unsafe. Bishop Aldhun this time took a southward direction with his companions and Cuthbert's body, and never paused until the whole party reached Ripon in Yorkshire. The place would be known to them by tradition as the temporary abode of Cuthbert in earlier life. They did not stay at Ripon more than three or four months. They set off for their old home at Chester-le-Street, and were within six miles of it, when a halt on the west side of Dunholme, or Durham, revealed to them

a situation, unequalled for beauty and many natural advantages by any other place in England. Here they took up their abode, led to it, so they told the tale, by the interposition of Providence. With the assistance of the official earl of the district and a willing populace, they cleared the summit of the hill of its native wood, and levelling the ground, began upon it the construction of a church of stone, the ancestor of the present stately cathedral of Durham. Three years elapsed before it was completed, during which time the body of Cuthbert was laid in a temporary church of wood, until a fitter resting-place was prepared. This was finished in 999. The wanderings of the faithful monks were at last over. With good cause they called Durham their Sion, a name which it has since borne; and they who have since become familiar with Jerusalem, have traced a resemblance, not in historical association only, but in situation and beauty, between Cuthbert's lasting home and the great city in the East.

In 1069 there was a short break in the peace which had reigned at Durham since 993. William the Conqueror came into the North to take vengeance on the people. The bishop of Durham and his clergy, true to their traditions, fled with the body of Cuthbert to its old home at Lindisfarne. After a short stay there, they found that their fears were unfounded, and returned quietly to Durham. (Symeon, *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* ed. Bedford, 179-185; *Reginald*, 30-1.)

In 1093, bishop William of St. Carileph began to replace Aldhun's cathedral by a more massive and noble structure, and from that year until 1104, whilst the fabric was in a transitional state, Cuthbert's remains were deposited in a tomb which had been prepared for them on the south side of the church, in the present cloister quadrangle. William of St. Carileph's church contained, of course, a proper feretory or shrine, to which Cuthbert's body was translated in 1104 with extraordinary ceremony. The remains are said to have presented the same appearance of incorruptibility which had been observed in 698. Laid in the coffin with Cuthbert were relics of other persons of renown. The head of king Oswald, the great patron of early Christianity in the North, was resting upon the saint's breast; and in the same receptacle, deposited in linen bags, were the bones of bishops Aidan, Eadbert, Eadfrith and Ethelwold, and the head of "the most glorious Ceolwulf." The chest also contained the relics of the Venerable Bede, which were afterwards placed in the Galilee at the west end of the church. At the translation these bones were removed from the coffin and were arranged around the feretory in little caskets of ivory or crystal. The head of Oswald was restored to its old resting-place. (See *Hist. Translationum S. Cuthberti*, ed. Surtees Soc. 158-201; *Reginald*, pp. 84-92.)

The reverence which was paid to Cuthbert is evidenced by the magnificent gifts which were heaped upon his church. The names of the benefactors were entered in a volume, called the *Liber Vitae Dunelmensis*, which used to rest upon the high altar in the cathedral. It dates from Saxon times, and the names of many of the earliest and greatest donors are inscribed in it in gold and silver characters. (Published by the Surtees Society, vol. xi.) The church of Durham

also possessed a privilege of sanctuary which was famous throughout the country. (See the *Sanctuary Register*, published by the Surtees Soc. vol. vi.) Of equal fame likewise was St. Cuthbert's banner, "the holie corporax cloth, which was within the corporax, wherewith Saint Cuthbert did cover the ehalice." This was frequently carried as a talisman into battle, and had always the credit of securing the victory. (*Rites of Durham*, 20-1; *Archaeologia Aeliana* n. s. part vi. 51-65.)

The shrine or feretory of St. Cuthbert was placed in the cathedral on a small platform behind and contiguous to the high altar. There is a full account of it in that very remarkable work which describes the ornaments and the customs of the church of Durham before the Reformation. (*The Rites of Durham*, Surtees Soc. publications, vol. xv.) The shrine was set off with a sumptuousness of decoration in the way of painting, jewelry and carving, which was deemed to be unrivalled. After the battle of Neville's Cross, the captured banners of the Scottish king and his nobles were suspended over the holy place, and the famous Black Rod of Scotland was added to its treasures. All these disappeared at the Dissolution, and at the present day nothing catches the eye on the vacant platform save a blue marble stone in its centre, under which the bones of Cuthbert were laid when his shrine was demolished. But there are still several grooved hollows in the pavement which are said to have been made in olden days by the knees of the worshippers.

At some unknown period, between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries, probably in the eighteenth, sprang up the tradition, which the author of Marmion has enshrined in his verse, that the body of Cuthbert is still preserved in the cathedral in a state of incorruptibility, and that the place is only known to three members of the Benedictine order, who regularly transmit the secret, so that there are always three who keep it. The truth of this story was practically dispelled in 1827 by an examination of the grave behind the present altar in which the body of the saint was said to have been deposited. The inquiry resulted in the discovery of relics, which, on the whole, may be distinctly identified with those which Reginald describes as being found in the grave in the year 1104. The subject has been fully investigated in the *St. Cuthbert of the late Dr. Raine*. The discovery, as may be imagined, excited much interest, and, naturally enough, some little controversy.

The bones of Cuthbert, with the skull of Oswald, were re-interred under their old blue stone, but the more interesting contents of the coffin were removed and are now exhibited to the public in the library of the Dean and Chapter of Durham. They consist of portions of the original coffin of oak, rudely carved, in which the body was laid immediately after death. There is also a pectoral cross of gold, of rare beauty, which probably belonged to Cuthbert himself; a small superaltar of wood overlaid with silver; a large comb of bone which is mentioned by Reginald; a burse and portions of many beautiful episcopal vestments of cloth of gold, and of most choice workmanship. Upon a stole is an inscription stating that the vestment was made for bishop Frithestan. This person

was bishop of Winchester and died in 932. It is only within the last few years that the presence of this robe at Durham has been satisfactorily explained. The narrative of a monk of Winchester has been published, stating how he took some vestments with him from Winchester to Durham, and put them with his own hands on Cuthbert's body. (Thorpe, *Diplomat.* 321.)

When Cuthbert's grave was opened at the Reformation, there were found in it, in addition to most of the articles already described, a ring of gold, a chalice of gold and onyx stone, a paten, and what is called "a metwold of gold." (Raine, *St. Cuthbert*, 216-217.) These, no doubt, would become the spoils of the royal commissioners. The ring is still in existence, and has been seen by the present writer. It came into the possession of Thomas Watson, Dean of Durham, and was afterwards given to the College of English Canonesses at Paris, whence in 1855 it was transferred to St. Cuthbert's College at Ushaw, near Durham. (See a notice and drawing of it in *Arch. Aeliana*, n. s. part vi. 66-8.) It is a plain massive thumb-ring, with a sapphire set in it. There are also several other relics of Cuthbert preserved. The MS. of St. John's Gospel, of mystic power, which was no doubt a personal relic, although it was taken out of the coffin as early as the year 1104, is now at St. John's College at Stonyhurst. (Raine, *St. Cuthbert*, 78.) It may be mentioned also that miracle of art, the precious volume known as the Lindisfarne Gospels, which has now passed away from Durham into the national Museum. It was this book which the monks of Lindisfarne had with them in their seven years' wandering, and which fell into the sea when they neared the Cumbrian shore, when the storm drove them back from Ireland. It is still marked with the stain caused by the sea-water. (Published in four volumes by the Surtees Soc. In the preface to the last volume is an account of the adventures of the MS.) Another companion of the monks in their wanderings from the eighth century to the close of the tenth, was the noble stone cross which bishop Ethelwold, Cuthbert's friend, caused to be wrought in cunning sculpture as a monument of both. In Simeon's day it was standing, "sublimis," in the cemetery at Durham. (*Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* cap. xii.)

Cuthbert, according to Bale, was the author of a set of injunctions entitled "*Ordinationes suae ecclesiae*," and beginning *Prima regula est de Domino*. He also wrote, *Praecepta vitae regularis*. (*Balaei Scriptt. Brit. Folio*, Basileae, cent. i. p. 84.) These pieces do not now exist. The literature, however, of which Cuthbert is the subject is very considerable, both in prose and verse. The earliest life of the saint in prose is that written soon after Cuthbert's death by some nameless person who resided either at Lindisfarne or Melrose, at the desire of bishop Eadfrith, and between 698 and 705. It is, no doubt, this work which Bede incorporated with his own, describing it as the production of the brethren at Lindisfarne. This biography is valuable not only for its very early character, but for the information it contains. It is in four books, and is printed in the *Acta Sanctorum* (March 20), and in *Bedae Opp. Minora*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 259-284. Mr. Stevenson corrects some of the errors with which the first imprint abounds.

We now come to the two lives by Bede. That in verse, the earlier in date, was written prior to 705, as king Aldfrith is mentioned in it as alive. The work is addressed to John the Presbyter, who was starting on a pilgrimage to Rome. Excluding a preface and a final prayer, the work consists of forty-six chapters, descriptive chiefly of miracles. The poem has been printed more than once. (*Acta Sanctorum*, March 20; *Canisii Lectt. Antiquae*, ii. pars i. 1-24; Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.* ed. Venice, ii. 878-899; *Beda*, ed. Smith, pp. 267-291; *Bedae Opp. Minora*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 1-43.)

The prose life by Bede is a work of a higher stamp, and is one of the best pieces of mediaeval biography that we possess. It was compiled, (1) from the Anonymous Life already mentioned; (2) from the author's poem on the same theme; (3) from the traditions of the monks of Lindisfarne, to whom the work was formally submitted for correction before it was regarded as complete. Bede dedicated his work to bishop Eadfrith and his congregation, to whom he was so much indebted for information. He was assisted by several persons who were personally acquainted with Cuthbert, viz., Herefrith Presbyter, Inguald of Wearmouth, Baldhelm and Cynmund of Lindisfarne, and others. It is difficult to appreciate too highly the tone in which this life is written and the facts with which it abounds. The work has gone through several editions. (*Acta SS.* March 20; *Suri. Vitae SS.* pp. 214 et sqq.; Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.* ed. Venice, ii. pp. 841-878; *Beda*, ed. Smith, pp. 227-264; *Bedae Opp. Minora*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 45-137.)

Next in order comes a short but very valuable tract entitled, *Historia de S. Cuthberto, et de commemoratione locorum regionumque ejus priscae possessionis a primordio usque nunc temporis*. This is printed in Twysden's *Decem Scriptt.* coll. 67-76; and fully and more accurately, in *Opp. Symeonis Dunelm.* ed. Surtees Soc. i. pp. 138-152. The tract gives a very brief summary of Cuthbert's life, but we derive from it invaluable information as to the fortunes of his spiritual descendants, and the acquisition of the endowments of his church. It was written certainly not later than the eleventh century.

After this work follows the *Historia Translationum S. Cuthberti*, by an anonymous writer in the eleventh century, which is printed entire, for the first time, in *Symeonis Dunelm. Opp.* ed. Surtees Soc. i. pp. 158-201. It had been previously printed in part in the *Acta SS.* March 20; *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben. saec. iv. ii.* 291, et sqq.; and in the *Appendix to the Opera Minora* of Bede, ed. Stevenson, pp. 285-317. The last three texts, however, are compilations, consisting of a part of the *Historia Translationum*; a short tract entitled, *Brevis Relatio de S. Cuthberto*, which will be noticed afterwards; and an interpolation of some chapters from Symeon's *History of the Church of Durham* (cf. Mr. Hinde's *Preface to Symeon*, pp. xxxix.-xlvi.). The work contains twenty-one chapters, the most valuable part being an account of the translation of Cuthbert's body in 1104. The tract seems to have been written at Durham possibly by Symeon himself, perhaps by Prior Turgot.

The next chronicler of St. Cuthbert, or rather, of the fortunes of his church, is Symeon of

Durham in his famous *Libellus de exordio atque procursu Dunelmensis ecclesiae*, which is printed in Twysden's *Decem Scriptores*, coll. 1-58; and, separately, by Thomas Bedford, 8vo. Lond. 1732, an edition of rare excellency. It is unnecessary to dwell upon this most important work, as it is more a history of the church of Durham than of its patron saint. Founded upon this chronicle is the *Brevis Relatio de S. Cuthberto* (Symeonis Opp. ed. Surtees Soc. i. 223-233, and *Preface* lvi. lvii.). The tract is very brief and unimportant. In addition to Symeon, the compiler uses the *Anonymous Life*, that by Bede, and the *Historia Translationum*.

Reginaldi monachi Dunelmensis *Libellus de Admirandis Beati Cuthberti Virtutibus quae novellis patratæ sunt temporibus*. (Edited for the Surtees Soc.) This work is written in the 12th century, and is dedicated to that eminent hagiologist, Aelred, abbat of Rievaulx. It is in 141 chapters, and, with very few exceptions, consists of descriptions of miracles, and curious historical incidents in connexion with the church of Durham and its property during the 12th century. The author was evidently a most credulous person, but he gives us many invaluable glimpses into the manners and events of his day. There is at Castle Howard a *Life of Cuthbert* in English verse, in twenty books, founded upon this work of Reginald. It is unpublished.

We now come to a different class of the Cuthbertine literature, namely, what is called the Irish life, *Libellus de ortu S. Cuthberti, de historiis Hybernensium excerptus, et translatus* (printed by Surtees Soc., *Biog. Misc.* pp. 63-87). Although there is no MS. of this life extant, older than the 14th century, it seems probable, from internal evidence, that it was written towards the close of the 12th. The design of this biography is to give Cuthbert ancestry. He is said, therefore, to have been the son of Muriadach king of Ireland, and to have come into Northumbria to be educated by his mother's brethren, bishops Meldan and Eatan. Special reasons also are given why women were prevented from entering the church of Durham. The author in the preface speaks of the "libellus" which he has already written about Cuthbert. It is possible, therefore, that the writer may have been Reginald, especially as there is some similarity of style. As to the credibility of the Irish life, the weight of evidence is against it. Not only is the story itself full of glaring improbabilities, but it is in direct opposition to the statements of the monks of Lindisfarne, who knew Cuthbert, to Bede, and to all the early writers. Still, it was adopted by John Wessington, prior of Durham, in the 15th century, and was accepted, apparently, after his time in his church. (*Rites of Durham*, 64-5, 112.) It is true also that women were not allowed to come farther into the nave of Durham Cathedral than the "cross of marble blue," which runs across it. But this order is to be accounted for, not so much by any special incident in Cuthbert's life, as by the dislike which so many of the Celtic and English saints had to the society of women.

The prose Irish life was versified, but the poem is still unpublished (Hardy's *Catalogue of MSS.*, i. part ii. 313). The same origin is ascribed to Cuthbert by John of Tynemouth in this life of that saint, which is printed by

Capgrave (*Nova Legenda Angliæ*, 69-79). This life is merely a compilation.

The Cuthbertine literature is not yet exhausted. There is an unpublished metrical life in the library of Lincoln's Inn, derived apparently from Bede. A similar life has been printed by the Surtees Soc. (*Biog. Misc.* pp. 92-117). It is of no authority, seeing that it ascribes to Cuthbert several miracles which are borrowed from Wilfrid and John of Beverley.

A long and valuable account of the materials for the history of St. Cuthbert may be found in Hardy's *Desc. Cat.* i. 297-317.

In more recent times Cuthbert has evoked the following works, *The Legend of St. Cuthbert; with the Antiquities of the church of Durham* (by Robert Hegg), published by B. R. Esq. [Richard Baddeley], 12mo. Lond. 1663. (Reprinted in 4to. at the private press of George Allan, at Darlington, in 1777; and, again, by John Brough Taylor, 4to., Sunderland, 1816.) The opening of Cuthbert's tomb was described in *Saint Cuthbert: with an account of the state in which his remains were found upon the opening of his tomb in Durham Cathedral, in the year 1827*, by the Rev. James Raine, M.A., 4to., Durham, 1828. This work produced some criticism on the part of the Roman Catholics, which is gently and hesitatingly expressed in *Remarks on the Saint Cuthbert of the Rev. James Raine, M.A.*, 12mo., Newcastle, 1828, ascribed to Dr. Lingard's pen, and more strongly in the *Saint Cuthbert* of the Rev. Charles (now archbishop) Eyre.

Lives of Cuthbert are to be found in nearly all the modern biographies of saints. There is much about him of great interest in Dr. Raine's *North Durham*, var. loc. [J. R.]

CUTHBERT (2) Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 740-758. He was a person of illustrious birth (Osbern, apud *Angl. Sacr.* ii. 75), and is first mentioned in a grant made by Ethelbert, king of Kent, to the monastery of Lyminge, in which he had been abbat (*Codex Diplom.* i. 103-4). In A.D. 736 he was consecrated bishop of Hereford, on the death of Wahlstod (Symeon, ed. Surtees, i. 13; Malmesbury, *de Gestis Pontif.* 8; Stubbs and Haddan, *Councils*, iii. 340, where the identity of the archbishop with the bishop of Hereford is shewn). Whilst Cuthbert was at Hereford he completed the decoration of a rich cross which his predecessor had begun, and set up a monument to the prelates who had gone before him. He chronicled also his own good deeds in verse (Malmesbury, *ut supra*, 299). In A.D. 740 he was translated to Canterbury, and went to Rome to receive the pall. He obtained, at the same time, permission from the pope to have a cemetery within the walls of Canterbury, and to have himself and his successors interred within their own church, and not, as heretofore, in the church of SS. Peter and Paul, outside the city's wall (Gervase, apud Twysden, col. 1641).

The chief point in Cuthbert's archiepiscopate was the holding of the council of Clovesho, which was of vast importance to the English church (Wilkins, i. 86, etc.; and 2nd ed. iii. 362-376). This council, and the affairs of England in general, were matters of much interest to Germany, and we find Boniface in correspondence with Ethelbald, king of Mercia,

and Cuthbert, reproving the former for his vices, and holding friendly and respectful intercourse with the other (Bonifacii *Epp.* ed. Giles, i. 132-47). It has been generally thought that these letters of Boniface preceded and brought about the meeting at Clovesho, but it is evident from Mr. Stubbs's remarks that Boniface was the scholar instead of the teacher, and that the acts of the English synod were the guide and model of its counterpart in Germany (*Councils*, ed. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 382-3).

It is plain that Cuthbert and Boniface were intimate friends. In A.D. 755, when Boniface was martyred, Cuthbert wrote a long letter to Lullus, archbishop of Mentz, on the glory that had accrued to the church by his death, and stating that the English church had resolved to keep his anniversary (Bonifacii *Epp.* ed. Giles, i. 218-223). Three years after this, on Oct. 26, 758, Cuthbert died. The circumstances of his interment were remarkable. It has been mentioned before that Cuthbert had obtained permission for the burial of the archbishops in their own cathedral church. This was certain to provoke much contention, and Cuthbert's design was to prevent it, and he succeeded. The bell tolled for the archbishop's decease, and the monks of St. Augustine's (SS. Peter and Paul) came in procession to the palace to carry off the body of the deceased prelate and inter it in their church. They now heard that Cuthbert had died three days before. A stone coffin had been carried into the palace, and the canons had quietly borne the corpse to its grave in Christ's church at midnight. The scene of triumph and rage may be easily imagined (Thorn, ed. Twysden, coll. 1772-3).

Cuthbert was a benefactor to Canterbury as well as to Hereford, building there a basilica, which was dedicated to St. John Baptist (Gervase, col. 1641). He had also some little claim to be considered a poet. Two short metrical pieces of his are preserved (Malmesbury, *de Gestis Pontif.* 299). Leland also says that he saw in the library of Malmesbury abbey a volume of Cuthbert's epigrams, which is now missing. It was probably from this very copy that William of Malmesbury extracted the specimens of his verse.

Wharton (*Angl. Sacr.* ii. 72) prints a few lines of a metrical life of Cuthbert by some nameless bard, the original of which is in the library at Lambeth (Hardy's *Catalogue*, i. pt. ii. 483). They are of little merit. (See also Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, and Wright, *Biogr. Brit.* 1st series, 305-8.) [J. R.]

CUTHBERT (3) Abbat of Malmesbury, appointed by his predecessor Ethelard, on his accession to the see of Winchester at some period between A.D. 766 and A.D. 778. William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Pontificum* erased six lines immediately following the mention of Cuthbert and it is thought that the passage originally contained strictures upon this abbat. His name occurs in the body of a charter of king Egferth, granting land at Purton in Wiltshire to his abbey, and it is he probably (Hadd. and Stubbs), who first of the four abbats of the diocese of Winchester attests the act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803. (Malm. G. P. lib. v. § 235; Kemble, C. D. Nos. 174, 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 546, and note; Willis, *Mit.*

Abbeys, i. 137; *Monast. Anglic.* i. 255; Birch, *Abbots of Malmesbury*, 6; Birch, *Fast. Monast.* 59.) [C. H.]

CUTHBERT (4) Abbat of Jarrow and Wearmouth, saec. viii. He was a disciple of Bede, and it is to his pathetic letter to Cuthwine that we owe our knowledge of the last days and hours of that great scholar (Symeon, *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* i. cap. xv.; Hardy's *Cat.* i. pt. i. 455-6). Cuthbert is said to have succeeded Hwetberht as abbat. Among the letters of Boniface is one addressed by that saint to Cuthbert, asking for copies of some of the works of Bede (*Epp.* ed. Giles, p. 86). Cuthbert was also a correspondent of Lullus, archbishop of Mentz, to whom he gave a copy of Bede's treatise on the Building of the Temple (*ibid.* 241, 250). There is no letter addressed to Cuthbert among Alcuin's Epistles, although there are two to Aethelbald and Friduin, his successors. They were, no doubt, acquainted, as Alcuin says, that his name had been for some time inscribed in the *Album* or *Liber Vitae* of Jarrow and Wearmouth (*Epp.* ed. Jaffé, 839, 841). [J. R.]

CUTHBRITHA (*Annales de Derleye*, quoted in *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 89), foundress of Wimburn Abbey. [CUTHBURG.]

CUTHBURG (CUDBURG, CUDBURH, CUTHBRITHA, CUTHBURGA), sister of Ina king of Wessex, foundress and first abbess of Wimburn. She was first the wife of Aldfrid king of Northumbria (A. S. C. Flor. Wig., Gaimar; Egfrid, as Henr. Hunt. says), but they separated, and as Florence relates, "pro amore Dei." Before she became abbess of Wimburn, but after renouncing the married life, she was a nun at Barking under the abbess Hildelitha, according to William of Malmesbury (G. R. ed. Hardy, vol. i. p. 49). She must have erected her monastery at Wimburn (as to which various dates are assigned) before A.D. 705, since it is mentioned in a letter of that date by Aldhelm bishop of Sherborne, as a monastery near the river Wenburnia, presided over by Cuthburga the king's sister (Aldhelm. *Opp.* p. 355, ed. Giles, 1844, *Pat. Eccles. Angl.*; also in the *Patrol.*, tom. lxxxix. p. 103). Her sister Cuenburh, or Quenbarga, is said to have been co-foundress with her, and both were buried at Wimburn. [CUENBURH.] Her memory was observed Aug. 31. An account of "Cuthburga Regina et Abbatisa Wimburnensis" occurs in the *Acta SS.* (Aug. vi. 696), also in Capgrave (*N. L. A. f.* 79). Hardy remarks that all the trustworthy information that has reached us respecting her and her sisters Cuenburh, Eadburh, and Tetta, is to be found in the *Acta SS. Ord. Sanct. Bened.* iii. 42, ed. Venet. He also gives an account of a MS. (*Vita S. Cuthburgae Reginae et Virginis*), which consists almost wholly of a dialogue between herself and Aldfrid (whom she terms "supra modernos reges literarum eruditus scientia"), and an exhortation she addressed to her nuns shortly before her death. (A. S. C. and Flor. Wig. *Chron.*, ad an. 718; Henr. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 724; Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1668, M. H. B. 784; Higd. *Polych.*, Gale, xv. Scriptt. 247; Hutchins, *Hist. Dorset.* 2nd ed. ii. 531; *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 88, 89; Birch, *Fast. Monast.* 59.) The *Monast. Angl.* (i. 436) notices that Lysons (*Envir. Lond.* iv. 62, 63) enumerat-

ing Cuthburga among the abbesses of Barking "from Mr. Lethieullier's MS." has no warrant of William of Malmesbury. That "MS." was in fact a history of Barking drawn up by Mr. Lethieullier himself, and not any ancient document. The story of Cuthburg and her sister has a very suspicious resemblance in two or three particulars to that of Cyniburga and her sister.

[C. H.]

CUTHBYRHT (*A. S. C.* p. 41, Thorpe), archbishop of Canterbury. [CUTHBERT.] [C. H.]

CUTHFRITH. The twelfth bishop of Lichfield, counted from Diuma (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 623). The Northumbrian annals, preserved by Simeon of Durham, place his ordination in the year 765 (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 663); and his name, "Cutfert episcopus" appears among the witnesses of a charter of Offa, dated 767 (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* No. 116). Berhtun, his successor, appears first in 774, but the Lichfield chronologist states the length of Cuthfrith's episcopate at three or four years; and one MS. of Florence of Worcester, dates his death in 769; (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 544; *Ang. Sac.* i. 428.) [S.]

CUTHGISLUS, CUTHGILS, son of Ceolwulf, and brother of Cynegils king of Wessex. (*A. S. C.* and *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad an. 674; *Flor. Wig. Geneal. Reg. W. Sax.* in M. H. B. 633; *Malm. G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 45.) [C. H.]

CUTHMANUS, ST., Cuthmanus, or Cutmen, confessor, of Stenninga or Steyning, in Sussex. The period at which he lived is uncertain, and has been supposed to have been as late in the 9th or 10th century. He was a native of England, the Bollandists say of the south of England, but others of Cornwall. In his youth he acted as his father's shepherd and herdsman. While tending his flocks he exercised unceasing prayer, which was prompted by his simplicity, humility and obedience. The accounts of him all speak of his wonderful spirituality. A somewhat quaint story is related of him. One day when he set free the oxen with which he was ploughing, so that they might go to the meadow, they were driven away and locked up by two boys, whose mother had heard the lowing. St. Cuthmanus, when he knew of it, seized the two boys, placed the yoke round their necks, and made them work instead of the oxen, so that the mark of the yoke remained on their necks till the day of their death. Their mother, it is said, died suddenly of fright.

After his father's death, Cuthman and his mother were reduced to great poverty, and he went about begging with her.

He ultimately settled down at Stenninga, Steyning, in Sussex, at the foot of Chanctonbury Ring, one of the highest of the South Downs. This parish, and that of Rye, were bestowed by Edward the Confessor on the abbey of Fécamp in Normandy, which had made the Bollandists suppose that the Stanninga or Estaninges of the martyrologists to be somewhere in Normandy, and that Cuthman died there. It is not likely that he ever left Sussex. Having made a vow to build a church, the site was there miraculously pointed out to him, and he built one, which rose to great honour. He is locally connected with the well-known legend of the Devil's Dyke, which is given at length in Ainsworth's *Ovingdean Grange*.

He is commemorated on the 8th of February. (*A.A. SS. Boll.* Feb. ii. pp. 197-199; Butler's *Lives of the Saints*.) [D. R. J.]

CUTHRED (1) (ÆDREDUS in Henr. Hunt., in M. H. B. 716, GUDRET in Gaimar), son of Cuichelm certainly, and most probably grandson of Cynegils king of Wessex, in which case he was nephew of kings Coinwalch and Centwine. But as authorities are not entirely in accord as to prince Cuthred's position in his family, the following details are offered. That he was the son of Cuichelm all agree (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 648, 661; *Flor. Wig.* ad ann. 648, 661, and *Geneal.* in M. H. B. 633); but the doubt is whether Cuichelm was the son or the brother of Cynegils. The *Saxon Chronicle* makes him son (*A. S. C.* ad an. 648); Florence, son in some passages unambiguously (*Flor. Wig.* ad ann. 614, 628, *Geneal.* in M. H. B. 633); in one passage (M. H. B. 529 c.) he is filius in the received text, but frater by another reading; in another passage (ad an. 661) Cuthred is nepos of Cynegils and fratruelis of Coinwalch and Centwine. But as fratruelis is certainly cousin, nepos must be nephew. Cuthred is fratruelis of Coinwalch in another passage of Florence likewise (ad an. 648). In Henry of Huntingdon, Cuichelm is the son of Cynegils in the received text (M. H. B. 715 b), but brother by a second reading; and in another place he is brother in the text (M. H. B. 716 b). William of Malmesbury (*G. R.* ed. Hardy, vol. i. 28) makes them brothers.

Cuthred accepted Christian baptism A.D. 639, which was four years after Cynegils, and three after Cuichelm, had set the example; and from the same bishop, Birinus the apostle of Wessex, who at the font "received him to son" (*A. S. C.*). On each occasion the important event took place at Dorchester (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 635, 636, 639), the old Roman town north of the Thames, the original seat of the Wessex bishopric. In A.D. 648 Cuthred received from Coinwalch, whom he had assisted in recovering the kingdom of Wessex (Hen. Hunt. in M. H. B. 716), 3000 hides (*A. S. C.*) or prædia (Ethelw.) of land near Aecesdune (Ashdown, *A. S. C.* tr. in M. H. B.). He died A.D. 661, while Coinwalch was still reigning. (*A. S. C.* and *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad ann. 639, 648, 661; Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 506; Gaimar, *Estorie*, vv. 1361, 1362, in M. H. B. 781.)

[C. H.]

(2) Abbat, attests three charters of Ethelbald king of Mercia; one between A.D. 723-37; another of A.D. 742, issuing from a council at Clovesho; a third between A.D. 716-743 (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 83, 87, 89; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 342 n.; Birch, *Fasts Monast.* 59).

[C. H.]

CUTHRED (3) King of the West Saxons; he succeeded Ethelheard in 741, and reigned until 754 according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, until 755 according to the more trustworthy authority of Simeon of Durham. His whole reign was a struggle against the great power of Ethelbald, king of Mercia, on the one hand, and the Britons on the other. In 743 he obtained the assistance of Ethelbald against the Britons; in 750 he had a struggle with one of his ealdormen, named Ethelhun; but three years after, in conjunction with Ethelhun, won a great victory

over Ethelbald at Burford, which marks the point at which the West-Saxon power began its continuous rise. He died childless, his son Cynric having been killed by his followers, about 748. Cuthred was a traditional benefactor of Glastonbury and Malmesbury, but the grants which bear his name are mostly spurious (Kemble, *C. Dipl.* Nos. 93, 94); two grants to Winchester (*ibid.* Nos. 1006 and 1007) are less questionable. [S.]

It is related in Camden that an annual festival was for many ages celebrated at Burford, at which were carried about the figures of a dragon and a giant in memory of the victory gained by Cuthred at Battle-edge, near the town, over Ethelbald king of Mercia, whose banner bearing the device of a golden dragon was captured (Camd. ed. Gough, i. 293). Henry of Huntingdon, however, assigns the golden dragon to Wessex. The event occurred in A.D. 752, near the borders of Gloucestershire. The battle with the Britons or "Welsh" is recorded in the *Saxon Chronicle* (ad an. 753) without remark, but Gaimar says the West Saxons were defeated (*Estorie*, v. 1803, M. H. B. 786). This reign still furnishes nothing of any interest for the church history of Wessex. Of the two sees into which the nation was now divided, Winchester was occupied by Daniel, Hunferth, Cyneheard; Sherborn by Herewald. Cuthbert was the archbishop of Canterbury. Cuthred was succeeded by Sigebert. Other varieties of the name are CUDRED and GUDRET. [C. H.]

(4) King of Kent, appointed on the fall of Eadbert Praen, by Cynewulf or Kenulf, king of Mercia, about 798; he died in 805, or more probably in 807. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 566.) [S.]

The archbishop of this reign was Ethelhard principally, and Wulfred after Aug. 3, 805; the bishops of Rochester, Weremund and Beormond, whose period somewhat corresponded (Stubbs, *Regist.*). The history of the reign, both secular and ecclesiastical, is to be studied in close connexion with Mercia, to which the Kentish crown was now subject. Kent was in fact fast verging to its fall. Cuthred reigned "solo nomine" (Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 25), and after one more succession the kingdom ceased, absorbed however not by Mercia but by Wessex. The establishment of an archbishopric at Lichfield threatened to transfer Kent's spiritual honour likewise to Mercia, but Ethelhard lived to see that danger pass. The troubles of the reign elicited some interesting letters from Alcuin to Ethelhard, and though these illustrate for the most part the Church of England at large, as represented by the see of Canterbury, and would therefore be out of place to notice here, there are a few passages of more local application, and as they bear on the church in Kent we may refer to them. Thus in a letter of A.D. 797 to the nobles and clergy urging them to recall their archbishop, who had deserted his charge, and warning them of their dangers from the northern invaders, Alcuin especially presses upon the clergy the study of holy Scripture; to give over adorning themselves "vanitate vestimentorum," contrary to the custom of the church; to shew nobility and ornament in their character; to be equipped and ready in the preaching of God's

word; by which means their laity and their men of war would be rendered strong, and their flock walk in the way of salvation (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 509, 510). In the following year, A.D. 798, returning to the same subject, Alcuin entreats the archbishop to expel both from himself his clergy "vanissimum vestimentorum cultum," and to which he likewise adds, "Conviviorum immoderatum usum;" and again he charges him to promote a revival of the reading of the sacred Scriptures (*ibid.* 520). In A.D. 802 while saying "silemium in sacerdotie perniciis est populi," he hints that they had been previously restrained from the liberty of preaching (*ibid.* 540); the fear of earthly power had kept them silent (*ib.* 553), and we may conclude that Mercian policy had kept a vigilant eye upon the clergy of Kent. Other public documents shew the see of Canterbury recovering its ground in temporalities (*ib.* 512), and the king himself endowing it (*ib.* 558). No monastic foundations in Kent are attributed to this reign (Birch, *East. Monast.* 7, 8); but we observe that the cathedral monastery receives a gift from the archbishop (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 555). On the chronology of the reign see *ib.* 559, note. Cuthred was the brother of Cynewulf or Kenulf king of Mercia according to Lappenberg (*Hist. Anglo-Sax.* stemma i. 191), who however gives no proof of it. Florence of Worcester's genealogy of the Mercian royal family (M. H. B. 630, 638) omits him where he appears in Lappenberg. He was succeeded by Baldred (Flor. Wig. *Chron. App.* M. H. B. 635; Henr. Hunt. M. H. B. 734; Gul. Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 25). Other forms of his name are CUDRED and CUDRET. [C. H.]

CUTHRED (5) The only abbat from the diocese of Hereford attesting an act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803. Of the monasteries of the period in that diocese nothing is known. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546, and note; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 59.) [C. H.]

(6) Presbyter, attests a charter of Cuthred king of Kent, Aug. 805 (Kemble, *C. D.* 190). [C. H.]

CUTHUINUS (Malm. *G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 148), bishop of Dunwich. [CUTHWIN.] [C. H.]

CUTHWIN (1) The first bishop of Leicester, who was appointed in 679 by archbishop Theodore when the Mercian dioceses were divided. He is not mentioned by Bede; and Florence of Worcester makes him bishop of Lichfield (*M. H. B.* 622), but the ancient lists of bishops place him at Leicester. Nothing else is known about him. (Councils, &c., Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 128.) [S.]

CUTHWIN (2) Monk at Jarrow, disciple of Bede, addressed by his fellow disciple Cuthbert on the death of their master. [CUTHBERT.] [C. H.]

(3) The eighth bishop of Dunwich, in the ancient lists (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* 618). His date falls about the middle of the 8th century, but is not exactly determined. [S.]

CUTSUIDA (CUDSUIDA), abbess. A charter of Oshere king of the Wiccil, about A.D. 692, grants land "ad construendum monasterium

Cutsuida abbatissae" (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 36; Hickes, *Thesaur.* i. 169). Another charter (A.D. 704-709) by Aethelheard and Aethelweard of the Wiccii, grants her free possession of land of five "mansiones" and named Ingim, which she had purchased of them for 600 solidi (*C. D.* No. 53; Hickes, l. c.; *Monast. Anglic.* i. 585). These charters having been preserved at Worcester (Hickes, *Thes.* ii. 300) among others having reference to the monastery there (*Mon. Angl.* l. c.), leads to the inference that Cutsuida was abbess of Worcester (Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 59), or at any rate that her monastery was one afterwards amalgamated with that house. [C. H.]

CUTULF, abbat of Evesham in a MS. list of abbats preserved by Dugdale. He succeeds Tyldbrith, who is undated, and precedes Aldmund, who held office A.D. 783 or 787 (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. 2; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 59). [C. H.]

CUTZUPITAE, St. Augustine, *Ep.* 53 (165), describes the Donatists worshipping at Rome as known by the names Montenses or Cutzupitae; on which we have a various reading "Cutrupitae." Elsewhere (*De Unitate Eccl.* 6) he repeats this statement, but there we have the various reading "Rupitae," which would be intelligible, but would not account for the other forms. The name was probably derived from the place at Rome where these schismatics held their meetings, and "Cutrupitae" seems as good a guess as we can make as to its original form. It is probably the same name that is intended by "Cotopitae" (Isid. *Hisp. Orig.* vii. l. vi. 54) and by "Gotispitae," (Pseud. Hieron. *Haer.* 32); these two writers describing the appellation as given to the Circumcelliones. We may dismiss the conjectures "Corrupitae" (Baronius) and Scototopici (Cotelier, *Ecc. Graec. Monum.* i. 789). The name does not appear to have any connexion with the "Campitae" of St. Jerome. (*Adv. Lucifer.* sub fin.) [G. S.]

CUUTFERT (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 116, A.D. 767), bishop. [CUTHFRITH.] [C. H.]

CWENBURH (A. S. C. ad an. 618), sister of Ina king of Wessex. [CUENBURH.] [C. H.]

CWICHELM (A. S. C. ad an. 626, edd. Ingram, M. H. B., Thorpe), king of Wessex. [CUICHELM.] [C. H.]

CWYFEN, Welsh saint of the 7th century, founder of Llangwyfen in Denbighshire; patron of Tudweilig in Carnarvonshire and of Llangwyfen, a chapel under Trefdraeth in Anglesey; commemorated on June 3 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 304). [C. H.]

CWYLLLOG, wife of Mordred the nephew of Arthur, reputed founder of Llangwyllog in Anglesey (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 228). [C. H.]

CYBAR (CIBAR, EPARCHIUS), anchorite near Angoulême. Butler thus spells the name, but the other works cited below, give Eparchius, Mabillon giving Cibar as a marginal note. He at first entered the monastery of Sedaciæ in Perigord, under abbat Martin, but afterwards secluded himself in a cell near Angoulême, where he was patronised by Aptoniæ II. the bishop of Angoulême, who ordained him priest. As he became popular and disciples flocked to him for instruction, a monastery at length sprung up.

It was not an uncommon thing for the hermit thus to pioneer the way for a monastery. Having occupied his cell for thirty-nine years he died July 1, 581. He was commemorated July 1. (Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, July 1; Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.* i. 252, ed. Venet. 1733; *Gallia Christ.* ii. 978, 979.) [C. H.]

CYBI (CHEBIUS, KEBIUS), a cousin of St. David, but some years younger. The name is pronounced *Kubby*. He was present at the synod of Brefi, and his memory near Llanddewi Brefi, the place where it was held, is preserved in the name of the church of Llangybi. The churches of Llangybi near Caerleon and Llangybi in Carnarvonshire were founded by him. He is especially distinguished as founder of a society at Caergybi or Holyhead in Anglesey. As presiding over this he was styled, according to the practice of the times, a bishop, though he never had authority over a diocese. The day of his commemoration is given as Nov. 6 by Professor Rice Rees (*Welsh Saints*, 266), but as Nov. 8 by Mr. W. J. Rees (*Cambro-Brit. Saints*, 495). See also Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 9, 143 n. 157 n. 159, 161; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 500, 513; Ussher, *Ant. Brit. wks.* v. 116, vi. 339, Chron. Index. [C. H.]

CYFEILACH, bishop of Glamorgan, killed A.D. 756 (*Brut y Tynyog.* as edited in *Myvyr. Archaiol. of Wales*, ii. 473; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 147). [C. H.]

CYFYW AB Cwynllyw, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Llangyfyw near Caerleon (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 233). [C. H.]

CYHELYN, 9th metropolitan of Caerleon, according to the *Iolo Manuscripts* of E. Williams (Stubbs, *Registr.* 154). [C. H.]

CYLINNIUS, a Gallic bishop, addressed in conjunction with bishop Proculus by Augustine "and the other fathers of Africa." The letter begs them to receive back Leporius, who had been banished for Pelagian opinions, but had changed his mind. (St. August. *Episc. Epistol.* Classis iii. num. 219, *Patrol. Lat.* xxxiii. p. 991). [W. M. S.]

CYMATIUS, bishop of Gabala, or perhaps Paltus, in Syria Prima, A.D. 341-362. It is supposed that he was one of the bishops who assisted Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, in his sudden consecration of Paulinus, presbyter of Antioch, chief of the Eustathian party. (Hieron. *Chron.* ad ann. 366, note i., *Patrol. Lat.* xxvii. p. 692; Ceillier, iv. 245.) [W. M. S.]

CYMUULFUS, king of the West Saxons, died A.D. 757 (Bede, *H. E. Contin.* ad an. ed. Moberly). See CYNEULFUS. [C. H.]

CYMWLF (Sim. Dun. ad an. 780, M. H. B. 665), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CYN-. See also CUN-, KIN-, KYN-.

CYNAN, 6th metropolitan of Caerleon, according to Williams's *Iolo Manuscripts* (Stubbs, *Registr.* 154). [C. H.]

CYNBRYD, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of Llanddulas in Denbighshire, slain by the Saxons at Bwlch Cynbryd; commemorated March 19 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 144). [C. H.]

CYNDEYRN, son of Arthog ab Ceredig, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Llangydeyrn, formerly subject to Llandyfaelog in Carmarthenshire; commemorated on July 25 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 211). [C. H.]

CYNDEYRN (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 261; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 144, 150, 157; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 498). [KENTIGERN.] [C. H.]

CYNDLILIG, Welsh saint of the 6th century, commemorated on Nov. 1 in the parish of Llanrhystud in Cardiganshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 281). [C. H.]

CYNE-. See also **CYNI-**.

CYNEBERHT (1), **CYNIBERCT**, the fourth bishop of the Lindisfari, in the see of Sidnacester. He is mentioned by Bede as bishop at the time at which the historian wrote his ecclesiastical history, that is, in 731. As his predecessor Eadgar attested the presumed genuine charter of Evesham in 706 (*Cod. Dipl.* No. 56) and his successor Alwig was consecrated by archbishop Tatwin in 733 (*Sim. Dun.*), the date of Cynebert must fall between these two limits. If the act of the council of Clovesho of 716 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 300), which is signed by Eadgar, be genuine, the date of Cynebert is still more nearly fixed. It was from him that Bede received his information on the ecclesiastical history of Lindsey. [S.]

(2), **KINBERT**, **CUNIBERCT**, the twelfth bishop of Winchester. He was present at the legatine synod of 787, in the record of which his name appears as *Chumbrechus* (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461). His attestation appears in numerous charters from 787 onwards, the last in 801. In 799, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, he went to Rome with the archbishop; but the journey belongs to the year 801 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 533). As his successor Almund appears in 803, Cynebert probably remained or died abroad. He was a friend of Alcuin, who addressed to him an extant letter (ed. Jaffé, No. 130), in which he mentions having met him in a synod, probably during his visit to England, 790-793. [S.]

CYNEBERHTUS (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 100, A.D. 755-757), abbat. [CUMBERTUS.] [C. H.]

CYNEBRYHT (*A. S. C.* ad an. 799, M. H. B. 340), bishop of Winchester. [CYNEBERT.] [C. H.]

CYNEBURH, -BURGA (*A. S. C.* ad an. 657, M. H. B. 315; Flor. Wig. *Geneal. Reg. Merc.* M. H. B. 630), daughter of Penda and queen of Northumbria. [CYNIBURGA.] [C. H.]

CYNEDRID, -DRYD, -DRYTHA, -DRIETHA (Edd. *Vit. Wilf.* c. 63; *Liber Vitae Eccles. Dunel.* Surt. Soc. 1841, various entries; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 59, 60), abbess. [CYNETHRITH.] [C. H.]

CYNEDRITHA (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 151), queen of Mercia. [CYNETHRITHA.] [C. H.]

CYNEGILS (KNEGILS), the first Christian king of the West Saxons. He was the son of Ceol, or Ceolric, succeeded his uncle Ceolwulf in 611, and reigned until 643. The early years of his reign were occupied in the consolidation of the

West-Saxon dominion. Having admitted his son Cuicelm to a share of sovereignty, he gained with his assistance a great victory over the Britons at Bampton (*A. S. C.* 614). In 626 the two kings seem to have engaged in a struggle for the supremacy in Britain, which brought them into collision with each of the other powers. After being defeated by Edwin, king of Northumbria, whom Cuicelm had attempted to poison (*Bed. H. E.* ii. 9), they won a great victory over the kings of the East Saxons, and in 628 fought a drawn battle with Penda at Cirencester. In 635, under the influence of Oswald of Northumbria, who was about to marry his daughter, he was converted and baptized by Birinus, to whom he gave the town of Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, as his episcopal see. He died in 643. (*H. Hunt.*, *M. H. B.* 716; *A. S. Chr.*; Will. Malmesb. *G. R. i.* § 18.) [S.]

For Beandune or Beamdune the *Monumenta* hesitatingly suggests either Bampton in North-east Devon or Bindon in East Dorset near Wareham (M. H. B. 306, and *Index Geogr.* 977). That the Saxon arms could have got so far west as the former at that early date is difficult to think, when we remember that the Britons hotly engaged them in Wiltshire at Bradford on the Avon in A.D. 652 (*A. S. C.* ad an.), and that only in A.D. 658 did Coinwalch succeed in driving them into the middle of Somerset. Beandune differs but slightly (*Dun* and *tun* being often interchanged) from Benetune, as Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 730) writes for Benesington or Benson, and this spot would be somewhat tempting were it not so far east. Yet the Britons, dwelling as they long continued to do (cf. E. A. Freeman, *Old Engl. Hist.* 39, 40, 65, and map, p. 38) in the midst of the Saxon conquests, might have struck a blow for an ancient possession of some importance (cf. CUTHRED of Wessex). Wherever the battle was fought it was a hotly-contested one, as "two thousand and sixty-five Welshmen" were slain (*A. S. C.* ad an.).

When Cynegils solemnly accepted the Christian religion at Dorchester in 635 he was giving his adherence to a growing cause. During his own reign he had seen the northern kingdoms submit to it, first under Edwin, and now again under Oswald; and the kings of the north were almost kings of England among the minor states of the heptarchy. He himself had been chastised by Edwin in 626 (*A. S. C.* ad an.). Oswald had just by a signal victory (A.D. 634) crushed Caedwalla and his Britons in the north, and kept the Mercian Penda in subjection. A marriage alliance with Northumbria was therefore something for a king of Wessex to be proud of. But Oswald's zeal for the continued advance of the Christian religion was no secret. The cross at Heavenfield in 634 must have been heard of everywhere, and in 635, the year when Cynegils was baptized, Aidan was established at Lindisfarne. It does not appear that Cynegils as a pagan had obstructed the mission of Birinus which was now in its early struggles; but neither had he done anything to originate or to support it. There was no Christian queen-consort in this case, and Birinus had to labour independently of the royal family. This circumstance distinguishes the West Saxon apostolate, and adds greatly to the interest of Oswald's appearance as a sponsor at Dorchester,

now in the second year of Birinus's labours (*A. S. C.* ad an. 635). The court scene is not described, and must be left to imagination; but the simple fact of the two kings standing together in such a relation is unique among the royal conversions of the heptarchy. One little touch of colour, however, drops in from the phraseology of the period. Oswald, in answering for the faith of his fellow-king and future father-in-law, "received him to son" (*Bede, H. E.* iii. 7). If Drogo's *Life of Oswald* is of sufficient authority, and the probability of the thing is almost enough, we may imagine the zealous Bretwalda as actively assisting in the conversion of the West Saxons, commending to them by personal exhortations the royal converts' example. To complete the picture, there was the Roman town itself, then retaining much of its old importance and appearance, traces of which still survive (as does a fine old church) to dignify the cradle of Wessex Christianity.

On this occasion Dorchester was given to Birinus for the seat of his bishopric, which had hitherto been exercised among the people without any fixed centre. It was here as in all other kingdoms of the heptarchy, whencesoever the missionary bishop might have been invested with his spiritual authority as a messenger to souls, it was the king alone who fixed the see. But it is a noticeable circumstance that Oswald substantially participated with Cyneigils in the disposal of this Wessex town. Both kings, as *Bede* expressly words it, joined in the gift, and it illustrates the Bretwaldaship, in this case the imperium, which the Northumbrian sovereign enjoyed (*cf. Bede, H. E.* iii. 6). The situation of Dorchester shews that Wessex under Cyneigils had made good its footing beyond the Thames, notwithstanding the event of A.D. 628 at Cirencester. The city remained the spiritual capital of Wessex for at least above forty years (see Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 127, and Smith's note at *Bede, H. E.* iii. 7), though it may not have been wholly lost to the Wessex nation until the capture of the neighbouring Benetun or Benson by the Mercians in A.D. 777 or 778. Its episcopal honours in the Mercian kingdom were continued, nor did they terminate before the Conquest.

Who shared the sacred rite at the first royal baptism of Wessex we are not told, and perhaps the silence is significant; but we know who did not; the king's crowned colleague Cuichelm declined, as did also prince Coinwalch. Nor are we even informed when and where it was that the princess gave herself to the church, nor when her marriage with Oswald took place.

The conversion of Cyneigils was an event of much importance in the progress of Christianity. It made the Christian crowns of the heptarchy now four to three, some thirty-eight years after Ethelbert had set the example to his brother kings. It brought much support to the little Christian kingdom of Kent, and diminished the isolation of the archiepiscopal see, which still remained cut off from the rest of Anglo-Saxon Christendom by the pagan East Saxons, South Saxons, and Mercians. Wessex, too, was isolated from the Christian states of its own blood; but the dominant nation of the island was in its alliance. A further importance of the Wessex conversion was in the new bearing it would pro-

duce towards the Christian Britons of the west, upon whom the Teutonic race was ever advancing still. The struggle for territorial predominance would at all events not now be further embittered by the wanton destruction of old native Christian foundations.

What may be called the ecclesiastical history of Wessex during the eight years that Cyneigils reigned as a Christian is soon told. Birinus retained the bishopric of the nation, and two more royal baptisms were celebrated at Dorchester, Cuichelm coming forward in 636 and Cuthred in 639, the last certainly, and both presumably, receiving the rite from Birinus himself, who received Cuthred to son. In this planting-period of the Wessex church no synods are recorded, and no monastic foundations (see Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, for this period, iii. 90-93; and Birch, *Fasti Monastici*, 2, 3). In the archiepiscopal see was Honorius; but he was not likely to be brought into any sort of contact with Wessex. The archbishops of Canterbury, hemmed in by paganism all around, were scarcely more as yet than bishops of Kent. Birinus, moreover, did not receive his mission from the chair of Augustine, but came direct from abroad. Dorchester therefore is the one locality, the three royal baptisms all the definite events, that we associate with the name of Cyneigils as the first Christian king of Wessex. The Winchester annalist of the 13th century naturally allows us to see more of his own distinguished cathedral on this occasion. Cyneigils, he states, gave Dorchester to Birinus only until he had built a church worthy of so great a priest in the royal city, since it was there he designed to erect the chief church of the kingdom, for which he had collected vast materials at his death (*Annal. Eccl. Wint.* in Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* i. 288). But if we are to believe Rudborne (*Angl. Sac.* i. 190), Winchester Cathedral was finished in the sixth year of Cyneigils and furnished with monks, and Birinus dedicated it in honour of the Trinity in the twelfth year of his own apostolate. Milner (*Hist. Winch.* i. 92) says that Cyneigils was buried in the cathedral he had begun to erect; but the only authority he can give is that his name is inscribed as "founder" on one of the mortuary chests now in Winchester cathedral (*ibid.* ii. 47).

Of his children, Cuichelm died before him, Coinwalch and Centwine came to the crown. The daughter who was to become queen of Northumbria vanishes out of sight, and we do not even know her name. St. Egelwine or Eielwini was always maintained, says Malmesbury (*G. P.* ed. Hamilton, 199), to have been a son of Cyneigils. The family connexions are exhibited in Lappenberg's elaborate stemma (*Angl. Sax. Kings*, transl. Thorpe, i. 286). The varieties of his name are CYNIGILS, CINEGILS, CINEGELS, CINEGILSLUS, KINGILS, KINEGILSLUS, KINEGILS, KENEGILZ. [C. H.]

CYNEGIUS (1) Prefect of the Praetorians at Rome, A.D. 384-390. In A.D. 384, the emperor Theodosius sent him a rescript at the request of Marcellinus and Faustinus, two presbyters of the Luciferian faction, enjoining that the Luciferians should have the same religious liberty as the Catholics, and highly praising some of their representatives. The 7th and 8th letters of

Gregory of Nyssa are addressed to this Cynegius, in behalf of Synesius and Alexander, two accused persons. (*Rescript. Theod.* ap. Sirmond, i. p. 262, *Patrol. Graec.* xlv.; Greg. Nyss. *Epist.* 7, 8, p. 1035; Ceillier, v. 154, vi. 219.) [W. M. S.]

CYNEGIUS (2) Son of a lady of great piety, named Flora, who had him buried in the church of St. Felix at Nola. Her inquiry of Paulinus, bishop of Nola, what benefit the dead would obtain by burial near a saint, was the occasion, in A.D. 421 or at latest 424, of St. Augustine's book, *De Cura pro Mortuis*. Paulinus had referred the question to Augustine (*August. lib. de Cura pro Mort.* and *De Octo Dulcitiis Quaestionibus*, ii. 2, *Patrol. Lat.* xl. 156, 591; Ceillier, x. 53).

[W. M. S.]

(3) A count of the 5th century, addressed by Firmus, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, in his fourth letter. Firmus exhorts him to fulfil his promise of visiting his mother church of Caesarea, and, in spite of his great age, promises him his earlier health if he will come. (*Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. p. 1483, Firm. Caes. *Episc. Epist.* 4; Ceillier, x. 150.)

[W. M. S.]

CYNEGYSLUS (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1002), abbat. [CENGILLUS.] [C. H.]

CYNEHEARD, KINEHARD, the eighth bishop of Winchester in the ancient lists (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 619). According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle he was appointed in 754, and his name is found appended to charters from 755 to 759, and to one of questionable authenticity as late as 766 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 115). Ethelheard, his successor, first appears in 778; but there is some reason to think that the list is confused owing to the identification of bishop Ethelheard with the archbishop of that name. [ETHELHEARD.] His death is placed by some MSS. of Florence in 788, but this is disproved by the appearance of his fourth successor, Cyneberht, at the Legatine Council of 787 (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 543). [CYNEBERHT.] Two letters of Cyneheard to Lullus are preserved among the letters of Boniface (*Mon. Moguntina*, ed. Jaffé, Nos. 110, 121). [S.]

CYNEHEARD, -HARD (CINEHARD, CHENEHART, KENEHARD, KENEHERT, KINEHARDUS, KINEARD, KYNHEARD), etheling, brother of SIGEBERT king of Wessex, by whose successor Cynewulf he was driven into exile. Cynewulf having gone to the vill of Merton on account of a certain woman, Cyneheard and his followers attacked him there, and in the fray which ensued, both the king and the etheling were slain. This tragedy, which is related in much detail, occurred A.D. 784, according to the *Sax. Chron.*, but A.D. 786 according to Simeon of Durham. Cyneheard was buried at Axminster. (*A. S. C.* ad an. 755; Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 784; Ethelwerd, *Chron.* M. H. B. 508, 509; Gaimar, *Estorie*, vv. 1821 sq.; M. H. B. 786; Hen. Hunt. *Hist. Angl.* M. H. B. 731, 734; Sim. Dun. *G. E. A. M. H. B.* 666.) [C. H.]

CYNEHEARDUS, presbyter, attesting a donation by Dunuuald to the church of St. Peter and St. Paul (afterwards St. Augustine) at Canterbury (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 109). [C. H.]

CYNESWITH (Flor. Wig. *Geneal. Regg. Merc.*, M. H. B. 630), queen of Mercia. [CYNWISE.] [C. H.]

CYNESWITHA, CYNESUTH, CYNES-UIUTH (KYNESUTH, KYNESUTH, KYNESWITH, KINESWITHA), daughter of Penda the pagan king of Mercia and his queen Cyneswith or Cynwise. She and her sister Cynburga were reckoned as saints, and of their five brothers, Peada, Wulfhere, Ethelred, Merewald, Mercelinus, all of whom were baptized, and all were kings, the three last were also reckoned saints. She had been betrothed to Offa king of the East Angles, a most attractive young man, but gave him up in order to follow the monastic life. It was at her persuasion that Offa went to Rome in A.D. 709. She became a nun in her sister's convent, "Kineburgae castrum," or "Castre." Both the sisters were present at the hallowing of Medeshamstede (afterwards called Peterborough) in the reign of their brother Wulfhere, and their names are attached to his charters. They were both buried in their own convent, and in the 11th century their remains were removed to Peterborough. (*A. S. C.* ad an. 657; Flor. Wig. *Chron. App.*, M. H. B. 637, 638, and *Geneal. Regg. Merc.* *ibid.* 630; Malm. *G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 108, 139; Matt. West. *F. H.* ad an. 705; Capgrave, *N. L. A. f.* 213; *Acta SS.* March, i. 441.) [C. H.]

CYNETHRITH, an abbess of some religious house belonging to bishop Wilfrid. In A.D. 709 she received the silk robe on which his dead body had been laid, and through which a miracle is said to have been wrought (Eddius, *Vita S. Wilfridi*, cap. lxx.). The name occurs more than once in the *Liber Vitae* of Durham. [J. R.]

CYNETHRITHA, CYNETHRYTH (KYNETHRYTH, KINETHRITHA), wife of Offa king of Mercia, mother of Egferth, who succeeded his father, and of two daughters, Eadburga wife of Brihtric king of Wessex, and Alfritha unmarried. She and her son attest a charter of the regulus Uhtred, A.D. 770, and another of Offa, A.D. 772 (perhaps should be 762). At her persuasion, A.D. 792 (*A. S. C.*; or 793, Flor. Wig.) Offa caused Aegilbert, king of the East Angles, to be decapitated. (*A. S. C.* ad an. 792; Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 793, and *Append.* in M. H. B. 638; Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 118, 119.) [C. H.]

CYNEUALC, -UUALC (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 985), king of Wessex. [COINWALCH.] [C. H.]

CYNEULFUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* in M. H. B. 541), CYNEWLFUS (ed. Thorpe, vol. i. 50), etheling. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CYNEULFUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 739), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CYNEULF, CYNEWULF, -WLFUS (CYNEULFUS, CYNEULF, CYNWULF, CYNWLF, CONULFUS, CUNULFUS, CONWULFUS, CINEWLFUS, CHENEWLF, KIMULF, KINEULFUS), bishop of Lindisfarne. Succeeded Ethelwold (A.D. 740, according to Sim. Dun., Bed. Contin.; A.D. 739, according to Flor. Wig.; A.D. 737, according to *A. S. C.*). Resigned A.D. 780 (Sim. Dun. A.D. 779 or 780, *A. S. C.*). Died A.D. 783 (Sim. Dun., adding in the 40th year of his episcopate;

A.D. 782, Bed. Contin.; A.D. 781, Flor. Wig.). He was succeeded by Higbald, and nothing further is recorded of him. (See also Henr. Hunt. in M. H. B. 727; Malm. G. P. ed. Hamilton, p. 267; Stubbs, *Registrum*, 6, 181.) [C. H.]

CYNEULF (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 104), king. [C. H.]

CYNEWEALH (Wend. *F. H.* ed. Cox, Index), king of Wessex. [COINWALCH.]

CYNEWULF, king of the West Saxons; succeeded in 755 or 756, and reigned according to the best authority until 786. His reign thus coincides with the greater part of that of Offa, whose glory has altogether overshadowed that of Cynewulf, and who, by the victory won over the West Saxons at Bensington, in 777, drove him finally south of the Thames, and placed the ancient settlement of Dorchester in the hands of Mercia. Cynewulf and his bishops wrote after the death of Boniface to renew with Lullus a league for mutual prayer, which they had made with his predecessor. He was traditionally a benefactor of the churches of Wells, Malmesbury, and Tisbury (Kemble, *C. D.*, Nos. 103, 104, 115), and a genuine charter of Cynewulf to his gesith, Bica, is preserved (*ibid.* No. 133). Cynewulf lived long enough to receive the papal legates, George and Theophylact, in 786, and joined with Offa in welcoming them; but he was killed the same year by his ealdorman Cyneheard, who surprised him during a visit to his mistress (*A. S. C.* 784; H. Hunt. in *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 731). [S.]

The accession of Cynewulf, which followed the brief reign of Sigebert, synchronises with the commencement of the Northumbrian disorders after the abdication of Eadbert [CEOLWULF]. Interest thenceforth centres in the other two great powers, Mercia and Wessex, for the future of England lay in one of those. Benesington, Bensington, Benson, or Benetune, with its British name, called by Henry of Huntingdon a "castrum" (M. H. B. 730), was a strong frontier post south of the Thames, commanding a Roman road which there crossed the river; and Dorchester, with its Roman termination, occupied a corresponding position four miles up the stream on the opposite side. Wessex had won the former town from the Britons two centuries before (*A. S. C.* ad an. 571). A great struggle for the possession of it now ensued between the rival powers across the Thames, and Offa's ultimate triumph is recorded by the ancient writers in language of much emphasis. The event is dated A.D. 778 by Florence, but A.D. 777 in the Saxon Chronicle (see also Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 509; Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 730. For the antiquities of Bensington see Camden, ed. Gough, 292, 308). Offa now had a footing south of the Thames similar to what Wessex had so long held by means of Dorchester on the north. But besides this formidable antagonist, Cuthred had to maintain the standing contest with the West, respecting which we read strong general language, such as, "Britones saepissime proelii detrivit permaximis" (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 755), but no definite events. Coming to ecclesiastical affairs, we find that the see of Winchester during this reign was occupied by Cyneheard, Ethelhard, Egbald, Dudda, Cynebert; CHRIST. BIOGR.

and Sherborn by Herewald and Ethelmod. The archbishops of Canterbury were Cuthbert, Bregwin, Jaenbert (Stubbs, *Regist.*). From the church matters recorded in Haddan and Stubbs for this period (*Councils*, iii. 396-443), we judge that the influence of Wessex does not equal that of Mercia. The points that concern Wessex are for the most part interesting rather than important. Wessex has its share in the vigorous correspondence going forward with bishop Lullus, and there is a possible Wessex synod at one of the numerous synodic camping grounds called "Acleah" or Acle, suggesting tented meadows (like Runnymede), and oak shades (like Augustine's Oak), grave councils, and perhaps cheerful relaxation. The royal letter on prayer-union occurs at p. 439 (and cf. COENGILS); and the papal mission at p. 443. Two Wessex monastic foundations are attributed to this reign, both in Wiltshire, at Ellandune or Wilton and Bitunmaum or Ad Tueoneam (Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 7). The tragic story of Cynewulf's death at Merton in Surrey, by the hand of the etheling Cynehard, brother of Sigebert whom Cynewulf had displaced, is narrated with unusual detail in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (ad an. 755). All we are told of the family of Cynewulf is that he was "kinsman" of the two brothers and that "their right paternal kin reaches to Cerdic" (*A. S. C.* *ibid.*). In Florence, *Geneal. Regg. West. Sax.* (M. H. B. 633) he stands in the pedigree unconnected between Sigebyrht and Bryhtic. He was buried at Winchester (*A. S. C.* l. c.). The varieties of his name are, CYNIUULFUS, CYNULF, CENULF, CYNEULF, CHENEWOLF, CEOWLF, KINEULFUS, KINEULFUS, KINUULF, KINEWLF, KENEWOLF, KINWLF. [C. H.]

CYNEWULF, bishop of Lindisfarne, consecrated A.D. 740 (Symeon, *de Gestis Regum*, ed. Surtees Soc. p. 13). In 750 he fell under the displeasure of Eadberht, king of Northumbria, for giving shelter to prince Offa, who had taken sanctuary at Lindisfarne. The monastery was besieged, and Cynewulf imprisoned at Bamborough, the charge of his diocese having been delegated to Friothubert, bishop of Hexham (*ibid.* p. 19; and *Hist. Eccl. Dunelm.* ii. cap. 17). He was released, and in A.D. 780, worn out with years and labour, made Higbald his deputy in the bishopric with the assent of the congregation. He died after three years spent in retirement (*ibid.* cap. xix.). [J. R.]

CYNEWULF, king of the Mercians. [KENULF.]

CYNEWULF, CYNEWULFUS, CYNEULFUS (CINEULF, CHENEWLF), etheling, slain by Ina king of Wessex, A.D. 721. (*A. S. C.* and Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 721; Ethelw. *Chron.* in M. H. B. 507; Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1687, in M. H. B. 785.) [C. H.]

CYNFAB, early Welsh saint, patron of Capel Cynfab, formerly in the parish of Llanfair ar y Bryn in Carmarthenshire; commemorated on Nov. 15 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307). [C. H.]

CYNFARCH OER, chieftain in North Britain, afterwards a saint in Wales, in the 5th century; reputed founder of Llangynfarch in Maelor, Flintshire, a church destroyed by the Saxons in the battle of Bangor, A.D. 603 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 168). [C. H.]

CYNFARWY, early Welsh saint, patron of Llechgynfarwy church in Anglesey: commemorated Nov. 7 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307). [C. H.]

CYNFELYN AB BLEIDDYD, Welsh saint, of Bangor Deiniol, of the 6th century, founder of Llangynfelyn in Cardiganshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 260; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 498). [C. H.]

CYNFRAN, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of Llysfaen in Rhos, Denbighshire, and patron of the well there named Ffynnon Cynfran (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 144). [C. H.]

CYNFYW, CYNYW, Welsh saint of the 6th century, possible founder of the church of Llangynyw in Montgomeryshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 233). [C. H.]

CYNGAR (CUNGAR). For the early Welsh saints of this name, and the difficulty of identifying them, see Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 183, 211, 232. [C. H.]

CYNGEN, son of Cadell, prince of Powys in the 6th century, distinguished for the patronage he afforded to the Welsh saints, and for his liberal endowments to the church. He bestowed lands upon the monastery of Bangor Iscoed in his territory, for which he was afterwards reckoned among the Welsh saints. There was once a church at Shrewsbury dedicated to him. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 161, 206, 207; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 498, 531.) [C. H.]

CYNHAFAL, Welsh saint of the 7th century, founder of Llangynhafal in Denbighshire; commemorated on Oct. 5 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 295). [C. H.]

CYNHAIARN, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Ynys Cynhaiarn, a chapel under Crucaith in Carnarvonshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 275). [C. H.]

CYNI-. See also **CYNE-**.

CYNIBALDUS, abbat, attests two charters of Cuthred, king of Wessex, A.D. 749 (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 1006, 1007; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 61). [C. H.]

CYNIBERCT (1) (CYNEBERHT, KINBERT) fourth bishop of Lindsey, from A.D. 706 to 732 (Beda, *H. E.* iv. 12; *Flor. Wigorn.* i.; Symeon, *de Gestis*, ed. Surtees Soc. p. 11). He corresponded with Beda about the history of his diocese, and his help is acknowledged in the preface to the *H. E.*

(2) Abbat of Hreutford (? Redbridge), who baptized in A.D. 686 the two sons of Arvald, king of the Isle of Wight, before they were put to death by Caedwalla (Beda, *H. E.* iv. 16). [CUNBERHTUS.]

(3) A deacon of Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, mentioned in a letter from Boniface to his master (Bonifacii *Epp.* ed. Giles, i. 139). [J. R.]

CYNIBILL, brother of bishops Cadda and Ceadda, and of the presbyter Caelin. He himself was presbyter to Cadda, and Bede relates how the latter was devoting the whole of one Lent to the consecration of a site for his monastery of Lastingham, and how, being sum-

moned away to the king when ten days of the period remained, Cynibill remained on the ground and completed for him the dedicatory devotions. This is all that is known of him (Beda, *H. E.* iii. 23). [C. H.]

CYNIBURGA (KINEBURGA, KINNEBURGA), one of the two daughters of Penda the pagan king of Mercia, the other being Cynise of Kineswitha, and both of them reputed as saints. According to Florence of Worcester (*Chron. App.* M. H. B. 638), she married Alfrid king of Northumbria, but left him pro amore Dei, and entered the monastery which her brothers Wulfhere and Ethelred, kings of Mercia, constructed for her, and which was called after her "Kineburgae Castrum," in which also her sister Kineswitha was a nun. William of Malmesbury makes a similar statement (*G. R.* i. 110, ed. Hardy). Bede also relates that she was the wife of Alechfrid, son of Oswy of Northumbria (*H. E.* iii. 21). In a charter of A.D. 664, considered by Kemble as doubtful or spurious (*C. D.* No. 984), she appears as presiding over a monastery called after her own name, "Monasterium Cyniburgense" (see also Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 60). Florence does not make her abbess, but only sanctimonialis. Capgrave, in his life of her, says that a monastery having been built at Caistor or Dormancaster in Northamptonshire, on the Nene, Cyneburga retired from the world and became abbess of it. Camden (ed. Gough, ii. 155) states that at Caster "Kinneburga presided over this house of her own foundation as the mother of the holy virgins," borrowing the words of "an ancient writer," to whom no reference is given. The *Monast. Anglic.* (vi. 1621) gives a similar account. It is also stated (*A. S. C.* ad an. 657) that the two sisters were present at the consecration of Medehamstede in the reign of their brother Wulfhere, and signed the charter (M. H. B. 313, 315); and moreover that in the 11th century Aelfs abbat of this monastery (then called Peterborough), removed the bodies of the sisters from Caestre to Peterborough (*A. S. C.* ad an. 963, M. H. B. 393). This account very much resembles that of the two saints Cuenburga and Cuthburga, sisters of Ina king of Wessex, and the foundation of the monastery of Wimburn. Cuenburga likewise was the wife of Alfrid king of Northumbria, from whom she separated pro amore Dei. [CUNBURGA.] (See also Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 370, 384.) [C. H.]

CYNIDR, Welsh saint of the 5th century, possible founder of Llangynidr and Aberyscir, two churches in Brecknockshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 148, 149). [C. H.]

CYNIFRID, CYNIFRITH (1) Abbat of Gilling, co. York (in Gaetlingum), and brother of Ceolfrið, abbat of Jarrow and Wearmouth. He seems to have died in the pestilence of A.D. 664 (*Hist. Abb. Gyrovensium*, Auct. anon.; apud Bedae *Opp. Hist. Minora*, ed. Stevenson, p. 319).

(2) A physician who attended the ex-queen, abbess Etheldreda (Aedilthryda) in her last illness at Ely, which he afterwards described, and was present at the disinterment of her remains in A.D. 695. (Beda, *H. E.* iv. 19; *Vita S. Etheldritae*, apud Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.* ed. 1733, ii. 726-7.) [J. R.]

CYNIMUND, CYNEMUND, a monk of Lindisfarne, and afterwards of Jarrow in the time of Bede who describes him as "fidelissimus mihi nostrae ecclesiae presbyter." He narrated to Bede a miracle of bishop Aidan which had been told him by Aidan's presbyter Utta (*H. E.* iii. 15), and another of Cuthbert, whom he had personally known (Beda, *Vita S. Cuthberti*, cap. xxxvi.). His name occurs in the *Liber Vitae* of the church of Durham (p. 10). [J. R.]

CYNIN, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of Llangynin near St. Clears in Carmarthenshire, and said to have been a bishop (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 144, 145). [C. H.]

CYNLLO, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder or patron of three churches in north Radnorshire, Nantmel, Llangynllo, and Llanbister (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 12, 133). [C. H.]

CYNMUR, Welsh saint of the 6th century, one of the companions of St. Teilo after his return from Armorica (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 253). [C. H.]

CYNOG (CYNAGW), son of Brychan, Welsh saint in the 5th century of eminent sanctity, patron of several churches in Brecknockshire among which are Defynog, Merthyr Cynog, and Llangynog (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 138, 139). [C. H.]

CYNOG (CYNOC, CINAUC, CINNAUC, KENAUC, KINOCUS), bishop of Llanbadarn, and afterwards successor of David at St. David's, according to one reading of Giraldus Cambrensis (*Opp.* vol. vi. ed. Dimock, p. 102), died A.D. 606 (*Annal. Camb.*). No particulars are recorded of him. Jones and Freeman (*Hist. of St. David's*, 248, 258) can come to no certain conclusion as to him. The following authors may be consulted: Stubbs, *Regist.* 154, 157; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 146; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.*, works, v. 106; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 174, 242. [C. H.]

CYNON, Welsh saint of the 6th century. He accompanied Cadfan to Bardsey, where he was made chancellor of the monastery. He is the reputed founder of the church of Tregynon in Montgomeryshire, and the patron of Capel Cynon, subject to Llandysilio Gogo in Cardiganshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 215). [C. H.]

CYNRED, -DUS (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad ann. 704, 708, 709), king of Mercia. [COENRED.] [C. H.]

CYNRIC (KYNRICUS, KINRIC, KINERICUS, KENRICUS, CHENRIZ), etheling, son of Cuthred king of the West Saxons, a valiant and impetuous youth, slain in a military tumult, A.D. 748, in the 9th year of his father's reign. (*A. S. C.* and Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 748; Hen. Hunt. *Hist.* in M. H. B. 728; Gaimar, *Estorie*, v. 1789, in M. H. B. 786; Matt. West. *F. H.* ad an. 749.) [C. H.]

CYNUDYN, Welsh saint of the 6th century, dean of the college of Padarn at Llanbadarn Fawr. It has been suggested that a stone in the churchyard of Llanwaws in Cardiganshire, inscribed "Canotinn" may have been a monument to his memory (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 261.) [C. H.]

CYNULF (1) (Ethelwerd, *Chron.* in M. H. B. 507, 508; Kemble, *C. D.* No. 100, A.D.

755-757), king of the West Saxons. [CYNEWULF.] [C. H.]

CYNULF (2) (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 796 in M. H. B. 339), king of the Mercians. [KENULF.] [C. H.]

(3) One of four presbyters from the diocese of Dunwich, attesting an act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 547). [C. H.]

CYNWALH (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 648, transl. in M. H. B.), king of the West Saxons. [CYNWALCH.] [C. H.]

CYNWISE, CYNESWITHA, or **KINESWITH**, the wife of Penda, king of Mercia. She is mentioned by Bede as holding Egfrith, the son of Oswy, as a hostage at the time of Penda's death. According to Florence of Worcester (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 637), Cynwise was the mother of the five sons and two daughters of Penda; of whom three sons and both the daughters are regarded as saints. [S.]

CYNWULF (*A. S. C.* ad ann. 737, M. H. B.), bishop of Lindisfarne. [CYNWULF.] [C. H.]

CYNYW, Welsh saint. [CYNFYW.]

CYNWYD CYNWYDION, Welsh saint of the 6th century, a member of the congregation of Cattwg, and presumed founder of Llangynwyd Fawr in Glamorganshire (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 208, 270). [C. H.]

CYNWYL, Welsh saint of the 6th century; one of the sons of Dunod, Dinothus, or Dinott, and co-founder with him of the monastery of Bangor Iscoed. He is himself deemed the founder of Cynwyl Gaio, the church of a parish adjoining that of Llanddewi Brefi; of Cynwyl Elfed in Carmarthenshire; and of Aberporth in Cardiganshire. He is commemorated on April 30 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 206, 260). [C. H.]

CYPRIANUS (1) THASCIUS CAECILIUS. *Name*.—He is styled Thascius Cyprianus by the proconsul (*Vit. Pontii*), and styles himself Cyprianus qui et Thascius in the singular heading of *Ep.* 66. He took the name Caecilius, according to Jerome (*Cat. Ill. Vir.* v.), from the presbyter who converted him, and he is called Caecilius Cyprianus in the proscription (*Ep.* 66). In the only place, however, where this presbyter's name is given by Pontius (c. 4) all the MSS. and Manutius read Caeciliani; and nothing is said of the adoption. The only recurrence I find of the praenomen is in the African calendar Sept. 1. "Tascius Martyr," and its rarity leads to the misnomer Tatiuss in a decree of Gelasius. The name Cyprianus is itself rare; not occurring in the Inscriptions of Muratori, or Orelli, but in Böckh (4, No. 9412) *Κηπριανος*, and occasionally in Augustine's time. Pape quotes it also from Proc. v. 11, Phot. Cod. 184, Lactant. 5, 1. Its origin is obscure. If it were derived from *Κύπρις* it would be more common, like similar derivatives from deities' names. But her votaries prefer the name Aphrodite. Pape properly calls it a late name, but derives it absurdly from "copper." The occurrence of the name Cypris, and the connexion of Carthage with Cyprus, suggest this third derivation.

His Birthplace is not indicated by the quoted

phrases of Prudentius, Hymn 13, "proprius patriae martyr," Suidas's *Καρχηδών ἐξ ἧς ὠρμᾶτο*, nor his own allusion to Carthage as the happiest place on earth to him "where God had willed that he should believe and grow up in the faith." Rather had it been his native place also, we might have here expected him to mention it.

He was an orator, and afterwards even a teacher of rhetoric ("in tantum gloriam venit eloquentiae ut oratoriam quoque doceret Carthagini," Hieron. *Comm. Jon. c. 3*, and cf. Aug. *Serm. 312, § 4*). It is not quite clear what is meant by Jerome's speaking of him as a former "adsertor idololatriae," and Augustine's as "having decorated the crumbling doctrines of demons." They may refer to some panegyric, or to some suits about temple property. Pontius speaks of his *memoriosa mens*, which is illustrated by his extraordinary copiousness and facility of quotation. His style is very polished, and, as Augustine points out, became more simple and beautiful with time, and (as his critic believed) with the purer taste of Christianity. He edited for Christians the phraseological dictionary of Cicero (see Hartel's praef. ad fin.). His systematic habits and powers of business contributed greatly to his success as the first of church organizers.

His address was dignified, conciliatory, affectionate. His looks attractive by their grave joyousness. His dress is remarked on as answering to his tone of mind. He never assumed the philosopher's pall, which Tertullian his "master" maintained to be the only dress for Christians; he thought its plainness pretentious. Augustine speaks of the tradition of his gentleness, and he never lost the friendship of heathens of high rank (Pont. 14). He was wealthy, his landed property considerable, and his house and gardens beautiful (Pont. *Vit. ad Don. i. xv. xvi.*).

His *Conversion* was then important in the series of men of letters and law who were at this time added to the church, and who so markedly surpass in style and culture their heathen contemporaries. Pearson rightly sets aside the inference of Baronius (from *De Dei gratia*) that Cyprian was old at his conversion, but that he was so seems to be stated, however obscurely, by Pontius (c. 2, "adhuc rudis fidei et cui nondum forsitan crederetur supergressus vetustatis aetatem"). Christian doctrines, especially that of regeneration, had previously excited his wonder, but not his derision (*ad Don. iii. iv.*). He was converted by an aged presbyter, Caecilian.

During his catechesis he analysed and conversed with the circle about him on scripture Lives; he devoted himself to chastity; he sold some estates, and distributed the proceeds to the poor. He also composed, in his *Quod Idola dii non sint*, a Christian assault on Polytheism, freely compiling the 1st and 2nd sections of his tract from Minucius, § 20-27, § 18, § 32, and his 3rd section from Tertullian's *Apology*, § 21-23, with some traces of Tertull. *de Anima naturaliter Christiana*. A comparison of this pamphlet with the originals is the best illustration of his ideal of style. He retains the very language to a great extent, but erases whatever seemed rugged, ambiguous, or strained. He maintains a historical kernel of mythology, points out the low character of indigenous Roman worship; illustrates the

activity of deluding daemons by the scenes which went on at exorcisms, of which, however, he scarcely seems (as Tertullian does) to have been an eyewitness. He contrasts this with the doctrine of Divine unity, which he describes nobly, but illustrates not felicitously. The History of Judaism, its rejection of its Messiah, and the effects which Christianity is producing in the individual, and commencing on society, bring him to his new standpoint. He is perhaps the first writer who puts the continuous sufferings of believers in evidence of the credibility of their statements.

The restatement and co-ordination of previous arguments was probably not ineffective in the hands of the famous Thascius, but as yet he exhibits no conception that Christianity is to be a world-regenerating power. He deliberately excludes providence from history (*Quod Id. v.*).

At the Easter following, the season most observed in Africa for this purpose, he was probably baptized, and to the autumn after we refer the *ad Donatum*, a monologue, a brief Tusculan held in his own villa, on *The grace of God*. It already exhibits Cyprian not as a spiritual analyst or subtle theologian, but irrefragable in his appeals to the distinctly New Life which has appeared in the world, amid the contemporary degradations—the repudiation of the responsibility of wealth, the disruption of the client-bond, the aspect of the criminal classes, the pauperisation of the mass, and the systematic corruption by theatre and arena. For the present, however, withdrawal from the world into Christian circles is the only remedy he hopes. "Divine Grace" is an ascertained psychological fact, and this is the subject of the treatise, though as yet narrow in application.

He soon after sold, for the benefit of the poor, his horti, which some wealthy friends bought up afterwards and presented to him again. Meantime he resided with Caecilian. We can only understand the expression of Pontius (who similarly lived as a deacon with Cyprian), "erat sane illi etiam de nobis contubernium . . . Caecilianum," to mean that he was at that time "of our body," the diaconal. We find other instances of the closeness of this bond. Baronius and Bishop Fell are equally inexcusable in understanding what is said of Caecilian's family and of Job's wife as having any bearing upon the question of Cyprian's celibacy. There is no indication of his having been married. Caecilian at his death commended his family to him, although not as officially curator or tutor, which would have contradicted both Christian and Roman usage.

His *Ordination*.—His activity while a member of the *ordo* or *consensus* of presbyters is noticed, but he was yet a neophyte when he became bishop. The step was justified on the ground of his exceptional character, but the opposition organised by five presbyters was now and always a serious difficulty to him. The Plebes would listen to no refusal, and frustrated an attempt to escape. He subsequently rests his title (*Ep. 43, Ep. 66, Vit.*) on their suffrages, and on the "judicium Dei," with the *consensus* of his fellow bishops. In ordinary cases he treats the *election* by neighbour bishops as necessary to a valid episcopate (*Ep. 57, v.; Ep. 59, vii.; Ep. 66*). From this time Cyprian is usually addressed both by others and by the Roman

clergy as *Papa*, though the title is not attributed to the bishop of Rome until long after. An earlier instance of the use of the name occurs at Alexandria, but there is some reason to believe that the first application of the name is traceable to Carthage.

Some time between the July of A.D. 248 and the April following Cyprian thus became bishop, a few months before the close of the "thirty years' peace" of the church. His *Theory of the Episcopal Office* seems to have been his own already, and as it supplies the key to his conception of church government may be stated at once. The episcopate succeeded to the Jewish Priesthood* (*Ep.* 8, i.; *Ep.* 69, viii.; *Epp.* 65, 67, i.; *Testim.* iii. 85); the bishop was the instructor (*Ep.* 50, xi.; *Unit.* x.); and the judge (*Ep.* 17, ii.). In this later capacity he does nothing without the information and advice of presbyters, deacons, and laity. Again, he is the apostle of his flock (*Ep.* 3, iii.; 45, 66, iv.), by direct succession, and the diaconate is the creation of his predecessors. The usual parallel between the three orders of the Christian and Jewish ministry differs entirely from that drawn by Cyprian.

The stress laid on the responsibility of the laity is very great. Though the virtue of the office is transmitted by another channel, it is they who, by the "aspiration of God," address to each bishop his call to enter on that "priesthood" and its grace, and it is their duty to withdraw from his administration if he is a "sinner" (*Ep.* 67). The bishops do not coopt into or enlarge their own college. Each is elected by his own Plebes. Hence he is the embodiment of it. "The bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop." They have no other representatives in councils, he is naturally their "member." These views appear fully developed in his first epistle, and in the application of texts in his early *Testimonia*; it is incredible that they should have been borrowed from Paganism, and unhistorical to connect them with Judaizers. They are (although Cyprian does not dwell on this aspect) not incompatible with a recognition of the priesthood of the laity as full as that of Tertullian.

The African episcopate had declined in character during the long peace; many bishops were engaged in trade, agriculture, or usury, some were conspicuously fraudulent or immoral, or too ignorant to instruct catechumens and avoid using heretical compositions in public prayers. *De Laps.* 4; *Ep.* 65, iii.; *Auct. de Rebat.* ix.; *Aug. c. Don.* vii. 45; *Resp. ad Epp.* (Sedatus). Similarly among the presbyters strange occupations were possible (*Tert. de Idol.* c. 7-9), and unmarried deacons shared their chambers with spiritual sisters who maintained their chastity to be unimpaired. The effect of the persecution was salutary on this state of things, and was felt to be so. To the eighteen months of "peace" which remained belong his *Epp.* 1-4, and the treatise on the dress of virgins, which answers to his description of his employment as "serving discipline" during that interval. In three of the letters his authority is invoked be-

yond his diocese, and wears something of a metropolitan aspect. Otherwise it is to be noticed that the African bishops rank by seniority.

To these letters Mr. Shepherd has taken objections, which, if valid, would be fatal to the genuineness of much of the Cyprianic correspondence, and the present writer may therefore be allowed to state (though without space here to exhibit the arguments) that a rigorous investigation of those objections is conclusive in favour of the epistles.

De Habitu Virginum.—Many Christian women lived, as a "work of piety," the self-dedicated life of virgins though in their own homes. Tertullian had cured the fashion of going unveiled, which some had claimed as symbolic of childlike innocence, yet with the avowed object of rendering their order attractive. Vanity, sentiment, and the sense of security were still mischievous elements, and Cyprian writes mainly against the extravagant fashions, half Roman, half Tyrian, in which the wealthier sisters appeared. His book, though in language drawing largely from Tertullian's treatise of similar title, resembles much more in matter and aim his *Cultus Feminarum*. Cyprian is here so minute and fastidious in his reduction of the violent rhetoric of Tertullian, that this might almost pass for a masterly study of writing; and Augustine regards it as a very perfect work, drawing from it illustrations both of the "grand" and of the "temperate" style (*Aug. de Doctrina Christiana*, bk. iv. pp. 78, 86).

In estimating the probable influence of this booklet on ascetic life, it is not satisfactory to find that the incentives used are partly low and partly overstrained,—the escape from married troubles, espousals with Christ, higher rank in the resurrection; while efficiency in works of charity, the power of purity, self-sacrifice and intercession, are not dwelt on.

Testimonia ad Quirinum, libb. iii.—These though not certainly belonging to this time are more like his work now than afterwards. They are texts compiled for a layman (*filius*). I. in 24 heads on the succession of the Gentile to the Jewish church. II. 30 heads on the Deity, Messiahship and salvation of Christ. III. 120 on Christian duty. The skill and toil of such a selection are admirable. The importance of the text in elucidation of the Latin versions then afloat is immense, and Hartel is quite dissatisfied with what he has been able to contribute to this object. (Hartel, *Praefat. Cyp.* p. xxiii.)

Decian Persecution.—Cyprian's conviction of the need of external chastisements for the worldliness of the church was supported by intimations which he felt to be supernatural. The edict which began to fulfil them in the end of A.D. 249, aimed at effecting its work by the removal of leaders, and at first fixed capital penalties on the bishops only (*Rettberg*, p. 54; *Ep.* 66, vii.). Monotheism, even when licensed (like Judaism), had an anti-national aspect, and Christianity could not be a *licita religio*, simply because it was not the established worship of any locality or race. In this, and in the fact that torture was applied to procure not (as in other accusations) confession but denial of the charge (*Apol.* ii.; *Cyp. ad Demet.* xii. 11), in the encouragement of delation as to private meetings (*Dig.* xlviii. 4; *Cod.* ix. 8, iv. vi. vii.), and in the power given to magistrates under standing

* The bishop alone is called *sacerdos* throughout the Cyprianic correspondence. The presbyter also answers to the Levitic tribe. Each congregation (diocese), to "the congregation of Israel."

edicts to apply the test of sacrifice at any moment to a neighbourhood or a person, lay the various unfairnesses of which Tertullian and Cyprian complain. Dionysius of Alexandria, and with him Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Maximus of Nola, Babylas of Antioch, Alexander of Jerusalem, Fabian of Rome, were all attacked, the last three martyred. There was no fanaticism of martyrdom as yet. It seemed wrong to expose a successor to instant death, and no bishop was elected for sixteen months at Rome. Like the three former, Cyprian placed himself (before the end of January; Lipsius, *Röm. Bisch. Chronol.* p. 200) out of reach, and, with the same determination with which he afterwards pronounced that his time was come, refused concealment. The grounds for his retirement, consistently stated by himself, are the necessity of continuing the administration (*Ep.* 12, i. v. vi.), the danger which at Carthage he would have attracted to others (*Epp.* 7, 14), the riots it would have aroused (*Ep.* 43), and the insistence of TERTULLUS (*Epp.* 12, 14). The Cyprianic epistles of this period, passing between the Roman presbyters, the Carthaginian bishop and certain imprisoned presbyters (see MOYSES, MAXIMUS), deacons (RUFINUS and NICOSTRATUS), laymen, and particularly an imperfectly educated Carthaginian confessor CELERINUS (whose ill-spelt letters *Epp.* 21 and 22 are extant), present, when worked out, a tessellated coherence with each other and with slight notices in Eusebius (vi. 43), which is absolutely convincing as to the originality and genuineness of the documents.

The Lapsi.—Five commissioners in each town and the proconsul on circuit (*Ep.* 43, iii. 10, 56) administered the Decian edict. The sufferings by torture, stifling imprisonments, and even fire (14, 21) (*Ep.* 22) were very severe. Women and boys were among the victims. Exile and confiscation were employed. In the first terror there was a large voluntary abjuration of Christianity, whether literally by "the majority of his flock" (*Ep.* 11) may be uncertain, but Cyprian felt himself "seated in the ruins of his house." Scenes of painful vividness are touched in, but these must be passed by. Many of the clergy fell or fled, leaving scarcely enough for the daily duty of the city (*Ep.* 34, iv. 40, 29), as did many provincial bishops (*Ep.* 11, 59). Different classes of those who conformed were the *Thurificati*, *Sacrificati* (the more heinous) (*Ep.* 59), and *LIBELLATICI* (q. v. as also *LIBELLI*), whose self-excitation was less palpable. Of this class there were some thousands (*Ep.* 24). (Vid. MARTIALIS, Bp.)

Formation of a General Policy.—Cyprian from his retirement guided the policy of the whole West upon the tremendous questions of church communion which now arose. (1) Indifferentism offered the lapsed an easy return by means of indulgences from, or in the names of, martyrs. (2) Puritanism barred all return.

The Roman clergy first essayed to deal with the question in conjunction with the clergy of Carthage independently of Cyprian, whose absence they invidiously deplore (*Ep.* viii.). Their letter was returned to them by Cyprian himself, with some caustic remarks on its style (which is singularly incorrect, see Hartel's *Praefatio*, xlviii.) as well as on the irregularity of the step.

After this an altered tone, and Novatian's marked style is discernible in their letters. (*Ep.* 30 and ? 36).

The granting of indulgences (not by that name) to lapsed persons, by confessors and martyrs, which had been first questioned and then sharply criticised by Tertullian (*ad Mart.* 1 *de Pudic.* 22), grew very quickly under the influence of some of those clergy who had been opposed to Cyprian's election. The veneration for sufferers who seemed actually to be the saviours of Christianity was intense, and many heads were turned by the adulatory language of their greatest chiefs (cf. *Ep.* x. 24). Their libelli would presently have superseded all other terms of communion (see *LIBELLUS* III.).

A strange document (*Ep.* 23) is extant in the form of an absolution to "all the lapsed" from "all the confessors," which the bishops are desired to promulge. Rioters in some of the provincial towns extorted communion from their presbyters (*Ep.* 27, iii.). At Rome itself, the influence of Novatian with the confessors created a tendency to strictness rather than indulgence, and there were no such disorders, but they prevailed elsewhere (*Epp.* 27, 31, 32; *Ep.* 30, iv. 4; 30, vii.) Cyprian at once proposed by separate letters to his clergy and laity (to whom he writes with warm confidence), to various bishops, and to the Roman confessors and clergy (*Epp.* 15, 16, 17, 26) one general course of action: To reserve all cases of lapsed, without regard to the confessors' libelli, until episcopal councils at Rome and Carthage should lay down terms of re-admission for the deserving (*Ep.* 20; 55, iv.); then the bishops, with clergy and laity (*Ep.* 17, iv.; *Ep.* 31) assisting, to investigate each case; public acknowledgment to be made, re-admission to be by imposition of hands by bishop and clergy. Meantime the acts of the confessors to be recognised (*Ep.* 20, iii.), so far as that persons in danger, who might hold a libellus, should be re-admitted by any presbyter, or in extremis by a deacon (*Epp.* 18, 19). All others to be exhorted to repentance, and commended with prayer to God at their deaths. The grounds he urged were—(1) the wideness of the question, which was too large for individual discretion (*totius orbis*, *Ep.* 19, iii. cf. 30, vi.) (2) That if restored at once the lapsed would have fared better than those who had borne the loss of all for Christ. These principles are developed also in the *De Lapsis*, which however is not quite as M. Freppel describes it, "a résumé of the letters," but a résumé of the modified views of Cyprian a little later. In M. Freppel's Sorbonne Lectures (St. Cyprien, pp. 195–221) may be studied with profit the Ultramontane representation of this scheme as equivalent to the modern indulgence system, backed by assertions that the Roman church "indicated to Carthage the only course," which Cyprian "fully adopted." All however that the Roman clergy had recommended was mere re-admission of sick penitents, without any conception of a policy, or of the method by which it could be worked. These are developed step by step in *Epp.* 17, 18, 19, and communicated to the Roman church (*Ep.* 20). In replying through Novatian (*Ep.* 30, see 55 v.) the Roman presbyters re-state and adopt them (compare also *Ep.* 31, vi. 41).

Temper in Carthage.—Through the earlier

part of the above section of correspondence is perceptible a reliance on the laity. The clergy do not reply to his letters (*Ep.* 18), they defer to the *libelli*, or use them against him (*Ep.* 27). In *Ep.* 17 he entreates the aid of the laity as against them. When the concurrence of the African and Italian episcopate is obtained (*Ep.* 43, iii.), and that of Novatian and the Roman clergy and confessors (*Epp.* 30, 31), assuming a stronger tone (*Ep.* 32), with his own clergy he requires them to circulate the whole correspondence, which is done (*Ep.* 55, iv.), and excommunication is announced against any who should allow communion except on the terms agreed on.

About November, 250, persecution relaxed (possibly owing to the Gothic advance in Thrace), and though it was still unsafe for Cyprian to return, he endeavoured to deal with the distress of sufferers who had lost their all, and to recruit the ranks of the clergy, and allay the excitement still prevailing among the lapsed, by a commission (vicarii) of three bishops, CALDONIUS, HERCULANUS, VICTOR, and two presbyters, NUMIDICUS and ROGATIAN (*Epp.* 41, 26).

Declaration of Parties.—The excitement on the question of the lapsed is evinced by two classes of stories then afloat as to judgments following both on unreconciled offences, and on presumptuous communion (*De Lapsis*, 24, 25, 26). Cyprian employed both to urge delay, but they do not emanate from his party of moderation. At Carthage the party of laxity became prominent; at Rome, that of exclusiveness.

(1.) *The party of laxity* was composed of confessors, spoiled by flattery (*De Laps.* 20), fashionable lapsi, who declined all penance (*Laps.* 30), influential ones, who had forced certain clergy to receive them, but also some clergy who united against Cyprian's policy with the five presbyters who had from the first resisted him. Of these three were undoubtedly DONATUS, GORDIUS, FORTUNATUS (Maran. *Vit. Cyp.* § xvii.; Rettberg, pp. 97–112). That the fourth was GAIUS of DIDDA, or AUGENDUS, is but a guess. The principal in position and ability was the presbyter NOVATUS (Pearson's JOVINUS and MAXIMUS, and Pamelius' REPOSTUS and FELIX are impossible; see those names). That Cyprian's five original opponents still acted against him is shewn by "olim secundum vestra suffragia" (*Ep.* 43, v.), though in 43, ii. he seems only to conjecture their complicity with FELICISSIMUS. This man had been associated by NOVATUS with himself as deacon, in the management of a district called Mons (possibly the Bozra itself) (*Epp.* 52, 59, 36). Cyprian complains of not having been consulted in this appointment, which, owing to the then position of the deacons, gave the party the control of considerable funds. All the arrangements hitherto agreed on were disregarded by them, Cyprian's missives unanswered, and his commission of relief treated as an invasion of the diaconal office of Felicissimus, who announced, while other lapsi were at once received into communion, that whoever held communications with or accepted aid from the commission would be excluded from communion or relief from the Mons (*Ep.* 43, ii.; *Ep.* 41, where the conjecture in *morte*, or references to *Monte* in Numidia, or to the *Montenses* at Rome, who were Donatists, and were never (anciently) confused with the Novatianists or called Montanistæ,

are absurd; though Hefele, *Novatianischer Schisma*, ap. Wetzter and Welte, K. Lexik. and *Conciles*, t. ii. p. 232, countenances these confusions). It is with the name of Felicissimus that the lax party is generally connected (*Ep.* 43, iii. v. vii.), and he with a fellow deacon AUGENDUS, a renegade bishop REPOSTUS, and certain others, the five presbyters not among them, was presently excommunicated. There is no evidence, nor any contemporary instance, to warrant the belief that Novatus ordained Felicissimus deacon (see the MSS. reading *Ep.* 52, "satellitem suum diaconum constituit," which Hartel has unwarrantably departed from), nor is there any such appearance of presbyterian principles in this party, as divines of anti-episcopal churches, Neander, Rettberg, D'Aubigné, Keyser, have freely assumed. The party were in episcopal communion, took part in the episcopal election at Carthage, presently elected a new bishop for themselves, and procured episcopal consecration for him. When Novatus visited Rome, he threw himself into the election then proceeding, and, after opposing the candidate who was chosen, procured episcopal consecration for his nominee there also. Felicissimus too must have been a deacon already, or he could not have involved himself and Novatus in the charge of defrauding the church (*Ep.* 52, i.; 50, i.)

(2.) *The Puritan Party.*—The strength of the Puritans, on the other hand, was in Rome. A group of confessors there, of whom the presbyters MOYSES and MAXIMUS [see also RUFINUS, NICOSTRATUS, URBANUS, SIDONIUS, MACARIUS, CELELINUS] were the chief, united with Novatian and the clergy in approving Cyprian's proposals. The modification of discipline by martyrs' merits was never countenanced here (*Ep.* 28, ii.); nevertheless, Moyses, before his death (which probably happened on the last day of the year 250), had condemned the extreme tendencies of Novatian towards the non-reconciliation of penitents (see Valesius' correct interpretation of Euseb. vi. 43, and Routh, *R. S.* iii. p. 81). While Cornelius at Rome and Cyprian were moving towards greater leniency than their resolutions had embodied, Novatian, without questioning the hope of salvation for the lapsed, was now for making their exclusion perpetual, and teaching that the purity of the church could not otherwise be maintained.

The earthly conditions of the invisible and visible church had not yet been discussed as the Donatists compelled them to be, and Novatian's growing error, though in the present application it completely severed him from Cyprian and the church, was not in principle different from that which Cyprian (though without producing a schism) held in relation to baptism. Early in A.D. 251 the Roman confessors were liberated; they lost whatever influence Moyses had exercised on them; they had been drawn towards Novatian, and when Novatus, arriving from Carthage, attached himself to this party, because, though its puritanism was alien to his own practices at home, it was the only opposition existing in the capital which threatened to overthrow the Cyprianic side, they were at once organised into a party to secure the election of a bishop of Rome, who would break with Cyprian. The moment for election was given by the absence of Decius and his leading officers on the frontier or in Illyria on

account of the base alliance of Priscus with Cniva, and the revolt of Valens. The party of moderation however prevailed in the church and secured the election of Cornelius, and consecrated him in spite of himself by sixteen bishops^b ("vim" *Ep.* 55, vii.).

First Council.—Cyprian returned to Carthage after Easter (23rd March) from his fourteen months' absence (biennium), which seems to have been prolonged by a fear of the "faction" (*Ep.* 43, i.) rekindling persecution (*Ep.* 55, v.) by some demonstration. The bishops of the province met in April for the first council, held in Carthage, for half a century (AGRIPPINUS), but the discussion on the lapsed was postponed by letters from Rome, which Cyprian laid before them, viz. Cornelius's announcement of his election (*Ep.* 45, ii.) and a temperate protest against it from Novatian (45, iv.) (Maran, p. lx. misinterprets this against the sense of Baluze, whom he edits). The protest was soon followed by a mass of charges, which Cyprian declined to submit to the council. This was excellent policy, but at the same time a curious exercise of personal authority in that earliest type of returning freedom—the church council. At the same time he made them despatch two of their number, CALDONIUS and FORTUNATUS, to Rome, to report.

Caldonius was instructed to procure attestations of the regularity of the ordination of Cornelius from bishops who had attended it (*Ep.* 44 and cf. 45, i.). Meantime, communications with the Roman church were to be addressed only to the clergy and not to Cornelius. (The statement of Lipsius, p. 204 on *Ep.* 45 v., is too strong.) He was also to lay before the clergy and laity, so as to guard them against clandestine influence, the whole correspondence about Felicissimus (*Epp.* 41, 43, 45, v.). The council, then reverting to its programme, is obliged to despatch first the question of Felicissimus, since, if he were justified in his reception of the lapsed, no terms of communion need be discussed; but if the main issue went against him they could not on such ex post facto ground deal with him disciplinarily. His offence consisted not in his theory, which might conceivably be correct, but in his re-admitting people whose cases had been by due notice reserved.

Cyprian, to his honour and like a good lawyer, was not present during the trial of his opponent, who was condemned. He does not employ the first person in relating it (*Ep.* xlv. 5) as he always does of councils which he attended, and from *Ep.* 48 we must conclude that he was at Hadrumetum at that very time.^c

^b Lipsius has shewn conclusively that the consecration of Cornelius was about March 5 (*Chronol. d. römischen Bischöfe*, p. 18); a fact which must be borne in mind, as the usual statement that it was in June introduces endless contradictions into the common account, and has obliged even Pearson to resort to unmanageable hypotheses of long recesses in the first council of Carthage and of several journeys of Novatus to Rome.

^c This absence of Cyprian from the trial of his opponent solves difficulties otherwise insoluble. Pearson and Tillemont attribute to the council various adjournments, partly to dispose of the long period required by their false date for Cornelius's election, and partly to give room for the visit to Hadrumetum. *Frequenter acto* (*Ep.* 59, xvi.) means *largely attended*, not, as Pearson and Tillemont,

The programme of the council was again interrupted still more seriously. Two African bishops fresh from Rome, Stephanus and Pompeius, had brought evidence of the regularity of Cornelius's ordination (*Ep.* 55, vii.) as conclusive as the commissioners could have obtained, and the council had expressed itself as formally satisfied (*Ep.* 45, i.) when four new delegates from Rome (MAXIMUS, not the confessor, AUGENDUS, &c.) announced the consecration of Novatian to the Roman see.

This surprise (for fuller details of which see NOVATIAN) was prepared by the party of severity, who were disappointed by the election of Cornelius, stimulated by EVARISTUS, whom Cyprian regarded as the author of the movement (*Ep.* 50), and directed in their action by NOVATUS (q.v.), who, possibly without being a mere adventurer, nor on the other hand at all deserving Neander's characteristic exculpations, had no doctrine of his own to maintain, but came to Rome simply to endeavour to promote a supposed independence by frustrating the arrangements made by the bishops as to the reception or exclusion of the lapsed. At Carthage therefore he belonged to the broad party, at Rome to the narrow.^d

It is a mistake to suppose that his change of party was unnoted; compare *Ep.* 52, iii. (4), "damnare nunc-audet sacrificantium manus," with *Ep.* 43, iii., "nunc se ad perniciem lapsorum verterunt," i.e. by indulgence. It is also a mistake (though Lipsius falls into it, and it is universal with the earlier writers), and introduces confusion into the history, to assume that Novatus made several voyages to and fro. If his arrival be fixed soon after March 5, A.D. 251, it will be found to solve the various problems. Their embassy to Carthage, rejected by the council ("expulsi," *Ep.* 50, not from Africa, as Pearson), appealed to Cyprian (*Ep.* 44). They were not prepared to find that he had moved towards leniency as much as Novatian to severity from their late common standpoint; and they are told plainly that their position must now be considered as external to the church. Accepting this, they proceed to construct a schismatic episcopal body with wide alliances. Somewhere close to this point the treatise *De Unitate*, or the germ of it, was first delivered in the form of a speech, or a read pamphlet, to the council. We

assembled again and again. Lipsius has ingeniously conjectured, to meet the second difficulty, that the council empowered Cyprian to recognise Cornelius after their dissolution, if he were satisfied. But the council, before breaking up, were abundantly satisfied on the point, and directed him to be acknowledged (*Ep.* 45). So that it is out of the question that afterwards Cyprian should have gone to Hadrumetum and suspended its correspondence with Cornelius.

^d It may here clear some difficulties in Cyprian's letters which Maran and others have confused, if we observe that Stephen and Pompey left Rome before Novatian's consecration. It is clear from the sensation they produced that the Novatianist embassy brought the first news of it. The council could "refute and repel" its charges, because, though they had not received (expectavimus) their own commissioners' report (as Maran, *V. Cyp.* lxi., erroneously), they had been satisfied by Stephen's. Hence *supervenerunt*, 44 i. (1), means "came on the top of our expectancy," not "came after Novatianist embassy." The council could not, as they did, have excommunicated the embassy at once, if up till then they had only received Cornelius's letters, of which they were seeking ratification.

reserve an outline of it to a later point. Messengers to Cornelius (PRIMITIVUS, METTIUS, NICEPHORUS acolyte) then convey full accounts of the procedure, and inform him of his general recognition as bishop.*

Simultaneously appeals, which were ultimately successful, were addressed by Cyprian to the Roman confessors to detach themselves from the schism in which they found themselves involved (MOYSES, MAXIMUS). The original work before the council, the restoration of the lapsed, had been facilitated by the two episodes, which had cleared off the extreme parties on either side. They now listened to Cyprian's treatise on the lapsed; but they inclined to a course even milder than he suggested, while they were less disposed than he to give the "Martyres" any voice in the decisions.^f

Their encyclical is lost, but the particulars are extricable from his *Letter to Antonian* (Ep. 55), which, since it treats only of the restoration of the libellatici, not of the lapsed, must be earlier than the second council, A.D. 252, and from the verbal resemblance of Ep. 54 (3) to 55 (v.) must be very near the event. We thence gather that they resolved—I. On an individual examination of the libellatici; II. Episcopal restoration of non-sacrificers after penance (Ep. 55 v.); III. Of sacrificers if penitents at death (55, xiv.); IV. No restoration of those who deferred penance till death (55, xix.).

A Roman synod was held in June or July^g by 60 bishops of Italy, who accepted these decisions, and excommunicated Novatian. Cornelius announced the facts in *four* (so Tillemont correctly) *Greek* (so Valois correctly) letters to Antioch (Eus. vi. 43), with two (non-extant) of Cyprian.

Briefly to sum the constitutional results of this First Council of Carthage: 1. The views of the primate are submitted to those of the council; he admits the change (Ep. 55, iii.). 2. The intercession and merits of the martyrs, as affecting the conditions of restoration, are set aside entirely. 3. On the other hand (as against Novatian), no offences are considered to be beyond the regular power of the church to remit. 4 (against Felicissimus). No power except that of the authentic organisation can fix terms of communion. It will be at once seen that the free council of bishops had taken position as a Christian institution, exercising supreme governmental functions, and had laid clear lines as to where church authority resided. They further ruled that there could be no subsequent canvassing of the

claims of a bishop once ordained. And the resolutions were issued in the name of the bishops only.

The Reconciliation of the Novatianist Confessors at Rome.—A second embassy of Novatianists followed the report of the first, in order to press Cyprian home; Primus, Dionysius, NICOSTRATUS, EVARISTUS, and above all, NOVATUS; to whose leaving Rome Cyprian does not hesitate partly to ascribe his own next success (Ep. 52 (2), ii.) Cyprian's letters to the Novatianist confessors are among the most beautiful and skilful in the collection; and Augustine cites no less than three times a passage from the letter on their return as embodying the absolute scriptural answer to puritan separations. It is the *first* exposition of the parable of the Tares, and St. Paul's image of the Great House. Prevailed on by the arguments used to them, and shocked by the consequences of their action, the whole party, with numerous adherents, returned to the Catholic side, and were publicly and magnanimously received, like the leaders of the same sect at Nicaea, and the Donatists at Carthage, and the Arians at Alexandria, without forfeit of dignity (Epp. 49, 52, 53, 46, 54, 51). To Cyprian this was more than an occasion of Christian joy. It was the triumph of his theory (Ep. 51 *ad fin.*). The Date of this event may be accurately determined as being *after* the Carthaginian Council, (since Cyprian does not mention this as sitting, in his letters on the confessors, and he read the account of their recantation to the church (Ep. 51), not to the bishops,) but *prior* to the Roman council, or else they would have been excommunicated by it, which they evidently were not; and since Cyprian says they recanted on the departure of Novatus, it was after the second embassy had left Rome.

Treatise on Unity.—The principles of this treatise, read in the council, and sent to the Roman confessors (Ep. 54), so shape all Cyprian's policy, that it is best here to notice it. It indicates its date minutely by allusions to the severe party (Novatian's) (iii. ministros &c. viii. uno in loco &c. ix. feritas x. confessor xi. episcopi nomen xiii. aemuli), and by the absence of allusion to the lax party (Felicissimus), whose schism must have been noticed in such a paper if the question had not been concluded. In c. v. its original form as an address to bishops is traceable. The first appearance of Cyprian's characteristic error about baptism occurs in c. xi.

Its first problem is the existence of schism (as distinct from heresy), "altar against altar," with freedom from corrupt doctrines and lives. The sole security is the ascertainment of the seat of authority and bond of unity. This is indicated by Christ's commission given once to Peter alone, yet again to all the apostles in the same terms. The oneness of the commission and the equality of the commissioned were thus emphasised. The apostleship, continued for ever in the episcopate, is thus universal, yet one: each bishop's authority perfect and independent, yet not forming with the others a mere agglomerate, but being a full tenure on a totality, like that of a shareholder in a joint-stock property. "Episcopus unus est cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." It is in the above definition, ch. iv., that the famous interpolation has been made, which Roman authorities (Mgr. Freppel, late Pro-

* There is no reason to suppose with Lipsius (p. 204 n.) that any correspondence is lost, except the synodic epistle about Felicissimus, for Ep. 44 says expressly that the details will be given *viva voce*.

^f Ep. 54, iii. 55 v. 3. To postpone the appearance of the *De Lapsis* to November, as Pearson does, or to any moment after the council was over, is to attribute to Cyprian a publication quite out of date and recommendations already disposed of. Therefore, if 'ultio,' c. i. is to be pressed to mean the death of Decius (which is not necessary in spite of the consensus for it), it only shews that ours is a second edition.

^g The old date, October, is due to the mistake as to Cornelius's election. Jerome calls this synod "Romana Italica Africana," as if it were one with the Carthaginian Synod, (*De Scr. Ec.* 66, Labbe, i. pp. 865-8.) and from this phrase Baronius has imagined three councils.

fessor at the Sorbonne, *S. Cyprien et l'Égl. d'Afr.* Lect. 12, Professor Hurter, of Innsbruck, SS. PP. Opuscula, v. i. p. 72) even now feel it important to retain. The loss of it suggested the endeavour to make up for it by weaving together other texts from Cyprian to prove that this one after all represented his doctrine; an attempt which would certainly never have been dreamed of if this spurious passage had not seemed to make him so strong a support. Such special pleading is performed with fullest ability by P. Ballerini (A.D. 1756, *De vi ac primatu Romm. Pontiff.* xiii. § iii. ed. Westhoff, 1845.) The MS. history is to be found fully in Hartel's preface, p. ix. p. xliii. It was rejected by Baluze (p. xiii. p. 397, p. 409, and Latini *Bib. S.* p. 179 and praef.), and inserted by authority in the editions by Manutius and the Benedictines published in their names. The actual origin of the interpolation is partly in marginal glosses (as Latini proved) and partly in an Epistle of Pelagius, ii. (A.D. 854; Pelag. ii. *Ep.* 6; Labbe, vol. vi. p. 627; ed. Ven. 1729), who produces as "terrible testimonies of the fathers," a passage of Augustine nowhere else to be found, as well as this one four centuries before it made its way into a manuscript. Its introduction of the primacy of Peter as the centre of unity is a clumsy interruption of the argument and an overthrow of Cyprian's universal principle of the "copiosum corpus Episcoporum" (*Ep.* 68 iii. 55 xx.) as the core of the visible unity of the church. The rest of the treatise is the development in beautiful language, and the illustration from nature and scripture, of his principle. Schism is a divine test and praepudicial separation of unbelievers in principle. Lastly, unity in the visible church must mirror the unity of God and the faith, and separations are due, not so much to individual teachings as to a radical selfishness commonly sanctioned in religious, no less than in secular, life.

The working of the Legislation.—The legislation had been brought out by the clergy—naturally the austerer class; the one which had most inducements not to fall. It was too severe. The approach of the great plague evoked edicts for sacrifice and roused superstitions which renewed the popular feeling against Christians, and led to the magisterial and popular outbreak of A.D. 252, which is too formally called the Persecution of Gallus (*Ep.* 59, viii.), and which supernatural presages, not justified by the event, foreshadowed as more cruel than that of Decius (*Ep.* 57, vi.; 58, i.). Of the libellatics some rigorously tried to follow, others openly defied the conciliar enactments (*Ep.* 57, 65 iii.; 68 ii.). Many palliations appeared on examination. A second council of forty-two bishops at Carthage, held on May 15, 252 (*Ep.* 59, xiii.), determined to re-admit without exception or postponement all who had continued penitent. Their synodic letter (*Ep.* 57), by Cyprian's hand, is a complete answer to his former sterner strain. The motive cause is the necessity of strengthening by communion those who will shortly be called to suffer.^h

^h *Ep.* 64. The synodic letter of the third council characterises the ground for re-admission accepted by the second council as *necessitate cogente*, and that of the first as *infirmirate urgente*, and blames bishop Therapius for having neglected both. *Ep.* 64, therefore, cannot, with Mr. Shepherd (Letter ii. p. 10, following Lombert ap.

The Novatianists having attracted converts from heathenism and now given up hope of Cyprian, consecrated their legate Maximus to be (anti-)bishop of Carthage.¹ The lapsed of the lax party, not being penitents, were not admissible on the new conditions; the party had increased to a number reckoned scarcely smaller than the Catholics (*Ep.* 59, xxi. 17), but the milder terms now offered would diminish them. The leaders therefore needed a more positive basis (*Ep.* 59, xv. xvi. (14)), and being taunted as the only unepiscopal body among Christians (*Ep.* 43, v.), procured the adhesion of PRIVATUS (q. v.), a deposed bishop (*Ep.* 59 xiii.), and consecrated FORTUNATUS a second anti-bishop in Carthage^k by the hands of five bishops.^l This fact was immensely exaggerated (59 xiv. 11), and Felicissimus sailed to Rome as legate of his new chief, hoping that a recognition might be procured for numbers which would be useful against Novatianism. They reported the unpopularity of Cyprian at Carthage, and threatened to appeal, if rejected, to the Roman laity (*Ep.* 59, ii. iii. xxv.). Cornelius was disconcerted. Cyprian's observations on this, which begin in a half sarcastic tone (*Ep.* 59, ii.), rise to glowing indignation, as he narrates the overwhelming work at this moment entailed on him by the examination in presence of the *plebes* of the returning schismatics and libellatics. The demand for strictness in readmission comes (as usual after times of trial) from the mass.^m

The leniency of the bishop and council, the gross mistake of a rival episcopacy, and the popular claim for discipline, rapidly broke up the party (59, xxi.) and reduced its congregation to a handful.

Clerical Appeals under the same Regulations.—It is not safe to assert that the terms of readmis-

Pearson, Ann. Cyp. p. 456), be dated before *Ep.* 57, nor (as Maran) synchronise with it; for they could not censure the neglect of a rule they were in the act of making; and why should only 42 bishops have issued letter 57, out of 66 who issued *Ep.* 64? Add to which that 64 is written in a peaceful time, such as began with Aemilian Ap. 253. See further Pearson's arguments, of which one is good, one inadequate.

¹ Not earlier. *Ep.* 52 ii. Novatus has *not yet* made a bishop in Carthage. *Ep.* 59 xi. Maximus is spoken of as sent *nuper* (A.D. 251) consecrated *nunc* (the *Ep.* being subsequent to Id. Mai. A.D. 252). From *Ep.* 55 x., we find they had bishops in many places before Council II. The step, then, had been *delayed in Carthage*, and this must have been because they still had hopes of Cyprian, which, though misplaced, seem to me not unnatural.

^k Dean Milman (Lat. Chr. vol. i. p. 48) apparently missed the fact that there were two anti-bishops, one of each extreme; and also fell into the error of making Fortunatus a Novatianist.

^l These were Privatus of Lambaese, condemned by a council of 90 bishops, under Donatus, Cyprian's predecessor, Felix, a pseudo-bishop of Privatus's making; REPROSTUS, a lapsed bishop, Maximus and Jovinus, Sacrificati, whom from their having been condemned by nine bishops, and then by the first council, I conclude to have been bishops.

^m Socrates' (v. 19) statement that this was the occasion on which Penitentiaries were first appointed to hear private confession, seems counter to the whole spirit of the time. Sozomen (vii. 6) represents the Roman mode of penance much later, when the bishop is himself the fellow penitent and the absolver. This contradiction of his statement that Penitentiaries were an institution in the West as well as the East, shows how little was known of the origin or date of the office.

sion for clerics were considered separately at the second council, but immediately after it is accepted that lapsed bishops and clerks could never resume orders (*Ep.* 55, ix.). In *Ep.* 65 Cyprian rests this on the Levitical institution and on his own visions. In *Ep.* 67 vi. however he speaks of all bishops being agreed on this. In *Ep.* 72, iii., four years later, the principle extends to presbyters and deacons who had taken part in a heresy or schism. And at first sight it presents a singularly contradictory appearance of laxity that only Novatianists and Donatists held the indelibility of orders to be such that their recanting bishops resumed their functions (*Optatus*, i. p. 27).

There are three cases. 1. THERAPIUS, bishop of Bulla, admits Victor, a lapsed presbyter, without due penance. Fidus, bishop, reports this to the third council of sixty-seven bishops (A.D. 253), considering that Victor should be re-excommunicated. The council decline to rescind the boon of "God's Priest," but censure Therapius, apparently in his place (*Ep.* 64—*objurgare et instruisse*), for neglecting the terms of the second council without any consultation of the laity. The same letter (*ad Fidum*, 64) contains an important decision as to age of baptism. [*v. FIDUS.*]

2. Fortunatus, bishop of Assurae, lapsed, and in his place was elected Epictetus; but the lapsed party (*Ep.* 65, v. iii.) on their return claimed for him the function and emoluments. The ground of order would have been sufficient; but Cyprian, with his characteristic error, urges the vitiation of any church function discharged by an unworthy minister, and recommends individual canvassing, if necessary, to unite the flock under Epictetus.

3. The most important case is that of BASILIDES and MARTIAL (q. v.), in A.D. 254, when the Spanish churches of Leon, Astorga, and Merida appeal to Cyprian against the negligent decision of Stephanus, now bishop of Rome, in favour of the restoration of their lapsed bishops. The letter of the Carthaginian council of thirty-seven bishops, A.D. 254 (*Ep.* 67), penned by Cyprian, declares the verdict of the bishop of Rome mistaken and to be disregarded. This letter also insists on the duty of a laity to withdraw from communion with a "sacriligious" or "sinful" bishop, and marks the universal sense that there resided in a congregation no power to make valid the sacramental acts of a nominee who lacked the note of true orders (*Ep.* 67, iii.; compare Routh, vol. iii. p. 152).

Practical Organisations and Christian Culture.

(a) *Captivity.*—During the session of the council an extensive raid was executed by the Berbers, who, severely ruled as they were without any attempt to civilise them, were beginning that steady advance on Numidia which in a few years replaced the whole range of Ferratus in their possession. In 252 their front line reached from Thubunae on the salt-marsh to the terebinth forests of Tucca, and they deported large numbers of the Christians of no less than eight sees. Several inscriptions relate to this invasion (see *Revue Afric.* vols. iv. vii. viii.). About 800 pounds was subscribed by the sixty bishops and Carthaginian community (*Ep.* 62), and sent to them.

(b) *Plague.*—But the great field on which the

expanding powers of humanity were gathered up and animated by the church was opened by the great plague which reached Carthage in A.D. 252, having travelled two years from Ethiopia through Egypt. Great physical disturbances had preceded it (*ad Dem.* ii. 1, vii. 5). The eruption and the brain affection which marked the plague of Athens are not recorded of this; nor yet the pulmonary symptoms, which, perhaps, were not developed in the African climate. The other symptoms seem to be identical, and the devastation far more awful, extensive, and enduring. It lasted twenty years; reduced the population of Alexandria by half; destroyed the armies of Valerian before Sapor; kept the Goths off the Thracian border, and for some time killed five thousand persons daily in Rome (*v. Eutrop.* ix. v.; *Hist. Aug. Galli*, v. p. 177; *Dionys. ap. Eus.* vii. 22; *Greg. Nyss. Vit. Greg. Thaum.* § 12). The efforts of the emperors Gallus and Valerian in burying the dead were appreciated, otherwise their efforts were confined to supplications to Saturn and Apollo. (See three types of coins of Gallus in British Museum, and see Cohen, *Médailles Impér.* vol. iv. p. 270; Bandusi, vol. i. p. 58.)

Horrible scenes of desertion and spoliation ensued in Carthage as in Athens (*Pontii Vit. Cyp. and Cyp. ad Dem.* 10 (8) 11 (9)), when universal physical terror or audacity overpowered all other sentiments. As in Neo-Caesarea and Alexandria so in Carthage, the Christian clergy stood out as the first champions of life, health, and feeling. Cyprian addressed his community in a speech, which it was wished could have been delivered to the city from the rostrum, on the duty and divineness of prayer and help to the persecutors (*Respondere Natalibus* was his watchword), and then proposed and carried a scheme for the systematic care of the city. Filled with his motives and under his influence rich and poor undertook the parts he assigned, raised a large fund, formed a nursing staff and burial staff, and allowed no religious distinction in their ministrations. But their abstinence from religious processions and sacrifices marked the Christians as enemies of God and man, and the "Overseer of the Christians" was demanded by name for a contest with a lion (*Epp.* 59, viii.; 66, 44). The terrible work lasted on till his exile five years later, as we must conclude from Pontius' juxtaposition of the events, with his remark that exile was the reward for "withdrawing from human sight a horror like hell."

(c) *Ad Demetrianum.*—Their chief foe was an aged magistrate (*sub ipso exitu Dem.* 25 (22)), not the pro-consul (Pearson), but perhaps one of the five primores, formerly an inquirer into the truth of Christianity, in Cyprian's own friendship (i.), now himself an inventor of accusations (c. 2) and tortures, xii. (10). The pamphlet in which Cyprian assails him is much wider in its aim than Tertullian's *ad Scapulam*; both have the remonstrance against the suppression of the one natural worship, the appeal to the demeanour of the now prevalent sect (*pars paene major cunisque civitatis*) to the effects of exorcism, and the influence through suffering of the Christians. But while Tertullian for once refrains from denunciation, and is almost gentle in his examples of warning, Cyprian's object is wider; he answers the question, "Whence all this political

and this physical misery?" The heathen answer attributed it to the divine displeasure at toleration. Cyprian accepts also a certain theory of mundane decrepitude, but bases his real reply on the general dissolution of the bonds of society; an important passage, perhaps the very earliest on slavery (viii. (6)), marks the exact stage reached by the Christian consciousness on this subject.

So also the theory of *Resentment* is exhibited in a certain stage of purification, though some of the language would be intolerable now. The eternal conservation of beings for eternal suffering is laid down (xxiv. 21). The most original part of the essay is the development for the first time of the *Theory of Probation* (already struck out in his slightly earlier epistle 58 to Thibaris) as grouping the phenomena of humanity.

Jerome hastily (*Ep.* 83 *ad Magn.*; *Lact. Inst.* 5, 4) criticises Cyprian for advancing scriptural proofs to a heathen. 1. But Demetrian already knew something of Christianity. 2. Cyprian does not quote authors' names, as to one familiar; 3. quotes nothing but *plainly fulfilled* predictions. All which (as well as the classical tone and quotations) fits the case exactly, and answers Rettberg's incompetent conjecture that Demetrian is a fancy figure.

(d) *On the Mortality*.—This treatise, or epistle as Augustine calls it (he quotes it no less than six times), presents to the Christians the consolatory primitive view of the topics set threateningly before Demetrian. It is meant to elevate their view of both the persecution and the plague, from which some expected providential exemptions, while others hated it only as an interference with martyrdom; he explains his theory of probation and of predictions as evidencing a divine plan. He cannot reject, but he gives a Christian turn to the general belief in the world's decay; urges organisations for relief of suffering; treats moral causes in society as affecting general and even physical phenomena. In c. xxvi. occurs what seems more than a coincidence with phrases in the *Te Deum*. In c. xx. he condemns the use of black for mourners.

(e) *On Work and Alms*.—A pastoral, which may indeed be connected with the incidents of *Ep.* 62, but more probably has a wider reference to the demands made by the plague and coincident troubles on the exertions and liberality of the Christians. Among circumstances known to us directly it would be more natural to link it to the great speech which Pontius mentions as having been delivered at that time to the community. Here again we find Cyprian working out the new faith into a life-system; philosophically (as in a kind of Tusculan) adjusting moral feeling and practice to the newly gained higher facts about God and Man. See ch. ix. x. xi. practically developing that "loss is gain," and "gain is loss," to those who are within the care of Christ, xvi. Christ becomes a social element which uplifts the poor; their claims take precedence of family claims; the possession of a family only increases the obligation to his poor.—In xxii. a bold passage, almost Goethesque, in which Satan apostrophises Christ on the superior liberality of his own school.—The *Doctrine* of the first part i-vii. develops the unfortunate conception (which is roundly stated also *Ep.* 55, xviii. (14)), of *Good Works* acting on

sins done after baptism, as baptism acts to remit former sin. Neander (*Ch. Hist.* vol. i. p. 391, Bohm) remarks that while this same thought appears in Tertullian (*De Poenit.*), yet no one person can be looked on as the author of it. It is a natural and popular materialistic germ of the doctrines of Rome on penance.

(f) *The Exhortation to Confessorship* is a practical manual of scripture passages, connected by brief remarks, under thirteen heads of reflection. It was compiled at the request of a layman, Fortunatus. Its existence sufficiently indicates the extent of suffering which a persecution developed. A more sober tone as to the persecutions of the martyrs is perceptible. The introduction of the seven Maccabees not only as examples, but as a type of unity (*ad Fort.* xi.) dates this as later than *De Unitate*, where every other possible type is accumulated but not this one. The teaching on probation also marks the stage of his thoughts. He computes the world to be near 6000 years old (*ad Fort.* ii. Compare *Tert. de V. V.* i.).

(g) *On the Lord's Prayer*.—To promote intelligent devotion was his next aim. This treatise is written with precision and with visible delight. The time is clearly shewn by his deductions on unity (xxiv. cf. *De Unit.* xiv. (12)); on the danger of withholding communion from penitents (*De Or.* xviii.), and on the confessor's temptations to arrogance (xxiv.).

Cyprian follows Tertullian freely, not transcribing as before; adopts the African 'ne nos patiaris induci' without remark (cf. *Aug. de Dono Persev.* vi. 12), and 'fiat in caelo' (id. iii. 6); illustrates more fully from scripture, and uses a different version. His silence probably evinces Tertullian's success in remonstrating against superstitious observances in praying (*Tert. Deor.* xi. xvi.), and he does not, like his 'Master,' hail the 'confusion of nations' as a mark of the kingdom; but in his expansion of the symbolism of praying thrice a day we have the earliest use of Trinitas in Latin as a name of Deity (in *Tert. adv. Prae.* 3, it is not exactly this). In A.D. 427 Augustine (*Ep.* ccxv.) used the treatise successfully with the monks of Adrumetum to prove the Pelagian errors contrary to the Cyprianic doctrine. He quotes this short treatise of '*victoriosissimus Cyprianus*' elsewhere thirteen times to the same effect. Yet not one term occurs in it which became technical in that controversy; a fact which would alone evince its early date. Mr. Shepherd, however (Fourth Letter to Dr. Maitland, 1853), has undertaken to prove that its writer was acquainted with the work of Chromatius (d. A.D. 406) and is more "sacramental" than that author, Gregory Nysen, or Chrysostom; and than Augustine's doubt as to the application of the 'daily bread' allows; he observes that Venantius (6th cent.) does not use it, though his predecessor, Hilary, refers the readers of his commentary to it in preference to commenting himself; having thus satisfied himself of the lateness of the Cyprianic treatise, Mr. Shepherd therefore asperses the genuineness of the great Augustinian works which cite it.

The critical comparison with Chromatius requires for its statement a minuteness and space here inadmissible. But the result of such investigation has been to leave no doubt that Cyprian is the middle term between Tertullian

and Chromatius. Briefly, Chromatius knows no argument or illustration of Tertullian's which Cyprian has not employed; almost every one of these has in Chromatius (though a most condensed prosaic writer) some additional Cyprianic touch or colour adhering to it. Observe too Chromatius' insertion of the negative in his *qui necdum crediderunt* (§ iv.) in mistaken elucidation of Cyprian's obscure *in illis credentibus* (§ xvii.) precisely as later MSS. and editors have altered it. As to the Eucharistic language about daily bread, it is admittedly not more strong than in other Cyprianic treatises, nor visibly stronger than Chromatius. The Antiochene fathers of course are not Eucharistic in this clause because they followed Origen's interpretation of ἐπιούσιος. Augustine will not strictly limit the petition to the Eucharist (though for singular reasons, *Serm.* 56, 57, 58), but his more analytical, yet more mystical treatment of it is distinctly in a later mood than the simply moral handling of Cyprian.

That Venantius does not mention Cyprian in his unfinished treatise surely demands no explanation. His aim is more theological and his language very compressed. But tinges of Cyprian are perceptible in the passages on Sonship; perseverance; reigning with Christ; resistance to God's will, and ourselves being made heavenly to do it; but we may add that Ambrose's omission to comment on verses 1-5 of chap. xi. is inexplicable except for the existence of some standard treatise, such as is mentioned by Hilary (Mt. V.). "De orationis sacramento necessitate nos commentandi Cyprianus liberavit."

Interval.—Cornelius' exile, with others, to Civita Vecchia, his decease in June 253, as a martyr, in the then sense of the word, the short episcopate of Lucius, his exile, speedy return, and death, not later than 5th March, A.D. 254 (*Cyp. Epp.* 60, 61, 67, 68), find place in Cyprian's correspondence,^a not without some undue exaggerations, as when he compares the reappearance of Lucius to that of John Baptist, as heralding the advent. Not later than this we place the epistle (63) to bishop Caecilius, reproving the omission of wine in the chalice, and distinctly indicating the symbolical importance of a mixed cup; the necessity of a congregation to constitute a sacrament; the irregularity of evening communion.

To Sept. 253, and its council of 66 bishops, belongs the condemnation of the postponing for even a few days, on ritual grounds, the administration of the other sacrament to infants. To it belongs the affair of THERAPIUS, as above.

Changed Relations with Rome, and Cyprian's Error of Re-baptism.—In A.D. 254, Easter was on April 23, Stephanus was made bishop of Rome May 12, the Carthaginian Council met towards autumn (September?).

It had seemed to Cyprian a token of divine displeasure at the Novatianists, that they did not suffer with the church; and their prosperity might have seemed to form Stephen's policy in so anti-puritan a mould, except for his over-indulgence to MARCION (q. v.), the Novatianist

bishop of Arles (*Ep.* 68); but his was rather a policy of general resistance to the spiritual power compacted by Cyprian and Cornelius; a policy of the widest comprehension on the one basis of submissiveness to his see. The cases of BASILIDES and MARTIAL have been mentioned. Cyprian's tone to him is one of both compassion and dictation (*Ep.* 68), and from his letter to FLORENTIUS PUPIENUS (66) it is plain that others besides Stephen felt, rightly or wrongly, more than aversion to the immense influence of Cyprian. And, although the whole church has decided that Stephen was right in the great controversy which arose, it was long before his character recovered the shock of his impetuous collision with Cyprian, and grew capable of his fictitious crown of martyrdom.

The next group of documents belongs to the years A.D. 255 and 256, and is occupied with the controversy on Re-baptism (*Epp.* 69-75, *Sent. Epp.* lxxxvii.). For though Cyprian objects to that term (*Ep.* 73, i.) catholic doctrine insists on the assertion it involves.

Notwithstanding the council of AGRIPPINUS, and the reception of thousands of heretics by re-baptism in the African church (*Ep.* 73, iii.), numbers had been readmitted without it (*Ep.* 73, xxiii.; Aug. says the practice had fallen off). On the other hand, though Stephen appeals to the constant tradition of his church against re-baptizing, this is simply to ignore the action of Callistus (Hippolytus, p. 291, a passage which is against the idea of that author's Novatianism, but which Hefele monstrously wants to apply to Agrippinus (*Hist. des Conciles*, vol. i. p. 87, Paris). An allusion to Stephen (*Ep.* 69, x.) seems to imply that Stephen stirred the question first. Rettberg considers after Maran that his Oriental dispute had already occurred (p. 170). So Hefele. But this is not necessary. Cyprian (*de Un.* xi.) early committed himself to language as strong as he ever used again.

The original inquiry is whether the non-heretical Novatianists, baptized as such, can be received to catholic communion. It extended itself (73, iv.), until the case of Marcionites and even Ophites was debated; Stephen would include, and Cyprian exclude, all. At first the difficulty was only "Is not the exclusive African practice itself a Novatianistic mark—being otherwise used only in that sect?" Our briefest method will be first to enumerate the documents, and then to classify their often repeated arguments.

[1.] Magnus, a layman, makes the first application, and is replied to by Cyprian with affectionate respect (*Ep.* 69). [2.] The bishops of Numidia who, though without formal vote, had adopted the practice, apply next; the reply is from 33 bishops of Africa, with the presbyters of Carthage (*Ep.* 71). This is Cyprian's *Fifth Council and First on Baptism*. *Ep.* 70 is their conciliar declaration of the necessity of (re)baptism. [3.] A Mauritanian bishop, Quintus, is answered in *Ep.* 71, enclosing *Ep.* 70, now widely circulated (71, iv.), breathing an injured tone as towards Stephen, and indicating that the council had not been unanimous (*Ep.* 71, i., plurimi... nescio qua praesumptione quidam).

[4.] The *De bono Patientiae* was published about this time to be, without one word upon the subject matter of the controversy, a calming voice in the rising storm. The *De Zelo et Livore* is

^a On the death of Cornelius and his sepulture, see Mommsen, *Chronog. vom Jahre* 354, p. 631; De Rossi, *Roma Sott.* vol. ii. pp. 66-8, and on the true date of his death, as distinct from his festival, Lipsius, *Chron. d. Pap.* p. 192.

generally (and probably) thought to be a very little later in date, and similar in purpose. It is equally reticent on passing events, unless (in vi. 5) there may be an allusion to Novatian. There are a few close verbal resemblances between the two treatises, especially in *De Pat.* xix. (11) and *De Zelo*, iv. and v.

[5.] Next year, A.D. 256, the 6th Council under Cyprian and 2nd on Baptism, composed of 71 bishops, Numidian and African,^o unanimously re-affirm the opinion in an unconciliatory synodical epistle to Stephen, conscious of the offence they will give, and enclosing the 70th and 71st epistles. This epistle is mentioned by Jerome, *adv. Lucif.* But Augustine (*Resp. ad Epp.* 15) seems not to have seen it, which is strange.

[6.] Jubaian, a bishop of Mauritania, forwards to Cyprian a copy of a paper there circulating, with some authority, which recognises even Marcion's baptism (*Ep.* 73, iv.). It may have been issued by one of those native bishops who dissented (*Sentt.* *Epp.* 59, 38, and cf. *Aug. Resp. ad Epp.* 52, con. *Donat.* vii. 16, 6). Rettberg agrees with 'Constant. *Ep. Pontif.* p. 226,' that it was Stephen's letter to the East. Cyprian sent Jubaian a reply so elaborate, that, at the final council, he read it aloud as his own best exposition of his views, with Jubaian's convinced answer. Cyprian's letter went accompanied with all the documents sent to Stephen, and a copy of his *Patience*.

[7.] A deputation of bishops waited on Stephen but were not received (*Ep.* 75, xxv.); the letter which they bore was answered (74, i.) in terms appreciative of the greatness of the question (75, xvii.), but not arguing it, charitable to the separatists, affirming the tradition, (75, v.; 73, xiii.) resting on the authority of the see (75, xvii.), and styling Cyprian "a pseudo-Christ, a pseudo-apostle and treacherous worker." It would be unfair not to recognise anxiety under the word "treacherous," while Fabian of Antioch, by dallying with Novatianism, was complicating Stephen's position; and Cyprian's own language as to "favourers of Antichrist" (69, x.) had exposed him to retaliation. Stephen had circulated in the East a paper which awakened "lites et dissensiones per ecclesias totius mundi" (75, xxiv.), declaring he would hold no communion with bishops who used second baptism (*Ep.* 75, xxiv.; 74, viii. Dionys. *Al. ap. Eus.* vii. 5).^p

The natural reply of the metropolitan of Cappadocia was "Thou hast excommunicated thyself."

The general history of re-baptism must be read elsewhere, but it was held in Cappadocia, Pamphylia, and other regions of Asia Minor as a practice received "from Christ and from the apostle" (75, xix.), and it had been confirmed by the councils of Synnada and Iconium.^q

^o A.D. 312. The relations of Numidia with Carthage seem unsettled (Hefele, *Conciles*, vol. i. p. 170).

^p H. Valois is right, I believe, in thinking this a threat. Routh thinks it was actual excommunication, and Lipsius that he excommunicated Cyprian. Observe that several bishops of the seventh council were very early in the Roman calendar for iv. Id. Sep.

^q Lipsius's reasons (pp. 219, 20) for dating Iconium so late as A.D. 255 are surely quite insufficient. Eusebius (vii. 3) says Cyprian was πρῶτος τῶν τότε to hold rebaptism, which is a most accurate expression. He has already said that it had been held in very populous churches, and

Dionysius the Great^r recommended *forbearance* to Stephen, and to the eminent Roman presbyters Dionysius and Philemon.

[8.] Pompey, bishop of Sabrata on the Syrtis, was the next inquirer, asking for Stephen's reply (*Ep.* 74). Cyprian sends it with the antidote, a fine letter, though not moderate, closing with an amendment on the canon of Stephen. Pompey was convinced if he had wavered, and his proxy at the council was presented by his neighbour the bishop of Oea.

[9.] The 7th council of Carthage, or 3rd on baptism, held September 1, A.D. 256. Eighty-seven bishops of all the three provinces, with presbyters and deacons, met in the presence of a vast laity.^s

The council opened with the reading of the Jubaian correspondence, and the letter to Stephen (*Sent.* 8), and with a brief speech from Cyprian, large and pacific (*Aug. R. Epp.*). Each bishop then by seniority delivered his opinion, of which we have a verbal report: from some a good argument, from some a text, an antithesis, an analogy, or a fancy: here a rhetorical sentence, there a solecism, or an unfinished clause; a simple restatement, a personality, a fanaticism; two of the juniors vote with the majority on the ground of inexperience. But on the whole we must admire the temper and the ability of so large a number of speakers. The council had a great moral effect. It kept Roman influence at bay for a long time.

Jerome is mistaken in asserting in his youthful *contra Luciferianos*, that these fathers recanted. The custom was not specifically repealed till the synod of Arles, nor for Asia Minor till the first of Constantinople. But, from peculiar circumstances, it was specially accepted in the East, and is the basis now of the rebaptism by the Jacobites, not only of heretics and Nestorians, but of orthodox Christians.^t

has told us of the old council of Agrippinus which declared it. Asia had quietly continued, Africa had mostly dropped the practice, and Cyprian was the first τῶν τότε to revive it. Lipsius is actually driven by his own special pleading to say there were two synods of Iconium "which must not be confounded," one named by Firmilian, and one by Dionysius—about the baptism of heretics—at the same place—at very considerable interval—both making exactly the same declaration.

^r Jerome (*Script. Ecc.*) says Dionysius took the strict view. Himself seems (*Eus.* vii. 9) to say the opposite, and cf. vii. 7.

^s I believe the above will be found a simple and sufficient account of the circumstances of the correspondence, and that there is no want of Mosheim's and Rettberg's little amusement of inventing lost documents. The letter of Stephanus shewn to Pompeius is the same which Firmilian saw. The legation of course presented the synodical letter, which was meant to be final: accordingly Cyprian (in *Sentt. Ep.*) speaks of the question as resting henceforth with individual bishops.

^t Of the seventh council Mr. Shepherd says, "wonderful to say, it has a date." So has the second (*Ep.* 59, xlii.). Of another event he remarks, "It would have been far more natural to have said A.D. 180, or some such date." It would have been an excessively interesting use of the Christian era, and Mr. Shepherd has doubtless noted the careful dates of other documents, Tertullian's historical allusions, Augustine's letters. The paucity of dates is, however, singular. It may have some connexion with the African hostility, even to civil usages dependent on heathenism. The Donatists at Carthage, A.D. 411, treat the fact that the acts of the council

Before the winter of 256^a Cyprian's messengers to Firmilian returned with [10] his reply, the most enthusiastic letter of the series. We have it in Cyprian's translation from the Greek.^x

It has points of great interest; compares the bishop of Rome to Judas; shews the antiquity of rebaptism in Asia; touches on their annual synods; the fixed and extempore portions of the liturgy; the quasi-supremacy of Jerusalem; the unity under wide divisions. For arguments to the point it relies on Cyprian's letters.

We will now briefly classify Cyprian's arguments and the answers to them, avoiding the making him responsible for his partisans, whose judgment in council (vii.) differs much from his. Firmilian on the other hand summarises sensibly. Cyprian then urges for Rebaptism (A), OBJECTIVE grounds. (a) *The unity of the church*, viz. that in the critical point of "church and non-church," schism does not differ from heresy (69, iii.): the representation of sacred acts outside not equivalent to sacred acts within: "one Lord, one faith," there may be, but not "one baptism," for this implies "one church," which the schismatic renounces. (b) *Unity of Belief*. In its African form the creed ran, "Dost thou believe the remission of sins and life everlasting through holy church?" and was accordingly null at the moment of baptism away from the church. (c) *Baptism is a function of holy orders* on account of its remissory virtue in respect of sin (not Tertullian's doctrine (*De Bap.* xvii.), and holy orders have no being outside the church (73, vii.), so that the whole question of episcopal authority as the bond of unity and divine organisation is involved^y (*Ep.* 72, i.), and if external

baptism is true, the church has many centres; not one foundation rock, but several (75, xvii.). The separatist teacher surrenders (70, ii.) the animating, unifying Spirit, and cannot through his personal earnestness convey that Spirit to followers by baptizing them^z (*Ep.* 69). (d) *The imposition of hands on the readmitted separatist* expresses that he has not, but needs to receive, the Holy Ghost: Stephen's party use this rite, and quote the apostles at Samaria in instance. But without that Spirit how could the separatist consecrate even the water? or the unction of confirmation? (*Ep.* 70, i.; cf. *Sentt.* *Ep.* 18; on the significance of this "royal" oil, see Bunsen; and on the Novatianist disuse of it, Routh, vol. iii. pp. 69, 70.) Above all, how give the New Birth which, as the essence of the sacrament, is essentially the Spirit's act (*Ep.* 74, v. vi. &c.)? (e) *Baptism in the absence of the Spirit is a Judaic, a carnal rite; a defilement*, more than a deceiving semblance, a material pollution (*Ep.* 75, xiii.; 72, i.; 73, xxi.; 69, xvi.; cf. *Sedatus, Sentt.* *Ep.* 18; Victor Gordub. *Sentt.*, whom Augustine criticises as going to lengths beyond Cyprian; still the frightful expression of *De Unit.* xi. involves all this). The pretender can "neither justify nor sanctify" (69 x.), who but the holy can hallow (69, ii.)? who but the living give life (71, i.)? (f) *Christ not present to make up for the unworthiness of the minister*. For if so His Spirit could not be absent (75, xii.), and that he is absent is admitted by the necessity for imposition of hands (*id.* xiii.).

(B.) *Subjective grounds.* (a) *Faith of recipient insufficient* (*Ep.* 73, 75, ix.): to be effective must be true; but is deficient in cardinal point, viz. the remission of sins by the church, even if not false, and, as often, blasphemous (73, iv. v. 74); (b) *not secured by the formula*. In the Roman church there was still such absence of rigidity that it was argued that without the Trinal form baptism into Christ's name sufficed (*Ep.* 74, v.). Cyprian however points to the clear words of institution, and appeals to common reason to decide whether one is truly baptized into the Son who denies his Humanity (*Ep.* 73 v.),^a or treats the God of the Old Testament as evil (74, iii.): even if the genuine formula be used, still the rite is no question of words; the absent Christ and Spirit are not bound by them as a spell. (c) *Incapable of definition*. It is not the church's part to graduate departures from the faith. Even death in behalf of a heresy cannot restore to the church. If what is universally accepted as ipso facto baptism (in blood) is unavailing, how can ordinary extraneous baptism be more (*Ep.* 73, xxi.; *De Unit.* xiv. (12) xix.; or *Dom.* xxiv.)?

(C.) *The historical argument* is handled by Cyprian in the most masterly way. (a) Usage is not worth considering as more than an apology for ignorance; cannot be matched against reason (71, iii. 73); (b) is not universal on side of Stephen (*Ep.* 71); (c) cannot be inferred from the non-baptism of restored perverts: their case

episcopis dedit" in the mouth of one of the bishops. *Sentt.* *Ep.* 17.

^x "Qui non habet quomodo dat?" became a catchword of the Donatists. The reply of the Catholics was "Deum esse datorem" (*Optat.* p. 103).

^a The basis of this is Tert. *de Bap.* xv.

of Ciria, A.D. 305, commence with the consular date as an evidence against their genuineness. The Catholics reply, that though the Donatists avoid dates, the Catholics use them. But it may be that the Donatists preserve the old puritanic tradition. Cf. *Aug. Brev. Coll.* c. *Don.* p. 569, 3li. diel, cap. xv. § 26, 27. (Athanasius's objection to the date in the creed of Sirmo is of another colour.) For an account of the Romanist assaults on it, see Rettberg, pp. 189, 90. Augustine accepted it, when some wished to make it of Donatist origin, on the ground of its containing so much against Donatism.

^a Stephen died, and Cyprian was exiled before the winter of 257.

^x It is impossible not to recognise Cyprian's style in it; equally impossible not to see the Greek [A] in some of its compound phrases and coupled epithets (*e.g.* i. magnam voluntatis caritatem in unum convenire; iii. velociter currentes, iv. quoniam sermo . . . distribuatur, &c.) [B] In the literal (sometimes awkward) rendering of words; iv. seniores et praepositi (=presbyteri et episcopi) for πρεσβύτεροι καὶ προεστώτες; vii. praesident majores natu, where Cyprian could not have used presbyteri, and yet age is not to the point; fratribus nam longe positus (μακρὰν κεκείμενος); v. inexcusabilem: vi. eos qui Romae sunt; aequaliter quae; vii. possidenti potestatem; x. nec vexari in aliquo; quamvis ad imaginem veritatis tamen; xxi. volentibus vivere; xii. Nos etiam illos quos hi qui. [C] Instances where the Greek is not thoroughly mastered; viii. nisi si his episcopis quibus nunc minor fuit Paulus (? τῶν νῦν); xii. ut per eos qui cum ipsi, &c.; cum unmeaning—observe in ix. patrias of local persecutions in Asia Minor. The remarkable translation of *Eph.* 4, 3, in xxiv. is in the same words as in three other places of Cyprian, and differs from every other known rendering; even the African Nemesianus in this council uses curantes instead of satisfagentes.

^y This view becomes "Christus baptizandi potestatem

differs from that of heathens, who had (to begin with) been made heretics, not Christians. (d) The practice of heretical bodies, which had always recognised any previous baptism, was no example to the church (74, iv.); nor could the Novatianist practice of rebaptism be a warning against it (73, ii.); it was either accidental coincidence, or imitation (*simiarum more*), and, if the latter, it was evidence. (e) *Casuristic difficulties* upon the necessity of "regeneration within the church" as to the position of unbaptized martyrs (73, xxii.), heretics hitherto readmitted and deceased (xxiv.), cases of rebaptism where baptism had been valid, baptism by a demoniac, are met by Cyprian with a breadth of which St. Augustine (*contra Crescon.* ii. 41) says, in the midst of his refutation, "such simplicity is enough for me."

(D.) *Biblical arguments*.—The familiar ones need no more than enumeration: the one loaf; one cup; the ark; the schismatic (not heretical) gainsaying of Korah; the apostles' baptism of men who had already received the Spirit, a fortiori needed for those who confessedly had not. We may admire the ingenuity with which he treats such passages as Acts ii. 38, in *Ep.* 73, xvii., or Phil. i. 18, in *Ep.* 74, 75, 73, xiv.; but about many Cyprian might fairly be addressed in the words which Optatus (b. iv. p. 96) uses to Parmenian: "You batter the law to such purpose that wherever you find the word Water there you conjure out of it some sense to our disadvantage." He probably originated the application of Eccles. xxxiv. 25, "Qui baptizatur a mortuo quid proficit lavatio ejus," which the Donatists constantly quote against Augustine, and which Augustine answers only by referring *mortuus* to a heathen priest or vicious Christian instead of a heretic. He quotes several times the LXX addition to Prov. ix. 19, "Drink not of the strange font," and Jer. xv. 18, ii. 13, "Deceiving waters," "broken cisterns." In some of these applications there is poetical force, as of his favourite "garden enclosed and fountain sealed," and of the doctrines of New Birth and Sonship (*Ep.* 74, v. vi); in Heresy who was never the Spotless Spouse we can never find a mother (*Ep.* 75).

To this Stephen finely answers that she was an unnatural mother indeed (75, xiv.) who exposed her children so soon as they were born, but that the church's part was to seek them and bring them home and rear them for Christ.

Dispersed as this system of Cyprian's lies, through his correspondence and tracts, it will be seen that in his mind it was not fragmentary, but logical and coherent. Over the theory promulgated by one of his powers and character, backed by an army of bishops,^b moving as one man under him, yet independent enough each to find their own telling arguments (Conc. III.), Stephen's triumph without a council, against remonstrances from the East, and hindered by his own pretentiousness and uncharitableness,^c was great. It was deserved also, for Rome represented freedom, comprehensiveness, and safe latitude.

^b Some required exorcism (*Scntt.* 7, 8, 31); some declared heretics worse than heathens; a painfully early development.

^c Animosus, iracundus; again, audacia, insolentia, inhumanitas are some of the sins charged to him.

She decided upon one grand principle, the same on which Jerome afterwards decided the analogous question of re-ordination (*adv. Lucif.*). Cyprian's principle was the same which blinded Tertullian (*de Bapt.* xv.); which was extended by the Donatists to make moral defects in the minister debar grace;^d which led Knox and Calvin to deny baptism to the infant children of "papists," and the Genevan divines to allow it, on the hope that "the grace which had adopted" the great-grandfathers might not yet be so "wholly extinct that the infants should have lost their right to the common seal" (Hooker, iii. 1, 12).

Augustine (*Resp. ad Episcopos*) developed the categorical answer to each separate argument of Cyprian and his bishops, but the true solution was applied at once by Stephen. The grace of baptism is of Christ, not of the human baptizer.^e He who baptizes does not "give being or add force" to the sacrament. Cyprian's language about "justifying and sanctifying" may well have shocked the Church of Rome, and makes Stephen's anger partly intelligible. The child or heathen who learns Christ through the teaching of the heretic cannot be charged with "defect or disorder," in the reception of a sacrament, to which he comes with purest faith, and which it is the will of God to impart to all. Though excluded "from fellowship in holy duties with the visible church," he is still a member of such visible church. (*Ep.* 73, xvi. We must take the fragmentary quotation, 75, i. "Si quis ergo a quacunque haeresi venerit" with the other, "In nomine Christi baptizatus," and compare Routh, *R. S.* vol. iii. p. 183.)

The only real blot which Cyprian struck was the *vulgar explanation* of the laying on of hands at re-admission. Upon that hypothesis his own view was justifiable. But the act was not really understood by the intelligent to be the imparting of the Spirit for the first time to those who had it not; it was the renewing by the Spirit, and introducing to communion of a repentant and now enlightened child of God.^f "A son of God" in spite of any theological error, Stephen declares him in the fullest sense to be (*Ep.* 74, vi.; 75, xvii.). The expression seems to have been much cavilled at in Carthage, and is mentioned even in *Ep.* 72, after the second council.

And now it ought to be noticed that (as the Novatianists saw) Cyprian had a real point of contact with Novatianism. In the instance of Lapse he discovered its fallacy. In the instance of Heresy he fell into it. The visible church, according to him, included the worst moral sinner in expectation of his penitence; it excluded the most virtuous and orthodox baptized Christian

^d Of the use they made of Cyprian himself see Aug. *contra Crescon.* II. xxiii. 40: "Scripta Cypriani nobis tanquam firmamenta canonicae auctoritatis opponitis." (Cf. *Ep.* 93, *ad Vincent.*; *Epp.* 108, 9, *ad Macrob.*)

^e Optatus, B. v. p. 99, well expresses it: "Has res unicuique non ejusdem rei operarius sed credentis fides et Trinitas praestat." By implication he answers many of the detailed difficulties, but the great name of Cyprian visibly restrains him. Again, p. 103: "Omnes qui baptizant operarios esse non dominos et sacramenta per se sancta esse non per homines."

^f Besides its use in ordination the imposition of hands had three intentions. 1. Confirmation. 2. Reception of penitents. 3. Exorcism. The 2nd is what Stephen applies here. The 3rd was desired by some extreme partisans.

who had not been baptized by a catholic minister.^s

Nevertheless although the Roman church then took a wider view than Cyprian as to the sonship of man to God, Cyprian was much greater (and this is the true church-moral of this part of his history), upon the possibility and duty of union in diversity. Augustine well draws out the independence of thought and action which Cyprian wished to be maintained without exclusiveness, and tells us (Aug. v. *de Bapt.* 17) how he was never weary of reading the conclusion of the epistle to Quintus. Every bishop was free to judge for himself, none to be persecuted for his views, and *therefore* every one to be tender of the bonds of peace: "Salvo jure communionis diversa sentire."

The unanimity of such early councils and their erroneousness are a remarkable monition. Not packed, not pressed; the question broad; no attack on an individual; only a principle sought; the assembly representative; each bishop the elect of his flock; and all "men of the world," often christianised, generally ordained late in life; converted against their interests by conviction formed in an age of freest discussion; their Chief one in whom were rarely blended intellectual and political ability, with holiness, sweetness, and self-discipline. The conclusion reached by such an assembly uncharitable, unscriptural, uncatholic, and unanimous.

The consolation as strange as the disappointment. The mischief silently and perfectly healed by the simple working of the Christian society. Life corrected the error of thought. Augustine beautifully writes: "It is of no light moment that though the question was agitated among bishops of an age anterior to the faction of Donatus, and although opinions differed without the unity of the colleagues being marred, still this our present use has been settled to be observed throughout the whole Catholic church diffused throughout the world" (*contra Crescon.* i. xxxii. 38). The disappearance of the Cyprianic decisions has its hope for us when we look on bonds seemingly inextricable, and steps as yet irretrievable.

It may be noted, as affording some clue to the onesided decisions, that the laity were silent, though Cyprian seemed pledged to some consultation with them. (See esp. *Ep.* 31 and 19, ii.) It must have been among them that there were in existence and at work those very principles which so soon not only rose to the surface, but overpowered the voices of her bishops for the general good.

It was a parliament of officials, provincial governors. That it did not represent church opinion—that, namely, which we now accept as church doctrine, may be inferred—(1) from the absolute unanimity of the eighty-seven utterances; (2) from the strange avowal of two, that being incompetent to give an opinion they vote with the majority; (3) from the very important and powerful contemporary work of the "Auctor de Rebaptismate;" (4) from the silent reversal of the decision.

^s Thus the extreme of sacerdotalism was a fixed tenet with our own Puritan divines, who held the minister "to be of the substance of the sacrament." Compare Hooker, *Ec. Pol.* V. lxi. 5; Neander, vol. i. p. 540, Bohn tr.

The last Persecution.—Of the thirty-one Numidian bishops who sat in the great council, the next glimpse of church offices shews nine as convicts^h in the mines *metallum Siguense* (? Siga, where there were copper-mines in Mauritania, or Sigitia in Numidia itself) and in two other places.ⁱ A subdeacon and four acolytes were commissioned by the metropolitan (already himself an exile), and his friend Quirinus to visit them, and supply them with necessaries (*Epp.* 77-9). Cyprian had been apprehended, as perhaps the first African prisoner (*Epp.* 77-8), in August A.D. 257. Valerian's first edict (*Acta Proconsulis*, and *Acta Praef. Augustalis*) had then been issued on the suggestion of Macrianus, a principal patron of the Egyptian "Magi," after a long administration of fairness to the Christians. The "eighth" persecution lasted the Apocalyptic 42 months until his death in 260. (Dion. Al. ap. Pearson, *Ann. Cyp.* p. 59; Euseb. vii. 10, v. ii. 70.) On the 2nd of August, 257, before the exile of Cyprian, Stephen died. His reputation as a martyr, which dates from the 6th century, is due to a transference to him of incidents from the death of Xystus, of which the singular history is traced by De Rossi, *Roma Sott. Cr.* vol. ii. p. 85, &c. He was succeeded on the 25th Aug. by Xystus,^k whom, not without a stroke at the dead lion, Pontius calls "a good pacific high-priest."

No "state enemy" could be treated with more consideration than Cyprian received. Aspasius Paternus, the proconsul, heard him *in secretario*, and without confiscation or personal restraint simply required his retirement to Curubis, a free town, near the sea (in deserto loco), lonely, but pleasant, and well supplied (Pontius, cf. Gibbon, vol. ii. 248, Smith's edition). It was at the same time that the withdrawal of Dionysius was ordered and performed (*Eus.* vii. 11). On the 14th September a dream, related at once to his friends, was found after his martyrdom to have foretold it for that day twelve months. Attended by his deacon, and allowed the presence of friends, and "offering" no doubt, as in his former banishment, "his daily sacrifice," he actively organised relief for more helpless sufferers and subsidised them largely himself.^l After eleven months spent thus, the new proconsul Galerius Maximus, already a dying man, recalled him to his home in Carthage (*horti*). When a rumour arrived that Marcianus "entrusted with the whole republic," by Valerian now on his last march to Persia, was determined to carry things to an extremity with Christians, Cyprian was probably the first African who procured a copy of the tremendous rescript, and of the letter which was about to

^h Morcelli, *Africa Christiana*, vol. i. p. 21, questions whether the separate Praeses Numidiae was continued long after Septimius, apparently not noticing (*Cyp. Ep.* 77, ii.) that these confessors were tried before the Praeses.

ⁱ Pearson supposes a marble quarry to be their workplace—*tenebrae* and *teter odor fumi* indicate mining and smelting rather.

^k See these calculations in Lipsius, *Chron. d. Röm. Bisch.* p. 213.

^l Gibbon strangely seems to have understood the words *documentum professionis dedit* (i.e. taught how to hold fast our profession) to mean "an account of his behaviour was published for the edification of the Christian world," (*Ep.* 77.)

be issued to the Praesides (*Ep.* 80). The proconsul in Cyprian's trial mentions both the extension of capital penalties to presbyters, and the new prohibition of the use of cemeteries for worship. His messenger returned with the full intelligence of sweeping measures before their publication, and with news that Xystus had been beheaded (*Pont. Vit. Cyp.* xii.; *Leon. Sacr. Muratori*, vol. i. p. 391), on Sunday, the 5th of August, in the cemetery of Praetextatus^m when actually "teaching" in his episcopal chair, and with him four of the great Eoman deacons."

It may be taken as historical fact that on Wednesday, the 29th of the previous June, Xystus had translated the supposed remains of St. Peter to the cemetery known as Cata Cumbas, on the Appian Way, and those of St. Paul to the Ostian Way. It is possible that this increasing reverence to two malefactors executed two centuries before both shewed the magistrates that the spirit of the sect was becoming more dangerous, and determined them to withdraw from Christians the protection which the burial laws hitherto accorded to rites celebrated in connexion with places of sepulture; and further, that this occasioned a withdrawal from the better known cemetery of Callistus to the more obscure one of Praetextatus (see De Rossi, *Rom. Sott.* vol. ii. p. 41; and Lips. ll. cc.), and the death of Xystus in that place. The news of it had scarcely reached Carthage when Galerius, now in residence at Utica, summoned Cyprian thither in honourable form (*Ep.* 81). Having previously refused offers of a retreat, urged on him even by heathens, he now said he was resolved not to die, or utter the dying prophecy with which he apparently expected to be inspired, away from his people. Accordingly, informed of the despatch before it came, he went into hiding in Carthage, there to await the proconsul's return. On his return, he re-appeared and re-occupied his own house.ⁿ The details of the trial are too numerous to repeat and too remarkable to abridge. They are found not only in the narrative of Pontius, but also in a "Passion of Cyprian," which we have in different forms, and which from its simplicity, provinciality, and minute topography, must be contemporary.^p

Cyprian was removed from his home on Aug.

^m After 11 months and 12 (6?) days' episcopate. Eusebius, by an error, in which he indulges in other instances, ascribes to him *years* for *months* both in chronicle and history; and Jerome repeats it from him. So in vii. 15 he seems to speak of him as alive after the edict of restoration. See Lipsius, l. c.

ⁿ *Sic lege* "cum eo diacones quattuor."

^p Nothing is more self-consistent than the language of *Ep.* 83, or more inconsistent with Gibbon's "recovering that fortitude which his character required."

^q They are entitled *Acta Proconsularia*, and so accepted by Pearson and Gibbon. Aug. *Serm.* 309 seems to quote either this *Passio* or some earlier document which is now imbedded in it. *Ep.* 77 ll. refers to Cyprian's confession "Apud Acta proconsulis" just after it was made. Does *Acta* mean merely "Trial before?" (Compare Opat. B. iii. p. 68, apud acta locuti sunt.) If it means "official report," how could a Christian report be so styled, or how could a heathen one give the details with such advantage to the prisoners? Dionysius Alex. refers a carping adversary to the record of his own trial before Aemilian, then prefect of Egypt (*Euseb.* vol. i. p. 384, notes on ὑπεμνηματισθῆναι).

13; the magistrate's broken health prolonged the examination; but the prisoner's rank shielded him from suffering or indignity. Though the language of the judge was stern, the Christians confessed the reluctance with which he gave sentence. In them sense of triumph in the possession of such a martyr is dwelt on with almost as much force as the sense of loss. With a strange mingled feeling, characteristic of the vividness with which in intense moments circumstances are apprehended which would at other times be trivial, they marked how little incidents combined to do him honour. The seat he rested on for the last time happened to be covered with a white cloth, the episcopal emblem. The trees were climbed, as he passed, by many a Zacchaeus. The eve and vigil of his martyrdom were kept by all his flock, watching through the night in the streets before his house, when as yet the only vigil of the Christian year was that which preceded the day of Christ's own Passion. The idea of this parallel took such hold that Augustine carries it to a painful pitch (*Serm.* 309). The two officers between whom Cyprian rode are compared to the two malefactors, between whom our Lord went to His Passion. Pontius compares the words of the sentence to the prophecy of Caiaphas. Cyprian received no dying prophecy, nor uttered any, though his time was ample. His words were very few, and no exhortation could have been so eloquent as the "Thanks be to God" with which he answered the judgment: "Our pleasure is that Thascius Cyprianus be executed by the sword."

Personal, Theological and Political Effectiveness.

—To sum the effect of Cyprian's thirteen years' episcopate in briefest terms. Over and above, 1. The social impressiveness for the time of a convert with such culture and such mental habits, and of that perfect ἐπιεικεία and πρᾶξις to which Augustine constantly reverts with delight, comes 2. His *Philosophy*. It is usual to expand the fact that he was no philosopher. Nevertheless his writings on Resentment, Patience, Probation, Envy, Self-devotion are most able essays towards establishing a new Christian basis of Morals, and have a permanent place in the series. 2. *Evidences*. As against both contemporary Judaism and contemporary Paganism his collections have a distinct worth. 3. *Interpretation*. He has a free ideal scheme before him (*Ep.* 64), but in detail falls from it, and makes mere riddles of texts. 4. *Organisation*. This is the real epigraph of his career. The magnitude of the effect he produced is incomparably greater than that of any other person, not excepting Hildebrand. (a) The *Church Council*, a local and doubtful institution before, became through his management the necessary institute and the imperial power of the church, and, with its system of representation by a Life-Aristocracy popularly elected, and its free discussionary scheme, exercised an important function in the regeneration of liberty. (b) *Episcopacy* grew silently into an institution of the Roman Empire, strong with the lasting virtues of Roman institutions, and only biding its time for recognition.

5. The *individual Independence*, as he sketches it, of elected bishops preserved, while it remained, a grand democratic strength to what after a time sank to an oligarchic, and under the papacy to an administrative magistracy. This must again

be the key of church government in states which have not that intimate union with the church which the ideal of a Christian nation requires. Since there has not been proper occasion before, we here give references on the subject of this *Independence*, which to the policy of Cyprian's time was so essential. (*Ep.* 55, xvii.; *actum suum*, &c., 72, iv.; *quando habet*, &c., 73, xxxvi.; *nemini præscribentes*, &c., 57, vi.; *si de collegis*, &c., 69, xvii.; *statuat. Sentt. Epp.* Praef. 6.) As to the "resistance to Roman claims" there exists what may be so called; only with this qualification, that Cyprian is totally unconscious of any claims made by the see, and resists Stephen purely as an arrogant individual.

Cultus.—There were two famous basilicas erected, one on the place of his martyrdom (*in agro sexti*), where was the *Mensa Cypriani*, from which Augustine often preached; the other on the shore (*Aug. Conf. v.*; *ad Mappalia*, *Aug.* vol. vii. App. p. 37; *ad Piscinas*, *Victor Vitens. i. v. iv.*). In this Monica spent the night of her son's departure for Italy, praying and weeping. In Sulpicius Severus (*Dial. i. 3*) his friend comes hither to pray on his way from Narbonne to Egypt. The adoration reached such a height that Gibbon is charmed to call him "almost a local deity." His feast and the gales which blew then were called Cypriana (*Procop. Vand. i. 20, 21*; *Greg. Naz. Or. 18, ap. Ducange, s.v.*). There are still on the "brink of the shore" the massive ruins of a church which must be Saint Cyprian's. Davis (*Carthage and her Remains*, p. 389) describes them fully, and it is not hard to see how he has misled himself into not recognising what they are.

The relics of Cyprian were given (strange conjunction) by Haroun al Raschid to Charlemagne. The sequel may be seen in Ruinart (*Acta Mm. Cypri.* § 17, and in the epistle of J. de la Haye, prefixed to Pamelius' Cyprian, fo. b. 3).

Texts.—Of the MSS. and their connexions a new and good account is given by Hartel in his preface, as also an account of the editions; which are (after him):—

Princeps, Rome, A.D. 1471, repeated same year and in 1483 at Venice. One printed at Memmingen, 1477 (treatises and epistles first separated); Deventer, 1477; Paris, 1500; Rembolt's, 1512. The first critically constructed edition, with additional works, and discriminating spurious from genuine, was that of Erasmus, Bale, 1520, often reprinted, but in 1530 and 1544 only with mentionable improvement: the latter often called from H. Grave, whose annotations are given.

P. Manuzio, Rome, 1563. This was undertaken by the great critic Latino Latini, who worked with the famous Verona MS., and greatly improved on Erasmus, but withdrew because a higher power tampered with his text again and again while in the press.

Guill. Morel, Paris, 1564. Still better corrected by old codices.

J. de Pamèle, Antwerp, 1568, attempted to place the epistles in order, but corrupted the text incredibly: relied mainly on the fullest MSS., especially the "codex cambronensis," which is "interpolatissimis interpolation," and had no critical judgment.

N. Rigault, 1648. A progressive textual critic with good manuscripts, and a good commentator.

J. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, 1682, in the main Rigault's text, but used additional English MSS.; unhappily neglects their "evident mistakes." The edition is preceded by Pearson's *Annales Cyprianici*, a work of wonderful sagacity and patience, determining the order of many epistles and works, and correcting endless previous mistakes, though leaving some corrections still for Lipsius.

Etienne Baluze spent fifteen years on an edition of Cyprian, collected above thirty MSS., and died at the age of eighty-eight, having just printed the genuine works. The edition was completed for the Benedictines by Dom Prudent Maran and brought out at the royal press in 1726, with certain alterations of both text and notes to satisfy the Roman curia. The critical faculty of Baluze was inferior to his mighty erudition.

D. J. H. Goldhorn, Leipsic, 1838. A useful text-book, well emended.

J. Hartel, 3 vols. 8vo., 1868-71, in the Vienna Corpus Scriptt. Eccl. Lat. All the works attributed to Cyprian, with the *Ad Novatianum, Auctor de Rebaptismate, Pontii Vita*, &c., and Indices. A new recension, for which above forty MSS. have been studied, classified, valued, and reduced to a most clear apparatus criticus, with keen attention to orthography, and almost always a judicious discrimination of the preferable readings; a valuable preface on the principles and history of the text-formation. [E. W. B.]

CYPRIANUS (2) A magician of Antioch, who was hired by a man named Idas, to make a Christian virgin Justina enamoured of him, and was converted himself and martyred with her at Damascus under Decius, according to the *Menology of Basil*, Oct. 2; at Nicomedia under Diocletian in September according to others. The whole story is very probably a figment. He is the pretended author of the confession of St. Cyprian, found in some MSS. He has been confounded with the great St. Cyprian, not only by Prudentius (*Peri Steph.* 13), but by Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 18). (See Tillem. iv. 47, 601; Ruinart, p. 194; Ceillier, ii. 258, 347; and acts given by Surius and Lipomannus, v. 394; Cologne, 1680.) [E. B. B.]

(3) Another Cyprian of Corinth is commemorated March 10, among the disciples of QUADRATUS, of whom a romantic story is told, which, as it stands, is absurd. His martyrdom, if there be any reality in it, must belong to the persecution of Diocletian. [E. B. B.]

(4) A learned presbyter, to whom St. Jerome writes from Bethlehem (Letter 140, ed. Vall.), expounding Psalm xc. [W. H. F.]

(5) A deacon, mentioned by St. Jerome (Letter 112, ed. Vall.) as the bearer of three letters from Augustine to him at Bethlehem. [W. H. F.]

(6) ST., bishop of Bordeaux, was the sixth bishop of that diocese, and took part in the council of Agde (A.D. 506), held by permission of Alaric, king of the Visigoths, as well as in the celebrated synod of Orleans under Clovis I. (A.D. 511). He appears to have succeeded St. Gallicinus after the interregnum caused by the Arian troubles. The time of his death is un-

certain. (Sammarth. *Gallia Christiana*, ii. 791; Lopes, *Egl. de Bordeaux*; Le Cointe, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* vol. i. pp. 240, 288.) [D. R. J.]

CYPRIANUS (7), ST., third bishop of Toulon, and second patron of that city, flourished in the time of Anastasius, Justinus, and Justinianus, emperors, and of Clovis, king of the Franks, and of Childebert his son. He belonged to the principal family in Montelieu, Marseilles, and was a disciple of St. Caesarius of Arles, whose life he wrote in the year 530. The memoir was continued by Messianus, presbyter, and Stephanus the deacon, who had also been pupils of Caesarius, and was afterwards published by Vincentius Barralis in his *Chronologia Lirinensis*. It is also to be found in Surius, 22nd August. According to these and Mabillon, Cyprian was bishop of Toulon, and lived in the year 541, during the fourth council of Arles, but they say that the time of his death is uncertain. He was ordained deacon at the age of thirty by Caesarius, who did not ordain deacons before that age. He was therefore probably born in the year 475 or 476. His life of Caesarius gives an account of the war which was waged between Alaric, king of the Goths, and Clovis, and in which Alaric was killed, A.D. 509. "To-day," he says, "the state of Arles is under the rule of Childebert, king of the Franks, son of Clovis."

Cyprian was present at the fourth council of Arles, A.D. 524. In 527 he subscribed to the council of Carpentras, and the synodical letter to Agroecius bishop of Antipolis. In A.D. 529 he came to the third synod of Vaison. In the same year he took part in the second synod of Orange, and was sent by Caesarius to the council of the bishops beyond the Isar, at Valentia, where he outshone all in scriptural and patristic knowledge. In 541, after the conquest of the Arian Goths, Cyprian went to the fourth council of Orleans, A.D. 541.

Cyprian was one day in the camp of king Alaric holding a public disputation, when two noblemen, officers of Saxony, named Mendrianus and Flavianus, entered, and were converted and baptized on the spot. They followed Cyprian to Toulon, and lived as hermits near the sea.

After the death of Caesarius, Cyprian remained in the bishopric in peace. But soon afterwards Alboin, king of the Goths, invaded Gaul with a large army, and devastated all the cities of Gallia Narbonensis with fire and sword. His soldiers butchered the people, and killed many bishops. They found Cyprian, together with his friends Mandrianus and Flavianus, in the church, cast them out, and killed them (Aug. 556). Such is the account of his death given by Guesnayus in *Annal. Massil.*, but the Bollandists say that he was not martyred, but died a happy death, A.D. 549.

His body was found in 701 in the episcopal house, on the 3rd of October, but according to another account in 1301.

Cyprianus and two other bishops wrote a life of Caesarius of Arles, an epitome of which is given in the 67th vol. of the *Patrol. Lat.* p. 997.

The authorities for the life of Cyprianus are: Bouche, *Chorograph. et Hist. Prov.* tom. i. p. 337; the Councils of the 6th century; *Gallia Christiana*, i. 743; and Le Cointe, *Annal. Ecclesiast.* i. 454, etc.

He is commemorated on the 3rd of October (*AA. SS. Boll.* Oct. ii. pp. 164-178; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. pp. 1001, 1253, *Caesarii Arelat. Vita*; *Gallia Christiana*, i. 741.) [D. R. J.]

CYPRIANUS (8), ST., abbat, Périgneux. He was also called Subrauns. He took the religious habit in a monastery of which the abbat's name was Savalon, towards the middle of the 6th century. Having been a model to the whole community, he retired to a solitude near the Dordogne, where he built a hermitage, which afterwards gave rise to the little town of St. Cyprien. He died towards the end of the 6th century, and Gregory of Tours recounts legends of several appropriate wonders, and calls him a man of magnificent piety. (*Migne, Encycl. Théol.* xl. 687; Greg. Turon. *de Gloria Confess.* cap. 100, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. 902.) He is commemorated on the 9th Dec. [D. R. J.]

(9) A monk of Monte Cassino in the time of the emperor Constantinus VI. and the empress Irene. He composed a Sapphic hymn on the miracles of St. Benedict, in 24 stanzas, to be sung on his festival (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxxix. p. 1050; cf. Petr. Diac. *Lib. de Viris Illustr.* cap. 7; Ceillier, xii. 105.) [W. M. S.]

(10) ST., martyr, lies buried in the church of St. Francis, Boulogne, and is commemorated on the 10th March. The Bollandists failed to obtain any information about him. (*AA. SS. Bolland.* Martius, tom. ii. ad diem x. p. 2.) [D. R. J.]

(11) ST., author of a poem on the resurrection, at the end of the works of Tertullian. (Moréri, *Grand Dict. Historique*, vol. iv. p. 342 (Paris, 1759); *Amplissima Collectio*, Martene and Durand, vol. ix. (Paris, 1733); Ceillier, Index.) [W. M. S.]

CYPRUS, one of the seventeen guards in the story of CHRYSE. [G. S.]

CYR (Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, June 16), infant martyr. [CYRICUS.] [C. H.]

CYRA. [CIAR.]

CYRENIUS, duke, and governor of Pelusium on the Nile in the 5th century. Isidore of Pelusium, presbyter and abbat, complains in a letter that Cyrenius had fixed a placard on the church of Pelusium taking away from the citizens the right of justification in case of accusations, and of refuge in the church. Pelusium is said to have suffered as much from its governor Cyrenius as from its bishop Eusebius. (Isid. *Epist.* i. 178; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxviii. 298; Ceillier, viii. 483.) [W. M. S.]

CYRIACUS (1), and **THEODULUS**, sons of HESPERUS and ZOE, slaves of a rich man named Catalus, of Italy, martyred in the time of Hadrian, commemorated May 2 (*Menol. Basil.*) [E. B. B.]

(2). [CHRYSE.] In the Latin versions the name is Quiriacus. [G. S.]

(3) A child, who with his mother JULITTA was martyred at Tarsus in the Diocletian persecution. (*Menol. Basil.* July 15. See also Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* 477.) [CYRICUS.]

In the *Decretal* of Gelasius *de libris*, the acts of Quiricus and Julitta are said to pass for a piece of heretical composition, and therefore not to be read in the Church of Rome (De Smedt,

Introductio Generalis in Hist. Eccl. Critice Tractandam, p. 115).

[E. B. B.]

CYRIACUS (4), ST. His name occurs in the martyrologies, but little more can be ascertained. He is said to have been a deacon at Rome, and there to have suffered martyrdom very early in the 4th century. The Bollandists quote Anastasius, the Librarian of the Vatican in the 9th century, as speaking in his *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum* of a church in Rome, dedicated by Pope Honorius I., in the 7th century, in memory of St. Cyriacus (*AA. SS.* Aug. 8); and the translation of his bones by Pope Marcellus, A.D. 308, from the Via Salaria in Rome, to a spot near the seventh milestone on the Via Ostiensis, is commemorated on Aug. 8th. They also relate from an anonymous MS. ("Palatinus s. Vaticanus") of uncertain date, how in the 10th century, that most prolific period of monkish marvels, a body was found on this spot with an inscription recording his name, was conveyed back to Rome in the 10th century by the pope Agapetus II. ("junior"), and there deposited with much pomp in the Via Lata, in the church "Sⁱ Stephani," henceforward called "Sⁱ Cyriaci," but, according to the writer in Moroni (*Dizion. Eccles.* s. v.) "S^{ae} Mariae di Via Lata." According to this story the emperor Otho (Otto), who was then in Rome, having gained the pope's consent or connivance, carried off by force one of the saint's arms, to the great dismay and grief of the abbees and her nuns to whom the church belonged, and presented it to the monastery of Bamberg, where the precious relic was welcomed with quite an ovation; the Roman abbees being consoled in some degree for its loss by the promise of the emperor to send his ambassador to the emperor Basilus, at Constantinople, to obtain certain relics of St. Nicolaus Myrensis for her nunnery (*AA. SS.* v. s.). The Bamberg *Annales* are silent, we are told (*ib.*), about this relic: but the story is at any rate characteristic of the passion for relic-worship in the age to which it belongs.

About Cyriacus himself there is yet greater uncertainty. By one account he suffered at Rome, by another at Augsburg ("Augusta Vinelicorum"), under Maximinus, Maximianus, or, as Baronius suggests, Maxentius; he was of a noble Tuscan family ("in Tuscìa") according to one version, according to another a slave in Rome (*ib.*). Baronius allows that the "Acta Marcelli," with their circumstantial and very rhetorical narrative of the saint's fortunes and miracles, are not to be depended upon ("nonnullis corrigenda." *Annal. Eccles.* iii. A.D. 309). Tillemont rejects the authority of the Acta Marcelli yet more unequivocally; and avoids pledging himself for the truth of the story of St. Cyriacus ("on prétend," &c., *Hist. Eccles.* v. § xlviii.). According to him, the name of Cyriacus was inserted, with the names of his fellow-martyrs Largus and Smaragdus, "dans le calendrier du Bucherius"; March 16 being the festival of his martyrdom, Aug. 8, of the removal of his bones; he adds, that in one calendar his name occurs on July 15, probably in regard to a church dedicated in his name on that day (*ib.*).

Tillemont, however, in another passage, affirms confidently that the Cyriacus, whose remains were

preserved in the Via Lata, was one of the martyrs in Rome (*Hist. Eccles.* vii. p. 640). He adds that some confusion has arisen, from the legend of a certain Jew, named Judas, who after being instrumental in finding the Cross in Jerusalem for the empress Helena, became a convert to Christianity, was baptized under the name of Cyriacus, subsequently was made bishop of Jerusalem, and eventually suffered martyrdom there in the reign of Julian. This legend, Tillemont says, was soon repudiated by the Greek historians, and, later, by the Latins (*ib.*).

In the 5th century a church and monastery were founded at Constantinople, outside the "Golden Gate," in memory of a St. Cyriacus by the Grand Chamberlain of the emperor Leo (Tillem. *H. E.* v. v. s.), and early in the next century mention is made of abbats of St. Cyriacus in the records of Constantinopolitan councils (*ib.*); but Tillemont thinks that this is probably another Cyriacus, the name being common among the saints of the Greek Church, and one of them in particular, of Nicomedia, whose festival occurs on April 7, being of considerable reputation (*ib.*). Cologne (Colon. Agripp.) claims to have the head of the Latin St. Cyriacus (*AA. SS.* v. s.); at Worms, in the collegiate church of "St. Cyriacus zu Neuhausen," which dates its foundation in the 9th century, other of his reliques are said to be preserved (Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* I. iii. p. 638).

See Le Nain de Tillemont (L. S.), *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, &c. Paris, 1701-12. 4to. (tom. v. vii.) *Acta Sanctorum* Bollandi, &c. Antverpiae, 1735. (Aug. 8.) Rettberg (F. W.), *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, Göttingen, 1846, 8vo. (Bd. i.). Baronius (Caesar), *Annales Ecclesiastici*, Barri-Ducis, 1864, &c., 4to. (tom. iii.) [I. G. S.]

CYRIACUS (5), a disciple of MARCELLUS of Ancyra (Epiphan. *Haer.* 72, pp. 842, 844).

[G. S.]

(6) Commemorated in the *Menology of Basil* as a man of Jerusalem, who discovered the true cross, and shewed it to Helena, and was thereby converted, and became patriarch of Jerusalem; and was martyred along with his mother by Julian the Apostate, his right hand being first cut off because his writings had made so many converts. He is unknown to history. [E. B. B.]

(7) Bishop of Adana in Cilicia. He was present at the council of Constantinople in 381, and by the permission of Diodorus of Tarsus, his metropolitan, remained behind on its separation to instruct Nectarius, on his unexpected elevation from the rank of a layman to the archiepiscopal see of Constantinople, in the duties of his office. (Soz. vii. 10.) Cyriacus was one of the three bishops commissioned by the council to convey their synodical letter to Damasus and the other bishops of the West. (Theod. *H. E.* v. 9.) [E. V.]

(8) Bishop of Synnada in Phrygia, friend and fellow-sufferer of Chrysostom, who together with Eulysius, bishop of Apamea, embarked with him when expelled from Constantinople, June, 404, and accompanied him on the first stages of his journey. The whole party was arrested at Nicaea on suspicion of complicity in the conflagration at Constantinople, and thrown

into chains. After a few days, Cyriacus and Eulysius were separated from Chrysostom and brought back and imprisoned at Chalcedon (Pallad. p. 38; Soz. viii. 22). While they were in prison Chrysostom wrote them a consolatory and encouraging letter (Chrysost. *Epist.* 147). Being acquitted of the charge Cyriacus was sent back to Constantinople (Pallad. *u. s.*), but was driven from the city by the law enforcing communion with Arsacius, Theophilus, and Porphyry. He fled to Rome, where he arrived towards the beginning of 405. He laid the statement of his own and Chrysostom's troubles before Innocent, his oral account being confirmed by the letters brought a few days afterwards by Eulysius (Pallad. p. 11). He accompanied the unfortunate western deputation to Constantinople in 406, and shared in the ill-treatment to which they were subjected (Chrys. *Epist.* 156, Pallad. p. 13). He and his eastern colleagues were seized and put on board a vessel, and it was reported that they had been drowned. But they were purposely reserved by their enemies for insult and ill-usage. They were conveyed to places of exile in the most remote and desolate parts of the empire. Cyriacus was imprisoned in the Persian fortress of Palmyra, eighty miles beyond Emesa.* (Pallad. p. 77.) Among the letters of Chrysostom there is a long consolatory epistle addressed to Cyriacus from Cucusus in 404 (Chrys. *Epist.* 125), the genuineness of which has been called in question by Hales (ed. *Savil.* p. 856), but satisfactorily established by Montfaucon in a *monitio* prefixed to the epistle.

[E. V.]

CYRIACUS (9), presbyter of Antioch, addressed along with Castus and Valerius and Diophantes by Chrysostom (*Ep.* 22, 62, 66, 107, 130, 222), and alone by his exiled fellow-presbyter Constantius in a letter mis-ascribed to Chrysostom (*Ep.* 241).

[E. B. B.]

(10) A deacon, who together with Paul accompanied the deputation of bishops who conveyed to Rome Chrysostom's letter to Innocent, in 404 (Pallad. p. 11). He was unable to join his namesake, bishop Cyriacus and his companions in Rome in 405, his health not permitting him to take a long voyage (*Ep.* 148).

[E. V.]

(11) A bishop, apparently resident at Constantinople, a friend and correspondent of Chrysostom. From a letter to Olympias, written at Caesarea on his way to Cucusus in 404, it is evident that Cyriacus had sufficient influence at court to intercede in Chrysostom's behalf and to render it probable that he could procure a change in his place of exile (*Ep. ad Olymp.* 12). There are two letters of Chrysostom to Cyriacus, one indignantly reproaching him for not having written in reply to his many letters (*Ep.* 202); the other commending to his good offices the son of Sopater, the prefect of Armenia, who was residing at Constantinople for the

* Le Quien and others suppose that Cyriacus who was banished to Palmyra was a different person from the bishop of Synnada, and give him Emesa as his see. The mistake has been caused by an error of the scribe who wrote (Pallad. p. 77) Κυριακὸν τὸν Ἐμέσης ἐνδοτέρῳ ὁδοῖκοντα σημειῶν εἰς Παλμύραν, instead of Κυρ. Ἐμέσης ἐνδοτέρῳ κ. τ. λ. "80 miles further up the country than Emesa" (see Tillemont, xi. 608, note 88).

purposes of study (*Ep.* 64). Chrysostom recommended Constantius to apply to Cyriacus for aid in carrying his plans into effect (*Ep.* 221).

[E. V.]

CYRIACUS (12), Quiragos or Shahag, bishop of Daik in Persarmenia, in the time of Chosroes III., A.D. 390–411 (Faustus Byzantinus, vi. 11 in Langlois, *Coll. Hist. Arm.* i. 309).

[E. B. B.]

(13) Sub-deacon of the church of Macedonia, A.D. 414. Pope Innocent I., writing to the bishops of Macedonia, complains that they have taken no notice of the good testimony which the Roman church had borne to Cyriacus and Dizonian; begging them to receive them with sincere good-will, and to put a stop to the quarrels in which their enemies involved them. (*Ep. Innocent.* i. num. 17; *Patrol. Lat.* xx. 537; Ceillier, vii. 516.)

[W. M. S.]

(14) Bishop in Thessaly in the time of pope Boniface I. In a letter to Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, Boniface tells him that he has separated from his communion Cyriacus among other Thessalian bishops, unless they obtained pardon through Rufus. They had obtained a law from the emperor Theodosius II., which placed them beyond the special jurisdiction of Rome and Thessalonica. (*Letters of Boniface I.* num. 13, *Patrol. Lat.* xx. p. 776; Ceillier, viii. 10.)

[W. M. S.]

(15) Bishop of Lodi (A.D. 451–452). Bearer of the synodal letter of the Council of Milan in A.D. 451 to pope Leo the Great. (Leo Mag. *Ep.* 97, *Patrol. Lat.* liv. § 1081, 1083; Ceillier, x. 681.)

[W. M. S.]

(16) One of the two deacons appointed to summon the bishops to the sessions of the Council of Chalcedon. (Tom. iv. *Concil.* p. 381; Ceillier, x. 684.)

[W. M. S.]

(17) Bishop of Tyana. He supported the demand of Julian and Severus for the condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, and the Tome of Leo, but in 518 turned completely round and signed the "relatio" to John the patriarch of Constantinople, drawn up at the synod which met in that city, which asked for the restoration of the names of Leo of Rome, and Euphemius and Macedonius of Constantinople to the diptychs, and the condemnation of Severus and the other impugnors of the decrees of Chalcedon. In the Latin acts he appears as "Dominicus" (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1586, v. 167; Le Quien, i. 400.)

[E. V.]

(18) Abbot of St. Andrew at Rome, employed by Gregory the Great about A.D. 593 in the conversion of the Barbaricini in Sardinia. Zabarda, duke of Sardinia, helped the work by offering them peace if they would become Christians. Hospiton, their chief, was the first who submitted. The Sardinian bishops were themselves not sufficiently zealous to undertake the duty. (Greg. Mag. lib. iv., *Epist.* 23, 24, 25, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. p. 692; Ceillier, xi. 436, 497.)

[W. M. S.]

(19) 30th Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 595, or 606 (*Art de Vér. les Dates*). He was previously presbyter and steward, *οἰκονόμος*, of the great church at Constantinople (*Chronicon Paschale*, p. 378). Gregory the Great received the legates bearing the synodal letters which announced his consecration, partly from a desire not to disturb the peace of the church, and partly from the personal respect which he enter-

tained for Cyriac, but in his reply he warned him against the sin of causing divisions in the church, clearly alluding to the use of the term oecumenical bishop (Gregorii *Epistol.* lib. vii. 4, *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 853). But the personal feelings of Gregory towards Cyriac appear to have been most friendly. There is a letter extant written in most affectionate terms, in which he recommends to his protection John, a presbyter of Chalcedon and Athanasius of Lycania, into whose faith he had examined, not necessarily in a judicial or official capacity, and found them correct and orthodox in their confessions (*ibid.* Epist. 4). In two letters also to the emperor Maurice he speaks as rejoicing in the appointment which had been made (*ibid.* Epist. 6, 7). In the latter of these, however, he mentions that at the ordination of Cyriac a verse had been chanted from the 117th Psalm, "This is the day which the Lord hath made," Gregory, although expressing the utmost sympathy with the fervour of their rejoicing, greatly blames this use of the text, as being too sacred to be applied to any man.

The legates sent by Cyriac to Rome with his synodal letters had declared that they held the opinion that at the descent of our Lord into Hades all spirits who would believe in Him as their Lord were at once released from prison. Gregory wrote to Constantinople to rebuke them for so doing, though in gentle terms, reminding them that such opinions had been held to be heretical by Philaster and St. Augustine (*ibid.* Ep. 15). Cyriac, however, does not appear to have been involved with his legates in this controversy. It appears that Cyriac did not attend to the entreaties of Gregory that he would abstain from using the title of Oecumenical Bishop, for Gregory wrote afterwards both to him and to the emperor Maurice, declaring that he could not allow his legates to remain in communion with Cyriac as long as he retained the title. In the latter of these letters he compares the assumption of the title to the sin of Antichrist, since they both exhibit a spirit of lawless pride. "Quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum praeurrit, quia superbiendo se ceteris praeponit" (*ibid.* Epist. 28, 30). In a letter to Anastasius of Antioch, who had written to him to remonstrate against disturbing the peace of the church, Gregory defends his conduct on the ground of the injury which Cyriac had done to all other patriarchs by the assumption of the title, and reminds Anastasius that not only heretics but heresiarchs had before this been patriarchs of Constantinople. He also deprecates the use of the term on more general grounds—"si unus episcopus vocatur universalis universa ecclesia corrui, si unus universus, cadit" (*ibid.* Epist. 24). In spite of all this Cyriac was firm in his retention of the title, and appears to have summoned, or to have meditated summoning, a council to authorise its use. For in A.D. 599 Gregory wrote to Eusebius of Thessalonica and some other bishops, stating that he had heard they were about to be summoned to a council at Constantinople, and most urgently entreating them to yield neither to force nor to persuasion, but to be steadfast in their refusal to recognise the offensive title (*ibid.* lib. ix. 68 in *Patrol. Lat.*). Cyriac appears to have shared in that unpopu-

larity of the emperor Maurice which caused his deposition and his death (Theophan. *Chron.* p. 242, A.M. 6094; Niceph. Callis. *H. E.* xviii. 40; Theophylact. *Hist.* viii. 9). He still, however, had influence enough to exact from Phocas at his coronation a confession of the orthodox faith and a pledge that he would in no way disturb the church (Theoph. *Chron.* p. 243, A.M. 6094). He also nobly resisted the attempt of Phocas to drag the empress Constantia and her daughters from their sanctuary in a church of Constantinople (*ibid.*, p. 246, A.M. 6098). Perhaps some resentment at this opposition to his will may have induced Phocas to accede more readily to the claims of Boniface III. that Rome should be considered to be the head of all the church, in exclusion of the claims of Constantinople to the oecumenical bishopric (*Vita Bonifacii III.* apud Labbe, *Acta Concil.* t. v. 1615). Cyriac died A.D. 606, and was interred in the church of the Holy Apostles (*Chronicon Paschale*, p. 381).

Cyriac appears to have been a man of remarkable piety and earnestness, and able to conciliate the esteem of all parties. It is recorded of him that he built a church dedicated to the Θεοτόκος in a street of Constantinople called Diaconissa (Theoph. *Chron.* 233, A.M. 6090; Niceph. Callis. *H. E.*, xviii. 42).

[P. O. and C. H.]

CYRICIUS, or *Quiricius* (Cave erroneously calls him Syricius) bishop of Barcino (Barcelona) in Spain, c. 662. He was the author of two letters to Ildefonsus of Toledo, first published, together with Ildefonsus's replies, by D'Achery (*Spicileg.* i. 308-311) and also by Migne (*Patrolog.* xcvi. 1 sq.). In the former of these letters he thanks Ildefonsus in language almost blasphemous in the extravagance of its praise, for having sent him his work on the Virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which had greatly comforted him on his return to his cell from a journey, so thoroughly fatigued that he was unable even to attend the divine offices. In the second he entreats Ildefonsus to devote his time to the elucidation of the obscurities of Holy Scripture. Taio of Saragossa dedicated his five books of *Sententiae* to him. Taio's letter and Cyricius's reply are given in Migne (*Patrolog.* lxxx. 729-731).

[E. V.]

CYRICUS, martyr, commemorated June 16. At Ecclesgreig, in the parish of St. Cyrus, Kincardineshire, and at St. Ceres, Fifeshire, we find traces of St. Cyricus, whose veneration appears to have been introduced into Scotland at an early period. There seems to be little reason for doubt that this is the martyr Cyriacus who, with his mother Julitta, suffered in the Diocletian persecution; but we have no account of how the dedication came to the east of Scotland. He is to be distinguished from the Pictish king Cyric, Grig, or Gregorius, who had his chief residence at Dunottar in that neighbourhood in the 9th century (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 319-20; Jervise, *Epitaphs*, 36, 52; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, p. cxxvii. sq.).

[J. G.]

Other spellings of this infant martyr are CYR, QUIRICUS, CERICUS, CURIG. The place of martyrdom was Tarsus in Cilicia, and further accounts may be seen in *Acta SS. June*, iii. 17; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, June 16; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307. Butler's date is A.D. 304.

[C. H.]

CYRILLA, nurse of St. Benedict, patriarch of the monks of the West. Shocked when a boy by the corruption of his fellow-students at Rome, Benedict fled from school, and was followed unsuccessfully by his nurse. (*Ann. Bened.* cap. 1; *Greg. Mag. Dialog., Patrol. Lat.* lxi. 127; *Ceillier*, xi. 156.) [W. M. S.]

CYRILLUS (1) bishop of Antioch, who succeeded Timaeus A.D. 283, and held the see for 20 years, to A.D. 304, when he was succeeded by Tyrrannus. Eusebius speaks of him as his contemporary. During his episcopate Dorotheus attained celebrity as an expounder of scripture (*Euseb. H. E.* lib. vii. c. 32; *Chronicon* ad ann. 4 Probi). According to an obscure tradition he suffered martyrdom at the commencement of Diocletian's persecution, and is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology July 22. [E. V.]

CYRILLUS (2), Κύριλλος, bishop of Jerusalem, was probably born in Jerusalem or its immediate neighbourhood, c. 315. We have no information as to the school in which he was brought up, but his writings prove that his education was liberal, and embraced a large variety of subjects. Toutée has laboriously collected evidences (c. ii.) of his acquaintance with physics, dialectics, physiology, mythology, &c. That he was a diligent student of Holy Scripture is certain, from the intimate knowledge, at least of the text, shewn in his Catecheses. But he was only acquainted with the LXX. His knowledge of Hebrew, we see from his attempts to interpret proper names (e.g. Samuel, *Introd. Lect.* 14; Bosor, xiii. 27; Judas, ib. 9, &c.), was only second-hand, and often incorrect. His commendation of the virtues of a monastic life (e.g. iv. 24, xii. 25-33, xv. 23) have been strained into a proof of his having at one time embraced it. Of this there is no evidence. Cyril had a sister who was the mother of Gelasius, bishop of Caesarea. He was ordained deacon probably by Macarius, c. 335 (*Soz. H. E.* iv. 20, where the text is doubtful), and priest by his successor Maximus, c. 345. Maximus, notwithstanding Cyril's youth, entrusted him with the responsible duty of instructing the catechumens, and preparing them for baptism. He also allowed him the exceptional privilege, sometimes granted by bishops to presbyters of eminent ability (e.g. to Chrysostom by Flavian of Antioch, and to Augustine by Valerius of Hippo), of preaching to the people in full church on the Lord's Day. In his office of catechist, c. 347, he delivered the catechetical lectures by which his name is chiefly known. (*Hieron. de Vir. Illust.* § 12.) These lectures were preached without book on the evenings of the weeks of Lent, in the basilica of the Holy Cross, or *Martyrium*, erected on Calvary by St. Helena. His references to the locality are numerous and interesting (e.g. iv. 10-14, x. 19, xiii. 4, 22, 39, xviii. 33). The five mystagogical lectures were addressed during Easter-week at noon to those who had been baptized on Easter-eve in the Anastasis, or church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The episcopate of Maximus terminated at the close of 350 or the beginning of 351, and Cyril was chosen to fill the episcopal chair of Jerusalem. A cloud of doubt and difficulty hangs over his elevation to the episcopate, which at this distance of time it is hopeless to dispel. The

almost contemporary authority of Jerome, supported by Rufinus, demands chief attention. He can hardly have been mistaken as to the main fact, though a theological prejudice and personal dislike may have warped his judgment and caused him to represent the case in the least favourable light. On some leading questions Cyril and Jerome were decidedly opposed to one another. In the great controversy of the day Cyril belonged to the Asiatic party, Jerome to that of Rome. In the Meletian schism also they took opposite sides; Cyril supporting Meletius, Jerome being a warm adherent of Paulinus. An atmosphere of fierce controversy is always most unfavourable to the habit of calm investigation and faithful statement. What wonder, therefore, if then as now the worst was only too readily believed, and too rashly published of a zealous adherent of the opposite party? Jerome asserts (*Chronicon ad ann.* 349) that on the death of Maximus the Arians invaded the church of Jerusalem and promised to appoint Cyril to the vacant throne if he would repudiate his ordination by Maximus; that Cyril consented to the humiliating terms, served some time in the church as a deacon, and was then rewarded with the episcopate by Acacius, the semi-Arian bishop of Caesarea, and according to the seventh Nicene canon, Metropolitan of Palestine; that he then dishonourably persecuted Heraclius, whom Maximus, on his death-bed, had nominated his successor, and degraded him to the presbyterate. This account is supported by Rufinus (*H. E.* i. 23, "Sacerdotio, confusa jam ordinatione, susceptor"), and it is hardly possible to reject it altogether. Socrates and Sozomen, though they say nothing of Cyril's repudiation of his orders, are almost equally unfavourable to his orthodoxy, identifying him with the semi-Arian party of Acacius and Patrophilus. They also introduce a new element of confusion by the statement that the see of Jerusalem was vacant not by death, but by Maximus's deposition and expulsion by the semi-Arians (*Socr.* ii. 38; *Soz.* iv. 20; *Theophan. Chronograph.* p. 34). This may safely be rejected. In refutation of Jerome's account, Cyril's advocates triumphantly point to the synodical letter to pope Damasus of the bishops assembled at Constantinople, the year after the second Oecumenical Synod, A.D. 382 (*Theodt. H. E.* v. 9), which speaks of Cyril in terms of high eulogy, as a champion of the orthodox faith against Arian heresy, τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον Κύριλλον πλείστα πρὸς τοὺς Ἀρειανούς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις ἀβλήσαντα, and affirms his canonical election to the bishopric of Jerusalem, κανονικῶς παρὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας χειροτονηθέντα πάλαι. (*Theodt. H. E.* v. 9.) But this does not touch the point at issue. Acacius was, as we have said, the metropolitan of Cyril's province. He and his fellow bishops were, notwithstanding their heretical bias, the legitimate authorities for conferring the episcopate. Cyril's election and consecration by them was therefore strictly canonical. Besides, the silence of the members of the synod as to facts occurring thirty years before does not disprove them. Whatever might have been Cyril's earlier heretical failings, he was on the orthodox side then. (*Cf. Socr.* v. 8, Κύριλλος τότε ἐκ μεταμελείας τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ προσκείμενος, and *Soz.* vii. 7.) His adhesion was valuable, and it would have been as impolitic as it

was needless to revive an ancient scandal now almost forgotten.

But while we are compelled to accept Jerome's account as containing a groundwork of truth, Cyril's own writings quite forbid us to follow his authority in classing him with the Arians, or charging him with heretical tenets. Circumstances might render his orthodoxy equivocal. His early patron, Maximus, was somewhat of a waverer. His friends and associates were semi-Arians, and he was chosen to the episcopate by them, with the hope of his supporting their cause. But no error of doctrine is to be discovered in his writings, though he seems to have been afraid of the test word "Homousion," which nowhere occurs in his catecheses. He is well characterised by the Duc de Broglie (*L'Église et l'Empire*, iii. 402) as "formant l'extrémité de l'aile droite du Semiarianisme touchant à l'orthodoxie, ou de l'aile gauche de l'orthodoxie touchant au Semiarianisme," and he may be regarded, certainly in the later part of his life, as one of those of whom Athanasius speaks (*de Synod.* 41), as "brothers who mean what we mean, and only differ about the word."

The first year of Cyril's episcopate was rendered memorable by the appearance, May 7, 351, of a remarkable parhelion, or other atmospheric phenomenon, over the city of Jerusalem, which to minds excited by the struggle between the Christian faith and a fast-declining heathenism, appeared a miraculous manifestation of the symbol of redemption intended to establish the faith and to confute gainsayers. The spectacle produced great excitement in the city. The churches were thronged with worshippers, and many Jews and Gentiles, it is said, were converted to the faith. So important did the phenomenon appear to Cyril that he wrote a letter to the emperor Constantine describing it. This has been preserved to us. The authenticity of this letter has been called in question by Rivet, but the internal evidence from the similarity of style is strong, and it is accepted by Blondel. The occurrence of the word "homousion" at the close of the letter is however suspicious, and leads us to question whether the prayer for the emperor in which it stands is not a later addition. (*Soz.* iv. 5; *Philostorg.* iii. 26; *Chron. Alex.* p. 678; *Theophan.* p. 35, a.)

If Acacius had reckoned on Cyril as a faithful adherent and ready instrument in carrying out his plans, the fallacy of his expectations was very soon shewn. Scarcely had Cyril established himself in his see when a distressing controversy, which became the source of much evil to the church, arose as to the claim to priority of their respective sees (*περί πρωτείας*, *Theodt.* ii. 25; *περί μητροπολιτικῶν δικαίων*, *Soz.* iv. 25). Cyril grounded his claim on the apostolical rank of his see, Acacius on the decision of the Council of Nice (*Can.* vii.), which placed the bishop of Aelia, i.e. Jerusalem, under the bishop of Caesarea as metropolitan. This contest for pre-eminence was speedily embittered by mutual accusations of heterodoxy (*ἐντεύθεν εἰς ἀπεχθελὴν κατέστησαν καὶ ἀλλήλους διέβαλον ὥς οὐχ ὁγίως περί Θεοῦ φρονοῖεν*, *Soz.* iv. 25). For two years Acacius continued vainly summoning Cyril to his tribunal, and at last cut the controversy short by deposing him from his see (*φθάνει καθελών*, *Soz.* u. s. 357 or 358) at a small packed synod of his

own adherents. The ostensible grounds were very trivial: contumacy in refusing to appear; and the charge—afterwards brought against Ambrose by the Arians—of having sold some of the church ornaments during a prevailing scarcity to supply the wants of the poor (*Socr.* ii. 40; *Soz.* iv. 25; *Theodt.* ii. 26; *Epiph.* *Haeres.* lxxiii. § 23-27). An additional charge was that of having held communion with Eustathius and Elpidius after they had been deposed by the Synod of Melitina, in Lesser Armenia. (*Soz.* u. s.; *Basil.* *Ep.* 253 (74).) Cyril was forced to yield. He left his see, not however without an appeal to a larger council, the justice of which was allowed by Constantius. This is noted by Socrates (ii. 40) as the first instance of an appeal against the decision of an ecclesiastical synod.

On leaving Jerusalem Cyril first retired to Antioch, which he found destitute of a bishop, Leontius having just died (*Theodt.* ii. 26). From thence he proceeded to Tarsus, where he was hospitably received by the bishop Silvanus, one of the best of the semi-Arians, who availed himself of his powers as a preacher. We find him also here in communion and friendship with other leading members of the same party, Eustathius of Sebaste, Basil of Ancyra, and George of Laodicea (*Soz.* iv. 25; *Philost.* iv. 12). But the enmity of Acacius pursued his rival "even unto strange cities." Silvanus was warned against holding communion with one who had been deposed for contumacy and other crimes. But Cyril had gained great popularity at Tarsus by his sermons, the people would not hear of his leaving them, and Silvanus declined to attend to the admonition (*Theodt.* u. s.).

Nearly two years after his deposition, September, 359, Cyril laid his appeal before the Council of Seleucia, at which he took his place among the semi-Arians. Acacius vehemently protested against his admission to the council. "If Cyril did not leave the synod, he must." Some of the bishops, in the cause of peace, begged Cyril to yield, at least temporarily, till his appeal had been heard. Cyril refused, and Acacius quitted the council, but soon returned, and took a leading part in the subsequent stormy debates. The semi-Arian party, however, were in the ascendant, and the tables were turned on Acacius, who was himself deposed, and Cyril restored (*Theodt.* ii. 26; *Socr.* ii. 40; *Soz.* iv. 22; *Philost.* iv. 12). Acacius was not the man to yield without an effort. He and his friends at once started for the capital, where they anticipated their rivals, and had little difficulty in persuading the weak Constantius to summon a fresh council to settle the disturbed affairs of the church. At this council fresh accusations were added to those formerly adduced. The charge of sacrilegiously disposing of the church goods was revived, and the emperor's indignation was excited by hearing that a baptismal robe of gold brocade, presented by his father Constantine to Macarius, which had been sold, had unfortunately found its way into the wardrobe of a theatre, and had been recognised on the stage. Acacius's arts prevailed, and Cyril was a second time banished (*Socr.* ii. 42; *Soz.* iv. 25; *Theodt.* ii. 27).

On the accession of Julian, 361, Cyril was reinstated in his see, together with all the exiled bishops (*Socr.* iv. 1; *Soz.* u. s.; *Theodt.* iii. 4.

Amm. Marcell. xxii. 5). On his way to Jerusalem he visited Meletius at Antioch, who commended to his protection the son of the high-priest of Daphne, who had become a convert to the faith, and feared the consequences of his father's wrath. He accepted the charge, and carried away the lad by night (Theodt. iii. 14). At Jerusalem he calmly watched the attempts of Julian to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, and is said to have foretold that it must fail (Socr. iii. 20; Rufinus, i. 37). This is not the place to enter on the vexed question of the supernatural portents by which this impious attempt to give the lie to the express words of Christ was frustrated. It will be enough to remind the reader that though they are not mentioned by Jerome, are doubted by the candid Lardner, and, of course, scoffed at by Gibbon, the facts are confirmed to us, not only by the evidence of early Christian writers, who might be only too ready to give credence to them (Socr. iii. 20; Soz. v. 22; Theodt. iii. 20; Chrysost. c. *Jud. et Gent.* i. 709, 789, 790; Greg. Naz. *Oratio adv. Julian.* ii. 9-12; Ambros. *Epist.* xl. ii. 946, &c.), but "strange as it may seem," to quote Gibbon's words, c. xxiii., "by the unexceptionable testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii. 1), the philosophic soldier," and a heathen. The statement that Julian had resolved to sacrifice Cyril, and other leading adherents of the faith to his hatred for Christianity, on his return from Persia, may probably be regarded as a calumny of the careless and untrustworthy Orosius (Oros. *Hist.* vii. 20).

During the reign of the orthodox Jovian Cyril's episcopate was undisturbed, and the accession of Valens and Valentinian found him in quiet possession of his see, 364. In 366 his old enemy Acacius died, and Cyril was not slow to assert the claim to priority for the see of Jerusalem, which had been the cause of such bitter strife between them. In apparent defiance of the canon of Nice he immediately claimed the nomination to the see of Caesarea, and appointed Philomenus. He was deposed by the Eutychian faction, and another Cyril substituted. He, in return, was deposed by Cyril, who consecrated his sister's son Gelasius in his room, A.D. 367 (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxiii. 37).

The year 367 saw Cyril for a third time deposed, and driven into exile by the edict of the Arian Valens, in company with all the prelates recalled by Julian (Socr. ii. 45; Soz. iv. 30; Epiph. *Haer.* lxvi. 20). His banishment lasted till the death of Valens and the accession of Theodosius, Jan. 19, 379, when he once more, and for the last time, resumed the occupation of his see, which he retained quietly for the eight remaining years of his life (Hier. *Vir. Ill.* c. 112; Socr. v. 3; Soz. vii. 2). On his return he found Jerusalem rent with schisms, infested with almost every form of heresy, and polluted by the most flagrant crimes and other viciousness of life. To combat these evils he appealed to the council held at Antioch, 379, which despatched Gregory Nyssen to his aid. But the disease was too deeply seated to admit of an easy or speedy remedy. Gregory departed hopeless of a cure, and in his "Warning against Pilgrimages," drew a dark picture of the depravation of morals in the Holy City (*De Evitibus Hieros.* p. 656).

In 381 Cyril was present at the second Oecu-

menical council held at Constantinople, when he took rank with the chief metropolitans, the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. On this occasion he declared his full adhesion to the Nicene faith, and his acceptance of the test word, Homousion (Socr. iv. 8; Soz. iv. 7). The following year the bishops who were present at the capital, in their letter declining Damasus's invitation to a council at Rome, vindicated the episcopal rank of Cyril, as canonically unquestionable, together with that of Nectarius and Flavian, and spoke of him in the terms of high respect already quoted (Theodt. v. 8).

Cyril's death is stated to have occurred March 18, 386 (Socr. v. 15; Soz. vii. 14; Bolland, March 18, p. 625 b). He was bishop of Jerusalem for thirty-five years, sixteen of which he passed in exile.

Cyril's works consist of eighteen "Catechetical lectures," addressed to catechumens (*κατηχήσεις φωτισζομένων*) and five "Mystagogical lectures," addressed to the newly baptized (*μυσταγωγικαὶ κατηχήσεις πρὸς τοὺς νεοφωτιστούς*). These, as we have seen, were composed in his youth (*ὡς ἐν τῇ νεότητι συνέταξεν*, Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* c. 112), about 347, while he was still a presbyter. The genuineness of these lectures, received by the whole Church as the work of Cyril, has been severely questioned by Rivet (*Crit. Sac. lib.* iii. c. 8; Oudin, *Scr. Eccl. Ant.* i. 461-464); Rössler (*Bibl. der Kirchengesch.* Th. 5, p. 441), and others. The internal grounds for suspicion are so feeble, that we may say with Mosheim, that they are such as could only have suggested themselves to minds anxious at all costs to get rid of evidence damaging to themselves. The external grounds are also worth little. They arise from the fact that in the Augsburg MS. the last five lectures bear the name of John, bishop of Jerusalem; and in a Roman MS., those of Cyril and John jointly; as well as that they, especially the five last, are not so often quoted or referred to by ancient writers as we might have expected. These arguments are well confuted by Touttée, and Schröckh (*Kirchengesch.* xii. 375-382). They are quite worthless against the *Consensus Ecclesiae*, confirmed by the large quotations made from them by Cyril's contemporary Rufinus, in his *Expositio Symboli*, and by the reference to the 4th lecture by Theodoret (*Dialog.* ii. 106). The homogeneous structure of the whole work, and the references contained in them to the preceding lectures equally forbid the severance of the five mystagogical lectures from the Catechetical. Vossius (*de Tribus Symbol.* Dissert. i. 35-36), though accepting their authenticity generally, holds that they have been very largely interpolated. But his arguments are feeble. Cyril's "Catechetical lectures" possess considerable interest, as being the earliest example extant of anything in the shape of a formal system of theology. Their value is also great from the testimony they bear to the canon of Scripture, the teaching of the church on the chief articles of the creed, and on the sacraments, and from the light they throw on the ritual of the church of the fourth century. The perfect agreement of his teaching, as Dr. Newman remarks (*Library of the Fathers*, vol. ii. part i. pp. ix.-x.), as regards the doctrine of the Trinity, with the divines of the Athanasian school, of whom he was suspicious, and suspected by them, is of great

weight in determining the true doctrine of the early church on that fundamental question, and believes Cyril from all suspicion of heterodoxy. But his Catecheses do not rank at all high as an argumentative or expository work, and few would care to read them for their own sake; nor has Cyril any claim to a place among the masters of Christian thought, whose writings form the permanent riches of the church.

Cyril's only other works preserved to us are a Homily on the sick man at the Pool of Bethesda, delivered while he was a presbyter, and his letter to Constantius on the luminous cross.

There are editions of his works in Greek, Paris, Morel, 1564; in Greek and Latin, Cologne, 1564; and in Latin, Paris, 1589; in Greek and Latin, by Prevot, Paris, 1604, 4to; and Petau, Paris 1622, fol. Prevot's edition was reprinted, together with the works of Synesius of Cyrene, Paris, 1631, fol. These editions were all surpassed by the English one of Thomas Milles, in Greek and Latin, Oxford, 1703, fol., and this was in its turn exceeded by the Benedictine edition of A. A. Touttée, Paris, 1720, fol.; and Venice, 1761, fol. The introduction contains very elaborate and exhaustive dissertations on the life, writings, and doctrines of Cyril. These are reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. xxxiii. There is an edition by Reischl, Munich, 1848, 8vo, 2 vols. We may also mention Van Vollenhoven, *Specimen Theolog. de Cyrilli Hieros. Catechesibus*, Amstel. 1837, 8vo.

The chief modern authorities for Cyril's life and doctrines are Touttée, *u. s.*; Tillemont, *Mémoires Ecclés.* vol. viii.; Cave, *Historia Literaria*, i. 211, 212; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xii. 343, sq.; Newman, preface to the Oxford translation, *Library of the Fathers*, ii. 1. [E.V.]

CYRILLUS (3) an intruding bishop of Jerusalem, who, according to Epiphanius (*adv. Haer.* lvi. p. 637), followed by Baronius and Touttée, was thrust into the see of his great namesake during his deposition, in succession to Herennius. The two Cyrils are identified by Tillemont (*Mem. Eccles.* tom. viii. p. 783) and the Bollandists. There are not sufficient data to determine the point. [E. V.]

(4) A presbyter or bishop of Palestine, to whom Jerome had delivered a written confession of his faith, to which he refers the presbyter Marcus in a querulous letter, written A.D. 377 or 378, remonstrating against being so continually applied to for proof of his orthodoxy. (Hieron. *Epist.* lxxvii. (xvii.) § 4.) He is identified by Blondel with Cyril of Jerusalem, but the relations between Cyril and Jerome were not such as to render it possible that he would lodge such a document with him. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* tom. xii. pp. 49, 624; Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* tom. ix. p. 450.) The *Explanatio fidei ad Cyrillum* sometimes attributed to Jerome, and found in some editions of his works, is supposititious. [E. V.]

(5) Martyr of Heliopolis in Syria, a deacon who suffered for the faith in the time of Julian, having previously displayed great zeal in the destruction of idols, in the reign of Constantine. (Theod. *H. E.* lib. iii. c. 7; Suidas, *sub voc.*) [E. V.]

CYRILLUS (6), a bishop in Armenia, reconciled by St. Basil to the church at Satala in 372. (Basil. *Epist.* xcix. § 4.) [E. V.]

(7) ST., archbishop of Alexandria. He was a native of Alexandria; he had been studious from early years, and had learned theology under monastic discipline in "the desert." During this period of his life he had been re-proved by Isidore of Pelusium, who was for years his venerated monitor, for occupying himself, even in "solitude," with worldly thoughts and interests (Isid. *Epist.* i. 25); and it is evident from his whole career that so strong a will and so vehement a nature could never be thoroughly satisfied with a life of contemplation. "After five years' abode in Mount Nitria," his uncle, the then archbishop Theophilus, summoned him to Alexandria, where he was ordained, and where he expounded and preached with great reputation (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 226).

Theophilus died on Oct. 15, A.D. 412. Cyril was put forward for the vacant chair; his rival, the archdeacon Timotheus, was strong in the support of the local government; but after a tumultuous contest, Cyril was enthroned, three days after his uncle's death. (See his first Paschal homily.)

His episcopate, thus begun in trouble and discord, seemed at first to forebode nothing better than a course of violent and untempered zeal, as if the fierce spirit of Theophilus were governing his conduct. He shut up the chamber of the Novatians, took away their "sacred treasure," and deprived their bishop Theopemptus, of all his property (Soc. vii. 7). This unsparing use of the great powers within his reach as archbishop was followed up by an attack upon the large body of Jewish residents. They had provoked him by an exhibition of implacable hostility. One Hierax, a schoolmaster, always foremost in applauding Cyril's sermons according to the fashion of the day, was denounced by the Jews as an encourager of sedition when he was present in the theatre at the promulgation of a prefectorial edict. Orestes, the prefect, who hated Cyril as a formidable rival potentate, took occasion to have Hierax publicly tortured in the theatre. Cyril thereupon tried the effect of menaces on the principal Jews of Alexandria. This only increased their bitterness; they began to organise plots against the Christians; and one night a cry rang through the streets, that "Alexander's church was on fire." The Christians rushed to save their sanctuary: the Jews, recognising each other, as had been pre-arranged, by rings made from the bark of palm branches, fell upon and slew the Christians whom they met. At day-break Cyril, at the head of an immense crowd, took forcible possession of the synagogues, expelled the Jews from the city, and abandoned their property to plunder. Orestes, naturally indignant, complained to the emperor, Theodosius II., then a boy of fourteen. Cyril, on his part, addressed to the court an account of the Jewish outrages, and, at the suggestion of the people, endeavoured to pacify the prefect. Orestes would not listen; Cyril extended to him, as a form of solemn appeal, the book of the Gospels; it might well have occurred to Orestes that the archbishop had forgotten some of its precepts when he in person led on a multitude of Christian zealots to revenge one violence by

another. And many of the Nitrian monks, whose fierce zeal had been intensified by the monastic *esprit de corps*, hastened to Alexandria, encountered the prefect in his chariot, and denounced him as a pagan idolater. "I am a Christian," he replied; "I was baptized by the bishop of Constantinople." Thereupon a monk named Ammonius flung a stone, which wounded Orestes in the head. The people seized the monk, who was tortured with a severity which proved fatal; and Cyril so utterly forgot himself as to give the dead man a grand church funeral, to speak of him as Thaumasius, and to panegyrise him as a martyr. The "sober minded" Christians would not recognise such a saint, and Cyril ere long allowed the whole affair to sink into oblivion. But a more famous tragedy followed. The gifted female philosopher, Hypatia, was the boast of Alexandrian paganism. Fired with the notion that she incensed Orestes against Cyril, a furious mob of so-called Christians, headed by a "reader" named Peter, one day dragged her from her carriage, bore her into the great Caesarean church, so often referred to in the Athanasian history, killed her with sharp shells, tore her body to pieces, and burned it at a place called Cinaron. This hideous crime, done in a sacred place and in a sacred season—it was the Lent of 415—brought, as Socrates expresses it (vii. 15) "no small reproach on Cyril and the church of the Alexandrians."

Here one question inevitably suggests itself. Was this foul murder indeed what Gibbon in one passage calls it, an "exploit of Cyril's? Did he take any part in it, or did he approve it *ex post facto*? It has been said that "Cyril was suspected, even by the orthodox, of complicity in the murder" (Stanley's *Lect. on East. Ch.* 293). Socrates, as sympathising with Novatians, has been considered to do Cyril less than justice: but in this case he does not intimate such a suspicion against the archbishop, any more than he does against the whole church of Alexandria. He says, and has a perfect right to say it, that this church and its chief pastor were to some extent disgraced by the occurrence of such a deed among its members. As for Damascius's assertion that Cyril really prompted the murder (Suidas, p. 1059), we cannot consider as evidence the statement of a pagan philosopher who lived about 130 years after the event, and was a thorough hater of Christianity. We are justified in regarding it, with Canon Robertson (*Hist. Ch.* i. 401) as "an unsupported calumny"; but with the same writer we will add that "the perpetrators were mostly officers of his church, and had unquestionably derived encouragement from his earlier proceedings; and his character deservedly suffered in consequence." His was the too common case of a man who stirs up a force of passions which frequently outrun his control. The turbulent and furious "parabolani" and others, who shed Hypatia's blood at the foot of the altar, were but "bettering the instruction" which had let them loose upon the synagogues. Their bishop had let his indignant zeal virtually persuade him that the wrath of man could work the righteousness of God; he was bent on making the kingdom of Christ assert itself, as a sovereign power, in the face of the world, and he would have argued that rough-handed means must not be

declined in the cause of the church, amid her strife with Jewish fanaticism and a pagan society foul and rotten to the core. His name has paid dearly for the error, and the great doctrinal cause which he upheld so stoutly in after years has suffered for the faults of his earlier life.

It was but natural that the government should in the next year restrain the clergy from political action, and, in particular, by restrictions on the number and conduct of the parabolani.

Cyril had inherited his uncle's animosity against John Chrysostom, who, in his opinion, had been canonically deposed; he rejected with bitterness the advice of Atticus of Constantinople to place "John's" name on his church diptychs (*Ep.* p. 204); and it was not until after the memory of that persecuted saint had been rehabilitated at Constantinople as well as at Antioch, that the archbishop of Alexandria, urged by Isidore of Pelusium not to perpetuate a private feud under the pretext of piety (*Isid.* i. 370), consented in 417 to follow these precedents, and so to resume for his church communion with Rome and the West in general, which had held aloof from all who did injustice to "John's" memory—a memory which Cyril never learned to love. (See Tillemont, xiv. 281.)

We may pass over several uneventful years, during which Cyril must be supposed to have occupied himself in ordinary church affairs and in theological literature. He wrote his yearly Paschal addresses, and composed his work on *Adoration in Spirit and in Truth*, his treatise on the Holy Trinity, his commentaries on the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the minor prophets, and the Gospel of St. John, and his refutation of Julian's treatise against Christianity.

We now come to the great controversy with which Cyril's name is pre-eminently associated. In the end of the year 428 he became aware of the excitement caused in Constantinople by the preaching of the archbishop, Nestorius. The line of thought which Nestorius had entered upon, under the influence, as it seems, of Theodore of Mopsuestia, led him to explain away the mystery of the Incarnation by reducing it to a mere association between the Eternal Word and a human Christ. The Alexandrian see had agents at Constantinople, who would be careful to keep Cyril well informed of all events of ecclesiastical interest: and the denial, by Nestorius and his supporters, of the strict personal oneness between "God the Word" and the Son of Mary—a denial of which the formula was, "Let no one call Mary Theotocos"—was an event which, as it ere long called forth an indignant protest against the archbishop's teaching on the part of a layman of Constantinople, Eusebius, afterwards bishop of Dorylaeum, was certain to excite the vigilant zeal of a prelate like Cyril, opposed, alike by temperament and antecedents, to all opinions which undermined the mysterious majesty of the Christian faith. Very early in January 429 Cyril entered on the subject in his Paschal letter or homily for that year, the seventeenth of the series; in which, while affirming with great vividness and emphasis the reality and permanence of Christ's manhood, he enforced the singleness of his Divine Personality, and even applied to His human mother, in two distinct passages, a phrase stronger than Theo-

τοκος,—μήτηρ Θεοῦ. Four months later, about the end of April, when the controversial sermons of Nestorius—exhibiting no little confusion of thought, but clearly indicating a disbelief in what is theologically termed the Personal Union—had come into the hands of Egyptian monks, Cyril wrote to all who within his jurisdiction were “practising the solitary life,” a long letter, upholding the term Theotocos in its true sense, as not meaning “mother of the Godhead,” but mother, as regarded the manhood, of Him who, being in the form of God, assumed the form of a servant, and, being the Lord of Glory, condescended to suffer the death of the cross. If it was true, Cyril argued, that Jesus Christ was God, it was by consequence not less true that His mother was Theotocos. If she was not rightly so called, her Son was a human individual external to the divine nature, and was not in a true sense Emmanuel. This letter, it may be added, cites at length the Nicene Creed in its original form, ignoring the alterations made by the Council of Constantinople, and insisting that the Creed identified Jesus Christ with the Divine Co-essential Son.

Nestorius was much displeased at the reception given to this letter by some official persons at Constantinople when it was transmitted thither from Egypt. He ordered one Photius to answer it, and encouraged some Alexandrians who were residing at the imperial city, and had been rebuked by Cyril for gross offences, to prefer complaints against him (Mansi, iv. 1003, 887). On the other hand, Cyril, having also been interrogated by Celestine of Rome as to the genuineness of Nestorius's sermons, wrote his first letter to Nestorius (Cyr. *Ep.* p. 19; Mansi, iv. 883), the point of which was that the prevailing excitement had been caused, not by the letter to the monks of Egypt, but by Nestorius's own refusal to allow to Christ's mother a title which was the symbol of her Son's real Divinity. Cyril also referred to a work “On the Holy and Co-essential Trinity,” which he himself had written in the lifetime of Nestorius's predecessor Atticus, and in which he had used language on the Incarnation which harmonised with his letter to the monks. Nestorius replied very briefly, and in a courteous tone; although he intimated dislike of what he deemed harsh in Cyril's letter (Cyr. *Ep.* p. 21; Mansi, iv. 885). He evidently did not wish to quarrel with the see of Alexandria, although he practised considerable severities on monks of his own city who withstood him to the face. Cyril, for his part, was not forward to press the controversy to extremes. During the latter part of 429, he was even blamed by some for inactivity. But he may have written at this period, as Garnier thinks, his “Scholia,” or “Notes,” on the Incarnation of the Only begotten (Mar. Merc. ii. 216), and in February 430 (probably after hearing how Nestorius had upheld a bishop named Dorotheus in his anathema against the word Theotocos), he wrote, in synod, a Second Epistle to Nestorius—the letter which became a symbolic treatise sanctioned by General Councils. (See it in Cyr. *Ep.* p. 22; Mansi, iv. 887; comp. Tillemont, xiv. 338.) Nothing can be more definite and luminous than his disclaimer of all Apollinarian notions, which had been imputed by Nestorius to those who confessed the “Theoto-

cos”; his explanation of the idea intended by that phrase; his peremptory exclusion of the theory of a mere association as distinct from a hypostatic or personal union, and his not less emphatic assertion of the distinctness of the natures thus brought together in the one Christ. “Not that the difference of the natures was annulled by the union, but rather that one Godhead and Manhood constituted the one Lord Jesus Christ, by their ineffable concurrence into unity. . . . Thus we confess one Christ and Lord.” The answer of Nestorius was characterised by *ignoratio elenchi*, and could not be regarded as a satisfactory statement of belief (Cyr. *Ep.* p. 25; Mansi, iv. 891). Cyril wrote another letter to some of his own clergy resident at Constantinople; the Nestorian argument from the impassibility of the Godhead, he put aside as not to the purpose; and he described Nestorianism as an attempt to constitute two Christs and two Sons (Cyr. *Ep.* p. 32; Mansi, iv. 1003). As a record of Cyril's personal feeling, this letter is in two points worthy of special notice; it recognises the proverbial eloquence of “John” Chrysostom, and it expresses the writer's desire for peace, if peace could be had without a sacrifice of truth. He disapproved of a draft of a petition to the emperor which these clerics had sent him; it was too vehement. In a similar strain he wrote to a common friend of Nestorius and himself, declaring, with an evident earnestness which may remind us of his great predecessor Athanasius, that he cared for nothing so much as the faith, and that his desire, as regards Nestorius, was that his brother bishop might be preserved from the charge of heresy (Cyr. *Ep.* p. 31; Mansi, iv. 899). A long letter “On the Right Faith,” which he wrote about the same time to the emperor Theodosius, contained an elaborate survey of former heresies, and of the error now spreading in the church. It is to this treatise (Cyr. tom. v. par. 2; Mansi, iv. 617) that reference might specially be made in considering the charge so often brought against men like Cyril, that their keen-eyed speculative orthodoxy stands coldly apart from all care for practical religion. Cyril, at any rate, felt the vital importance of his cherished doctrine in its bearings on the Christian life: he urged that if the Word were not personally incarnate, *i.e.* if the human Teacher and Sufferer were not really one with the eternal Son of God, the faith of Christian men would be made void, the work of their salvation would be annihilated, and the cross would lose its virtue. For the very principle of Christian redemption lay in this, that it was one and the same “Ego” who, possessing, by virtue of His incarnation, at once a divine and a human sphere of existence, could be at once the God of mankind and the Saviour who died for them. In chapter 21 he dwells, in pursuance of this idea, on the death of Christ as being a full satisfaction (δῶρον ἀληθῶς ἀντάξιον). This treatise contains an argument on which Cyril was never weary of insisting: it was particularly congenial to the depth and awe, the richness and the tenderness, of his thoughts on the great mystery of incorporation into Christ. From the admitted truth that the flesh of Christ was received in the Eucharist as life-giving, he argued that it must be, in a real sense, the flesh of God. In the sixth chapter of the treatise, he says that

Nestorians would not have erred by dwelling simply on the difference between the natures of "God" and "flesh": that difference was undeniable; but they went on to assert an individual and separate being for the man Jesus as apart from the Divine Word, and this was the very point of their heresy. In chapter 27 he rises to an almost Chrysostomic range of religious eloquence when he sets forth the superangelic greatness involved in the idea of "the Lord of Glory." Another treatise, in two books, was addressed to the princesses, Pulcheria, the gifted sister of the feeble emperor, Arcadia, and Marina (Cyr. tom. v. par. 2; Mansi, iv. 679, sq.). In the first book he argued at length from Scripture for the oneness and Divinity of Christ, for His position as the true object of faith, and for His office as life-giver and atoner: and among the texts which he urged were Heb. i. 3, 6, xiii. 8; Titus ii. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Eph. iii. 17; Gal. i. 1; Phil. ii. 6; Matt. xi. 28, xvi. 16, 20; John i. 14, xvii. 3; 1 John v. 5 (without the words about the "heavenly witnesses"). He laid great stress on the vastness of the claim advanced by and for Christ in Scripture, and on the unreasonableness of demanding so absolute an obedience towards one who was not personally Divine. He asked how the death of a mere man could be of such importance for the race? Many a saint had lived and died, but not one by dying had become the saviour of his fellows. He quoted nine passages from earlier writers in support of the term Theotocos, or of the doctrine which it guarded. In the second book he professed specially to explain texts relied on by Nestorians, including parts of Heb. ii. and Matt. xxvii. 46, Luke ii. 40, 52, John iv. 22, Mark xii. 32; as to which last text he seems to recognise, as he does elsewhere (though sometimes favouring a different view), a limitation of knowledge in Christ's manhood, analogous to His submission, in His human sphere, to pain and want, and consistent with a perpetual omniscience in His Divine consciousness (*Ad Regin.* ii. 17). In accordance with the emphatic assertion (ii. 7) of the value imparted to Christ's death by His Divinity, the work concludes with "for all our hope is in Christ, by whom and with whom," &c.

In these treatises, if some texts are strained beyond their natural meaning, there is yet a remarkable exhibition of acuteness and fertility of thought, pervaded and quickened by what Dörner calls Cyril's "warm interest" in Christianity as a religion. It was probably about April 430 that Cyril answered the letter of the Roman bishop, which he had received as far back as a year before (*Ep.* p. 26); he informed him that the main body of the faithful of Constantinople (acting on the principle fully recognised in the ancient church, that loyalty to the faith was a higher duty than ecclesiastical subordination) were holding off from the communion of Nestorius, but that they greatly needed support and countenance; and in very deferential terms he asked Celestine to say whether any fellowship could be maintained by orthodox bishops with one who in fact was disseminating heresy (Mansi, iv. 1011). With this letter he sent a series of passages illustrative of what Nestorius held and of what church-writers had taught, translated into Latin "as well as Alexandrians

could" perform such a task, and to be shewn by his messenger Posidonius to Celestine, if the latter had received anything from Nestorius. One other letter of Cyril's belongs to the summer of 430: he addressed himself to the aged Acacius bishop of Berrhoea, who communicated the letter to John the patriarch of Antioch, but in his answer informed Cyril that many who had come to Syria, fresh from the preaching of Nestorius, were disposed to think him not committed to heresy. It is observable that Cyril tells Acacius that some had been led on by Nestorianism into an express denial that Christ was God (see Mansi, iv. 1053).

And now we reach a landmark in the story. On August 11, Celestine, having held a synod which pronounced Nestorius to be heretical, gave Cyril a commission of a stringent character (see this letter in Mansi, iv. 1017). He was to "join the authority of the Roman see to his own," and, on the part of Celestine as well as for himself, to warn Nestorius that unless a written retraction were executed within ten days, giving assurance of his accepting the faith as to "Christ our God," which was held by the churches of Rome and Alexandria, he would be excluded from the communion of those churches, and "provision" would be made by them for the church of Constantinople, i.e. by the appointment of an orthodox bishop. Had Cyril been as violent and imperious as he is often said to have been, he would not have deferred by a single day the carrying out of these instructions. But he took time to assemble, at Alexandria, a "Council of all Egypt," and then, probably on Monday Nov. 3, wrote his Third Letter to Nestorius (*Ep.* p. 57; Mansi, iv. 1067; Routh, *Ser. Op.* ii. 17), in which the bishop of Constantinople was required to anathematise the errors which he had maintained, and a long dogmatic exposition of the true sense of the Nicene Creed was given, with a careful disclaimer of all confusion between Godhead and manhood. To the end of the letter were appended twelve "articles," or "chapters," couched in the form of anathematisms against the various points of the Nestorian theory: e.g. that Emmanuel is not really God, and Mary not Theotocos; that the Word was not personally joined to flesh; that there was a "connexion" of two persons; that Christ is a "God bearing man;" that He was a separate individual acted on by the Word, and called "God" along with Him; that His Flesh was not the Word's own; that the Word did not suffer death in the flesh. These propositions were not well calculated to reclaim Nestorius; nor were they, indeed, so worded throughout as to approve themselves to all who essentially agreed with Cyril as to the Personal Deity of Christ. On the contrary, the abruptness of their tone, and a certain one-sidedness which made some of them open, *primâ facie*, to serious criticism from persons who, without being Nestorians, felt that in the attack on Nestorianism the truth of Christ's real and permanent manhood might be in danger of losing its due prominence, were obstacles to their acceptance; and as we shall see, he was afterwards obliged to put forth explanations of their meaning. Cyril wrote two other letters to the clergy and laity, and to the monks of Constantinople, urging them to contend, or praising

them for having already contended, for that faith in Christ's true Godhead of which "Theotocos" was the recognised expression (Mansi, iv. 1094). Four bishops were sent from Alexandria, as bearers of the Synodal documents to Constantinople, and deliver the anathematisms to Nestorius in his palace, after the conclusion of the Eucharistic service, either on Sunday Nov. 30, or on Sunday Dec. 7. He met the denunciations of the Alexandrian Synod by enlisting several Eastern bishops in his cause, including John of Antioch, and Theodoret, who accused Cyril of Apollinarianism: by preaching in an orthodox strain to his own people, and by framing twelve anathematisms of his own, some of which betrayed confusion of thought, while some tended directly to confirm the imputations current against his teaching: for instance he would not allow Emmanuel to be called very God. Theodoret, whose views on the subject were not as yet clear or consistent, composed a reply to Cyril. Andrew of Samosata, in the name of the "Eastern" bishops properly so called, also entered the lists of controversy against the great theologian of Egypt, who answered both his new antagonists by composing an Apology for the twelve articles (Mansi, v. 19) and a Defence of them against Theodoret's objections. These treatises, the latter of which was addressed to a bishop named Eupotius (Mansi, v. 81), threw light on the state of mind to which Cyril's anathematisms had seemed so offensive. The Easterns, or Andrew speaking in their name, exhibit some remarkable misconceptions of Cyril's meaning, e.g. when they tax him with denying Christ's flesh to be of real human derivation; but they absolutely disclaim the view which would make Jesus merely a pre-eminent saint, and they speak of worship being due to the One Son. Theodoret uses a good deal of language which is *primâ facie* Nestorian; his objections are pervaded by an *ignoratio elenchi*, and his language is repeatedly illogical and inconsistent; but he and Cyril were essentially nearer to each other in belief than, at the time, they would have admitted (Hooker, v. 53. 4), for Theodoret virtually owns the personal oneness, and explains the phrase "God assumed man," by "He assumed manhood." Both writers speak severely of each other: Theodoret calls Cyril a wolf, and Cyril treats Theodoret as a calumniator. Cyril in his "Reply to the Easterns" and in his letter to Eupotius earnestly disclaims both forms of Apollinarianism—the notion of a mindless manhood in Christ, and the notion of a body formed out of Godhead. As to the latter, John i. 14, he says, excludes it. In the reply (on art. 4), he admits "the language appropriate to each nature." He points out the confusions of thought which had misled Theodoret as to "God" and "Godhead"; he insists that the eternal Son Himself, retaining His divine dignity and perfections, condescended to assume the limitations of manhood; and so (*ad Eupot.* 4, as in *ad Regin.* ii. 17, &c.) he explains Mark xii. 32, and so says, with a touch of devotional tenderness which amid the clash of polemics is particularly refreshing, "He wept as man, that He might stop thee from weeping. He is said to have been weak as to His manhood, that He might put an end to thy weakness" (*ad Eupot.* 10). He adhered with characteristic definiteness to the point really involved—the

question was, he felt, whether Jesus was a human individual (to be viewed ἰδιώως, as he repeatedly says) or whether He were the Divine Son Himself appearing in human form and occupying, without prejudice to His inalienable and pre-existent majesty, a human sphere of existence. In the former case, the Son of Mary must be regarded simply as a very highly-favoured saint; in the latter case, as a Divine Redeemer. In the former case, Christianity appeared, to Cyril's mind, to lose its distinctive power and preciousness; in the latter case it shone forth in its Divine reality, as a Gospel worthy of the name. To quote from the last section of the long letter to Eupotius: "Let us all acknowledge as Saviour the Word of God, who remained impassible in the nature of the Godhead, but suffered, as Peter said, in the flesh. For, by a true union, that body which tasted death was His very own. Else, how was "Christ from the Jews according to the flesh," and "God over all, and blessed for ever, amen?" and into whose death we have been baptized, and by confessing whose resurrection are we justified? The death of a mere man," &c. "or do we, as is indeed the case, proclaim the death of God who became man and suffered for us in flesh, and confessing His resurrection, put away the burden of sin?" To this same period may be assigned Cyril's five books "Against Nestorius," unless we place them in the preceding year. In these he comments on passages in Nestorius's sermons, and by all forms of argument and illustration sets forth the question really at stake—Had the Divine Son Himself become incarnate, or had He closely allied Himself to a man?

But we must now look back to that memorable November of 430. Before the Egyptian deputies could reach Constantinople, Theodosius issued letters to the metropolitans of his empire, summoning them to meet at Ephesus in the Pentecost of the following year, with such bishops as each might select, for the purpose of holding a General Council. This resolution, taken at the instance of Nestorius, had the effect of suspending all hostile action on the part of any individual bishop or provincial synod. Theodosius, who was prejudiced against Cyril, wrote sharply to him, censuring his "meddlesomeness" and "rashness," and complaining of his having written separately to the princesses. In compliance with the imperial order, Cyril arrived at Ephesus with fifty bishops, about June 2, 431. He had already written from Rhodes to his own clergy and laity (*Ep.* 81) as "present with them in spirit, though absent in body," entreating the aid of their prayers, and exhorting them during his absence to persevere in their religious duties. The details of the history of the Ephesine Council, or Third Oecumenical Synod, will be found elsewhere. [EPHESUS, Councils of, in *Dict. Chr. Ant.*] Here it is enough to specify the occasions on which Cyril came prominently forward. A fortnight elapsed before the council was opened: Cyril, like other prelates, employed himself in strengthening the cause which he had at heart by earnest addresses: but the "encomium" on the Virgin, included among his works as delivered at this time, is perhaps spurious. Another discourse, evidently genuine, speaks of Nestorius with more moderation. Cyril wrote another letter to the Alex-

andrian Church, in which he spoke of "the evil one, the restless beast" (meaning obviously Satan) as "plotting against the glory" of the Divine Saviour (*Ep.* 82). After long waiting for the arrival of John of Antioch and his attendant bishops, Cyril received a cordial letter from his brother patriarch, announcing that he had been travelling incessantly for a month, and that he hoped to "embrace Cyril" in five or six days more (*Ep.* p. 83). There also arrived two metropolitans who bore from him a message to the bishops, to the effect that he requested them to proceed with the business in case he should be delayed. The question at once arose—"Should the bishops wait any longer?" It would have been clearly better, even as a matter of policy, to wait a few days for John's arrival. The cause of orthodoxy could never be aided by its being associated with, to say the least, the appearance of unfairness or impatience. But Cyril and his suffragans were, it may be surmised, not at all desirous of John's presence, for they knew he would be hostile to the Cyrilline articles: they encouraged the idea that he was purposely loitering from a reluctance to join in measures against Nestorius (an idea which appears to have been unfounded, *Evagr.* i. 3) and they took advantage of the fact that other bishops were weary of waiting, the rather that illness, and even death, had appeared amid their body. So it was that the Council was opened on June 22; and John's message, which evidently referred to a possible delay beyond the six days specified in his letter, was unjustifiably quoted in defence of a refusal to wait for him during that period. In this matter, it is impossible to acquit Cyril of blame; and it is evident that the fault "brought its own punishment in the confusions that ensued" (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 259).

Cyril presided in the assembly: he did so, not in virtue of the commission from Celestine to act in his stead—which had been already acted upon in the Alexandrian Council of November—but as the prelate of highest dignity then present, and as holding the proxy and representing the mind of the Roman bishop, until the Roman legates should arrive. (See Tillemont, xiv. 393.) Cyril called on the Council to judge between himself and Nestorius: the main facts were stated by his secretary; when Nestorius refused to appear, Cyril's second letter to him was read, and at Cyril's request the bishops pronounced upon its orthodoxy: it was, they declared, in entire accordance with the faith. His third letter was received, not with any express approbation, but, as it appears, with a tacit assent, which might be held to extend to the "articles." (The Council professed, afterwards, that it had approved Cyril's *epistles*; Mansi, iv. 1237.) After all the evidence producible as to Nestorius's opinions, and as to the mind of orthodox fathers had been laid before the Council (and great stress was doubtless laid on Nestorius's recent avowal, "I never will admit that a child of two or three months old was God," Mansi, iv. 1181, 1239) the deposition and excommunication of Nestorius were resolved on by the assembled bishops: and Cyril signed the sentence before his brethren in these words: "I, Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, sign, giving my judgment together with the Council." He afterwards wrote in support of the act to two bishops and two priests, with

the much revered Dalmatius, an abbat of Constantinople, and to the Alexandrians and to the monks of Egypt (*Ep.* p. 84 sq.).

When the patriarch of Antioch, with a few bishops, arrived on June 26 or 27, vexation at the course taken by the majority led him and his friends into violent and reckless conduct: they held a "council" of their own, and "deposed" Cyril, and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, imputing to the former not only Apollinarianism, which, however unjustly, had been already imputed to him by favourers of Nestorius, but the heresy of the ultra-Arian rationalist Eunomius. On the other hand, the Council of Ephesus, now reinforced by the Roman legates, treated Cyril and Celestine as one in faith, and proceeded to summon John—Cyril being disposed, had not the bishop of Jerusalem prevented it, to move for a sentence of deposition on the patriarch of Antioch, after the first summons (see Mansi, iv. 1311). It was of course easy for Cyril to repudiate and anathematise the heresies which had been imputed to him; and in doing so he coupled with them the Pelagian errors, together with those of Nestorius. John of Antioch, having disowned the Council's summons, was excommunicated, together with his adherents. Late in July Count John, the imperial high treasurer, was sent by Theodosius to Ephesus, with a letter in which Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius were all three treated as deposed. Accordingly Cyril, like the two others, was put under arrest, and guards slept at the door of his chamber. Letters written by his opponents induced Isidore of Pelusium to write to him, exhorting him to avoid the bad precedents of his uncle's violent conduct, and not to give occasion for the rumour that he was swayed by personal animosity (*Ep.* i. 310). Cyril, for his part, spoke, in a letter to three of his suffragans then at Constantinople (*Ep.* p. 91), of infamous falsehoods as circulated against him, but as detected by Count John. He thanked God, he said, for having been counted worthy to suffer, for His Name's sake, not only bonds but other indignities. He received from a priest named Alypius a letter which in glowing terms described him as an imitator of the grand career of Athanasius. While the two rival assemblies of bishops, the council and the "conciliabulum," sent deputies to the court of Theodosius, Cyril employed himself in writing an "Explanation" of his "articles," and vindicating them against the charge of a confusion between the Godhead and the Manhood, or of any teaching inconsistent with the distinct existence of the latter, in the one Divine Person of the Incarnate Lord. Theodosius, in his final award, gave orders that Cyril and his friends should return home, but abstained from condemning the "Eastern" bishops, who on their side complained of his partiality to their opponents. On Oct. 30, Cyril returned to Alexandria: and shortly afterwards, Maximian, a pious and simple-hearted man, who by virtue of an imperial mandate had been consecrated to the see of Constantinople in the room of Nestorius, announced his accession to Cyril, who in his reply compared him to the faithful Eliakim, invested with the stewardship of Hezekiah's household on the deprivation of the unworthy Shebna. This letter contained a statement of orthodox doctrine, and a disclaimer of all ideas

of "confusion" or "alteration" in the Divine nature of the Word. (*Ep.* p. 94 sq.; Mansi, v. 257 sq.)

Cyril was indeed conscious of the importance of defending himself against the charges of his opponents; and he began a vindication of his conduct, to be laid before the emperor (Mansi, v. 225). Theodosius, hoping that John and Cyril might be reconciled, endeavoured to arrange a meeting between them at Nicomedia. Cyril was disposed by this time to shew considerable moderation, and resolved to insist on nothing but the condemnation of Nestorius and the recognition of Maximian. The meeting, it was found, could not take place: but a council at Antioch framed six articles, expressly rejecting those of Cyril, but accepting Athanasius's 'Letter to Epictetus' as an exposition of Nicene orthodoxy. The reply of Cyril shewed that he had mastered his natural tendencies to vehement and unyielding self-assertion. He wrote to Acacius of Berrhoea, the oldest bishop of Syria, who had forwarded to him the six articles by the hands of the "tribune and notary" Aristolaus. The letter (preserved, in a Latin version, in the "Synodicon," Mansi, v. 831) is worthy of attention: Cyril represented the impossibility of withdrawing what he had written against Nestorius: it would be easy to come to a good understanding about the "articles" of the Alexandrian synod, if only the Easterns would accept the deposition of Nestorius. "Those who anathematise them will see that the meaning of the articles is directed solely against his blasphemies." For himself Cyril disavowed and condemned once more the heresies imputed to him, and asserted the impassibility of the Divine nature in Christ, while insisting that He, the Only-begotten Son, Himself "suffered for us in the flesh," according to the words of St. Peter.

This letter (which is referred to by Cyril in subsequent letters, *Ep.* pp. 110, 152, 155) opened the way to a reconciliation between Cyril and John of Antioch. The latter, although in his recent council he had bound himself to demand a recantation of the Cyrilline articles, now declared that Cyril had fully cleared himself from all heretical opinions. After a conference with Acacius, John sent to Alexandria Paul, bishop of Emesa, a man of experience whom they both could trust, in order to confer with Cyril. (See Cyril's letters to Acacius and Donatus, *Ep.* pp. 111, 156.) When Paul reached Alexandria, Cyril was for a time laid up with illness (Mansi, v. 987): but when he was able to see Paul, he received him, as Paul himself said, kindly and pacifically, and as became a bishop (Mansi, v. 288). They began their conference: Paul presented to Cyril a confession of faith as exhibiting the mind of John of Antioch (*Ep.* p. 103); it had been originally written at Ephesus by Theodoret (Tillemont, xiv. 531). "We confess," so ran this formulæ, "our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, to be perfect God and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and a body, before the ages begotten of the Father according to Godhead, but in the last days Himself the self-same, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary according to Manhood; of one essence with the Father as to Godhead, of one essence with us as to Manhood. For there took place an union of two natures;

wherefore we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. According to this idea of an union without confusion, we confess the Holy Virgin to be Theotocos, because God the Word was incarnate and made Man, and from His very conception united to Himself the temple assumed from her." The formulæ, although it dwelt more than Cyril had been wont to do on the double aspect of the Incarnation, was accepted by Cyril as representing Paul's own faith, and he placed a corresponding statement in the hands of Paul. The latter asked whether he would stand by Athanasius's letter to Epictetus. "Certainly; but is your copy of it free of corruption?" Paul produced his copy; Cyril compared it with the authentic text, and found that it had been tampered with (Mansi, v. 325). After further conversation the two bishops agreed to "forget" the troubles of Ephesus. Paul gave Cyril a letter from John, which, though gentle and dignified in tone, referred to the "articles" in language which annoyed Cyril; his temper gave way, and he spoke of the letter as "insulting." Paul soothed him with courteous assurances, but Cyril proceeded to the point which John had ignored—the recognition of the deposition of Nestorius, and the condemnation of his heresy. Paul offered to make such a declaration in John's name, but Cyril, promptly and keenly, insisted that John himself should put his hand to it (Mansi, v. 313). Just as little could he give way as to the case of four Nestorianising metropolitans, deposed by the new archbishop of Constantinople: that sentence, he insisted, must stand good (Mansi, v. 349). Paul then, in writing, satisfied Cyril as to his own orthodoxy, and Cyril thereupon allowed him to join in the church-service of Alexandria, and even invited him to preach on Christmas Day, 432, in the great church (Mansi, v. 293). The bishop of Emesa began his sermon with the angelic hymn, proceeded to the prophecy of Emmanuel, and then said, "Thus Mary, Mother of God, brings forth Emmanuel." A characteristic outbreak of orthodox joy interrupted the discourse. The people cried out, "This is the faith! 'Tis God's own gift, O orthodox Cyril! this is what we wanted to hear." Paul then went on to say that a combination of two perfect natures, the Godhead and Manhood, constituted "for us" the one Son, the one Christ, the one Lord. Again the cry arose, "Welcome, orthodox bishop!" Paul resumed his discourse, and explained St. Peter's confession as implying a duality of nature and an unity of person in Christ. On New Year's Day, after alluding to Cyril as a kind-hearted trainer who had smiled upon his performance, he preached at greater length on the unity of the Person and the distinctness of the natures, as being co-ordinate and harmonious truths: and his teaching was heartily endorsed by Cyril, who sent two of his own clergy to accompany him and Aristolaus, the emperor's secretary, who was very zealous for the re-union, to Antioch, with a paper for John to sign, and a letter of communion to be given him when he had signed it. But Cyril thought it necessary to exert himself for the same object in another direction: he considered Maximian languid in the cause, and he wrote many letters to persons connected with the imperial court, including the "Augusta" Pulcheria, in order to bring their

influence to bear upon John, and to separate him definitely and finally from Nestorius (Mansi, v. 988). These letters were backed up by presents which were euphemistically called "blessings" (eulogiae) and which were employed by Cyril as a matter of course, for he knew but little of delicacy and scrupulosity as to the means to be used in gaining over a court to the church's interests. He also assured Theognostus, Chamosynus, and Leontius, his "apocrisarii" or church agents at Constantinople (*Ep.* p. 152) that this peace with John implied no retraction of his old principles.

It was in the spring of 433 that John of Antioch wrote to Cyril, reciting the formulæ of re-union, abandoning Nestorius, and condemning Nestorianism (Mansi, v. 290). In another letter, written in a tone of warm friendship, John entreated Cyril to believe that he was "the same that he had known in former days" (*Ep.* p. 154). On April 23 (Pharmuthi 8) Cyril announced this reconciliation in a sermon (Mansi, v. 310, 289), and replied to John in a letter beginning, "Let the heavens rejoice and the earth be glad" (*Ep.* p. 104; Mansi, v. 301). In this letter (afterwards approved by the council of Chalcedon) he cited the text, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," as expressing the happiness of the restored peace; and added his usual disclaimers of all opinions inconsistent with the reality of Christ's manhood. He commented on John iii. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 47, 1 Peter iv. 1. He also sent to John a copy of the genuine text of Athanasius's "Letter to Epictetus." John himself became an object of suspicion and animosity to the thoroughgoing Nestorianisers, and even Theodoret, though he admitted that Cyril's recent language was orthodox, would not abandon Nestorius's cause. In another direction, doubts and anxieties were excited by the language now sanctioned by Cyril. Isidore, to whom Cyril had always allowed great freedom of admonitory speech, and who had blamed him heretofore for unyieldingness, now expressed a fear that he had made too great concessions (*Ep.* i. 324). Other friends of his were scandalised by his acceptance of the phrase "Two Natures." Was not this, they began to ask, equivalent to a sanction of Nestorianism? Cyril found himself once more obliged to vindicate himself on a point of orthodoxy. He wrote a long letter to Acacius of Melitene (*Ep.* p. 109; Mansi, v. 309), who had signified to him that some disquietude was felt. In this letter he narrated the recent transactions; and then, after insisting that the formulæ was not (as some had represented it) a new creed, but simply a statement called forth by a special emergency (inasmuch as those who signed it had been accused of rejecting the Nicene faith, and were therefore constrained to clear themselves of such an imputation), he proceeded to exhibit the essential difference between the formulæ and the Nestorian error. Nestorius, in fact, asserted two Christs: the formulæ confessed one, both divine and human. And then Cyril added that the two natures which had been spoken of in the formulæ were indeed separate in mental conception, i. e. considered apart from Christ, but that "after their union" in Christ "the nature of the Son was but one, as belonging to one, but to One as made man and incarnate:" again, "The nature of the Word is confessedly one, but has become incarnate," for "the Word took

the form of a servant," and "in this sense only could a diversity of natures be recognised, for Godhead and Manhood are not the same in natural quality." Thus, in regard to the Incarnation, "the mind sees two things united without confusion, and nowise regards them, when thus united, as separable, but confesses Him who is from both, God, Son, and Christ, to be one." "Two natures," in Nestorius's mouth, meant two natures existing separately, in one who was God and in one who was Man; John of Antioch and his brethren, while admitting that Godhead and Manhood in Christ might be regarded as intrinsically different, yet unequivocally acknowledged His Person to be one.

The phrase, "one incarnate nature" of God the Word, or "one nature, but that incarnate," had been already (*ad Regim.* i. 9) quoted by Cyril as Athanasian: although there is, to say the least, great doubt whether the short tract "On the Incarnation of God the Word," in which it is found, was really written by Athanasius. But, as now used by Cyril in his vindication of the formulæ from Nestorianism, it became in after days a stumblingblock, and was quoted in support of Monophysitism (Hooker, v. 52. 4). The question then arises, Did Cyril in fact hold what was condemned in 451 by the council of Chalcedon? Would he have denied the distinct co-existence of Godhead and Manhood in the one incarnate Saviour? and were the fathers of Chalcedon wrong when they proclaimed Cyril and Leo to be essentially one in faith? What has been already quoted from this letter to Acacius ought, it should seem, to warrant a negative answer to this question. What Cyril meant by "one nature incarnate" was simply, "Christ is one." He was referring to "nature" as existing in Christ's single Divine Personality (cf. *Adv. Nest.* ii.: compare note in Athan. Treatises, *Lib. Fath.* i. 155). When he denounced the idea of the separation of the natures after the union, he was in fact denouncing the idea of a mere connexion or association between a human individual Jesus and the Divine Word. Therefore, when he maintained the nature to be one, he was speaking in a sense quite distinct from the Eutychian heresy, and quite consistent with the theology of Chalcedon.

Other letters, written by Cyril under the same circumstances, throw light on his true meaning. Successus, an Isaurian bishop, had asked him whether the phrase "two natures" were admissible (*Ep.* p. 135; Mansi, v. 999). Cyril wrote two letters to him in reply: in the first, after strongly asserting the unity of the Son both before and since the Incarnation, he quoted the "one nature incarnate" as a phrase of the Fathers, and employed the illustration from soul and body, "two natures," being united in one man, in order to set forth the combination of Godhead and Manhood in one Christ (compare his *Scholia de Inc.* 8). There was, he added, neither a conversion of Godhead into flesh, nor a change of flesh into Godhead. In other words, Christ's body, though glorified, and existing as God's body, was not deprived of its human reality. In the second letter, written in express reply to objections taken by Successus to statements in the first, Cyril fully admitted that Christ "arrayed Himself with our nature," so that in Him both Godhead and Manhood, in Christ, retained their

natural distinctness (cf. p. 143), and that the human nature was neither diminished nor subtracted. Further on he repeated the phrase, "one nature, but that incarnate," in the sense (as the context shews) of "one who in His original nature was God, by incarnation becoming man." In another letter, addressed to a priest named Eulogius, he gave a similar account of the phrase; it is obvious that he viewed it as guarding the truth of the Personal Union (*Ep.* p. 133). In another, which is addressed to a bishop named Valerian (and is remarkable, among other things, for the emphasis with which the Divinity of Christ is exhibited as bearing on His Atonement), the word "nature," in this connexion, is evidently used as synonymous with "person" or hypostasis: and as if he were specially anxious to exclude all possible misconception, he used such language as the following: "He, being by nature God, became flesh, that is, perfect man. . . . As man He was partaker of our nature." This language agrees with that of his 17th Paschal Homily (*Cyr.* v. ii. 226). We may also compare his words in *Adv. Nest.* ii. tom. vi. 50, to the effect that while the divine and the human natures are different things, as all right-thinking men must know, yet after the Incarnation they must not be divided, for there is but one Christ. Again, *ib.* p. 45, that Christ is not twofold is explained by the context to mean that Christ before and since the Incarnation is one and the same Person; and, *ib.* p. 48, the reason for calling Christ's Godhead the *φύσις* is explained by the consideration that He was originally God, while in the fifth book of the same treatise (*ib.* p. 139) He is said to have given up His body to the laws of its own nature (*τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως*). In the ninth book 'de S. Trinitate' (dial. quod unus est Christus) he denies all transmutation or confusion of the natures, admits or rather asserts the distinctness of Godhead and Manhood, and in reply to the objection, "If we say there is one nature of the Son, even though He be viewed as incarnate, there must needs be supposed an absorption of the human nature," he answers, "Nothing of the kind: οὐδὲ μὰ πρὸς ἡμῶν ἀνολόγητο φύσις, σεσαρκωμένου τε καὶ ἐνηθρωπηκότος," adding that "the bush burning yet unconsumed was a type of the non-consumption of the Manhood of Christ in its contact with His Divinity" (cf. *Schol.* 2, 9).

To return to the history. Maximian dying in April 434, was succeeded by Proclus, whose glowing sermon on the Incarnation had been among the earliest expressions of orthodox zeal against the Nestorian theory, and who deserves to be remembered as a very signal example of the compatibility of orthodox zeal with charitable tenderness (*Soc.* vii. 41). Soon after his accession, the imperial court resolved to enforce on all Eastern bishops the acceptance of the concordat, so to call it, which had reconciled John with Cyril, upon pain of expulsion from their dioceses. The Nestorians, on their side, were indefatigable in circulating the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had formed the theological mind of Nestorius: and Cyril, who was informed of this during a visit which he paid to Jerusalem, was stirred to new energy by the evident vitality of the theory which he so earnestly abhorred. He wrote to the "tribune" Aristolaus, and to John of Antioch, complaining

that, as he was informed, some bishops were repudiating Nestorianism insincerely or inadequately, and were declaring that its author had been condemned merely for denying the "Theotocos" (Mansi, v. 996, cf. *ib.* 970). He urged that the bishops should be required to anathematise Nestorianism in detail. John interposed, requesting that no new test should be imposed; and Cyril found that he had gone too far (Mansi, v. 969, 972, 996). He was much annoyed at Theodore's pertinacious refusal to anathematise Nestorius—a refusal in which we may add, Theodore persisted until the eighth session of the council of Chalcedon (*ib.* v. 997). As the Nestorianisers professed entire adherence to the Nicene Creed, Cyril drew up an exposition of it (*Ep.* p. 174, Mansi, v. 383, cf. *ib.* 975) addressed to certain "fathers of monks," in which he urged the incompatibility of that "venerable and oecumenical symbol of faith" with the denial of the personal unity of the Saviour. In this tract, a copy of which he sent to Theodosius, he disclaimed, as usual, any "fusion, commixture, or so-called consubstantiation" (*συνοσίωσις*) of the Godhead with the flesh. He drew up a short treatise in three books to prove that Mary was Theotocos, that Christ was one and not two, and that while He was impassible as God, He suffered for us in flesh that was His own. This he intended as an antidote to the Nestorian arguments which, as he learned, were rife in Syria (Mansi, v. 995).

The name of Theodore was at this time a watchword of eager controversy. Proclus of Constantinople, in his "Tome" addressed to the Armenian clergy, in which he spoke of "one incarnate person" (not "nature") of God the Word, had condemned Theodore's opinions without naming him (Mansi, v. 421): the messengers who carried this document to John of Antioch inserted Theodore's name, without authority from Proclus, as the author of certain passages selected for censure. John and his suffragans accepted the Tome, but declined to condemn Theodore by name. Proclus rejoined that he had never wished them to go beyond a condemnation of the extracts. Cyril was so far from feeling any tenderness towards Theodore, that he traced Nestorianism to his teaching, and to that of Diodore of Tarsus (Mansi, v. 974), and wrote vigorously in support of this thesis (*ib.* 992). A synodal letter from John and his suffragans, stating their objections to the proposal that Theodore's name should be anathematised on the score of some expressions which, as they urged, were capable of being taken in a sense accordant with the language of eminent fathers, drew forth from Cyril a somewhat indignant reply. Theodore, he said (*Ep.* p. 195), had "borne down full sail against the glory of Christ"; it was intolerable that any parallel should be drawn between his language and that of Athanasius or Basil: he insisted that no one should be allowed to preach Theodore's opinions; but at the same time, he did not urge any condemnation of his memory, and even dwelt on the duty of welcoming all converts from Nestorianism without a word of reproach as to the past. He saw that it would be imprudent to proceed publicly against the memory of a theologian so highly esteemed that the people cried out in some Eastern churches, "We believe as

Theodore did," and would rather be "burnt" than disown him; and he wrote to Proclus advising that no further steps should be taken in the matter (*Ep.* p. 199).

The remaining events of Cyril's long episcopate may be very briefly told. He wrote to Domnus, the successor of John in the see of Antioch (and afterwards unhappily conspicuous in the Euty-chian controversy), in behalf of Athanasius sometime bishop of Perrha, who described himself, falsely it appears, as sorely wronged by some of his own clergy (*Ep.* p. 208). In another letter to Domnus, peremptory in style, he took up the cause of another aged bishop named Peter, who professed to have been expelled and plundered of his property on the pretext of a renunciation of his see, which after all had been extorted from him (*Ep.* p. 209). In both these cases Cyril shewed a somewhat impulsive readiness to believe the story of a petitioner, and a somewhat dictatorial temper in regard to the affairs of another patriarchate. He was informed by some abbots of the Thebaid, when they paid a visit to Alexandria, that some bishops had given scandal by ordaining men who had recently married, or who had for their insubordination been expelled from monasteries. On this subject he wrote to the bishop of Libya and Pentapolis (*Ep.* p. 211); compare the letter in which Isidore urged him to inflict fitting punishment on the worthless priest Martinian of Pelusium, who had gone to Alexandria with the professed expectation of bribing Cyril to give him a bishopric (*Isid. Ep.* ii. 127; Tillemont, xiv. 661). He wrote a work against the Anthropomorphites, whose wild fancies about the Divine nature (as being limited and corporeal) had given such trouble in the days of his predecessor; and in a letter on this subject to Calosirius, bishop of Arsinoe, he added a caution against the false mysticism which insisted on prayer to the exclusion of all labour, and on the "senseless" opinion that the Eucharistic consecration lost its efficacy if the sacrament was reserved until the following day. "Christ's holy Body," wrote Cyril, "is not changed; but the power of consecration and the lifegiving grace still remain in it" (*Op.* vi. 365). In the last year of his life he wrote to Leo, then bishop of Rome (to whom, as archdeacon of Rome, he had written in 431 against the ambitious schemes, as he regarded them, of Juvenal bishop of Jerusalem (*Leon. Ep.* 119, 4) on the right calculation of Easter for the year 444, which according to the Alexandrian cycle of 19 years he fixed for April 23. In that same year, on the 9th or the 27th of June, he closed his eventful life.

It must be needless to add that Cyril's character is not to be estimated aright by ascribing any serious value to a coarse and ferocious invective against his memory, which was quoted as Theodoret's in the fifth General Council (*Theodor. Ep.* 180; see Tillemont, xiv. 784). If it were indeed the production of the pen of Theodoret, the reputation which would suffer from it would assuredly be his own. What Cyril was, in his strength and in his weakness—in his high-souled struggle for doctrines which were to him, as they must be to all thoughtful believers in Christ's Divinity, the expressions of essential Christian belief, or in the moments when his old faults of vehemence and impatience

reappeared in his conduct—we have already seen. He started in public life, so to speak, with dangerous tendencies to vehemence and imperiousness which were fostered by the bad traditions of his uncle's episcopate, and by the ample powers of his see. It would be impossible to maintain that these evils were wholly exhausted by the grave errors which—exaggerations and false imputations set aside—distinguished his conduct in the feud with the Jews and with Orestes: when, although guiltless of the blood of Hypatia, he must have felt that his previous violence had been taken as an encouragement by her fanatical murderers. The old impatience and absolutism were all too prominent at certain points of the Nestorian struggle; although on other occasions, as it must be admitted by all fair judges of his conduct, influences of a softening and chastening character had abated the turbid impetus of his zeal, and had taught Cyril to be moderate and patient. "We may," says Dr. Newman (*Hist. Sketches*, iii. 342), "hold St. Cyril a great servant of God, without considering ourselves obliged to defend certain passages of his ecclesiastical career. . . . Cyril's faults were not inconsistent with great and heroic virtues, faith, firmness, intrepidity, fortitude, endurance, perseverance." Those who begin by condemning dogmatic zeal as a fierce and misplaced chivalry for a phantom, will find it most difficult to be just to a man like Cyril. But if his point of view, which was indeed the point of view taken by many great religious heroes, and eminently by Athanasius, be understood and appreciated in its full force, as supplying the general motive for his actions, it will not, at least it ought not, to be difficult to do justice to his memory, even where theological convictions like his are not professed or entertained. The issue raised by Nestorianism was to Cyril a very plain one, which involved the very essence of Apostolic Christianity. Whatever ambiguities might be raised by a Nestorian use of the word *πρόσωπον*, it was clear to Cyril that the new theory amounted to a denial of the Word Incarnate. And it was not a mere theory of the schools. Its promulgator held the great see of the Eastern capital, involving a central position and strong court influence; and he was in personal character no amiable dreamer or scholastic pedant, whose fancies might die away if left to themselves. He has in modern times been spoken of as "the blameless Nestorius": he was in his own times spoken of as "the incendiary," on account of a zeal against other forms of heresy which impelled him to take strong measures against opponents of his own. This was the enemy against whom Cyril made up his mind to do battle for the doctrine of a real Incarnation and a really Divine Christ. He had to reckon on opposition, not only from Nestorius himself, but from large numbers—a miscellaneous company, including civil functionaries as well as prelates—who accepted the Nestorian theology, or who thought that strong language against it was uncalled for and offensive. He might have to encounter the displeasure of an absolute government: he certainly had for some time the prospect of that displeasure, and of all its consequences: he had the burden of ill-health, of ever-present intense anxiety, of roughly expressed censure, of reiterated imputations affect-

ing his own orthodoxy, of misconceptions and suspicions which hardly left him a moment's rest. Whatever faults may be discerned in his conduct of the controversy, this at least not only may, but must be said—not by mere eulogists of a canonised saint, but by those who care for the truth of history—that the thought as well as the heart of Christendom has for ages pronounced judgment in the cause between Cyril and Nestorius; and that this judgment has accepted, as the expression of Christian truth, the principle upheld by the former against the latter. It has been seen that when the mist of words is cleared aside, a real and profound question divided the disputants; and (to take a familiar instance) that stanza of Charles Wesley's Christmas hymn which begins,

“Christ, by highest heavens adored,”

conveys the Cyrilline or Ephesine answer to that question in a form which exhibits its close connexion with the deepest exigencies of spiritual life. Cyril, as a theological writer, has greater merits than have been sometimes allowed by writers who find it difficult, as it would seem, to approach the subject of his life in a spirit of equity. His style, as Cave admits, may be deficient in elegance and in eloquence: he may be often tedious, and sometimes obscure, although, as Photius says (*Cod.* 136), his “Thesaurus” is remarkable for its lucidity. His comments on Scripture may be charged with excessive mysticism, or with a perpetual tendency to bring forward his favourite theological idea. There may be found weak points in his argument; such, for instance, as undue pressing of texts, and fallacious inferences, several of which might be cited from the treatise “To the Princesses.” But any one who consults, e.g. the “Thesaurus,” will acknowledge the ability with which Cyril follows up the theological line of Athanasius (see pp. 12, 23, 27, 30, 50), and applies the Athanasian mode of thought to the treatment of Eunomian rationalism (p. 263), and the force and vividness with which in this treatise and in other works, he brings out the Catholic interpretation of cardinal texts in the New Testament. His acquaintance with Greek literature and philosophy is evident from the work against Julian: but he speaks quite in the tone of Hippolytus's “Little Labyrinth” (Euseb. v. 28) when he deprecates an undue reliance on Aristotelian dialectics and *à priori* assumption on mysteries transcending human thought (*Thesaur.* 87, *de recta fide* 16, 17).

Fragments of Cyrilline treatises, which have not been preserved entire are preserved in synodal acts and elsewhere, and other works, as his “Paschal Cycles” and “The Failure of the Synagogue,” are mentioned by Sigeber and Gennadius. The Monophysites used on festivals a “Liturgy of St. Cyril,” which is substantially identical with the Greek “Liturgy of St. Mark” (see Sir W. Palmer's *Orig. Liturg.* i. 86, and Neale's *Introd. East. Ch.* i. 324) and their traditional belief, expressed in a passage cited from Abu'lberkat by Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 171, is that Cyril “completed” St. Mark's Liturgy. “It seems highly probable,” says Dr. Neale, quoting this, “that the Liturgy of St. Mark came, as we have it now, from the hands of St. Cyril”: although, as Palmer says, the orthodox

Alexandrians preferred to call it by the name of the Evangelist founder of their see. The Coptic Cyrilline Liturgy is of somewhat later date, and more diffuse in character. It seems not improbable that the majestic invocation of the Holy Spirit which is one of the distinctive ornaments of St. Mark's Liturgy, if it was not composed during the Macedonian controversy in the 4th century, represents to us the lively zeal of the great upholder of the Hypostatic Union for the essential Divinity of the Third Person in the Godhead.

Cyril's works have been thrice edited—(1) by George of Trebizond, at Basle, A.D. 1546, in four volumes; (2) by Gentianus Hervetus at Paris, 1573, 1605, in two volumes; and lastly (3) by John Aubert, canon of Laon, and master of Laon College in Paris, 1658, in six volumes, containing—1. “On Adoration in Spirit and Truth,” and the “Glaphyra,” or polished comments on the Pentateuch; 2. five books on Isaiah; 3. on the minor prophets; 4. on St. John's Gospel; 5. part i. the “Thesaurus”: nine Dialogues on the Trinity, Incarnation, and that Christ is one and the Lord; “Scholia on the Incarnation; 5. part ii. the Paschal and other Homilies (the Greek bishops, according to Gennadius, *de Vir. Ill.* 57, used to recommend the Homilies to be learnt by heart), the 61 Epistles, the “De rectâ Fide,” the “Ad Reginas”; 6. five books against Nestorius: the explanation of the twelve articles; the defence of them, in reply to the Eastern bishops; a similar reply to Theodoret; ten books against Julian; a book against Anthropomorphites; a treatise on the Trinity, assigned, but without certainty, to Cyril; and some specimens of “anagogic” interpretation of Scripture. Aubert dedicated his work in a curious letter to Cardinal Richelieu. His edition has not yet been superseded; there is no Benedictine St. Cyril. In 1859 Dr. Payne Smith, afterwards Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and now Dean of Canterbury, published in a complete form Cyril's Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel, translated from a Syriac version; and in 1868 appeared the first two volumes of an elaborate edition by Ph. E. Pusey, M.A., of Christ Church, containing the commentary on the Minor Prophets. Two other volumes, containing eleven books of the Commentary on St. John, appeared in 1872. [W. B.]

CYRILLUS (8) deacon to St. Hilary of Arles, by whom he was wonderfully cured, after having had his foot bruised by the fall of a large stone. (Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, tom. viii. 434, 435; *Vita Hilarii Arelat.* cap. xv., *Patrol. Lat.* l.) [D. R. J.]

(9) Bishop of Adana in Cilicia Prima, one of the Oriental or Antiochene party at the council of Ephesus (A.D. 431). He signed the remonstrance against the opening of the council by Cyril of Alexandria, before the arrival of John of Antioch and his companions (Baluz. *Concil.* col. 698), as well as the sentence of deposition passed by them on Cyril and his adherents (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iii. col. 598). His name is appended to several of the documents in the *Tragoedia Irenaei*, viz. to the letter to the clergy and people of Hierapolis, and that to the church of Constantinople, asserting that John's council was the legitimate one and that Cyril and his party were heretics (c. xiii. Baluz,

col. 706, c. xxviii. *ib.* 725); and the letter of remonstrance, conjointly with Zenobius, bishop of Zephyrius, to Alexander of Hierapolis and his suffragans, for not openly acknowledging their claims (c. cxxx. *ib.* 833). We have also a letter of Theodoret's to him, urging him to labour for the peace of the church (c. clxi. *ib.* 859). He took part in the synod of Tarsus (A.D. 434), and gave his signature to the terms of reconciliation between the churches of Alexandria and Antioch (Baluz, col. 941). [E. V.]

CYRILLUS (10), bishop of Coela in Thrace, in the 5th century. In conjunction with Euprepius, bishop of Byza, he represented to the 7th session of the council of Ephesus (July 31, A.D. 431) that in the provinces of Europe there was an ancient custom that each bishop should hold two or three sees; Cyrillus being, for instance, bishop of Callipolis as well as Coela. Fritilas bishop of Heraclea, who had attached himself to Nestorius, would, they feared, send bishops to these towns which belonged inseparably to other sees. The council authorised the existing custom; but afterwards special bishops were given to Callipolis and other towns. (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 805, 810; Ceillier, viii. 591.) [W. M. S.]

(11) ST., fourteenth bishop of Treves, succeeded St. Severus, and was followed by Jamblichus. He rebuilt the cell of St. Eucherius near Treves, which lay burnt and deserted; but on a different site (if we correctly understand the statements under various hands), and the restored structure was dedicated by pope Eugenius III. to St. Matthias the apostle. There he placed the bodies of the first three bishops of Treves, SS. Eucherius, Valerius, and Maternus. Some ancient Latin verses on their monuments are recorded, beginning—

"Quam bene concordis divina potentia jungit."

Cyrillus died about A.D. 458, and his remains were deposited near those of his predecessors just mentioned. He was commemorated on May 19. An old writer of Prague states that a considerable portion (*pars insignis*) of the bishop's relics were removed to that city by the emperor Charles IV. A.D. 1372. (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 378; Bolland. *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 431, 453; May, iv. 331.) [C. H.]

(12) Bishop of Gaza, one of the prelates who signed the synodical letter of John of Jerusalem to John of Constantinople, condemnatory of Severus of Antioch and his followers, A.D. 518. (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. v. col. 191.) [E. V.]

(13) Of Scythopolis (Bethshan), so called from his birthplace, a hagiologist, flourished c. 555. His father, John, was famous for his religious life. Cyril commenced an ascetic career at the age of 16. On leaving his monastery to visit Jerusalem and the other holy places, his mother charged him to put himself under the instruction of John the Silentiary, by whom he was commended to the care of Leontius the abbat of the monastery of St. Euthymius, who admitted him as a monk in 542. Thence Cyril passed to the Laura of St. Saba, where he commenced his sacred biographies with the lives of St. Euthymius and St. Saba, deriving his information from the elder monks who had seen and known those holy men. He also wrote the life of St. John the Silentiary and other biographies,

affording a valuable picture of the inner life of the Eastern church in the sixth century. They have been unfortunately largely interpolated by Metaphrastes. The following biographies are attributed to Cyril by Fabricius. (*Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 41, x. 155); (1) *S. Joannes Silentiarius* (*ap. Surium*, May 13); (2) *S. Euthymius* (Cotelerius, *Ecol. Graec. Monum.* ii. 200); (3) *S. Sabas*. (*ib.* iii. 220); (4) *Theodosius the Archimandrite* (only found in Latin, of doubtful authenticity); (5) *Cyriacus the Anchoret*; (6) *S. Theognis the Ascetic, bishop of Cyprus*. (Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* u.s.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* p. i. 529.) [E. V.]

CYRINUS (1) bishop of Chalcedon, an Egyptian by birth, and a relative of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, one of the most bitter and uncompromising of the enemies of Chrysostom. We first meet with him in 401, associating with Chrysostom on friendly terms, and accompanying him together with the bishops Paul of Heraclea, and Palladius of Hellenopolis, in his visitation of Ephesus and the Asiatic churches (Pallad. p. 134). From some unexplained reason this visitation converted Cyrinus from a friend into a most virulent enemy, and when in 403 Theophilus and his partisans arrived at Constantinople they met to arrange their plan of proceedings at his see of Chalcedon. No one displayed more violence than Cyrinus. He accused Chrysostom of pride, tyranny, and heresy, and Theophilus reckoned upon him as a most valuable ally. But a clumsy Mesopotamian bishop, Maruthas, accidentally trod on his foot and caused a wound, which inflamed and gangrened and eventually produced his death, after three years of intense suffering. Though Cyrinus was prevented by this accident from taking a personal share in the opening proceedings against Chrysostom, he managed to be present at the synod of the Oak, where he sustained the part of accuser, witness and judge (Photius, c. 59). His enmity never relaxed, and after Chrysostom's recall in 404, he took a prominent part in all the plots for his destruction, and was one of the four bishops who took his condemnation on their own heads, and demanded his banishment of Arcadius, as the only means of restoring public peace. (Pallad. p. 35; Soz. viii. 22.) He joined in the letter conveyed by Paternus to pope Innocent (Pallad. 10). His miserable death towards the end of 405, after twice resorting to amputation and enduring extreme torture, was regarded by the friends of Chrysostom as a mark of the vengeance of heaven (Soz. vi. 15, 19; Soz. viii. 16). [E. V.]

(2), otherwise Aribio, a German monk of the order of St. Benedict, who became abbat of St. Dionysius at Schlechdorf, and subsequently, in 760, the fourth bishop of Freising in Bavaria. He died in 783. Cyrinus wrote the life of St. Corbinianus, the first bishop of Freising. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 631.) [E. V.]

CYRION, bishop of Doliche, one of the subscribers to the Semiarian council of Seleucia. (Epiphani. *Haer.* 73, p. 874.) [G. S.]

CYRUS (1) of Beroea, succeeded Eustathius as bishop of that city, on his translation to the see of Antioch in 325. He was persecuted on account of his orthodoxy by the Arian party, and deposed by Constantius. (Athanasi. *Ep. ad Solit.* p. 812; *Apolog. pro Greg.* p. 702.) The Arian George of

Laodicea attributes to Cyrus the charge of Sabelianism brought against Eustathius, at the packed council of Antioch, by which he was deposed in 331. But Socrates argues for the improbability of the story, inasmuch as Cyrus was himself degraded on the same charge. (Socr. *H. E.* i. 24; ii. 9.) [E. V.]

CYRUS (2), bishop of Tyre, was present at the council of Ephesus in 431. He was a leading member of the party of John of Antioch and the oriental bishops, against Cyril of Alexandria, and was chosen as one of the deputation to wait on Theodosius to lay a complaint of the illegality of his proceedings, but being indisposed, Macarius of Laodicea took his place. He was deposed by Cyril in the name of the council. (Baluz. *Nov. Conc. Collect.* 577, 705, 725; *Tragoed. Iren.* c. 13, 28.) [E. V.]

(3) Bishop of Aphrodisias, metropolitan of Cairo. He was born of Christian parents, and was a monk before he was a bishop. He attended the council of Ephesus in 431, where he was conspicuous for his vacillation. He was one of the 198 prelates who signed the act of Nestorius's deposition (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 535), and expressed his approbation of Cyril's letter to Nestorius (*ib.* 465), and yet the next day, after the arrival of Candidian, his name is found with 15 others appended to the appeal of Nestorius to the emperors against the legality of the acts of the council, and for the convocation of another. (Baluz. *Concil.* 701.) His weakness of character was still more strikingly shewn, when at the "Robbers' Synod," in 449, he signed the act of condemnation of Flavian and Eusebius. (Labbe *Concil.* iv. 305.) The character of Cyrus, however, stood so high that in 456 he was specially exempted from the operation of a general law by the emperor Theodosius II., on account of his great merits. (*Cod. Theod.* vol. i., l. 37, p. 46; Tillemont, xiv. 378, 763.) [E. V.]

(4) Bishop of Phasis, near the mouth of the river of the same name among the Lazi, in Colchis, and afterwards patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 630-641, who took a prominent part in the measures of the emperor Heraclius for the union of the monophysite party with the Catholic Church. Heraclius on his return from his successful campaign against the Persians, met Cyrus at Phasis, and conversed with him on the scheme of union he had in view. The formula borrowed from the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, *ἐνέργεια θεανδρική*, which he hoped would be the basis of this union, was at first unacceptable to Cyrus, who applied for counsel to Sergius, the monothelite patriarch of Constantinople. Letters passed between them (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 916, 949, 952). Cyrus's difficulties were thus removed, and he gave his hearty support to the emperor's designs. His services were speedily rewarded by his elevation to the patriarchate of Alexandria, A.D. 630. His immediate predecessor was George, who, according to Eutychius (but the statement is deemed groundless by Dr. Neale), had deserted his bishopric either through fear or treachery, on the approach of the Saracen forces. As patriarch Cyrus set himself vigorously to effect the union of the Egyptian monophysites, known as Theodosians, with the catholic body. The basis of union was a formulary of agreement (*πληρο-*

φορα) in nine articles, the object of which was to establish a compromise between the dogmatic definitions of Chalcedon, and those of monophysitism, employing each mutually to explain the other (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 953 sq.). The seventh of these articles lays down that the "one and the same Christ, the Son, performed the works proper to God and to man by one theandric operation" (*μία θεανδρική ἐνέργεια*). The compromise was eagerly accepted by the Theodosians, who boasted that they had not come over to the church, but the church to them. It was in vain that Sophronius, a learned monk of Palestine then at Alexandria, protested with tears against such a sacrifice of truth to peace. A hollow union was effected, and Cyrus beheld with joy the Theodosians communicating in vast multitudes with the catholics. (See his letters, Labbe, vi. 921, 952.) But such an agreement however specious, being based on the suppression of real differences, could not be lasting. In an exceedingly short time it fell into such neglect that it was contemptuously termed "the washy union," *ἐνὼρις ὑδροβαφής*, and was succeeded by new and more bitter schisms. Sergius of Constantinople alarmed at the growing influence of Sophronius, who had been appointed patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 634, appealed to pope Honorius I., who wrote both to Sergius and Cyrus, as well as to Sophronius, approving of the oecumeny by which Cyrus had brought about the agreement, but deprecating the introduction of dogmatic definitions unsanctioned by the Catholic Church, and expressing his alarm at the pursuit of theological refinements inimical to true godliness (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 917-933; Harduin, *Concil.* iii. 1315, 1319). The wise counsels of Honorius were unavailing. The distractions of the church continued, and the *Ektthesis* published by Heraclius, A.D. 639, though formally accepted by a council at Alexandria under Cyrus, met with no better success.

While the Egyptian church was thus rent asunder by intestine divisions, the conquest of Egypt itself by the Saracens was fast approaching. Egypt was invaded by Omar's general Amrou in June, A.D. 638. So high was Heraclius's estimate of the ability of Cyrus that he committed to him the prefecture of Egypt and the conduct of the war. Cyrus prevailed on Amrou to withdraw his forces by the promise of the payment of an annual tribute, and of the betrothal to him of the emperor's daughter Eudocia (Theophan. pp. 280-281; Niceph. *Breviar.* pp. 17, 18). On hearing of these degrading propositions Heraclius indignantly summoned Cyrus to Constantinople. The intelligence of the siege of Alexandria alone saved his life. He was sent back to negotiate terms with Amrou. But he arrived too late. Amrou was too sanguine of the reduction of Alexandria to be diverted from his purpose. After fourteen months' siege the city capitulated and fell into the hands of the Saracens, Dec. 22, A.D. 640. The chief actors did not long survive the catastrophe. Heraclius died in February, A.D. 641, and, though the date is uncertain, Cyrus's decease was not much after.

(Neander, *Clark's transl.* vol. v. pp. 227-237; Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt*, vol. ii. p. 373; Gibbon, vol. vi. pp. 446 and 458.) [COPTIC CHURCH.]

[E. V.]

CYRUS (5) 43rd patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 705 to 711 or 712. He had formerly been a recluse, *ἐγκλειστός*, at Amastris, and had predicted to Justinian II. his restoration to the imperial dignity (Niceph. Constan. *Breviarium de rebus post Mauricium gestis*, p. 28; Theoph. Chron., p. 314, A.M. 6198). He is mentioned as taking part in the reception of Constantine, bishop of Rome, when that prelate paid a visit to Constantinople by order of Justinian II. (*Vita Constantini Papae*, apud Labbe, *Acta Concil. t. vi.* 1393). He was deposed by the monothelite emperor Bardanes, on his accession to the throne A.D. 711, and confined in the monastery of Chora, which he had founded (Theoph. Chron. p. 320, A.M. 6204). [P. O.]

(6). [JOHN AND CYRUS.]

CYRUS-FLORUS. [PAULUS SILENTIARIUS.]

CYTHERIUS (1) a resident at Caesarea, from whom Chrysostom had received much kindness during his short stay in that city, on his way to Cucusus in A.D. 404, and to whom, on his arrival at his destination, he wrote a grateful letter (*Epist.* 82). [E. V.]

(2) A friend of Paulinus of Nola, who writes to him (*Poem.* 24) about A.D. 400 to tell him of the shipwreck of Martinianus, and to praise him for dedicating his son to the service of God under Severus (*Patr.* lxi. 615). [E. B. B.]

D

DABHEOG, of Lough Derg, commemorated Jan. 1. Regarding this saint there is much uncertainty, both as to name and identity. O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 3) is of opinion that Dabheog, of Loch Geirg, in Ulster, is the same person as Mobheog, abbat of Termonn, or Gleann Geirg, of July 24, that his father was Bracan, son of Bracameoc, king (or chief) of Britain, and his mother Dina, a Saxon princess, and that he had also many brothers, who were saints, and have their names given in the martyrology. Colgan, in his memoir of St. Canoc or Conoc (Feb. 11), gives the same list of the children of Dina and Bracan, and adds that "St. Mobheocus qui Dabheocus, et Beoanus," patron of Gleann-gearg, was regarded with the deepest veneration up to his day, and had three festivals observed, viz. Jan. 1, July 24, and Dec. 16. There seems to be but little doubt that the *da* and the *mo* of the names are moveable and interchangeable prefixes, and that the saint had his abode on Lough Derg, in Donegal, where he has left his name in the townland of Seadavog, on the south shore of the Lough, and in the castle of Termondavog, now more generally called Termonmagrath. But whether he was one of the many children attributed to the Welsh chieftain, Brychan of Brycheiniog, and that again through a Welsh or Irish connexion, we cannot conclusively affirm, though it is without doubt the most generally received opinion. Yet Lanigan (*Eccles. Hist. Ir. i. c. viii. § 15*) thinks the story of St. Dabheog, of Lough Geirg, and the counting him brother of St. Canoc, are without sufficient foundation, while the idea

of his being contemporary with St. Patrick, and able to prophesy of St. Columba, he regards as a late invention, and inconsistent with what Colgan elsewhere (*Tr. Thaum.* 313, n. 4) feels bound to notice, namely, that (in the *Sanctilog. Genealog.* c. 19) St. Mobecus or Dabecus, of Gleann-geirg, is called son of Luainim, son of Dibracha, of the posterity of Dichu, who was the first convert of St. Patrick, in Ulster [CANOC and DICHO]. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 3, 201; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 312, c. 5, and *Tr. Thaum.* 390, c. 10; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 11 sq.; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 300, 3rd ed.; Rees, *Cambr. Brit. Saints*, 602 sq.) [J. G.]

DABIUS [DAVIUS, DAVID], P. July 22. The account which Alban Butler gives (*Lives of the Saints*, vii. 374, ad diem) of this saint from Colgan in MSS., is that he was a zealous Irish priest, who preached with great success in his own country and in Alba, and was patron saint of Domnach Cluana, now Donach Cloney, in the county of Down, and of Kippen, in Scotland, where a famous church was dedicated under his invocation, by the name of Movean. We still have Kippendavie besides Dunblane. This saint is the same as Biteus, Mobion, Dobi, Davius, and David, who was abbat of Inis Cumsraigh (or Inis Couscry, now Inch, county Donegal), and venerated on this day [BITEUS]. He was son of Congell, son of Erc, of the family of Maccarthennus (Mar. 24), and offspring of Eochaidh; as descended from the race of the Dal-Buan, in Ulster, he was related to St. Cronan or Mochua of Balla (Mar. 30), in whose life Colgan relates how he was born of one who was long barren. To him, probably more than to St. David or Dewi of Wales, are the Celtic dedications to St. David to be assigned (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 789, c. 4; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 320). [J. G.]

DABONNA is often given by Colgan and others in the list of nephews and nieces of St. Patrick; he stands as one of the seven sons whom Darerca bore to Restitutus or the Lombard, and is called bishop of Cluain-na-manach, in Arteach, Connaught; but as much doubt rests on the whole kindred of St. Patrick, and specially on that which relates to his sisters and their families, nothing can be safely affirmed of Dabonna [DARERCA]. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 718, cc. 6-9, and *Tr. Thaum.* 228; Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 167-8.) [J. G.]

DABRECOG, of Tuam-dreman, May 9. He appears in the *Mart. Tall.* under this name, and may be the saint whom Mar. O'Gorman commemorates on this day, and calls Dubricin or Dabricin. In the catalogue of Irish saints from the *Mart. Tall.* (Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 11, col. 2) he is called "Da-Breccoc," probably to suggest the etymology. [J. G.]

DACHIAROG has not preserved his place in history, though in the *Four Masters* (at A.D. 825) "Dachiarog, i.e. the saint of Airglu," is cited as a prophet. He may have been the Ulster saint Ciaroc, Ciarog, or Mochuaroc, who, with Breccan, was one of the "two heroes of purity who loved Christ faithfully," especially as Breccan or Berchan is also called a prophet [BERCHAN (1)]. The parish of Errigalkerooge (Dachiarog's residence or church), in the barony of Clogher, co. Tyrone, derives its name from

him, and once had a very important monastery: there are still many relics of antiquity there. (*Book of Rights*, by O'Donovan, pp. lix. lx.; Joyce, *Ir. Names of Places*, 309, 3rd ed.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 416 n. 4, 439.) [J. G.]

DACHONNA. The name is a very common one, either simply as Conna and Connan, or, with the prefixes of veneration and affection, *Da* or *Do*, and *Mo*. It appears to have been the baptismal name of St. Machar [MACHAR]. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 60, n. 1 and *Tr. Thaum.* 175 n. 64, 178 n. 115.)

The most famous Dachonna was bishop of Connor, May 15. He was of the race of Eoghán, son of Niall. The death of "St. Dachonna the pious, bishop of Condere," took place, according to the *Irish Annals*, in the year 726 (*Ann. Tigh.*), and when the Danes burned Inis Patrick, near Skerries, county Dublin, in 798, they are said to have carried off St. Dachonna's shrine. The barony of Tiaquin (Tigh-Dachonna) in Galway is so called from one named Dachonna who is unidentified. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 127; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 240; Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 203; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 292, 3rd ed.)

[J. G.]

DACHUAILEN, son of Guaire, of the race of Niall of the Nine Hostages (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 75), Mar. 12. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 368, 369 n. 3) cites from the domestic festilogies, Culan, Culen, or Dachuallen, son of Guaire, whose genealogy he traces up to Niall, yet cannot decide as to whether he is this Dachuallen of Mar. 12, or another whom he calls Culan, and, with the honorific prefix, Dacuallan of Feb. 18 [CULAN].

[J. G.]

DACIANUS (1) A persecuting praeses of Spain, A.D. 303 or 304, under Diocletian and Maximian. He was noted for the severity with which he carried out the orders of these princes, and his measures were especially directed against bishops, presbyters, and all ordained ministers. Among his numerous victims were Valerius bishop of Saragossa, and Vicentius archdeacon of Saragossa, whom he summoned to Valentia for examination. The bishop was only exiled, but the archdeacon was put to death. The account of Vicentius's martyrdom, which is drawn out in great detail, represents a perfect duel between the martyr and the governor. Dacianus was bent on winning a victory, but was discomfited at all points, by the sufferer's constancy in life and by his body in death, for Dacianus could neither cause the birds of prey to touch the corpse, nor the sea to swallow it (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc. Mart.* 366-373). It was also under him that the eighteen martyrs of Saragossa suffered (Ruinart, 468; Usuard, *Mart.* April 16). He planned the extermination of the entire body of the Christians of Saragossa, by feigning to grant them permission to go unmolested whithersoever they pleased, provided they quitted the city: but as soon as they had all left, the gates were closed behind and they were slaughtered by soldiers who lay in ambush (Ruinart, 469). The brothers Justus and Pastor at Complutum (Alcalá de Henares) were also martyred under him (*Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 143), as well as Fides and her companions at Agen in Aquitaine (*Acta SS.* Oct. iii. 264 b). [C. H.]

DACIANUS (2) One of the 49 martyrs of Carthage in A.D. 304, in the persecution of Diocletian, under the proconsul Anulinus. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc. Mart.* p. 382; Ceillier, iii. 20, 21.) [SATURNINUS; DATIVUS.] [W. M. S.]

(3) Metropolitan of Byzacene in Africa, in the 6th century. To him is addressed a rescript in A.D. 541 by the emperor Justinian I., confirming the acts of his council. A second rescript came next year. (Labbe, *Concil.* v. p. 380; Ceillier, xi. 859; Baronius, anno 541, § 10.)

[W. M. S.]

DACRIANUS, a supposed Benedictine abbat, the reputed author of two works entitled *Speculum Monachorum* and *Spiritualis Vitae Documenta*, printed under his name in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Colon. vol. viii. and elsewhere, and ascribed to the 8th century. But it is more probable the name is a feigned one, alluding to the tears (δάκρυα) of the writer at the dissoluteness of monastic life, and that the treatises were really composed by Ludovicus Blosius, an abbat of the middle of the 16th century. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 643; Fabric. *Bibl. Lat.* lib. iv. col. ii. p. 3.)

[E. V.]

DACYLORYNCHITAE [PASSALORYNCHITAE] (Praedestinus, i. 63).

[G. S.]

DACUNUS, ST., one of the anchorites said to have come with St. Petrock to Bodmin, one of the most sacred sites in Cornwall, in the 6th century (Leland, *Collect.* i. 10).

[C. W. B.]

DADAS and QUINTILIAN, disciples of MAXIMUS the reader, at Dorostolus of Macedonia, martyred with him under Maximian, April 28 (*Menol. Basil.*). Mention is made of their relics and translation to the church of St. Mary in Vigilantia, Aug. 2 (*ibid.*).

[E. B. B.]

DADES, in one of the Gnostic systems, the archon of the fourth heaven (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxvi. 91).

[DAVID.]

[G. S.]

DADJAD. [DASHAD.]

DADO (1) or OUEN, ST., bishop of Rouen. [AUDOENUS.]

(2) Bishop of Amiens, is placed after Deodatus, about the end of the 7th century. But the order is questionable, and Dado and Deodatus may be variations of the same name (Gams, *Series Episc.* p. 487; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 1156).

[D. R. J.]

(3) First abbat of Rodez, lived in the 8th century, and built with his own hands a cell, at a place called Conchae. His first disciple was Medraldus, who succeeded him as abbat and obtained the *privilegium* from Lewis the Pious. Dado then retired to a more remote place, Grandevabrum. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 237.)

[D. R. J.]

DADOES. [MESSALIANI.]

DADOLENA, virgin, mentioned by St. Perpetuus, archbishop of Tours, in his will, dated 1st May, 475. He made two copies, which he signed equally; one he entrusted to Delmacius, whom he calls his son, the other to the virgin Dadolena. He ordered Delmacius to give his copy to the Count Agillon to open after his death in the presence of the priests, deacons, and clergy of his church. (*Episc. Testamentum, Patrol. Lat.* lviii. 754; Ceillier, x. 439.)

[D. R. J.]

DADUB. [DAVID (1).]

DAEGHELM, one of the two presbyter abbats from the bishopric of Lindsey who signed the act of the council of Clovesho, October 12, 803. He is believed to have been abbat of Bardney. (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 179, 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 546, 547; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 6.) [C. H.]

DAENE, abbat, attests a charter of Eadberht of Kent, A.D. 761, marked doubtful or spurious by Kemble (*C. D.* 106; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 62). [C. H.]

DAGAEUS. [DAIGH.]

DAGAMUNDUS, or DAGAMODUS, 9th abbat of the monastery of St. Claudius in Mount Jura, ruled in the 4th year of Childbert and in the 6th of Clotarius, kings of Burgundy, *i. e.* from the year 596 to 620, but according to Le Cointe from 593 to 628 (*Gall. Christ. iv.* 244). [D. R. J.]

DAGAMUS, bishop and confessor, is found in the Scotch calendars, and noticed by the Scotch hagiologists, as a strict maintainer of the traditional rites, as giving way with difficulty to the reasoning of St. Augustine, and as entirely refusing to adopt the new practice of the Roman, as against the British, Easter. He is said to have been educated at Bangor, and specially venerated in Galloway. But, however anxious the Scotch annalists, like Lesley, Dempster, and Camerarius, may be to attribute to him a derivation, education, and place in modern Scotland, he is rather to be assigned to ancient Scotia or Ireland, and is the bishop Daganus who is mentioned in the letter to the Scoti from Laurentius archbishop of Canterbury and Mellitus bishop of London, A.D. 609, as having "not only refused to eat with us, but even to take his repast in the same house where we were entertained" (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 4). Yet we are not told where he was bishop, and we can only make the probable assumption that he was Dagan, bishop of Ennereilly [DAGAN]. In Camerarius's calendar, his feast is May 29, and in Dempster's *Men. Scot.* March 22; the latter says he flourished in A.D. 555, or more probably 609. (Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 146; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* ii. 209; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 151; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 320-21.) [J. G.]

DAGAN, bishop of Inbher Daoile, now Ennereilly, in the barony of Arklow, co. Wicklow, March 12 and Sept. 13. He was of the race of Labhraidh Lorc, son of Oilill Aine, and progenitor of the men of Leinster. The father of Dagan was Colman, or rather Colmad, son of Conall, of the Dal-Messincorb in Leinster, and his mother Coeltigerna, sister of St. Coemgen or Kevin of Glendalough [COEMGEN], and others. Coeltigerna had four sons, who were saints, viz. Dagan, bishop of Inbher Daoile, Molibbeus, Molibba, or Libba, bishop of Glendalough (Jan. 8), Menoc or Enan (June 30), abbat of Glanealy, and Mobai, whom Colgan places on Dec. 13, though this last is doubtful. St. Dagan was educated at Liathmore, under St. Mochoemoc or Pulcherius (March 13), and, as some say, after visiting Rome he became abbat of Inbher Daoile, which is probably the same as Achadh-

Dagan, and is now marked out by the ruins of an old church, close to Mizen Head. He was one of the leaders in the Paschal controversy, and strongly espoused the native side against the Roman, and is probably the bishop Daganus mentioned by Laurentius and Mellitus as altogether intractable [DAGAMUS]. Notwithstanding this he is said to have been of a peculiarly mild disposition; he was a special friend of St. Molua (Aug. 4) of Clonfert, but the story of his presenting St. Molua's rule to St. Gregory at Rome, as told by Colgan, from Ussher, is entirely without foundation. Lanigan is of opinion that St. Dagan must have been born between the years 565 and 570, and his death took place on Sept. 13, A.D. 641 (*Ann. Tigh.*). Both March 12 and Sept. 13 are given as his festivals, and on the former Colgan gives his life. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 43, 584-7, 594; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 10, n. ¹⁴⁶, c. 12, n. ⁹⁴, c. 14, § 16; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 247, 335; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. xvii., wks. vi. 484; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 256 n. ^a; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 443, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

DAGILA, wife of a steward of Huneric, king of the Vandals. Under the persecution of Genseric, she several times confessed her faith. In A.D. 483, under Huneric, she was flogged with whips and staves till she was exhausted, and then exiled to a barren desert, whither she went with cheerfulness. They afterwards offered to send her to a less frightful place, but she preferred to remain where she was. (Victor, *de Persec. Vandalic.* lib. v. cap. 8, *Patrol. Lat.* lviii. 246; Ceillier, x. 460.) [W. M. S.]

DAGNUS, a corruption of the name DECIUS in the acts of St. Christopher. [CHR. W.]

DAGO, eleventh bishop of Orleans. Nothing more is recorded of this bishop than of his predecessors in the Annals of Orleans, except that his name is given in the series as the successor of St. Flosculus. He lived about the end of the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th (*Gall. Christ. viii.* 1413). [D. R. J.]

DAGOBERT, son of Chilperic I. He died about the end of the 6th century at the tomb of St. Médard, whither he had been taken to get cured of a disease, and his epitaph was written by St. Fortunatus. [*Vide* CLODOBERT.] (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. 243 n.) [D. R. J.]

DAGOBERT I., son of Clotaire II., was set up as king over the Austrasian Franks by his father in 622 (Fredegar, 47). His chief councillors and instructors were Arnulf, bishop of Metz, and Pippin the elder as mayor of the palace, the two founders of the Carolingian house. Fredegar (*ib.*) describes the great prosperity of the Austrasian kingdom under Dagobert's rule. In 625 Dagobert married Gomatrudis, and acquired a large accession of territory from his father Clotaire, territory north of the Loire, that had originally been Austrasian (Fred. 53). In 627 bishop Arnulf retired into a monastery, and was succeeded in the council by Cunibert, bishop of Cologne. In the following year (628), on the death of Clotaire, Dagobert became sole king of the Franks (Fred. 56). He proceeded to make a circuit of his kingdom, redressing grievances and examining into the ad-

ministration of justice (Fred. 58). He made Paris his principal residence (Fred. 60), and in this he was followed by most of his successors.

A change appears about this time to have come over Dagobert and his administration, due perhaps to the influence of the Neustrian nobles and the women of the court. As the chronicler says, Dagobert forgot the justice which once he loved (*cum omnis justitiæ, quam prius dilexerat, esset oblitus*, Fred. 60), and gave himself up to rapacity, avarice, and licentiousness. Pippin retired, or was driven from the court, to Orleans, and great discontent arose amongst the Austrasians.

The Frankish kingdom was at this time exposed to continual barbarian attacks on the eastern frontier, especially by the Wends. A great defeat was suffered in 630, and was followed by frequent invasions on the part of the Wends (Fred. 68). In the following year the Saxons offered to guard the frontier if their tribute was abated: the tribute was abated, but the frontier was not guarded (Fred. 74). In 632, as a more effective means of defence, Sigebert, Dagobert's son, was set up as subsidiary king of Austrasia, with Cunibert as his councillor, and Adalgisel, Pippin's son-in-law, as mayor of the palace (Fred. 75).

The general westward pressure of the barbarian tribes at this time is seen by the fact that 9000 Bulgarians sought refuge in the Bavarian territory. They were quartered throughout that district for the winter, and by Dagobert's orders cruelly massacred, together with their wives and children (Fred. 72).

In 633 Dagobert compelled the Austrasian chiefs to promise to allow Clovis, Dagobert's younger son, to succeed in Neustria and Burgundy after Dagobert's death, whilst Austrasia was to remain to Sigebert (Fred. 76). In 638 Dagobert died (*ib.* 79). To his reign is ascribed the redaction of the Bavarian code (*Lex Baiuvariorum*). Compare for his gifts to monasteries, &c., documents in Bréquigny, Pardessus' edition. See generally G. Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, vol. i. sub annis.

[T. R. B.]

DAGOBERT II., son of Sigebert III., king of the Austrasian Franks. On the death of his father in 656 Grimoald, the mayor of the palace, cut off Dagobert's long hair and banished him to Ireland. There he remained for upwards of eighteen years. During the anarchy which followed the death of Childeric II. Wulfoald, the mayor, sent to Wilfrid, bishop of York, asking him to fetch Dagobert over from Ireland and send him on to his native country. This Wilfrid did, and Dagobert was set up by Wulfoald's party as king in Austrasia (*Vita Wilfridi*, ap. Bouquet. iii. 601). That party was however overwhelmed by Ebrioin, who in 678 caused Dagobert to be murdered (*ibid.*). Compare G. Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, vol. i. sub annis.

[T. R. B.]

DAGOBERT III., son of Childebert III., king of the Franks, succeeded his father in 711, but only survived him four years, dying in 715 (*Gesta Reg. Fr.* 50, 52). On the chronology, see G. Richter, *Annalen d. Deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, vol. i. sub annis.

[T. R. B.]

DAGOBERTUS or RADABERTUS, 20th archbishop of Tarentaise, lived about the end of the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 703.)

[D. R. J.]

DAIGH (DAGAEUS, DEGA), bishop, son of Cairrell, of Inis-caoin-Degha (now Inishkeen or Enniskeen, on the borders of Louth and Monaghan), Aug. 18. A life of Dega Mac Cayrill is given by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Aug. 18, tom. iii. 656-62) from an anonymous author, "ex cod. MS. antiquo membraneo Salmanticensi"). He was of the race of Eoghan, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, and fourth in descent from him (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 212 n. ^k; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 223). His mother was Deidi, Deigha, or Dediva, daughter of Trian, son of Dubthach Ua Lughair; (for the husbands and children of Deidi, see *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Irel.* 4 ser. iii. 56-7). The date of his birth is unknown, but he is said to have been a pupil of St. Finnian of Clonard (Feb. 23), and he must have been a priest when he gave the viaticum to St. Mochta (Aug. 19) of Louth, who died A.D. 535. But if so, he could not have been connected with Berach of Kilbarry [BERACH (2)] in the 8th century. His fame chiefly rests on his skill as an artificer, or, as the *Calendar of Cashel* calls him, "faber tam in ferro quam in aere, et scriba insignis." In the prophecy regarding him attributed to St. Mochta, it is said, "Plurimum de ferro et aere, de auro, atque argento utensilia ad usum ecclesiae pertinentia artificiosè manus ista operabitur." Montalembert says: "Dega or Dagan passed his nights in transcribing manuscripts, and his days in reading, and carving in iron and copper. He was so laborious, that the construction of 300 bells and 300 crosiers of bishops or abbats is attributed to him, and the transcription of 300 copies of the Gospels." He died A.D. 587 (*Ann. Tigh.*). His chief festival was probably Aug. 18, but Colgan gives at Feb. 19 a memoir of St. Dagaeus, bishop, and quotes in it what evidently belongs to St. Daigh, the artificer: he suggests that Feb. 19 may be a minor festival. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 374, 405, c. 3, 731, cc. 20-1; Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 202; Reeves, *S. Adamnan*, 115, 208; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 89, Edinb. 1861; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 10, § 14; O'Connor, *Epist. Nuncup.* 178-79, and *Prolegomena*, ii. 144-45.)

[J. G.]

DAIRCHELL (DAIRCHOLLA), bishop of Glendalough, May 3. The Irish annals call him son of Curetai, and place his death in A.D. 678 (*Ann. Tigh.*), but give no particulars of his history, though he has obtained a place in the calendars (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 119).

[J. G.]

DAIRE (DARIA). In Irish calendars we find several saints of this name, but there is scarcely sufficient material preserved in history or legend to give them a well-defined individuality or place in history. In the third and fourth Lives of St. Brigida (in Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 541, c. 124, and 561, c. 89) an account is given of a virgin-saint named Daria, who was born blind and received sight from St. Brigida, but who no sooner saw than she closed her eyes again and asked the gift to be withdrawn, that the world might not seduce her mind from God. But who this contemporary of St. Brigida was we have no means

of deciding. In *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 213) is, "Daire, Virgin. Aug. 8. Eighty years was her age." For her identification Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 545, n. 67) refers, among others, to St. Daria, who is said to have been sister of St. Ruadhan (Apr. 15), abbat of Lothra, and must have flourished in the middle of the 6th century: also to St. Daria "quae et Soidhealbh, seu Pulcheria," daughter of Cathirius, who lived in the time of St. Corbmac (Mar. 26), and had her monastery blessed by him, so that its exceeding fertility obtained for it the name of Magh-gamnach, now Moygawnagh, in the barony of Tirawley, co. Mayo (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 248, c. 2, 775, n. 12, 752, c. 8); and also to that Daire or Daria, who is called mother of St. Ursula by Dempster, and is erroneously credited by him with the honour of giving the name to Kildare. [J. G.]

DALBHACH (DALMACTUS), of Cuil-Collainge, Oct. 23. According to O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 281), he was of the race of Oilill Flannbeg, son of Fiacha Muilleathan, son of Eoghan Mór, son of Oilill Olum. If we accept the itinerary in St. Alban's Life (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 615, c. 20) as consecutive and genuine, the position of Cuil-Collainge was in the east of the county of Cork, as St. Alban came from Connaught by the west coast of Munster, and, reaching the country of the Ui-Liathain (that is, of the O'Lehans, in the fertile district round the present Castle-Lyons, on the Bride river, a branch of the Blackwater, a few miles to the south-east of Fermoy), built a cell at Ceallcrumthir (the priest's cell) near the town of Culcollingi or Cilleulen, and then passed into the country of the Nandesi or Decies in the county of Waterford. Some miles distant, to the north of Fermoy, is the present parish of Kilgullane in the baronies of Condons-with-Clangibbon and Fermoy; and in the barony of Cork between Fermoy and Cork is Kilcully. *Mart. Tall.* (by Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xxxvii.) has "Dalbach Cule Colla" on the same day, and Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. 20) cites the place as Kilcully, in the North Liberty of Cork. Dalbach seems to have been a strict performer of penance, and it is said that "he never touched his hand to his side as long as he lived" (*Mart. Doneg.*). Some acts, or, more properly, encomiastic verses written in the Irish metre (patrio metro) on St. Caimin (Mar. 24) of Inisceltra are attributed by Colgan to St. Dalbhach (*Acta SS.* 746, c. 1, 747 n. 2). As a disciple of St. Abban (Mar. 16) and friend of St. Caiman, he must have lived about the first half of the 7th century. [J. G.]

DALFINUS, bishop or archbishop of Lyon, mentioned only by Bede and Eddius in their accounts of Wilfrid, under the dates, as computed, A.D. 654 and 658. The account given by these writers, by Eddius especially, betrays much exaggeration; and this writer, it must be remembered, was not in personal attendance upon Wilfrid until many years after. Dalfinus is represented as having, in or about A.D. 654, hospitably entertained Wilfrid when a young man proceeding for the first time to Rome to make himself acquainted with Roman usages that he might propagate them among his countrymen. Dalfinus soon became warmly attached to him and offered, if he would remain, to place

him in the government of a large district in Gaul, adopt him as his son, and give him his brother's maiden daughter for a wife. On learning the object of Wilfrid's mission, however, he ceased to press this point, equipped him for his journey, dismissed him with guides, and begged him to call again on his return. Wilfrid's homeward journey from Rome is computed to have been in A.D. 658. He once more took Lyon on his way and remained three years with the archbishop, who now conferred upon him St. Peter's tonsure, after the manner of the crown of thorns that encircled the head of Christ. Wilfrid also had here the advantage of learned doctors to assist him in his studies. Dalfinus had it in his heart to make Wilfrid his heir, but at that time an evil-minded queen, Balchith or Balchild, was persecuting the church, and, like the impious Jezebel who slew the Lord's prophets, gave orders for the death of nine bishops. Dalfinus was one of these, and Wilfrid accompanied him both before the queen's ministers and to the place of execution, encountering great danger thereby, but he being a foreigner was dismissed unhurt. The probability of this story involves the character of the queen and some points of chronology. She is said to have been by birth a Saxon, to have been sold to a great Frankish noble, Erchinoald, to have fled from him, and to have become the wife of Clovis II. king of the Franks. Clovis died A.D. 656, and shortly afterwards died Erchinoald, who was his mayor of the palace, Ebroin succeeding to that office. Balchild administered the kingdom as regent during the minority of her son Clothaire III., and when he came of age, A.D. 664, she retired into a monastery of her own foundation. She was afterwards one of the canonised saints of the church. Mabillon remarks that no one reading the acts of this queen would suppose her capable of inflicting death on pious bishops. The inconsistency between her character and the persecution attributed to her, in addition to the circumstance that Dalfinus is found in no list of the bishops of Lyon, and is known nowhere else in history, makes Dean Hook not scruple to consider the whole tale as a romance intended to embellish this period of Wilfrid's life. Other writers, however, take a different line, accepting the facts of the story, but substituting other names. Dalfinus, they say, must have been either another name of, or a mistake for, Annemund or Chanemund, the authentic bishop of Lyon at that period; and the Balchild difficulty is solved by attributing the persecution to her minister Ebroin. But if it was only at a later date, after the queen's retirement, that Ebroin exercised the authority of the state and behaved with so much cruelty, the story remains as suspicious as ever. (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 25; v. 19, Smith's note; Eddius, cc. 5, 6; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 43; Pagi, Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 658, t. xi. p. 501, ed. Theiner, 1863; Mabill. *Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* saec. ii. 777; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vii. 720; Hook, *Abps. of Cant.* i. 137.) [C. H.]

DALHUNUS. [DEAL-UN.]

DALLAN FORGAILL, of Cluain Dallain, Jan. 29. His proper name was Eochaid, to which we find added "Eigeas, the learned," and "Righ Eigeas, the king of poets." But his popular name,

and that by which he is now most familiarly known, is Dallan Forgaill, which is derived from the Irish *Dall* "blind," and Forchella the name of his mother (Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 114). The *Martirologies* of Donegal and Tallaght call him Dallan Forgaill of Maighin, and Colgan (*Acta SS.* 203-5) presents to us the most that is known of his life. His father was Colla, son of Erc, of the race of Colla Uais, monarch of Ireland (A.D. 323-6), and his mother was Forchella, from whom he got the name of Forgaill or Ua Forgaill, in Latin Forcellius. He was born on the borders of Connaught and Ulster, at a place which Colgan says was formerly called Masrige and Cathrige Sleacht, and in Colgan's day Teallach Eathach: by his father he was probably (*Mart. Doneg.*) cousin-german of St. Meadhog of Ferns (Jan. 31). He was early recognised as the royal poet and greatest scholar in Ireland, and is found recorded among the Milesian poets and historians in the *Book of Ballymote* (O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Irish*, ii. 52). In the end of the 6th century the bards had become a powerful and turbulent order in Ireland, countless in number, insatiable in their demands, and thinking themselves able to cope with the royal authority. (For an account of the state of education and learning at this period in Ireland, see O'Curry, *ut supra*, ii. Lectt. iii.-viii.) Their greed and folly culminated when they demanded the royal brooch from king Aedh, son of Ainmíre (A.D. 568-594), and, on his refusal, threatened to satirise him in their bardic lays. At once he issued a decree of banishment against them. At that time Dallan Forgaill was the Ollamh or chief poet, but how far personally implicated in the quarrel with king Aedh we do not hear. When Aedh summoned the estates of the nation in A.D. 590 to meet him at Drumceatt (now Daisy Hill, near the river Roe, not far from Newtown Limavady, in the county of Londonderry), to settle some political questions, the case of the bards was taken up, and matters would have gone hard with them, but for the intervention of St. Columba in their favour [COLUMBA (1)]: he pleaded successfully for their retention as a useful body, yet willingly yielded to their reformation by a reduction of their numbers, by rules laid down for their conduct, and by the putting them under better supervision. In gratitude for the eloquence and zeal of St. Columba in averting the threatened danger, Dallan composed a panegyric, which is known as the "Amhra Choluimcille," or Praises of St. Columba, and, though largely glossed, is preserved to the present day. As it now stands, it is written in a very old and almost unintelligible form of Irish, and may be found in the *Leabhar na Uidhre*, fol. 8 sq.; the *Leabhar Breac*, fol. 109 sq.; the *Liber Hymnorum*, p. 21 sq. (See Reeves, *Adamnan*, 17 n.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 203-4; and *Tr. Thaum.* 432, cc. 8, 9; O'Curry, *ut supra*, iii. 245-56; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 138 n.) It was long used as a form of charm, and the reciting of it was believed to be a safeguard in danger, and a sure remedy in blindness, Dallan himself having, it is said, received his sight on the completion of his poem at St. Columba's death. He is also said by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 204) to have composed other panegyrics in praise of St. Senan of Iniscatheay and St. Connall of Iniscail, which had the same wonderful effects: the former was extant in Colgan's day, while the other he could

not find. But as to his history before or after the Convention of Drumceatt we know little. He is said to have been made chief Ollamh or Special Master of Education and Literature at the reformation then inaugurated in Ireland, and we read in the *Leabhar na h.Uidhre* (fol. 83, b. a. col. 2) an account of a historical dispute between him and Mongan, king of Ulster, which is at least characteristic of the tone of the bards before the meeting at Drumceatt, though it may have no other value. In or about the year 594 Dallan was killed by the pirates on the island of Inis-Cail (now Inishkeel, in Gweebarra Bay, co. Donegal), and was buried in the church of St. Connall (May 22) of Inis-Cail, where his memory was long held in great veneration. He is popularly connected with several churches, as with Maighin, a church in Westmeath, Killdallain, now Killadallan or Kildallan, in the diocese of Kilmore and co. Cavan, Disert-Dallain, Tullach-Dallain in the diocese of Raphoe, and Cluain-Dallain, now Clonallan, in the diocese of Dro-more and co. Down. (Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* 114, 132-3, with references to writers on the "Amhra Choluimcille;" Todd, *St. Patrick*, 138-9; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, Edinb. 1861, iii. 191-8; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 63; O'Reilly, *Irish Writers*, 39; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 496-503; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 226, 3rd ed.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 12, § 13; *Irish Nennius*, by Todd, 180 n. &; Keating, *Gen. Hist. Ir.* 370-1; O'Connor, *Prolegomena*, ii. 71, 74, 76.)
[J. G.]

DALMACIUS, Irish saint. See DALBHACH.

DALMATIUS (1), censor at Antioch, commissioned by the emperor Constantine the Great to inquire into a charge brought by the Arians against Athanasius of having murdered Arsenius. Dalmatius wrote to the archbishop to prepare his defence. (Athan. *Ap. cont. Arian.* 144, *Pat. Gr.* xxv. 366.) Socrates (*H. E.* i. 27) calls him the son of Constantine's brother; but it is shewn on other authority that he was the emperor's brother by a different mother, called also Hannibalianus, being the father of Dalmatius Caesar. (Valesii Annot. ad Socr. l. c., *Pat. Gr.* lxvii. 157.) Baronius, calling the censor Delmatius, places the inquiry under the year A.D. 332. (*Annal.* t. iv. p. 258, ed. Theiner, 1863.)
[C. H.]

(2) CAESAR, son of Dalmatius the censor, and so a nephew of Constantine the Great. He is confounded by Socrates with his father; but it is shewn that in A.D. 332 the younger Dalmatius was a lad at Narbonne with his brother Hannibalianus attending the lectures of the rhetorician Exuperius; that he was summoned thence in 335, when still very young, by Constantine, who created him Caesar, invested with the purple, and sent him as king to Caesarea in Cappadocia. See authorities quoted in Valesii Annot. ad Soc., *H. E.* i. 27, *Pat. Gr.* lxvii. 157.
[C. H.]

(3) A tribune and notary who brought in A.D. 386 an order to St. Ambrose from the emperor Valentinian II.
[W. M. S.]

(4) Monk and abbat, near Constantinople, a powerful influence at the time of the council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) against Chrysostes the chamberlain and the Nestorian party at the court of Theodosius II.

His influence arose from his eminent piety, his strength of character, and his fiery zeal. Under Theodosius the Great he had served in the second company of Guards, had married, had children, and led a virtuous life. Feeling a call to a monastic life, he left his wife and children, except a son Faustus, and went to receive instruction from the abbat Isaac, who had dwelt in the desert since his infancy. Isaac at his death made him Hegumenus, superior of the monastery, under the patriarch Atticus. Consulted by councils, patriarchs, and emperors, he remained in his cell forty-eight years without quitting it. He is sometimes addressed as chief of the monasteries of Constantinople; but it is not determined whether this was a complimentary or official title. He is not to be confounded with Dalmatius, monk at Constantinople, bishop of Cyzicus; because the latter was present at the council of Ephesus in that capacity.

During the disputes of the Syrians and Egyptians at the council of Ephesus, Dalmatius, who had always signalled his fervour against the patriarch Nestorius (Mercat. tom. ii. Praefatio, p. 735, *Patrol. Lat.* xlviii.) received, in conjunction with the bishops Macarius and Potamon, a letter from Cyril of Alexandria, warning him that the official account, by Count Candidian, of the deposition of Nestorius, was not complete. (Cyril, *Epist.* § 84, num. xxiii., *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 131.)

During the supremacy of the Nestorian party at Ephesus, letters were conveyed by a beggar in the hollow of a cane from Cyril and the Athanasian or Catholic party to the emperor Theodosius, the clergy and people at Constantinople complaining that they had been imprisoned three months, that the Nestorians had deposed Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus, and that they were all in the greatest distress. A short memorial was added to the letter of the bishops, probably for Dalmatius; "The hot and unhealthy air kills us, scarce a day passes without a funeral, and the servants are sent away sick." (Pope Paul V., *Concil. Gen. Eccl.* [Rome, 1628] tom. i. pp. 483-486.) By this appeal Dalmatius was greatly moved. As he was praying, he believed he heard a voice summoning him to go forth at length from his retreat in the interests of truth. Into the merits of the Nestorian controversy this is not the place to enter; but Dalmatius thought the crisis to be of the highest moment. Accompanied by the monks of all the monasteries, with their abbats at their head, he sallied forth in a long procession and made his way to the palace. Among the abbats was Eutyches, at that time a friend of Cyril; his excess of zeal afterwards led to his heresy. The procession was divided into two companies, singing alternately; a vast crowd of sympathisers followed. The abbats were admitted to the emperor's presence; and the monks remained outside chanting. Returning to the people, the abbats asked them to go to the church of St. Mocius to hear the letter of the council and the emperor's reply. They passed down one of the great streets to the other end of the city near the gilded gate where the church lay; the monks continued their chanting, and carried wax tapers. Great enthusiasm was excited against Nestorius.

Arrived at the church, the abbats read the

letter of the bishops, which produced high excitement. Dalmatius, who was a presbyter, then mounted the pulpit, begged them to be patient, and in temperate and modest terms related his conversation with the emperor, and its satisfactory result. The outcome was that the emperor wrote to Ephesus, ordering a deputation of each party to arrive at Constantinople. In a letter to Dalmatius the council acknowledge that to him only is owing the emperor's information of the truth.

Proclus, archbishop of Constantinople, writing afterwards to John bishop of Antioch, mentions how very deeply scandalised the very holy archimandrite Dalmatius had been by the translation by Ibas bishop of Edessa of certain passages from Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Proclus, Op.* 651). (Cyril, *Epist.* numb. 23, etc., *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii.; *Concil. Gen.* i.; *Dalmatii Apologia*, p. 477; St. Procl. CP. *Episc. Epist.* iii.; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxv. p. 876, lxxxv. col. 1797-1802; Ceillier, viii. 290, 395, 396, 407, 594; Fleury, book xxvi.) [W. M. S.]

DALMATIUS (5) A monk, chosen by the people of Cyzicum, according to the canons, to be their bishop. Sisinnius, archbishop of Constantinople, had nominated Proclus (who afterwards succeeded to the patriarchal see). Dalmatius remained bishop of Cyzicum, for he was present with that title at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431. (Socrat. vii. 28; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. p. 802; Pope Paul, *Concil. Gen.* i. 372; Ceillier, viii. 403.) [W. M. S.]

DALMATIUS (6) ST., third bishop of Rodez, was ordained bishop in the year A.D. 524 or 525, held his bishopric 56 years, and died A.D. 580, in the fifth year of the reign of king Childebert. He subscribed at the council of Orleans in 541, and on returning from that council visited the bones of St. Martin at Tours. He was also present at the council of Clermont in 525, and at the first council of Arvern in 535. He had much to contend with on account of the Arian heresy, which was very prevalent in his time, also, about the year 535, on account of a fierce persecution of Christians by Amalaricus, king of the Goths.

Dalmatius was once condemned to death for the faith at Brives la Gaillarde. St. Anstites interceded for him with the tribune who had condemned him, but his intercession was of no avail, and Dalmatius was actually led out to execution.

Anstites then prayed for him, and the execution was hindered by some extraordinary atmospheric phenomena, and the condemned man lived to a good old age.

Gregory of Tours mentions his controversy with Modericus, bishop of Arisium, for the purpose of reclaiming for his diocese certain parishes which had been taken from it.

In describing his death, Gregory calls him "most exalted in all holiness, abstaining equally from food and the lusts of the flesh: a great giver of alms, and courteous to all: of no mean steadfastness in prayer and watching." He adds that he built a church, but often pulled it down to improve it, and so left it incomplete (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* 5, 5, and 47; *Gall. Christ.* i. 199).

Dalmatius is commemorated on the 2nd

f November (Labbe, *Bibl. Nova* MSS. ii. Appendix.) [D. R. J.]

DALMATUS, a soldier of the time of Theodorus, with Faustus his son, became disciples of the monk Isaac, and founded a monastery at Constantinople, afterwards called the monastery of Dalmatus. Died Aug. 3. (*Men. Basil.*)

[E. B. B.]

DALTA, Dalta-Christ, *i.e.* the foster-child or pupil of Christ, was used in Ireland as an honorific title of St. John the Evangelist: so also was Eoin na-bruinne, "John of the breast." "Eoin na-bruinne Dalta Dei" occurs in the Codex Maelbrigte. (See Dr. Reeves' paper thereon in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Jan. t. xiii. 1851, p. 9; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 321. See also *DIARMAID* (6).) [J. G.]

DAMAN, of Tigh Damain, in Ui-Criomhthannain (*Mart. Doneg.*) Feb. 12. He was brother of St. Abban (Mar. 16) and other saints, and nephew of St. Ibar (Apr. 23). His mother was Mella or Miolla, St. Ibar's sister, and his father Lagnenus or Laignech, son of Cannechus, of the Dal Cormac, and belonging to Leinster. But of his history tradition is silent. His residence, Tigh Damain, is now Tidowan, in the barony of East Maryborough, Queen's County. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 626, c. 3; *Book of Rights*, by O'Donovan, 216 n. 2; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Soc. Ir.* 4 ser. ii. 558.) [J. G.]

DAMASCIUS, the last of the celebrated teachers of the Neo-Platonic school at Athens, born at the end of the 5th century at Damascus, from whence he derived his appellation, his personal name being lost. He studied under Theon and Isidorus at Alexandria, and subsequently under Marinus and Zenodotus at Athens. At Athens he presided over the school of rhetoric and Platonic philosophy till the heathen schools were closed by Justinian, A.D. 529, when, with the rest of the staff, he repaired to Persia to the court of king Chosroes. His philosophical works are enumerated and described elsewhere (*Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, vol. i. p. 932). Here we need only particularise his life of his tutor Isidorus, of which we have an account given by Photius (*Cod.* 181). Photius describes Damascius as "excessively impious" (*εἰς ἄκρον δυσσεβείας*), availing himself of every opportunity of covertly attacking the Christian faith. He wrote in a very arrogant strain, dwelling with malicious pleasure on the mistakes and failings of those whom he mentions, not excepting the subject of his biography, Isidorus. From the abundance of personal information relative to the leading philosophers and Christian teachers of his time, this work, if it had been preserved, would have been of great value for the history of the epoch. (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 552; Fabric. *Bibl. Græc.* lib. v. c. 38, § 9; Suidas, *sub voc.*; Photius, *Cod.* 181; Wolf, *Anecdota Græca*, vol. iii. p. 195.) [E. V.]

DAMASUS, the successor of pope Liberius, said to have been a Spaniard and the son of Antonius. On the death of Liberius (Sept. A.D. 366) the factions which had disgraced his election [**LIBERIUS**] broke out with redoubled violence. The original root of bitterness had been Arianism; and Felix, the Arian antipope,

had been expelled by Liberius. But his partisans lingered in the church; and seven days after the death of Liberius they met and proclaimed Damasus pope in the Lucina [q.v. the crypt of St. Lucina in the catacomb of Callistus?]. Damasus had previously taken up a middle position between the contending parties, which may have specially recommended him to the electors, who could not hope to carry an extreme man. He had followed Liberius from Rome when he was exiled for opposing Felix; but had soon deserted him, and returned to be present at the election of Felix in his place. On the return of Liberius after three years, when the other adherents of Felix were disgraced, Damasus is said to have found both pardon and favour at the hands of the pope. Nevertheless, on the pope's death, about the same time apparently that the other election took place, the party of Liberius met in the Julian basilica and elected Ursicinus.

It is difficult to ascertain the truth with regard to the strife between the rival popes. A heathen writer, Ammianus Marcellinus (*Amm. Marcell.* xxvii.), speaks of the conflict as serious and bloody, but without imputing the exclusive blame to either side. Unfortunately, perhaps, for Damasus, the most detailed account we have of the struggle is that of personal enemies. This is in the form of a narrative preface to a petition (*libellus precum*) presented against him to the emperor by two aggrieved presbyters. From this source we hear of three distinct scenes of outrage, of each of which it is asserted that Damasus was the cause. First, he signalled the very day of his election (Oct. 1st) by breaking into the Julian basilica with a mob armed with clubs. Almost a month later (Oct. 26th) he attacked the Liberian basilica, to which seven of Ursicinus' priests had been carried by their own party, who had rescued them from captivity. He is said to have put a hundred and sixty of both sexes to the sword; and this appears to be the conflict meant by Ammianus, though he states both its place and the number of the slain differently; in consequence of which, he says, Juventius the prefect, finding himself unable to stem the tumult, withdrew from the city. Ursicinus was banished, but recalled the following year by Valentinian (Sept. 15th, A.D. 367); and this led to another sanguinary conflict in the church of St. Agnes in the December following, which was repressed by strong measures on the part of the prefect Maximinus.

A charge of adultery was brought against him by his enemies, seemingly shortly after; indeed he is taunted by the Preface to the *Libellus Precum* with being the favourite of the ladies of Rome. A form of trial seems to have been gone through, but Damasus was honourably acquitted, and his accusers excommunicated (Anast.).

What Damasus would have replied to all these accusations we have no means of knowing. But we can say that he used his success well, and that the chair of St. Peter, if acquired by violent means, was never more respected nor more vigorous than during his bishopric. He appears as a principal defender of the orthodoxy of the church against Arian and other heretics. Bishop Peter of Alexandria was his firm friend all along; and was associated with him in the condemnation of Apollinaris (Soz. vi. 25), and in the affixing the stigma of Arianism to Mele-

tius of Antioch and Eusebius, who were upheld by Basil (Basil, *Ep.* cclxvi. iii. 597, ed. Bened.). On Meletius' death Damasus struggled hard to gain the chair of Antioch for Paulinus, and to exclude Flavianus; nor was he reconciled to the latter till some time later (Soer. v. 15).

His correspondence with Jerome [HIERONYMUS], his attached friend and secretary, begins A.D. 376, and closes only with his death A.D. 384. Six of Jerome's letters to him are preserved, of which two are expositions of difficult passages of Scripture elicited by letters of Damasus asking the aid of his learning. Jerome's desire to dedicate to him a translation of Didymus' work on the Holy Ghost was only stopped by his death. In later letters Jerome speaks in high terms of Damasus; calls him "that illustrious man, that virgin doctor of the virgin church"; asserts that he was "eager to catch the first sound of the preaching of continence"; and that he "wrote both verse and prose in favour of virginity" (*Epp.* Hieron. 22, 48). From this may be gathered the attitude of Damasus towards the chief controversy of the day; and this also may be a reason why a charge like that above mentioned, of adultery, would be peculiarly injurious to him. Upon this evidence Milman (*Latin Christianity*, i. 69) founds his conjecture that Damasus was the patron in his generation of the growing monastic party within the church; a conjecture not improbable in itself, and rendered more likely by the ardent attachment of Jerome, and the veneration in which the memory of pope Damasus was held by later times, when the principle of monasticism had taken firm root in the Roman church.

But the best known record of Damasus will always be his labour of love in the catacombs of Rome. Here he laboured ardently and devotedly in rediscovering the tombs of the martyrs, which had been blocked up and hidden by the Christians during the last persecution. He "removed the earth, widened the passages, so as to make them more serviceable for the crowd of pilgrims, constructed flights of stairs leading to the more illustrious shrines, and adorned the chambers with marbles, opening shafts to admit air and light where practicable, and supporting the friable *tufo* walls and galleries wherever it was necessary with arches of brick and stone work. Almost all the catacombs bear traces of his labours, and modern discovery is continually bringing to light fragments of the inscriptions which he composed in honour of the martyrs, and caused to be engraved on marble slabs, in a peculiarly beautiful character, by a very able artist, Furius Dionysius Filocalus. It is a singular fact that no original inscription of pope Damasus has ever yet been found executed by any other hand; nor have any inscriptions been found, excepting those of Damasus, in precisely the same form of letters. Hence the type is well known to students of Christian epigraphy as the 'Damasine character.'" (*Roma Sotterranea*, by Northcote and Brownlow, p. 97.)

Besides these inscriptions Damasus did other works which prove his care for the relics of martyrs. He laid down a marble pavement in the basilica of St. Sebastian, recording by an inscription the fact of the temporary burial in that church of St. Peter and St. Paul (*ib.* p. 114).

He built the baptistry at the Vatican in honour of the same St. Peter; where De Rossi thinks, from an inscription in the Damasine character, was an actual chair which went by the name of St. Peter's seat (*ib.* p. 393), and he drained the crypts of the Vatican, that the bodies which had been buried there might not be disturbed by the overflow of water (*ib.* p. 334).

If De Rossi is right in a rather bold conjecture, an inscription in memory of pope Cornelius records that Damasus was ill at the time he ordered its erection (*ib.* p. 180). He died in December, A.D. 384, after a pontificate of eighteen years. He had prepared his own tomb before his death in the ground above the catacomb of Callistus, giving his reason in an inscription in what is called the Papal crypt of that catacomb:—

"Hic fateror Damasus volui mea condere membra,
Sed timui sanctos cineres vexare priorem."

(*ib.* p. 102.)

[G. H. M.]

DAMHNAT, virgin, of Sliabh Beatha, now Slieve Beagh, in Tyrone, commemorated June 13. Regarding this saint there is much difficulty, both as to her identity and the time when she lived. St. Aengus the Culdee calls Damhnat or Dimna the daughter of Bronachia, and sister of St. Fursey, but he is evidently in error (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 95, c. 4; Reeves, *Eccl. Antig.* 190). Colgan (*ib.* 713) would wish to identify her with St. Dimpna, the martyr in Belgium, but not very successfully, though the name of "the fugitive" may be in so far applicable to both. On the whole, it seems better to treat them as different persons [DIMPNA], and the virgin of Slieve Beagh as identical with the following. Thus among the saints of the family of the Orgielli, or offspring of Colla Dachrioch, Colgan (*ib.* 713, c. 4, n. 10) gives "St. Damnoda, *alias* Dymna," surnamed Schene, *i.e.* the fugitive, daughter of Damen, &c., and venerated on June 13. With reference to the same person, Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, pp. 323-4) presents two drawings of bosses on the crossier of the virgin and martyr, Damhnad Ochene, or "the Fugitive, whose memory," he says, "was venerated by the people of the extensive region of Oriel, as being their chief patroness," and who must have lived before the close of the 6th century. (Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 396; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, vi. 218, ad diem.) [J. G.]

DAMIANUS (1), said to have been sent as a missionary by pope Eleutherius to Britain. [DUVIANUS.]

(2) Martyr. [COSMAS (1).]

(3) Bishop of Sidon, a member of the synod at Antioch which condemned Athanasius of Perrha, A.D. 444, and also of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, when he gave his vote for the deposition of Dioscorus (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iv. col. 443), and signed the acts (*ib.* col. 787, 800). The fortieth letter of Theodoret is addressed to him, thanking him for his undeserved good opinion. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* ii. 813.) [E. V.]

(4) Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria. [See COPTIC CHURCH, p. 667.]

DAMIANUS (5) Commemorated June 1.

There was one of this name who was a companion of St. Regulus, and one of the churches of St. Andrew's was dedicated to him (Skene, *Chron. of Picts and Scots*, 187). Dempster enters him on June 1, as having received the relics brought by St. Regulus, and as being honoured at Cumbernauld, Dumbartonshire (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 151, at June 2; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 201, 321). But Leslaeus and Dempster also give a Damianus, who seems, from the association of names and dates, to be intended for one of those whom pope John IV. addressed in his Paschal letter [CRONAN (11)], (Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 152; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 210.) [J. G.]

(6) The fifth bishop of Rochester. He was a South Saxon, consecrated in the place of bishop Ithamar, by archbishop Deusdedit, no long time probably after his own consecration in 655. He had been long dead when archbishop Theodore in 669 arrived in Kent (*Bed. H. E.* iii. 20). He probably died soon after his patron the archbishop, as otherwise Deusdedit would have appointed a successor; or if he had long survived him, he might have consecrated Wighard and Ceadda (*Ang. Sac.* i. 330). Wilfrid's assertion in 664 that all the bishops in Britain were either Quartodecimans, or in communion with the Quartodecimans, seems to prove that Damian was dead at the time (edd. *V. Wilfr.* c. 12). [S.]

(7) ST., bishop of Ticinum, or Pavia. He is the same person as the Damianus, presbyter and bishop of Pavia of the Bollandists. (Paulus Diaconus, *de Gest. Langobard.* vi. 4, *Patrol. Lat.* xcv. 626; *AA. SS. Boll.* Apr. ii. 91-92.) [D. R. J.]

He succeeded Anastasius, A.D. 680, as bishop of Pavia, of which city he was a native. While still a presbyter he attended the synod held under Mansuetus, archbishop of Milan, against the Monothelites, A.D. 679, and was deputed to draw up an exposition of faith in the name of the synod, to be sent to the emperor Constantine V. This document was received with acclamation in the council of Constantinople, A.D. 680. Damianus died A.D. 710. (Ughelli, *Ital. Sacr.* p. 1082; Migne, *Patrol.* tom. lxxviii. pp. 1259-1268.) [E. V.]

DAMOETAS (1), a name given in Alcuin's letters to Riculphus archbishop of Mayence (Alcuin, *Epist.* 45, 122, 123, *Patrol. Lat.* c.). [RICULPHUS.] [C. H.]

DAMOETAS (2) FLAVIUS, a friend of Alcuin, who (A.D. 796) addressed two letters to him. He was a person of rank, serving in the army of Charlemagne against the Saxons, a man of parts and energy, both in war and peace. He had previously held a high juridical position. (*Alc. Epp.* 44, 46, *Patrol. Lat.* c. 210 sq.; *Epp.* 39, 41, ed. Froben.) [C. H.]

DANAX, the reader, of Aulon in Illyria, fled with the sacred vessels from a rustic riot against the Christians to a place by the sea five miles from the town, but they pursued him, let themselves down to him by ropes, bade him sacrifice to Dionysius, who made wine, and as he would not, cut him down with their swords and cast him into the sea, Jan. 16; year not specified. (*Ménol. Basil.*) [E. B. B.]

CHRIST. BIOGR.

DANIEL (1) Presbyter, said to have been martyred in Persia, February 21, in the 35th year of Sapor (A.D. 344), with a virgin, whose name in Chaldee meant Rose, after five days' torture and three months' interrogation, according to brief acts given from a Vatican MS. by Assemani. (*Mart. Orient.* p. 103.) [E. B. B.]

(2) One of the abbats of Scete in Egypt, in the 4-5th century. He was a disciple of Paphorutius, and served him in the capacity of deacon at the altar. He is the speaker in the fourth of the Collationes of Johannes Cassianus. Cassianus had met him during a tour in Egypt. (Cassian, *Collatio* 4, *Patrolog.* *Lat.* xlix. 583; Ceillier, viii. 116.) [W. M. S.]

(3) In *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 135) there is the entry at May 20, "Daniel of Tulach," of whom we know nothing further. In the tripartite life of St. Patrick there is a Daniel who was surnamed "Abhac, i.e. Nanus," from the smallness of his stature, and "Angelus" from the angelic innocence and purity of his soul; to him is traced the origin of the name Glenavy, a parish in Antrim, the church of which was given him by St. Patrick (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 147, c. 132, 183 n. 219; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 236; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 312, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

(4) Bishop at a council assembled by Cyril at Alexandria about A.D. 430, for the condemnation of Nestorius. He was one of the four bishops selected to carry to Constantinople the letter written by Cyril in the name of this council, together with the letter of pope Celestine in the name of a Roman council on the same subject. (Labbe and Cossart, *Concil.* ii. 1688; Ceillier, viii. 259.) [W. M. S.]

(5) A presbyter at Alexandria, sent in A.D. 438 to Acacius bishop of Meletina, Theodotus of Ancyra, and Firmus of Caesarea, with a credential letter by Cyril of Alexandria, to shew them the situation of affairs and the reply he proposed to send to the Oriental bishops at Antioch. (Baluzius, *Concil.* 917; Ceillier, viii. 302.) [W. M. S.]

(6) A bishop of the 5th century, addressed by Firmus archbishop of Caesarea; he is instructed to oblige a robber to return to his victims what he had taken from them. The man is to be punished at Caesarea when he is convicted; probably before the ecclesiastical tribunal. (Lupus, *Epist.* p. 318, *Patrol. Graeca*, lxxvii.; Ceillier, x. 152.) [W. M. S.]

(7) Disciple of the Egyptian solitary Arsenius (circ. A.D. 445), who performed for him the duties of hospitality to strangers arriving at his cell. (*De Vitis Patrum*, III. ch. viii. and xciii., VII. ch. xxxiv., *Patrol. Lat.* lxxiii.; Ceillier, viii. 399.) [W. M. S.]

(8) Bishop of Charrae (Haran), in Mesopotamia, in the middle of the 5th century. He was nephew of the celebrated Nestorian bishop of Edessa, Ibas, by whom, though very young and of ill-repute (according to Ibas' enemies) for disorderly and licentious life, he was consecrated bishop. Daniel sat in the council held at Antioch in the matter of Athanasius of Perrha (ATHANASIUS [3]), and gave his vote against him (Labbe, *Concil.* vol. iv. col. 733). Very grave charges were brought against him by the presbyters of Edessa, at the synod held at Berytus, to investigate the charges

against Ibas, among which were that he ordained men of unchaste life like himself, and caused public scandal by his immoral relations with a married woman named Challos, on whom and her children he lavished the church property, giving her timber for her buildings out of the ecclesiastical estates. (Labbe, *u.s.* col. 644, 648, 650, 651.) He was anathematised by Dioscorus at the "Latrocinium" of Ephesus. (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* tom. ii. p. 976.) [E. V.]

DANIEL (9) The Stylite, of the 5th century. Curiosity about these extraordinary persons has preserved us some details of his life. He was a Mesopotamian by birth. In his youth he had visited Symeon the Stylite; and had been afterwards fired by emulation. After having practised in convents for several years the exercises of monastic life, at the age of 47 he received as a legacy the cowl of Symeon, which had been coldly received by the emperor Leo, and established his pillar four miles north of Constantinople. The owner of the soil, who had not been consulted, appealed to the emperor and the patriarch Gennadius. Gennadius proposed to dislodge him, but was in some way deterred. Gennadius ordained him presbyter against his will, standing at the foot of his column. When the ceremony was over the patriarch administered the eucharist by means of a ladder, which Daniel had ordered to be brought, and received it in turn from the Stylite. He lived on his pillar for thirty-three years, and died at the age of eighty. The patriarch Euphemius assisted at his death, and gave him burial. By continually standing his feet were covered with sores and ulcers: the winds of Thrace sometimes stripped him of his scanty clothing; for days he was covered with snow and ice, till the emperor forcibly enclosed the top of his pillar with a shed. He was visited with reverence by kings and emperors as an oracle; but discouraged all who brought complaints against their bishops. Towards the end of his life, solicited eagerly by both sides, he took part in the dispute between Basiliscus (who usurped the throne of the East for two years from the emperor Zeno), a Monophysite and Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople. He descended his pillar, appeared in the city, denounced Basiliscus, and inflamed the people with such zeal, that Basiliscus published an orthodox edict. The following is his prayer before he began his life on the pillar: "I yield Thee glory, Jesus Christ my God, for all the blessings which Thou hast heaped upon me, and for the grace which Thou hast given me that I should embrace this manner of life. But Thou knowest that in ascending this pillar, I lean on Thee alone, and that to Thee alone I look for the happy issue of mine undertaking. Accept, then, my object: strengthen me that I finish this painful course: give me grace to end it in holiness." In his last will to his disciples, written as his end approached, after commending them to the common Father of all, and to the Saviour who died for them, he gives them the following special advice:—"Hold fast humility, practise obedience, exercise hospitality, keep the fasts, observe the vigils, love poverty, and above all maintain charity, which is the first and great commandment; keep closely bound to all that regards piety, avoid the tares of the heretics.

Separate never from the church your mother; if you do these things your righteousness shall be perfect." He was attended in his last moments by Euphemius patriarch of Constantinople, and Rais "*fidelissima*." By her he was magnificently buried at the foot of his column. Baronius places his death in A.D. 489. (*Vita S. Daniel*, ap. Surium, ad diem ii. decemb. cap. xli., xlii., xliii.; Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 41-3, 274; Ceillier, x. 344, 403, 485; Baronius, ed. Theiner, vol. viii. *ad an.* 460, § 20; 464, § 2; 465, § 3, 12, 13; 476, § 48, 50, 51, 53; 489, § 4.)

[W. M. S.]

DANIEL (10), a deacon from whom St. Perpetuus, archbishop of Tours, bought a country seat with the estate appertaining thereto. He is mentioned in the saint's will. He lived about the end of the 5th century. (*Spicileg.* tom. v. p. 105; Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, x. 439, 440; Perpetui *Testamentum*, *Patrol. Lat.* lviii. 754.)

[D. R. J.]

(11) Bishop of Bangor, commemorated Sept. 11. [DEINIOL WYN.]

(12) Bishop of Theodosiopolis (or Rhaesina) in Mesopotamia, c. A.D. 550, the author of works against the errors of "the Marcionites, Manichees, Chaldeans, and Astrologers." (Ebed Jesu Sobens. *Catalog.* c. 152; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* tom. iii. p. 223; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. col. 982.)

[E. V.]

(13) Abbat of the monastery afterwards known as St. Médard's at Soissons, on the west of the city near the right bank of the Aisne. The foundation of this house was begun by Clotaire I. king of the Franks, about the year A.D. 560, completed by his son Sigebert king of Austrasia, and dedicated about A.D. 562. Daniel, who is believed to have been a disciple of St. Maurus of Glanfeulle, was appointed the first abbat, and he is said to have obtained for the monastery the privilege of immunity from pope John III. He was succeeded by Gairaldus I. as second abbat (*Gallia Christiana*, ix. 410.)

[C. H.]

(14) Bishop of Cenn-Garadh, commemorated Feb. 18. This is the entry in the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 53), and the *Irish Annals* give his death about A.D. 660 (*Ann. Tigh.*). The church of Cenn-garadh is placed by the *Felire* of Aengus in the Scotch Gallgaedhela, or Galloway, but Lanigan (*Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 36) believes that the name should be read Killgaradh, now Oran, in the county of Roscommon, where St. Patrick is said to have founded a church. Its true identification is with Kingarth in the island of Bute, in the Firth of Clyde.

[J. G.]

(15) Monk of the monastery of Rhaitu in the 7th century, author of the *Life of John Climacus*, abbat of Mount Sinai (A.D. 605). He wrote at Rhaitu when persons were still alive who had seen this abbat; he mentions Isaac, a solitary, and another abbat John. (La Bigne, *Max. Bib. Pat.* t. x. p. 386.)

[W. M. S.]

(16) The sixth bishop of the West Saxons, who sat at Winchester from 705, when he was consecrated by archbishop Brihtwald, to his resignation in 744. Under him the West-Saxon diocese was divided, Aldhelm receiving the south-western portion, with his see at Sherborne, in 705, and Susex, with its see at Selsey, being apportioned in 709 to bishop Eadbert. Daniel was probably the most learned and active

bishop of his time in England; Bede mentions him as one of his assistants in the composition of his history, and as having established the church in the Isle of Wight (*H. E.* iv. 16). He is, however, best known from his connexion with St. Boniface, who received from him commendatory letters to Rome in 718, and some part of his correspondence with whom is preserved. In one of these letters (*Mon. Moguntina*, Ep. 15), Daniel instructs Boniface how to deal with the heathen, and in another (No. 56) he exhorts him to perseverance, and advises him how to deal with criminal priests, in answer to another letter of Boniface (No. 55), also extant. Besides these there are two other letters of Daniel on minor points, all however shewing piety, zeal, and prudence. Daniel visited Rome in 721; in 731 he assisted at the consecration of archbishop Tatwin; in 744 he resigned his see, and in 745 he died. His episcopate, which covers the reign of Ine, was the period of the great development and missionary exertion of the West-Saxon church. [S.]

Willis (*Mit. Abb.* i. 137), and the *Menasticon Angl.* (i. 255) insert a Daniel in the list of abbats of Malmesbury, between two Aldhelms, making him the second abbat, but their references do not bear them out, and he is certainly the bishop of Winchester, now retired from his see and living in that monastery, but not as abbat. William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* ed. Hamilton, i. 160) relates how after an episcopate of 43 years (*sic*) at Winchester, bishop Daniel withdrew to Malmesbury, where he ended his days as a monk, and where he was buried, though incorrectly supposed by some to have been buried at Winchester. Malmesbury says nothing about his being abbat. Rudborne also states that the bishop in his old age returned to Malmesbury, where he had formerly been a monk (Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* i. 195). The chronology of these writers agrees with the date of the supposed abbacy sufficiently to identify the ex-bishop with the Daniel of the list. But there is another list of abbats in a Cotton MS. lately published for the first time by Mr. W. de G. Birch, the first three being Aldhelm, Daniel, Megildulfus. Mr. Birch suggests that, without his being abbat, the bishop's rank may have given him a sort of precedence and authority that originated the tradition of his having presided. (Birch, *Abbots of Malmesbury*, 1871; text of the MS. at p. 27.) Florence of Worcester must be mistaken in saying that the bishop died at Winchester (Flor. Wig. *Chron.* ad an. 744). William of Malmesbury further mentions (357) that in his own day there was a fountain at Malmesbury called after bishop Daniel from his having been accustomed to pass his nights at it. [C. H.]

DANIEL (17), supposed bishop of Congressbury and afterwards of Wells. The Glastonbury Chronicle, in Wharton (*Ang. Sac.* i. 553), asserts that from A.D. 167 there was a series of bishops over Somersetshire seated at Congressbury, the last of whom was Daniel, who in the reign of Ina king of Wessex, and by his grant, transferred the see to Wells. Another chronicler, known as the Canon of Wells, repeats the statement of Daniel's transferring the see, adding that he celebrated the nuptials between Ina and Adelburga; that by the queen's mediation he received for the

see the manor of Tyderton; and that having sat 43 years he was succeeded by Sigarius. (*Hist. de Episc. Bath. et Well.* Wharton, *ib.*) Wharton regards this as entirely fabulous. The period of this Daniel was that of the real Daniel bishop of Winchester, whose name appears to have got mixed up with the Glastonbury traditions. More on this subject may be seen in Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.*, Works, v. 87, ed. 1847; Cressy, *Church Hist. of Brit.* iv. 11; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 150. For the Congressbury bishopric see CUNGAR. [C. H.]

DANIEL (18) Bishop of Salach, in Mesopotamia; placed in the 8th century. His *Commentary on the Psalms* is mentioned. (*Biblioth. Oriental.*, Assemani, tom. i. Rome, 1719-28, fol.; Ceillier, xii. 102.) [W. M. S.]

(19) or DANIHEL, succeeded Aribertus as 15th archbishop of Narbonne. He was one of twelve Gallic bishops present at the Roman council held in the Lateran basilica under pope Stephen IV., A.D. 769, concerning the election of the pope and the cultus of sacred images (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 1721). In the 14th year of Charles the Great he is mentioned in a decree of the Missi Dominici as successful in a dispute with Milo count of Narbonne (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 15). The principal event recorded of his episcopate was his holding a synod in the basilica of SS. Justus and Pastor at Narbonne on June 27, 788 (Baluze, *Petrus de Marca*), or 791 (*Gall. Christ.*), attended by the bishops of the provinces of Narbonne and Tarragona, which were then united, and by those of the neighbouring provinces of Arles, Vienne, Aix, Eause. Three subjects were discussed. (1.) The heresy taught by Felix, bishop of Urgel, concerning the adoption of the Son of God, and this was in all probability condemned, though there is no distinct information on that point. (2.) The state of the church of Ausona (Vich), the capital of the province of Tarragona, which had formerly lost its episcopal see through the invasion of the Moors and been ecclesiastically annexed to Narbonne. It was decided that it should remain in this subjection until the pagans were expelled, after which it should have a bishop of its own. (3.) A dispute with Winedurus, bishop of Elne, as to jurisdiction over the *Pagus Redensis*, in the Pyrenees, and this was decided in Daniel's favour (*Gall. Christ.* u. s.; *Petrus de Marca, de Concord. Sacerd. et Imper.* lib. vi. c. 25, add. by Baluze, in *Pet. de Marca, Marca Hispanica*, lib. iv. p. 345). Archbishop Daniel was succeeded by Nebridus, but the exact period of his death is unknown. [C. H.]

DANIHEL (Bede, *H. E.* Praef. iv. 16; v. 18, 23; Flor. Wig. *Chron. App. M. H. B.* 619), bishop of Winchester. [DANIEL (16).] [C. H.]

DAPHNUS, second bishop of Vaison, lived in the time of Constantine the Great, circ. 314. He came to the Council of Arles with Victor, an exorcist, at the order of the emperor. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 921.) [D. R. J.]

DARBELIN, virgin, commemorated Oct. 26. This saint is given as one of the four virgin-daughters of Mac Iaar, living at Cill-na-ninghen, now Killininn, near Tallaght, co. Dublin; they were Darinnill, Darbelin, Cael, and Coimgehall (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 285). [J. G.]

DARBILE (DERBHILEDH), Aug. 3 and Oct. 26. There seems little doubt but Darbile, of Achadh-chuilinn (Oct. 26), of the race of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh, is the same as Derbhiledh (Aug. 3), of the race of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh Muighmedhoín (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 211, 285). She was daughter of Cormac, son of Breccchius, and numbered among the saints of the family of St. Colman, and house of the Hy-Fiachrach; she was specially venerated among the descendants of Amhalghaidh, son of Fiachra, who accepted her as their patron in place of St. Corbmac (Mar. 25) (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 248, c. 2, 753, c. 13, 756 n. ³¹). She is also known as Darbile and Derivla of Irras, and though she is named among the saints at some wonderful but most improbable meeting at Ballysadare, held to welcome St. Columba's return to Ireland at the time of the Convention at Drumceatt, in A.D. 590, as related in the *Life of St. Farannan*, yet that she lived in the 6th century there can be little question, and probably she flourished in the middle of it. The church, where she lived, died, and was buried, "is situated in the wild and hitherto little explored district within the Mullet, in the barony of Erris and co. Mayo," and is described by Mr. Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, 320-2; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 337, c. 7, 340 n. ⁴⁵, and *Tr. Thaum.* 463, c. 55). [J. G.]

DARDANUS, CLAUDIANUS POSTUMUS, described as of illustrious birth and patrician rank, prefect of Gaul, in the years A.D. 409 and 413, to whom a law is addressed A.D. 413. It is probably to the same Dardanus that Jerome addressed a letter in A.D. 414. He calls him the most noble of Christians, and the most Christian of nobles, and says he had been twice prefect. Dardanus had written to ask what land it was that was so often promised to Israel; for he thought it could not be Palestine. Jerome follows his idea, and cites many passages from both Testaments which give a spiritual turn to the phrase. Amongst other books, he quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse; saying that the former was received as the work of St. Paul by all the Eastern churches and all the ancient Greek authors; the latter, although not generally accepted by the Greeks, was received by the Latins, because they found it quoted by the ancients. Another letter to Dardanus occurs in the two commentaries on the Psalms, which are falsely attributed to Jerome.

In A.D. 417, Augustine of Hippo wrote a letter to Dardanus, who is thought to be the same as the correspondent of Jerome. Dardanus had asked three questions:—(1) The meaning of the words, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." (2) The import of Luke i. 44. (3) Whether the baptism of encefites would operate on unborn children. The answer of Augustine is seen in book ii. *Retract.* cap. xlix. Augustine answers that Christ, as God, was everywhere, wherever his human soul was after death. He affirms strongly the localisation of His ascended body in the heavens. He points out that no general inferences can be drawn from the single miraculous occurrence in the case of Elizabeth, and that the baptism of mothers does not include their infants, for birth must precede new birth.

Although so high a character is given to Dardanus by Jerome, Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* lib. v. 9, *Patrol. Lat.* viii. 540) in writing to his friend Aquilinus, says that their grandfathers had all kinds of charges to lay against him.

It was by the zeal of Dardanus chiefly that the tyrant Jovinus was overthrown, king Atolf being induced to withdraw from his alliance. This is related by Tiro Prosper in his *Chronicon*, and by Olympiodorus.

The law addressed to Dardanus is the 117th of Honorius in the Theodosian Codex.

There is also an old inscription on a rock near Sistaricum in the province Narbonensis Secunda; which gives the name of his wife Nevla Galla, and his brother Lepidus; and ascribing patrician and other dignities to Dardanus (*Patrol. Lat.* lviii. p. 540). (Jerome, *Epp.* § 966, *Patrol. Lat.* p. 1099; S. Aug. *Episc. Epistol.* clxxvii.; *Patrol. Lat.* xxxiii. 832; Ceillier, vii. 560, 565; ix. 158, 159.) [W. M. S.]

DARERCA, widow, sister of St. Patrick, commemorated Mar. 22. At the outset we must distinguish between this Darerca, and another of the same name, who was otherwise called Modwenna or Monenna, and was abbess of Kill-Sleibhe, but whom Ussher (*Eccl. Ant.* c. xvii. wks. vi. 382), and partly Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 3, § 18, c. 8, § 9) confound with the sister of St. Patrick [MODWENNA]; she is also to be distinguished from Derbhfraich or Darerca, of Druim Dubhain [DERBHFRACH]. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 716-9) gives a detailed account of Darerca Vidua, sister of St. Patrick, from many different sources. Her father was Calphurnius, a British nobleman, and her mother, Conchessa, sister, or more probably niece of St. Martin of Tours. Her brothers were St. Patrick "Occidentalibus Europae sydus praefulgidum gentisque nostrae Apostolus," and Sannanus, father of St. Patrick the younger. She had two sisters, or perhaps four, namely, Lupita and Tigrida, and perhaps Liemanina and Richella, or Richenna: of these Lupita and Richella were virgins, but the other two, with Darerca, were married, and had a great number of children, who were bishops and abbats. The number and names of these Colgan (both as above and in *ib.* 258-64, and also *Tr. Thaum.* 224-231, c. 4) fully discusses, and to Darerca is given a family of seventeen sons, who were bishops, and two daughters, virgins. These she bore to two husbands, Conis and Restitutus (called also Huabardus or the Lombard), the three most notable of her sons being St. Mel, St. Mioch or Rioch, and St. Munis, all sons of Conis. In her old age she devoted herself to God, and took charge of the altar vestings, along with her sisters Lupita and Tigrida. Ussher gives full particulars regarding her dates and visit to Armorica with her sisters and family. But later writers, and especially Lanigan, have thrown discredit upon the whole story, and regard it as a fabrication, or at least an attempt to construct a Patrician history out of materials which have no connexion with St. Patrick; thus Lanigan mentions Darerca or Moninna, of Kill-Sleibhe, as probably being the original of Darerca the sister of St. Patrick, and other characters may have been similarly employed. (See also Dr. Todd, *St. Patrick*, 354, 360-1, but in his *Book of Hymns*, 108, 116 n.,

Dr. Todd seems to regard Darerca as really the sister of St. Patrick, and the story of the husbands and numerous family as a later invention; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. xvii. wks. vi. 372 sq. and *Ind. Chron.*; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 766.) [J. G.]

DARIA, Irish saint. See DAIRE.

DARIA, wife of Nicander, martyr in Moesia, under Maximus, in the persecution of Galerius. She bravely encouraged her husband to martyrdom; and when the judge sneeringly said that she only wanted another husband, she offered to die first. She was sent to prison, but was released before her husband's death, and was present. (Ruinar, *Act. Sinc. Mart.* p. 551; Ceillier, iii. 90.) [W. M. S.]

DARINNILL, daughter of Mac Iaair. Virgin of Cill-na-ninghen, Oct. 26. [DARBELIN.] [J. G.]

DARIUS, a count sent to restore peace in Africa, and as the Benedictine editors (Augustin. ii. 47, Migne) give reasons for believing, in A.D. 429. Augustine heard his praises from Urbanus and Novatus, and wrote to welcome him, and also greet his son Verimodus. Darius wrote back, almost worshipping Augustine, and hoping that he might live long to pray for him: Augustine answers, not attempting to conceal the pleasure Darius's letter had given him, and quoting a line from Ennius:

"Omnes mortales sese laudari exoptant."

Yet when good men are praised he says it does good not to those who get, but to those who give the praise. He sends Darius his *Confessions*, and begs his prayers. He also sends him his books *On Faith of things unseen*, *On Patience*, *On Continency*, *On Providence*, *On Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*. (Aug. *Ep.* 229-231.)

[E. B. B.]

DARLUGDACHA (DARDULACHA, DERLUGHACH, DERLUGDACHA), abbess of Kildare, Feb. 1. This saint has a Scotch and Irish, and also perhaps a Continental, connexion. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 229-30) gives a memoir of her, taken mostly from St. Ultan's *Life of St. Brigida*; the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. 1, tom. i. 186-7) chiefly follow Dempster in giving her acts. Under the name of Dardulacha, she is noticed by Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* lib. iv. vol. i. 214, Feb. 1) and by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 200, Dec. 1), but with no allusion to Kildare, or to any place but Frisengen, so that it seems doubtful whether they had the abbess of Kildare at all before their minds, though the names are similar, and Dempster places his saint on February 1, the feast of St. Darlugdacha. Of her birth and parentage we know nothing, except that she was not the sister of the martyrs Gunifort and Gunibald, as Dempster is usually interpreted as stating. She succeeded her mistress St. Brigida (February 1) in the abbacy of Kildare, and after a year in that office departed to the Lord, probably in the year 524. In the *Pictish Chronicle*, *Irish Nennius*, and like authorities, it is said that in the third year of Nectan Morbet, son of Erip, king of the Picts, she came to Britain as an exile from Ireland for Christ, and in the following year king Nectan presented Abernethy to God and to St. Brigida, Darlugdacha singing alleluia over the offering. But as to this legend we may

safely follow Dr. Todd in saying that it is "false and out of chronology." (Challoner, *Brit. Sanct.* pt. i. 95; Skene, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, 6, 28, 399; *Irish Nennius*, by Todd and Herbert, 161; Innes, *Civ. and Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. sect. 55, ii. sect. 9; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, ii. 225-8; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 321-2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 1, n. 22, c. 9, § 7.) [J. G.]

DASHAD (or DADJAD), of the race of the Kenthunians, lieutenant of Vartan, slain in battle for the faith in Armenia, Whitsunday, June 2, A.D. 451. (Lazarus Pharbensis, c. 36, and Eli-saeus, c. 6, in Langlois, *Coll. Hist. Arm.* ii. 222, 298.) An English translation of Elisaeus by C. F. Neumann was published for the Oriental Translation Fund, London, 1830. [E. B. B.]

DASIUS (1), according to the *Menology*, was a soldier at Dorostolus, where it was the custom to offer a human sacrifice to Saturn on Nov. 20, a month before the Saturnalia, and he, being selected for the purpose, preferred to die a Christian, which meant dying by torture. The event is referred to the time of Diocletian and Maximian.

(2) Martyr with Gaius and Zoticus at Nicomedia, Oct. 21. (*Men. Basil.*) [E. B. B.]

DATIANUS (1) Usuard, *Mart.* Ap. 16, persecuting governor of Spain. [DACIANUS.] [C. H.]

(2) One of the judges of PHOTINUS (Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxxi. p. 829). [G. S.]

DATIUS, bishop of Milan, c. A.D. 527. Encouraged by the successes of Belisarius in southern Italy, he took a leading part in bringing about the revolt of Liguria from Vitiges the Gothic king of Italy, and thus, in the words of Gibbon (c. xii.), "seduced his countrymen to rebellion and ruin." Accompanied by the chief citizens of Milan he went on an embassy to Belisarius at Rome, A.D. 538, and obtained from him a thousand Thracian and Isaurian troops, with whose help he felt confident he could hold the province for the emperor (Procop. *de Bell. Goth.* lib. ii. c. 7). About the same time Cassiodorus addressed a letter to him, still extant, relating to the distribution of corn to the people during the severe famine then prevailing (Cassiodor. *Variar.* lib. xii. Epist. 27). The next year, A.D. 539, saw the fallaciousness of Datus' overweening confidence. Milan was taken and sacked by the Goths, and Datus fled to Constantinople. On his way thither he proved his power as an exorcist during a sojourn at Corinth, by driving from a haunted house, which afforded convenient quarters for his numerous retinue, the demons which had rendered it untenable (Gregor. *Magn. Dial.* lib. iii. c. 4). When Justinian published his edict condemnatory of the three articles, A.D. 546, Datus refused to sign it, and in A.D. 547, on Vigilius being compelled by the emperor to leave Rome and repair to Constantinople, he sailed to Sicily to meet him and fortify him in his opposition to the edict, and returned with him to Constantinople, where he supported him vigorously in his controversy with Justinian, joined in the condemnation of Theodorus of Caesarea (Labbe, v. 335), and with Vigilius took refuge in the church of St. Peter, Aug. A.D. 551, from which the imperial troops vainly endeavoured to drag the pope by force; and was again his companion when, in the month of December, he a second time sought sanctuary

in the church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon. Vigilius, afraid to leave his asylum, appointed Datus, with others, his representative in the approaching discussions. (Vigil. *Epist.* xv.; Labbe, v. 328. 59.) Datus's death is placed in A.D. 555. The *Chronicon Mediolanense*, preserved at Milan, bearing Datus's name, has been proved by Mabillon (*Analect. Vet.* i. 3) to be wrongly ascribed to him (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 511; Dupin, *H. E.* vol. v. p. 30; Baronius, *Annal.* sub ann. 538, 539, 540, 547; Procop. *de Bell. Gall.*). [E. V.]

DATIVA (Carthaginian refugee?). Christian at Rome. (Cyp. *Ep.* 22.) See MACARIUS. [E. W. B.]

DATIVUS (1) bishop of Badae, in Numidia, a frontier post toward the Gaetuli. There was a praepositus limitis Badensis. *Sentt. Episc.* 15 Syn. Carth. Cyp. vii.; *Ep.* 76, one of the eight with NEMESIAN; one of the four joint authors of *Ep.* 77. [E. W. B.]

(2) Seventh bishop of Limoges, in the latter part of the 3rd century. He succeeded Adelphius in the bishopric. After nineteen years however he was deposed in the time of the persecution by Diocletian; but whether by the ministers of the emperor, on account of his defence of the faith, or by the bishops, on account of some lapse, is not known. He was replaced by a second Adelphius, who is thought to have been a grandson of the former, and was the first to see peace restored to the church under the emperor Constantine. (*Gull. Christ.* ii. 501.) [D. R. J.]

(3) Celebrated senator, martyred under Diocletian in A.D. 304, on Feb. 11. In spite of orders to the contrary, a company of the faithful met in the town of Abitina, in the proconsulate of Africa, to celebrate Christian worship and communion, at the house of one Felix Octavius. Forty-nine men and women were surprised by the official and magistrates of the town. They marched cheerfully to their destination, chanting hymns and canticles, having at their head Dativus the senator and Saturninus the presbyter, accompanied by his children. They confessed Jesus Christ, were chained, and sent to Carthage.

The proconsul Anulinus examined them; and when Dativus refused to say who was the chief of their company, he was tortured. As he lay under the iron, at a second examination, Dativus was accused by Fortunatianus, advocate, brother of the martyr Victoria, one of the arrested, of enticing her and other young girls to Abitina. Victoria, however, indignantly denied that she had gone there but of her own accord. The executioners continued tormenting Dativus, till the interior of his breast could be seen. He went on praying and begging Jesus Christ for patience. The proconsul, stopping the torture, asked him again if he had been present? "I was in the assembly," he answered, "and celebrated the Lord's Supper with the brethren." They again thrust the irons into his side; and Dativus, repeating his prayer, continued to say, "O Christ, I pray thee let me not be confounded." And he added, "What have I done? Saturninus is our presbyter."

The attention of the proconsul was now turned to Saturninus and others; Dativus was taken

from the rack, and again carried to gaol. Here he soon afterwards died. The others of the company were treated in much the same manner, and most of them were starved to death in prison. (Ruinart, *Act. Sinc. Mart.* p. 382; Ceillier, iii. 20, etc.; *A.A. SS. Bolland.* Febr., ii. p. 513, ex MS. Treverensi S. Maximini et Surio.)

[W. M. S.]

DAUSAS, martyr in Persia, A.D. 361, was among the captives carried away by Sapor when he took Bezabde or Phoenicia (Fynyk), the capital of Zabdiene, in A.D. 360. Heliodorus, the bishop, fell ill on the journey into Persia, laid his hands on the head of Dausas, made over to him the portable altar, and gave him charge of all those who had escaped the rack. Ordination by a single bishop was in this case of necessity considered sufficient. Day by day the captives celebrated the holy eucharist. The magi were angry, and reported to the king these promiscuous meetings of both sexes as occasions for cursing his majesty. Sapor, who was at Dursae in Daren, gave orders that Dausas and all who assembled with him should be carried to one place and there questioned. He gave Adaphares 100 horse and 200 foot soldiers for the purpose. When Dausas, with Mariabus, the coadjutor bishop, and priests, deacons, and laity, men and women to the number of 300, were met for a sermon, they were informed that it was the king's pleasure that they should go to the city of Saphet under Mount Nasebden, in the province Daven. They obeyed, but at the city gates Adaphares bade them halt, and gave notice that the king had heard how they had cursed him, and now they must embrace fire-worship or die.

"Cruel nation," cried Dausas, "the blood of the Christians of the East is still trickling from your fingers, and you will see the blood of Western Christians shed." Then turning to his flock, "Courage!" he said, "think that we shall be delivered from the yoke of bondage and restored to our country." The captives were then slain by fifties, to the number of 265. Twenty-five remained who apostatised. What had become of the other ten we are not told. A deacon, Ebed-Jesu, who had been left for dead, recovered, and was attended by a man in the neighbourhood, and together they buried Dausas, Mariabus, and some of the priests in a cave at the foot of the mountain, and shut the mouth of it with stones. (Assemani, *Mart. Orient. Occid.* p. 131 ff.; cf. Amm. Marcell. xx. 7; Rawlinson, *Seventh Monarchy*, p. 184; Ceillier, iii. 335.)

[E. B. B.]

DAVANAN. In the parish of Rothsay, in Bute, there are the ruins or vestiges of twelve little chapels, and among them is Kildavanan, which gave its name to a lordship, but whether there was a saint called Davanan, or whether Kildavanan meant simply the "church of the two little monks," is not known (*Orig. Par.* ii. 223-4, 229; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 322.) [J. G.]

DAVID (1) (in one MS. written Dadub), one of the four luminaries in the Barbeliot system (Irenaeus, i. 29). It is apparently the same name as the DATES of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26, p. 90): just as in the same lists we may probably identify the Eleleth of Irenaeus with the Elilaues of Epiphanius. [G. S.]

DAVID (2) Bishop of the 5th century. About A.D. 440, he carried a letter from pope Leo the Great to the bishops of Mauritania, and is praised by the pope. (*Patrol. Lat.* liv. 653, Leon. Mag. *Epist.* num. 12, § 666; Ceillier, x. 199.)

[W. M. S.]

(3) Deacon, treasurer of the church of Edessa, in the 5th century, one of the witnesses produced by Samuel, one of the four presbyters of that church, who had belonged to the party of Rabulas, their late bishop, and accused his successor Ibas before Photius of Tyre, etc. The judges rejected the testimony of David. (*Labbe, Concil.* iv. 653; Ceillier, x. 653.) [W. M. S.]

(4) Is a common form of the Irish Dabi, Mobi, &c. [DABIUS]. The most famous of the name was David, son of Guaire Ua Forannain, who succeeded St. Dubhthach in the episcopate at Armagh, in A.D. 548. He seems to have been of the family of the Hy-Fiachrach, and to have ruled only a short time at Armagh, as the *Four Masters* enter his death at A.D. 550, where also they call him "Legate of all Ireland." (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 188 n. e.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 269, 293; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 10, § 13; Ware, *Ir. Bishops*, by Harris, 38.)

[J. G.]

(5) ST. (DEGUI, DEWI), the most eminent of all the Welsh saints, called in his native tongue Dewi.

His Period.—The *Annales Cambriae*, our earliest authority for his existence, place his death in A.D. 601; and one reading, which the *Monumenta* only gives in brackets, under the year 458, has this entry: "St. Dewi nascitur anno tricesimo post discessum Patricii de Menavia" (M. H. B. 830, 831). Geoffrey of Monmouth places his death in A.D. 542, and William of Malmesbury in A.D. 546. Ussher has taken great pains to prove that he died A.D. 544, at the age of 82 (*Brit. Eccl. Ant. Works*, 1847; vi. 43, 44, Chron. Index, ad ann. 544); but Rice Rees, who has followed him in his computations, believes it is necessary to place his birth 20 years later, and fixes A.D. 566 as the last date possible for his death. Messrs. Jones and Freeman, in their *History of St. David's*, incline feebly to the A.D. 601 of the *Ann. Camb.*, and this also is the date adopted by Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, i. 121, 143, 148), who remark that David would thus come into view just as the history of Wales emerges from the darkness that conceals it for a century after the departure of the Romans. *His Life*, if it could be depended upon, would illustrate an extremely interesting period, when the native Christianity of this country, after outliving the Roman occupation, was struggling single-handed with a fiercer paganism, and just a generation before it had to encounter a reappearance of Rome and a new spiritual conquest.

His Biographers.—The earliest known *Life* of this saint was written some five centuries after his period by bishop Rythmark, Rithmarch, Ryddmarch, or Ricemarchus, the last but one of the British occupants of the see of St. David's at the close of the 11th century, who wrote only a few years before the bishops of St. David's became subject to Canterbury, and when it was their interest to make out the ancient independence of the Cambrian church. His

work, which is printed in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii., is the source of all the existing *Lives*; it professes to be drawn from documents extant at St. David's in the writer's time; the style is rugged and unclassical, but the author shews himself, as Jones and Freeman remark, well acquainted with the localities. He was followed, at the distance of another century, by Giraldus Cambrensis, bishop of St. David's from A.D. 1199 to 1203, who professed chiefly to present Ryddmarch in a more scholarly dress. His work will be found in the same volume of the *Anglia Sacra*, and in vol. iii. of Mr. Brewer's recent edition of Giraldus. Abridged from these are the lives by John of Tinemouth and Capgrave, and those inserted in the *Acta Sanctorum* of Colgan and the Bollandists, and none of these vary much from each other. The latest is one edited in 1853 from a Cotton MS. in Welsh and Latin (*Cambro-British Saints*, edited for the Welsh MSS. Society by W. J. Rees, p. 102). A *résumé* of authorities is given by Jones and Freeman (*Hist. of St. David's*, 240), and a full and careful list of all known materials, manuscript and printed, is to be seen in Hardy (*Descr. Catal.* i. 766).

The story of his life.—The asserted facts of St. David's life, or rather such of them as are not legendary on the very face, meet with various degrees of credence from authors of repute. Rees, in his *Essay on Welsh Saints*, while rejecting several circumstances as manifestly fabulous or incredible, such as his going to Jerusalem to be consecrated, is disposed to accept enough to make out a biographical narrative. We shall in the first place give an abbreviated sketch of this ground, selecting for the most part those incidents to which an historical interest would attach.

His father was Sandde ab Ceredig ab Cunedda, in mediaeval Latin Xantus or Sanctus, prince of Keretica, a province answering to modern Cardiganshire. His mother was Non, Nonna, or Nonnita (a name still preserved in "Nun's Well" and a ruined chapel existing on the shore of Bride's Bay), daughter of Gynyr or Caergawch. His birthplace was near Hen-Meneu or Hen-Mynyw, *latinè* Vetus Menavia, and he was baptized at Porth Clais in that neighbourhood (a narrow creek running inland for about a quarter of a mile) by Elvi, Aelvius, or Albeus, bishop of Munster, "who by divine providence had arrived at that time from Ireland." He is said to have been educated first under St. Ilutus in his college at Caerworgorn (afterwards called from him Llanilltyd Fawr, or Lanwit Major, five miles from Cowbridge), and subsequently in the college of Paulinus (a pupil of Germanus and one of the great teachers of the age), at Ty-gwyn ar Daf (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 178), or at Whitland in Carmarthenshire (Jones and Freeman); and here he spent ten years in the study of holy scripture. In course of time David became head of a society of his own, founding or else restoring a monastery or college at a spot which Giraldus calls Vallis Rosina (derived as is generally supposed from a confusion between *Rhos*, a swamp, and *Rhosyn*, a rose), near Hen-Meneu, and this institution was subsequently named, out of respect to his memory, Ty Dewi, House of David, or St. David's. In those days, remarks Rees, abbots of monasteries were looked upon in their own neighbourhoods as bishops, and were

styled such, while it is probable that they also exercised chorepiscopal rights in their societies (*Welsh Saints*, 182, 266; cf. Haddan and Stubbs, i. 142, 143). Such an episcopal or chorepiscopal dignity David enjoyed before his elevation to the archbishopric of the Cambrian church. It was the Pelagian controversy that occasioned his advancement to this summit. To pronounce upon the great heresy that was then troubling the church, archbishop Dubricius convened a synod at Brefi, and David, whose theological reputation was too great for him to be spared, had to be dragged to it from his beloved retirement. The eloquence and force with which he put the troublers to confusion made such an impression, that the synod at once elected him archbishop of Caerleon and primate of the Cambrian church, Dubricius himself resigning in his favour. The locality of this synod, which holds a marked place in Welsh ecclesiastical traditions, was on the banks of the Brefi, a tributary of the Teifi; Llanddewi Brefi it was afterwards called, from the dedication of its church to St. David. It is eight miles from Lampeter in the county of Cardigan, and from recent archaeological discoveries it has been identified with an important Roman station, the *Loventium* of the *Itineraries* (Lewis, *Top. Dict. of Wales*; cf. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 117). The Pelagian heresy, however, still survived, and the new archbishop convened another synod, the issue of which was so decided as to distinguish it by the name of the Synod of Victory. It is entered in the *Annales Cambriae*, "Synodus Victoriae apud Britones congregatur," under the year A.D. 569, but not with full confidence (M. H. B. 831). It is also mentioned, but without a date, in the *Annales Menevenses* (Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* ii. 648). After residing for a while at Caerleon on Usk, where the seat of the primate was then established, David, by permission of king Arthur, removed to Menevia. The transference of the head-quarters of the Cambrian church from the famed Roman fortress that commanded the entrance into Wales, the *Urbs Legionum*, to that obscure, remote, and extremely desolate region, has of course excited great curiosity as to what the reason could have been. Rees conjectures a desire to dignify a spot endeared to him by early associations. This would not be worthy of an archbishop. The "frequency of people at Carlegion," to which Godwin attributes it, was not worthy of a church. The "remote and solitary situation fitted for heavenly contemplation" (Jones and Freeman, 237) would be worthy of him had he been little else than an ascetic. Could there have been any better reason? We know that Menevia, the *Menapia* of the *Itineraries*, was one of the ports from which ships passed over into Ireland (Wright, *Celt. Roman, and Saxon*, 138). The Roman road *Via Julia* conducted to it; the voyage across was five and forty miles; the *Menapii*, one of the tribes which held the eastern coast of Ireland, were no doubt a colony from the opposite shore of Britain (*ibid.* 43); David's baptism by the bishop of Munster indicates a religious connexion between Menevia and Ireland. The tradition of a mission of the British church to Ireland to restore the faith there, under the auspices of David, Gildas, and Cadoc (Haddan and Stubbs,

Councils, i. 115) points the same way. Why may we not, therefore, account for the removal of the see by assuming that the tide of the Saxon conquest drove the British church to cultivate closer relations with their Celtic brethren opposite?

As primate, David distinguished himself by saintly character and apostolic zeal, a glowing, not to say an overcharged, description of which is given in Giraldus. It is generally agreed that Wales was divided into dioceses in his time. Rees, in his learned *Essay* on the obscure but interesting subjects of the Welsh saints, has carefully studied the dedications and localities of the churches of the principality, and among them are found a large number terminating in David's native name, *ddewi*, or otherwise connected with his memory (see the list in *Welsh Saints*, p. 52). These instances, moreover, are found to prevail in a well-defined district; and Rees has ingeniously used these circumstances for the purpose of ascertaining the limits of the diocese in which archbishop David exercised immediate jurisdiction. The result may be seen at pp. 197-199 of the *Essay*. His successor in the see was Cynog.

Such is the story of St. David, omitting glaring and obvious legends. Jones and Freeman have carefully examined it (*St. David's*, 246 sq.), and their conclusion as to what are the historical facts which we may safely accept is this: that St. David established a see and monastery at Menevia early in the 7th century, the site being chosen for the sake of retirement; that his diocese was co-extensive with the Demetae; that he had no archiepiscopal jurisdiction; that a synod was held at Brefi, in which he probably played a conspicuous part, but that the objects of it are unknown; and finally that of his immediate successors nothing is recorded (*ibid.* 257). These writers leave on their reader's mind a vivid impression of the "strange and desolate scenery" of the spot now named after St. David, and give some curious antiquarian details of it. The story has had to be sifted by Messrs. Haddan and Stubbs likewise, for the chapter of their *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, which is headed 'British Church during the Period of the Saxon Conquest.' But the nature of their important work did not allow of any connected narrative or discussion, and their views are given in various notes and observations (i. 115-120). It will suffice here to observe that as to the synod of Brefi and the synod of Victory, though the fact of their having been held is not questioned, the dates given to them respectively, a little before A.D. 569 and in A.D. 569, are later than Rees's latest possible date for David's death; while the accounts given of the synods by Rice-marchus, and Giraldus after him, are regarded as purely fabulous, and directed to the establishment of the apocryphal supremacy of St. David and his see over the entire British church. There is besides more than a doubt cast upon the statement that the purpose of those assemblies was to crush Pelagianism. Valuable documentary information and references as to the whole subject of the early Welsh episcopate are given in Appendix C of the chapter we are speaking of, and the point is maintained that "there is no real evidence of the existence of any archiepiscopate at all in Wales during the Welsh period, if the term is held to

imply jurisdiction admitted or even claimed (until the 12th century) by one see over another."

David was canonised by pope Calixtus about A.D. 1120; he was commemorated on March 1 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 201). [C. H.]

DAVID (6) sixth bishop of Spire and first abbat of Weissenberg, is described by Bruschi as a pious, wise, and most honourable man. He is said to have ruled his diocese eight years, about the middle of the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* t. v. p. 716.) [D. R. J.]

(7) ST., 41st bishop of Bourges, lived in the end of the 8th century and died A.D. 802. He is said to have been buried in the monastery of St. Laurentius (*Gall. Christ.* ii. p. 20). [D. R. J.]

(8) 5th abbat of the monastery of St. Martin, Savigni, near Lyons, lived in the reign of Charles the Bald (*Gall. Christ.* iv. p. 260). [D. R. J.]

DAZINAS, or DAZIZAS. Of the 4th century, addressed by Eustathius, A.D. 373, in a letter in which he accused St. Basil of bad faith, and of Apollinarian errors. (*Basil Mag. Epist.* xxxi. § 223, cxliv. § 379, *Patrol. Graec.* xxxii. pp. 566, 917; Ceillier, iv. 361, 453.) [W. M. S.]

DEAL-UN, or DAEBUNUS, an Englishman of the 8th century, addressed by Lullus, afterwards archbishop of Mayence, as his master. Sending him some little presents, he asks him to forward to him some works of bishop Aldhelm, either prose, verse, or rhyme. Lullus was then a deacon, in Germany. (*Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. 819, etc.; Ceillier, xii. 131.) [W. M. S.]

DEATH AND THE DEAD. I. Plato most, and Aristotle to some extent, influenced the teaching of the Fathers of the Church on death: the former by his interpretations of the beautiful myths relating to the unseen world and a future judgment before Radamanthus, Æacus, and Minos, at which every body was to appear naked and unclothed: which he said meant that death was no more than a separation of the soul from the body (*Gorg.* c. 80, and *Phaed.* c. 15); and the latter by proving metaphysically that the soul is in part separable from the body—the eternal from the corruptible. But besides its intrinsic recommendations, Christians saw this view authoritatively confirmed by the account given of the death of Christ in each of the Gospels: "He yielded up His spirit," as in St. Matthew; "expired," as in SS. Mark and Luke; the latter having interpreted it by anticipation in recording His last words: "Father, into Thy hands I will deposit my spirit;" and "gave up His spirit," as in St. John. This, again, was in harmony with the account given of the raising of the daughter of Jairus by St. Luke (viii. 55), "Her spirit came back:" and illustrated remarkably those remarkable words in Genesis (ii. 7) recording the creation of the first man, "Quum in primordio duo diversa atque divisa, limus et flatus, unum hominem coegissent:" as Tertullian says (*De Anim.* c. 27); and on which he founds his declaration further on: "Opus mortis discretio corporis animaeque" (*ib.* c. 51). So far therefore they were agreed; but on what ensued they hesitated, till at length with characteristic idiosyncrasy the Eastern and Western Fathers committed themselves to the two separate lines

of thought that lay open before them—having been already traced in separate schools—one by the writers of the O. T., where the death of the righteous and wicked, of Ahab (2 Kings xxii. 40) as well as David (1 Kings ii. 10), is described as sleep; the other in myths accepted by poets and philosophers, where the intermediate state is shadowed forth as so much time spent in conscious action or suffering by the disembodied soul previously to its final destination. Accordingly, St. Chrysostom is full of the first idea: "For this cause, too, the place itself is called a cemetery; that you may know that the dead laid there are not dead, but at rest and asleep. For before the coming of Christ death used to be called death . . . and not only so but Hades . . . but after his coming and dying for the life of the world, death came to be called death no longer, but sleep and repose" (*Hom. de Coem. et Cruc.* op. tom. ii. 398, ed Ben.). Elsewhere he speaks of it as a state of ease and of deliverance from the cares of this life, entitling all who departed thither in friendship with God to the congratulations of those who survived them (*Hom. in 1 Thess.* iv. 13; *ib.* i. 765). The one formidable circumstance that he connects with it—namely, that there is no place for repentance after death—he dwells upon exclusively to convert the living (*Ep. ad Theod.* i. 8; *ib.* i. 11). True, the church had always prayed for the dead: but that custom had come from the Jews; and was easily explained, on the supposition of a judgment to come, to have been prompted by considerations of it alone. The treatises of St. Augustine—*De curâ pro mortuis gerendâ*; his *Enchiridion* and *City of God* particularly—set Western minds speculating upon infinite points in the opposite direction; namely, what good the living might still be able to do for the dead, or the dead for the living. What special grounds, it was asked, had the church for commemorating saints and martyrs in her public services, besides praying for the dead? and what was it that had been meant by St. Paul in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians (ii. 16) when he contemplated "a man's work being burned, but himself saved, yet so as by fire"? To the last query the bishop of Hippo replied in his last-named work (xi. 26, § 4): "Post istius sane corporis mortem, donec ad illam veniatur, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicuntur perpeti, quem non sentiant illi qui non habuerunt tales mores et amores in hujus corporis vitâ, ut eorum ligna, foenum, stipula consumatur: alii vero sentiant, qui ejusmodi secum aedificia portaverunt, sive ibi tantum, sive et hic et ibi, sive ideo hic ut non ibi, saecularia, quamvis a damnatione venialia, concremantem ignem transitoriae tribulationis inveniant, non redarguo quia forsitan verum est." To the next, in his *Enchiridion* (c. 107): "Neque negandum est defunctorum animas pietate suorum viventium relevari, cum pro illis sacrificium Mediatoris offertur, vel elemosynae in ecclesiâ fiunt; sed is prosunt, qui dum viverent, ut haec sibi postea possent prodesse, meruerunt." It was by this subtle distinction that he avoided contradicting St. Chrysostom, and indeed all previous teaching in the church that there was no place for repentance beyond the grave.

Such was the argumentative basis for what was afterwards developed into the mediæval doctrines of indulgences and purgatory, never realised practically by Easterns to this day. On the remaining point there has been more harmony between the East and West in practice from the 5th century downwards; but in the East it wears still the language of poetry; in the West the hints suggested by St. Augustine in his first-named treatise have long since been reasoned out with dogmatic precision. "Quoniam ista questio vires intelligentiæ meæ vincit, quemadmodum opitulanti martyres iis, quos per eos certum est adjuvari—utrum ipsi per se ipsos adsint uno tempore tam diversis locis, et tantâ inter se longinquitate discretos: sive ubi sunt eorum memoriæ, sive præter suas memorias ubicunque adesse sentiuntur: an ipsis loco suis meritis congruo, omni mortalium conversatione remotis, et tamen generaliter orantibus pro indigentibus supplicant (sicut nos oramus pro mortuis, quibus utique non præsentamur, nec ubi sint, nec quid agant scimus), Deus omnipotens qui est ubique præsens, nec concretus nobis, nec remotus a nobis, exaudiens martyrum preces, per angelica ministeria usquequaque diffusa, præbeat hominibus ista solatia, quibus in hujus vitæ miseriâ judicat esse præbenda, et suorum merita martyrum ubi vult, quando vult, quomodo vult, maximeque per eorum memorias, quoniam hoc novit expedire nobis ad ædificandam fidem Christi pro cuius confessione sunt passi, mirabili atque ineffabili potestate ac bonitate commendat" (c. 16). Invocation of saints spread rapidly from the date of this treatise; but practically the Gentile world had been long since prepared for it by the hero-worship in paganism which it displaced.*

The remaining aspect in which we find death viewed by the Fathers was strictly new; viz. as having been entailed by sin. This had been authoritatively laid down for them by St. Paul in his one Epistle to Westerns, i.e. the Romans; and it was a doctrine that was more explicitly brought out afterwards in the Western than in the Eastern Church. The denial of it by Pelagius and his followers elicited its argumentative statement from St. Augustine. In opposition to their assertion that the condition of the natural man had not been changed by sin, "the Catholic faith," said he, "maintained the first man to have been so made that he need not have died; so changed by sin that he could not but die:" a penalty from which nobody, not even those who had been born again in Christ and renewed by His Spirit, had been exempted, so far as this life was concerned; but to which, if faithful in this life, they could not ever be exposed again—(c. *Julian*, i. 96). "Posse non mori," described, in his way of putting it, the condition of Adam before sinning: "non posse non mori," the condition of all men in this life since then: "non posse mori," the condition of all who obtain salvation through Christ in the next world. (Comp. *Alcuin*, *de Trin.* iii. 18; and *Lombard's Sentences*, b. ii. dist. 19.) Death and life were consequently both from God; but death had been incurred by man as a punishment, whether he liked it or not: life was offered to him as a

gift, which he might accept or not as he liked. When the Pelagians argued that eternal death alone was penal, St. Augustine rejoined by asking if the mere separation of the soul from the body be not penal also, why should nature manifest the repugnance to it that she does in all cases? (c. *Jul.* ii. 86). Who ever died by choice? Every body would rather not if he could.

Sin and death having been thus brought into juxtaposition as cause and effect, their respective natures were analysed anew with striking effect. Sin was the act of the soul, not of the body; and death the dissolution of the parts of the body, not of the soul. The soul was the culprit, and the body the sufferer. "Don't talk to me," says St. Cyril (*Catech.* iv.), "of the body being accessory to sin as a cause; for if sin be caused by the body, how is it that a corpse never sins?" Decay was not inherent in matter, but had been produced by the will. In reality, therefore, sin was and ought to be called death, and freedom from sin life. Those who continued in sin might be said to be dead while they lived; those who forsook sin to be risen from the one death truly so called. People were said to be dead in sin, and dead to sin; to be dying daily long after they had been baptized or born anew. St. Ambrose in one treatise (*De Bono Mortis*, c. 1) speaks of death as threefold: 1. the death of the soul by sin; 2. the death of the soul to sin; 3. the death of the body when we depart from this life. Elsewhere (*De Fide Resur.* ii. 36) he supplies a fourth kind: the death of the soul as well as the body which is in store for all those who depart from this life with sins unrepented. But this last is more commonly called the second death; the name supposed to be given to it in the Apocalypse (xx. 6), where it is described as powerless on those who "have part in the first resurrection," that is, in the resurrection from sin obtained through Christ in this life. Such, at least, is the interpretation of this passage by St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 1-9); according to which view we have two deaths and two resurrections contradistinguished, temporal and eternal in each case. Still, whether "the first resurrection" described there applies, or at any rate should be limited, to what takes place in this life, has been warmly debated by Millenarians as well as Roman Catholics. (v. Art. CHILIASTS.)

To the objection of punishing sins committed in this life with what is called "second death" in the next—temporal acts with eternal sufferings—the Fathers replied, that transgressions against the Infinite required infinite satisfaction, such as Christ had made, or endless penalties where that was rejected. And undoubtedly death regarded from their—or, in other words, the Christian—point of view, as due to sin, has suggested immeasurably deeper views of moral responsibility than any known to the wisest previously, and has elevated human character in proportion: "*Quotidie morior*, Apostolus dicit," in the words of St. Ambrose, "melius utique quam illi qui meditationem mortis philosophiam esse dixerunt. Illi enim studium prædicarunt: hic usum ipsum mortis exercuit" (*De Fide Resurrect.* ii. 35).

There was another side to this aspect, transcendently more Christian still. "For Christ

* See the tract of Archbishop Ussher, on 'Prayers for the Dead,' in *Tracts for the Times*, No. 72.

also suffered once for sin: the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God," as St. Peter says (1 Pet. iii. 18). The sacrifice for sin was infinitely more potent for good, than sin for evil. It not only cancelled death, but guaranteed immortality. The spell of death was dissolved when it had been undergone by One who was sinless: thus substantiating conversely, that it had been caused by sin. Christ being truly and properly man, and intending to die for man, underwent the self-same death that all of us undergo. His sufferings were terminated by His soul quitting His body. But, again, Christ being God as well as man, and both indissolubly, though His soul and body were parted from each other, there never was any separation of either from His Godhead. His Godhead was never absent from His flesh in the tomb, nor from His soul in hell; but, on the contrary, reunited them as soon as ever the debt which He had come to discharge for others was fully paid. According to the Fathers, this was symbolised in the verse which says, "Canst thou draw out leviathan with a hook?" (Job xli. 1.) As Rufinus expresses it (*In Symb.* § 16-17): "Sicut ergo hamum escā contactum si piscis rapiat, non modo escam ab hamo non removet, sed et ipse de profundo, esca aliis futurus educitur, ita et is qui habebat mortis imperium rapuit quidem in morte corpus Jesu, non sentiens in Eo hamum Divinitatis inclusum: sed ubi devoravit, haesit ipse continuū, et diruptis inferni claustris, velut de profundo extractus, trahitur ut esca caeteris fiat . . . Non ergo hamum aliquo aut injuriā Divinitatis Christus in carne patitur: sed, ut per infirmitatem carnis peraretur salutem, Divina natura in mortem per carnem descendit: non ut lege mortalium letineretur a morte, sed, ut per Sese resurrecturus januas mortis aperiret: velut si quis rex pergat ad carcerem, et ingressus aperiat januas, resolvat catenas, vincula, seras, et claustra comminuat, et educat victos in remissionem, et eos qui sedent in tenebris et in umbrā mortis luci vitae restituat. Dicitur ergo rex fuisse quidem in carcere, non tamen eā conditione quā fuerant ceteri qui tenebantur in carcere: sed illi quidem ut poenas solverent, hic vero ut absolveret poenas." The fact is, that having done this in His own case, Christ procured for us all the means of repeating it in perpetuity for ourselves. By enabling us to become partakers of His divinity (1 Pet. i. 4), He more than restored to us the original righteousness which Adam had before he sinned, and by the new germ implanted in us at our baptism, unless lost subsequently by our misconduct, secured the raising in incorruption of our bodies as well as our souls, and their reunion in bliss for ever. (See Bp. Bull's *State of Man before the Fall*; and Lombard's *Sentences*, ii. 19.) [E. S. Ff.]

II. The condition of the dead in Christ, immediately till their bodies are raised, must now be considered as a separate topic. If there is any one practice in the Christian Church, not specifically recognised in the New Testament, which can claim the sanction of primitive antiquity, it is that of praying for the souls of the faithful departed. It was, as has been said already, part of its inheritance from Judaism. The well-known passage in 2 Maccabees (xii. 41-45) shews that, both at Jerusalem and in Alexandria, among

Hebrews and Hellenists, it was thought possible "to make a reconciliation for the dead that they might be delivered from sin." Those whose death in battle was looked upon as a judgment for a secret sin, were yet not despaired of by their friends. Money was collected and a sin-offering was offered. The practice was clearly familiar and common. Prayers for the dead have entered into the ritual of every Jewish synagogue from the earliest times to which that ritual can be traced. The Talmud tradition that faithful Israelites should suffer in the fire of Gehenna for twelve months at the most for the sins of their lives, and that this time might be shortened by the intercession and offerings of their friends, may represent a later and corrupt development; but the use of the *kaddish*, or special prayer for the dead, which was believed to have this power, and which was used on Sabbaths, New-moons, and Feast-days, goes back to the second or third century, if not earlier (Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* 6). Inscriptions in Jewish cemeteries at Rome (Garucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, pp. 34, 44; *Nuove Epigrafi*, p. 8), belonging to the same period, lead to the same conclusion. The silence of the New Testament in reference to the practice, even where the subject-matter of teaching or narrative would naturally have suggested it, is of course significant. It is neither condemned as among the corrupt traditions of the Pharisees, nor enforced upon the members of the new society. One passage only, the prayer that Onesiphorus may "find mercy in that day," while direct messages are sent not to him, but to his household (2 Tim. i. 16-18, iv. 19) has been considered as implying that the practice which must have been familiar to St. Paul in his life as a Pharisee, was not abandoned by him in his work as an Apostle. It must be admitted, however, that there is a like absence of any distinct trace of such prayers in the Apostolic Fathers. It may have been that the dominant belief in the immediate nearness of the Second Coming of the Judge threw into the background the thoughts and anxieties of men as to the intermediate state between death and judgment. When we pass the threshold of the second century, however, the evidence of their use multiplies on every side, and is of such a nature that it leads to the conclusion that they had from the first been the natural growth of Christian thought and feeling as to the state of the departed. The Liturgy in the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 41) includes a prayer for all souls that have pleased God from the foundation of the world. That of St. James asks God to remember all, named or unnamed by the church, from righteous Abel downwards, and to give them rest in the land of the living, in the paradise of God. Those that have the names of St. Mark, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, contain passages substantially identical (Neale's *Ancient Liturgies*, pp. 18, 19, 65, 122, 136). The agreement of so many independent witnesses affords some proof that this element, common to all, was to be found in the archetypal Apostolic liturgy from which they were all derived. But the feeling that prevailed among the believers in Christ shewed itself even more strikingly in their monumental inscriptions. In the Catacombs at Rome, in the cemeteries of Gaul, we find the prayer — VIVAS IN PACE, VIVAS IN CHRISTO,

AETERNUM VIVATIS, SPIRITUS TUUS BENE REQUIESCAT, DEUS CHRISTUS OMNIPOTENS SPIRITUM TUUM REFRIGERET (Martigny, s. v. *Acclamations, Purgatoire, Rafratchissement*). Some of these may, it is true, belong to a later time than that of which we are now speaking, but there is no sign throughout of any break of continuity, no indication at any moment that the prayer was looked upon as a novelty. From first to last, the thoughts connected with death are those of rest, peace, tranquillity, all of them capable of increase through the prayers of friends on earth. When we pass to the writings of the teachers of the church, the witness is no less clear. Tertullian, at the time when he was the most zealous opponent of any innovation, speaks again and again, not only of prayers, but of the Eucharist as an "oblato," a "sacrificium," offered on the anniversary of a loved one's death, as a long-standing usage, a thing of course in the common life of all Christians (Tertull. *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3, *de Monogam.* c. 10, *Echort. ad Castit.* c. 11). Cyprian carries on the tradition in the same church, and treats the denial of the prayers of the church as the severest penalty (*Epp.* 34, 37). Origen is a witness for the Church of Alexandria (*in Rom.* xii.). Cyril of Jerusalem, as might be expected, reproduces the very phrases of the Liturgy of St. James (*Catech. Myst.* iv. 6), and teaches that the "greatest benefit" accrues to the departed from such prayers. When Aetius appeared as the precursor of the Protestant view on this subject, assuming one broad line of demarcation in the unseen world, on one side of which such prayers were needless, and on the other fruitless, he was treated as opposing what had been the practice of the church from the beginning (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 75). His protest was, at all events, uttered in vain. In all the Churches of the East and West prayers were still offered for the dead; the Eucharist, as the highest act of intercession, was still thought of as an "oblato," a "sacrificium," for them.

The thoughts as to the unseen world which suggested or followed upon the practice were, at first, as far as the data for judging go, hazy and undefined, and certainly did not involve what we know as the Romish theory of purgatory in its full development. The worshippers were not troubled with questions as to their heathen friends, were content to think of them as lost for ever, dwelt only on the condition of the departed faithful. And this they pictured to themselves as one of imperfect yet progressive blessedness, a place of rest and refreshment, not altogether without suffering, if suffering were needed for purification or satisfaction, with higher or lower degrees of light and glory, leaving for those nearest to perfection what was spoken of in the Gospels as Abraham's bosom and the paradise of God. Prayers availed to accelerate the progress, perhaps to mitigate the penalty. They were offered, accordingly, for all without exception, prophets, apostles, saints, martyrs, for Peter, Paul, John, even for the Mother of the Lord (Ambrose, *Serm.* 20 *in Ps.* 118; *Hilar.* *in Ps.* 118), who was not as yet thought of as exalted to her throne in Heaven. When feeling came to be crystallised into theory, however, as men of acute and logical intellect became prominent as teachers of the church, it was necessary to give more sharply

defined reasons. At first they were connected with the expectations of a millennial kingdom, and a resurrection of the just who were to be sharers in it. Tertullian is the chief exponent of this phase of thought. That "first resurrection" is the inheritance of all baptized persons who have not fallen into deadly sin, but a "modicum delictum" will be punished by a corresponding delay (*de Animâ*, c. 58). The object of prayers for the dead is to obtain "refrigerium" during the time of expectation and a share in the first resurrection (*de Monogam.* c. 10). Men will rise sooner or later according to their deserts (*Cont. Marcion.* iii. 24). The belief continued to determine the thoughts of men at least as late as the 4th century. Ambrose, praying for the souls of departed emperors, asks for a "matura resurrectio" (*de Obit. Valent. ad fin.*), speaks of them as "beati, si quid meae orationes valebunt" (*ibid.*), goes indeed one step further, and says of those who are not sharers in the first resurrection, at the beginning of the millennial kingdom, that they will continue "burning" till the second, or at least "remain longer in their punishment" (*in Ps.* i.).

Millennial expectations, however, though not formally abandoned, fell into the background, and the great theologians of the 4th and 5th centuries had to find a theory about prayers for the dead which did not depend on them. Chrysostom was content with an emotional rhetoric. The "prayers were not in vain;" the dead, even if sinners, might be helped by them, and not by them only, but by alms and oblations (*Hom.* 41 *in 1 Cor.*). They were to be used only for the baptized, for all others, the ἀμύητοι, there was only Gehenna. Even catechumens were to be helped (one does not see the logical ground of the distinction) by alms rather than by prayer (*Hom.* 3 *in Philipp.*, *Hom.* 24 *in Johann.*). The hypothesis of a penal discipline after death had meantime gained ground in the East, and Gregory of Nyssa, not without a marked tendency to a belief in universal restitution, says that those who are not purified by prayer and wisdom in this life must pass through the πύρ καθάρσιον after their departure. Augustine, in this as in other things, at once more logical and more emotional, has to reconcile his impulses and his theory. He has no doubt about his mother's salvation, yet he prays after her death that her sins may be forgiven her; that God will not enter into judgment with her; that his father too, though less advanced in holiness, may be forgiven also (*Confess.* ix. 13). The growing tendency to the cultus of saints led him, indeed, to think it wrong to pray for martyrs, who ought rather, "quia impleverunt caritatem," to be entreated to pray for us (*Serm.* 17 *de Verb. Apost. Tract.* 84 *in Joann.*). He recognises that there will be "purgatoriae poenae" for the sins of some men (*de Civit. Dei*, xx. 25). In the small treatise known as the *Enchiridion* he distinguishes more in detail. For the very good, prayers, alms, the sacrifice of the altar are acts of thanksgiving, for the not very bad, . . . well, in that case, they, at least, serve as a consolation to the living. So we may pray, he adds in words every way remarkable "ut sit plena remissio, ac certe ut tolerabilior fiat damnatio" (*Enchir. ad Laurent.* c. 110). The prayer of Prudentius for himself may be taken as expressing the feeling which must often

have been prominent in men's prayers for others :—

"Esto, cavernoso, quia sic pro labe necesse est
Corporea, tristis me sorbeat ignis averno,
Saltem mirificos incendia lenta vapores
Exhalent, aestuque calor languente tepescat :
Lux immensa alios, et tempora vincta coronis
Glorificent : me poena levis clementer adurat."

Hamartigenica, ad fin.

[E. H. P.]

DEBO or BEBO, was bishop of Avignon about the year 429. He was previously not an ecclesiastic, but a senator of advanced years and splendid character. Throughout his career he was universally beloved for justice, mildness, and every good work. In 433 he restored the church of St. Paul, which had been destroyed by the Vandals, and which he afterwards dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul. In the *Index Sanctandreaus*, he is referred to in the following words : "Quinto calendas Mali Debo episcopus, postquam sedisset annos circiter octo, et utiliter admodum et gloriose rexisset episcopatum, obdormivit in Christo, sepultusque requiescit in ecclesia sanctorum apostolorum, quam decenter construxerat, et cum magna solemnitate biennio ante consecraverat." Debo was the twenty-second bishop of Avignon, and was succeeded by Julius. (*Gall. Christ.* i. p. 861.)

[D. R. J.]

DECALOGUE. (Δεκάλογος, δέκα λόγια, δέκα κεφάλαια, νομοθεσία.) That the ten commandments have long occupied a high place in the scheme of Christian teaching cannot be denied. But has this been so from the foundation of Christianity? In the Apostolic Fathers there is little or nothing which bears directly on this question. The earliest evidence is found in Pliny's celebrated letter (x. 96), in which he asserts that the Christians of Bithynia used to bind themselves by a solemn oath to abstain from theft, robbery, adultery, and perjury (ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent). Tertullian in his *Apology* (ch. ii.) quotes Pliny's letter in a way which makes it almost certain that this "sacramentum" of the Bithynian Christians was based upon the commandments of the second table.

In his treatise *Adversus Judaeos* (ch. ii.), this father speaks more plainly. He asks how one could suppose that God gave the law to one people only and not to the whole human race. The principles of the decalogue had been given from the creation; the law of Moses was the latest and fullest edition of the original law (lex principalis). Also cf. *De Pudicitia*, chs. iv. and v.

The testimony of Irenaeus is still stronger. In the fourth book of his work *Adversus Haereses* the writings of Moses are called the words of Christ (ch. iii.); certain chief commands are identical in the Scriptures of both covenants (eminentiora et summa sine quibus salvari non potest in utroque eadem suasit, ch. xxvi.). Moreover the decalogue differs from the rest of the law (ch. xxxi.); its words are still in force and contain natural and universal laws; the precepts of bondage were fit only for punishing and educating the Jewish people.

Clemens Alexandrinus in his *Stromata* (bk. vi. ch. xvi.) speaks of the decalogue as a pattern of genuine γνῶσις (γνώσις δ' ἡμῖν ἐκκείσθω εἰς

σαφηνειαν γνωστικῇν). He also discusses the commandments in detail, and evidently looks upon them as permanently binding on Christians as well as on Jews.

Origen's opinion on the subject may be gathered from his eighth Homily on the book of Exodus, where in treating of the first and second commandments, he points out that the first was addressed not merely to the Israelites, but also in a higher sense to all who by forsaking sin have escaped the bondage of their land of Egypt.

If St. Augustine's views be asked, we may refer to his treatise *Contra Faustum* (bk. xv. chs. v. and vii.), where he maintains that the decalogue is hostile to the principles of the Manichaeans, and in proof of this discusses the commandments one by one. Again in his treatise *De Catechizandis rudibus* (ch. xxiii.) he asserts that after the descent of the Holy Spirit, the disciples instead of finding the decalogue a burden were able to keep it with a feeling of pleasure.

The testimony of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, whatever be the exact date of the work, is most valuable, inasmuch as it entirely supports the views of the above-mentioned fathers. The decalogue is called νόμος φυσικὸς (i. 6, 3), and a distinction is carefully drawn between the original law (Exod. 20) and the repetition of it (δευτέρωσις, Exod. 34) after the people had worshipped the golden calf (νόμος δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ δεκάλογος ἡν πρὸ τοῦ τὸν λαὸν μαρσοποιῆσαι θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐνομοθέτησεν). Christ abolished the additions made at the second lawgiving (πάντας τὰ διὰ τῆς δευτερώσεως ἐπέσκατα); the decalogue He confirmed and expanded (vi. 22, 4). The church has received the decalogue and has been taught the law (ii. 25, 11); the Christian is bidden to remember the commands of God (πάντοτε μνημένος τῶν δέκα τοῦ θεοῦ λογίων), and a bishop is expected to distinguish between the first and second lawgivings (νόμον καὶ δευτέρωσιν διαρίων), and to decide clearly what is the law for believers and what the fetters imposed upon unbelievers (τί ἐστὶ νόμος πιστῶν καὶ τί δεσμὰ ἀπιστῶν, ii. 5, 4).

The Christian church, therefore, from the first century onwards has laid a special stress on the decalogue, and has accepted and used it as a basis of moral teaching.

[W. J. J.]

DECENTIUS (1) Bishop of Leone in Spain, present at the council of Elvira, in A.D. 300 or 301. (Labbe, *Concil.* i. 969; Ceillier, ii. 603.)

[W. M. S.]

(2) Bishop of Eugubium in Umbria, circ. A.D. 416. Pope Innocent I. answers certain questions of his in a canonical letter, praising him for his attendance at Rome, and observance to the see of St. Peter, which must on account of its origin be always the guide in disputed ecclesiastical customs. In this letter Innocent confines his own diocese to the churches of the city of Rome. (Innocent I. *Epist.* num. 25, *Patrol. Lat.* xx. 551; Ceillier, vii. 518.)

[W. M. S.]

DECIMUS. Cyp. *Ep.* 24. See FELIX.

[E. W. B.]

DECIVS. The reign of this emperor, though among the shortest in the Roman annals (A.D. 249–251), has gained a pre-eminence in ecclesiastical history altogether disproportioned to

that assigned to it in the general history of the empire. It was burnt in on the memories of men as the reign of Mary was on the minds of English Protestants, as that of Charles IX. was on the minds of the Huguenots of France. It was a fiery trial at the time, and it was the occasion of many memorable controversies.

Of the earlier life of Cn. Messius Decius Trajanus we know but little. He is said to have been born at Budala, in Pannonia, but when he first appears in history it is with a grown-up son, himself between fifty and sixty, as a member of the Roman senate, in the last year of the reign of Philip the Arabian. The legions in Pannonia were mutinous, and had elected one of their officers, Marinus, as emperor. The senate were alarmed. Who would be able to restore order? Philip, as trusting to the popularity of Decius with the troops, and his loyalty to himself, assigned the task to him. He went, but either his loyalty failed, or he found himself unable to resist the impetuosity of the legions. Marinus was easily disposed of; but then they elected him, and forced him to lead them into Italy. Near Verona they encountered Philip, who was defeated and slain (June 17, A.D. 249), and Decius began to reign. As if conscious of the greatness of his task, he associated his own son and Annus Maximus Gratus with him as Caesars. His most conspicuous administrative act (all the more notable as determined on when he was contending against the Goths) was more significant, and, as far as it went, spoke strongly for his desire to govern well. The office of censor had been in abeyance since the reign of Titus. It was now restored by Decius. Wise or unwise, the step was that of a man who saw that unbridled luxury, and the social confusions that followed on it, were the evils which were hastening on the destruction of the empire. The speech, which is reported in the *Augustan History* as having been addressed by him to the newly-appointed censor (see Gibbon, c. x.), shows an earnestness of purpose which may fairly be set against such phrases as the "*execrable animal*," the "*hostis Dei*," applied to him by Lactantius (*de Mort. Persec.* c. 4) as indicating a general depravity of character prior to the persecution with which his name was identified.

The edict which made his name a byword of reproach had its origin, probably, in a like motive. What seemed to be needed was to restore the rigorous morality of the old Roman life, and to do that it was necessary to restore also the old religion which gave that morality its sanctions. The new faith, or, as it would seem to Decius, the new superstition, which was rearing its head in every city in the empire, sapping the foundations of the old, must be stamped out. If we may judge by the confessions of the great Christian teachers, who owned that the church had deserved the sufferings which now fell upon it, the lives of its members did not at that time present a very lovely aspect. Christian men were effeminate and self-indulgent, trimming their beard and dyeing their hair; Christian women painted their faces, and brightened their eyes with cosmetics. The clergy were covetous and ambitious, looking on their profession as a path to wealth and influence. In addition to these evils they presented, even more than they had done in the days of the Antonines, the aspect

of a secret society, with a highly compact organisation, slowly stealing on, year by year, towards an usurped dominion. If the old calamities of Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean, i.e. incestuous, orgies, had died out, or been refuted by the great apologists, it was not the less alarming to see that society enlisting among its members thousands in all classes throughout the empire. The fact that the late emperor had been supposed to favour it, that there were whispers that he had been secretly a member of it, was enough (even if we reject the wild story of his having done public penance before Babybas at Antioch) to add another element to the policy which Decius now adopted. The zeal with which officials and mob alike entered into the policy of persecution, the fact that it had been anticipated by an outbreak of fanaticism at Alexandria a year before the publication of the edict, shewed that a ruler, who would put himself vigorously at the head of the enemies of the Christian church, was sure to enlist the support of a party which might well seem to him stronger than that of its supporters.

That policy was opened early in A.D. 250, by an edict which is no longer extant,* but of which we can form a fair estimate, partly from an account of it given by Gregory of Nyssa (*Vit. Greg. Thaum.*), and partly from the history of the persecution, as traced by Cyprian, in his epistles, and the treatise *de Lapsis*, and by Dionysius of Alexandria (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 40-42). It did not order any sharp measures of extermination. The emperor did not contemplate a massacre like that of St. Bartholomew, or cruelties like those of the Dragonades. He aimed rather at following in the steps of the emperor whose name he had adopted. Magistrates throughout the empire were ordered, under heavy penalties, to put pressure upon the worshippers of Christ, so as to bring them back to the religion of their fathers. If that end were attained there was to be no further molestation. The prefects were not slack to act on their instructions, and the work began. Fear did its work on many whose faith had never had any real groundwork in conviction. The seats of the magistrates were thronged with apostates, some rushing eagerly to be conspicuous among the first to offer sacrifice, and sprinkle incense on the altar; some pale and trembling, as if they were themselves about to be sacrificial victims. In that crowd of renegades were to be seen, too, not a few of the base and feeble-hearted priests of the Christian church. Others found out an ingenious way of satisfying their conscience, and securing their position and their life. The magistrates of the empire were not above the influence of bribes, and for a reasonable money payment would give a certificate (*libellus*) that sacrifice had been duly offered, without making the actual performance of the rite compulsory. The *libellatici* were rightly branded by Christian feeling with a double note of infamy for this miserable compromise. They added the guilt of dishonesty and falsehood to that of cowardice and denial. Bad as the *sacrificati*, the *thurificati* might be, they were not so contemptible as these.

* A document purporting to give the text of the Edict was published at Toulouse in A.D. 1664, but is universally acknowledged to be spurious.

When the work had passed through this first stage, attention was directed to those who remained faithful, and measures of severity were, as in the time of Trajan, brought to bear on them. They were summoned, and, in the event of their not appearing, sought out and dragged before the prefects and other magistrates, questioned as to their faith, required to sacrifice, exposed to insults and outrages if they refused, thrust into prison, and, in many instances, ill-treated till they died. The persecution was met, as in all like crises, in very different ways, by men of different temperaments. Some, the wiser and more prudent bishops, such as Dionysius of Alexandria, and Cyprian of Carthage, followed the counsel of their Lord (Matt. x, 23), and the example of Polycarp, fled from the violence of the storm themselves, and exhorted their followers to do the same. Some, who thus withdrew from the common life of men, never returned to it (as e. g. Paul, the hermit of the Thebaid, and Maximus of Nice), and the Decian period has been commonly regarded, though with some exaggeration, as the starting-point of the anchoritic life. The wiser pastors continued, as far as they could, to watch over their flocks, and to keep them steadfast in the faith, even while they were exposed to taunts and suspicions from those to whom they seemed guilty of cowardice or deception. Others languished in prison, like the sufferers at Rome, of whom Cyprian tells, "*sine solatio mortis*." Some courted death not in vain, or met it bravely.

The persecution of Decius (commonly reckoned by church historians as the seventh) may fairly be measured as to its extent, if not its actual severity, by the list of martyrs under it who still retain their place in the calendar of the Western church. They shew that it was at once more extensive, and more systematic than any that had preceded it. Fabian, bishop of Rome, was among the foremost of the victims; Babylas of Antioch, Pionius of Smyrna (seized, it was said, while celebrating the anniversary of the martyrdom of Polycarp), Agatha of Sicily, Polyeuctes of Armenia, Carpus and his deacon of Thyatira, Maximus (a layman) of Asia, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, Acacius of the Phrygian Antioch, Epimachus and Nemesius of Alexandria, Peter and his companions of Lamp-sacus, Irenaeus of Neo-Caesarea, Martial of Limoges, Abdon and Sennen, Persians, who, being at Rome, were involved in the sufferings of the Christians of that city, Cassian of Imola, Lucian a Thracian, Trypho and Respicus of Bithynia, the Ten Martyrs of Crete, have all found a place in the martyrologies of this period, and, after allowing for the uncertainty which attaches to some of the names, the list is enough to shew that there was hardly a province of the empire where the violence of the storm was not felt. Among those, who by their sufferings earned the title of confessors (which seems to have been then, for the first time, used in this sense), though they escaped death, were Origen, who was tortured on the rack, and the boy Dioscorus who, at the age of fifteen, offered himself for the crown of martyrdom, but was spared by the Alexandrian prefect in pity for his youth. Not to be passed over, in telling the story of this reign, is the well-known legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, told for the first time by Gregory of

Tours (*de Glor. Martyr.* c. 95). Confessing the faith, like Dioscorus, in the prime of early manhood, they were, it was said, walled up in a cave, and left to die. They fell asleep, and the place acquired a local fame for its sanctity. In the reign of Theodosius (A.D. 447) the cave was opened, and the sleepers awoke, went forth and were startled at the changes which they witnessed, temples destroyed, and churches standing in their place. Their second life was, however, of short duration. They again lay down together and fell asleep, this time not to wake again.

Happily, the persecution was as short as it was severe. The attacks of the Goths (or the Carpi, probably a Gothic tribe), drew Decius and his son into Pannonia. They fell in battle, and with their death there was a lull till the accession of Valerian. In some respects the after-effects of the Decian persecution were more important than its direct results. It cleared off the crowd of half-hearted Christians, and left behind those who were prepared by its discipline for the severer struggles that were to come under Valerian and Diocletian. Questions arose as to the treatment of those who had apostatised (the "*lapsi*" of Cyprian's treatise) under its pressure. Were the "*libellatici*" to be dealt with on the same footing as the "*thuriificati*"? Were either class to be looked on as capable of readmission into the fold of Christ? Was that readmission to be conditional upon the church's normal discipline, or were the confessors of the period to be allowed to give a certificate of absolution (the "*libellus pacis*") to those in whose weakness or repentance they saw sufficient reason for indulgence? The uncertainty which gathered round much of the history of the period made it easy to find in it materials for polemical bitterness. Those who prided themselves, like many of the Roman confessors, on their constancy, looked down with scorn on the indulgence shewn by Cyprian and Cornelius to the "*lapsi*," and even taunted the latter with having been a "*libellaticus*." The tendency to ascetic rigorism of discipline would doubtless have shewn itself sooner or later in any case, but historically the whole long history of the Novatian schisms had its beginning in the Decian persecution. (Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 39-45; Cyprian *de Laps.*, and *Epp.* passim, the articles in this dictionary on the persons named above, and an excellent paper on DECIUS by Hefele in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchen-Lexicon*. For the general history of the reign, see Gibbon (c. x.), whose narrative is based on Zosimus and Zonaras.) [E. H. P.]

DECIUS I., eighth bishop of Mâcon (Matisco). The period assigned to him by Severius is from 599 to 612. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 1042.) [D. R. J.]

DECIUS II., succeeded Deodatus as eleventh bishop of Mâcon. In some old documents he is described as a saint, but nothing is known of his life. He lived in the latter part of the 7th century and the beginning of the 8th. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 1042, 1043.) [D. R. J.]

DECLAN (1). Among the many saints who went to the continent and wrought in the evangelisation of Bavaria, with St. Virgilius or Fergal, St. Rupert, St. Alto, and others, was St. Declan, who is said to have died at Frisengen, on, it seems, a first day of December in the middle

of the 8th century (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 19, § 12; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 301, col. 2).

DECLAN (2) Declan or Deglan, son of Erc, bishop of Ardmore, July 24. The legendary accretions of a late date have done so much to involve in almost impenetrable obscurity the life of this saint, especially when they are accepted as history by such recognised authorities as Abp. Ussher and Colgan, that it is now difficult to attain the truth through the misleading haze of fable; in legend his life has a well-defined outline, but in authentic history he is almost unknown, and to the genuine facts of his life we are mostly guided by inference. The origin of all the difficulty is to be sought for in the attempt in the 11th or 12th century, to shew that bishops were in Ireland before St. Patrick, and that therefore Armagh had no such clear pretensions to the primacy as were claimed for her. (See the whole question discussed by Dr. Todd, *St. Patrick*, 198, 220-1.) Declan was son of Erc and Deitsin or Dethidin, and through his father Erc, who was called "Dux Nandesii," or chief of the Desii, he was descended, not, as the *Mart. Doneg.* says, from Eochaidh Finn Fuathairt (the race of St. Brigida, of Kildare), but from Fiacha Suidhe, son of Fedlimidh Rechtmar (or the Lawgiver), who was king of Ireland, A.D. 164-174, or earlier according to the *Four Masters*. He was born in Decies, in the county of Waterford, to which as a descendant of Fiacha Suidhe his father belonged, but the date is our first difficulty. Those who would make him precede St. Patrick in evangelising Ireland, must place his birth at latest about the middle of the 4th century, while the acceptance of the genealogy in the Latin Life (*Vita S. Declani*), which makes Erc fifteenth in descent from Fedlimidh, puts it well into the 7th century, which, on the other hand, is probably too late; the nearest we can approach to it is perhaps by placing his birth towards the end of the 6th century. His parents were Christian, and the infant was baptized by a priest named Colman, in all likelihood Colman (Nov. 24), son of Lenin, of Cloyne, in the barony of Imokilly, co. Cork, who died A.D. 600; at the age of seven Declan is said to have been put under the charge of a holy man who was newly returned to Ireland, and was named Dimma or Dima. This is most likely to have been Dimma Dubh, subsequently bishop at Connor, but descended of the great Munster family of Dal Cais and Clan of Sil-m Blod; he lived till A.D. 658. (For this early part of St. Declan's life see *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 201; Todd, *ut supra*, 207-9; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 73, c. 2, and *Tr. Thaum.* 613, col. 2; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. 25; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 333 sq.; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* iii. 48.) From at least this point begins the mythical, where we are told how Declan remained for a long time under Dimma, along with many who afterwards erected cells in Munster; how he then set out for Rome, met St. Ailbhe, and was consecrated bishop, with the special mission to evangelise his native country; how on his way home he met St. Patrick, who was as yet unconsecrated, but who prophesied that in thirty years he would follow him to Ireland (Ussher and Colgan put this meeting with St. Patrick in A.D. 402); how he preached to his compatriots, and established a cell of seven men near Lismore, on

the spot where he was born; how he again visited Rome, spent some time as he returned with St. David at Menevia, and was miraculously guided to a place called Ard-na-georach, which he afterwards called Ardmore; and how the four bishops, St. Ailbhe of Emly, St. Ciaran of Saighir, St. Declan of Ardmore, and St. Ultan of Ardbraccan taught the people of Ireland, and had gathered many converts when St. Patrick landed; yet how after some opposition they were content to submit to St. Patrick as their common master, and have the extent of their episcopal jurisdiction regulated by him. But here the chronology halts on every hand, as St. Ailbhe died at the latest in A.D. 541, and St. David was consecrated probably in A.D. 540. Taking however everything into consideration, St. Declan probably was a contemporary of St. Ultan, and died about the middle of the 7th century, but Lanigan would put him a century earlier. (Todd, *ut supra*, 209-14; Lanigan, *ut supra*, i. c. 1, § 12, c. 6, § 7, c. 9, § 7; Ussher, *ut supra*, cc. 16, 17; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 459, c. 9; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, vii. 396; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* i. 40 sq. 220 n. 3; O'Flaherty, *Ogygia*, i. pt. 1, p. 43, ii. pt. 3, cc. 75, 79, 85.) Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 199-202) quotes largely from the *Lives of St. Ciaran, St. Ailbhe, and St. Declan*, for their connexion with St. Patrick, and (*ib.* 250-2, c. xv.) discusses, doing what he can to decide in the affirmative, the question whether there were Christians in Ireland before the arrival of St. Palladius and St. Patrick. The Bollandists (*Acta SS. Jul.* 24, tom. v. 590-608) have their usual carefully compiled commentary, followed by the *Life of St. Declan*, taken from a MS. of Louvain, and collated with a MS. of the college of St. Isidore, at Rome. [J. G.]

DECUMANUS, ST., a Welsh devotee, who lived as a hermit at the place called from him St. Decumanus, near Watchet in Somersetshire, on the sea-coast ("pervectus est ad littus oppositum prope castrum Dorostorum," Capgrave, fol. lxxxvi., who gives a legendary life of the saint). His sacred well was long pointed out there. He is said to have died A.D. 706 (*Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. 27, vi. 24; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 161). There was also a chapel dedicated to him in the parish of Wendron, near Helston, in Cornwall (Oliver's *Monasticon Dioec. Exon.* p. 443). [C. W. B.]

Castrum Dorostorum is now Dunster Castle. Rees, who gives the life under the name of Degeman, states that he was patron saint of Roscreowther in Pembrokeshire, and of Llandegeman an extinct chapel in the parish of Llanfihangel Cwm Dû, in Brecknockshire. (*Welsh Saints*, 305; see also Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 389; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 161.) [C. H.]

DEDA, presbyter and abbat of Peartaneu in the province of the Lindissi. Bede, who calls him "vir fidelissimus," had from him what he states concerning the early evangelisation of Lincolnshire and the multitude of people baptized in the Trent by bishop Paulinus in the presence of king Edwin. Deda's authority was an old man who had himself been one of the multitude, who also described the personal appearance of Paulinus preserved in Bede (*H. E.* ii. 16). Peartaneu is by Camden called Bardney, a monastery in the centre of Lincolnshire; but

all later authorities, including Camden's editor, point out the mistake, and shew that it was Partenay, a cell of Bardney (Camden, ed. Gough, ii. 229, 267; Tanner, *Notit. Lincoln.* lxi.; *Monast. Anglic.* i. 622, 625, note i.; Smith's Beda, *H. E.* ii. 16, iii. 11; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 62). Bede himself in one passage (iii. 11) clearly distinguishes the two houses, calling Beardaneu a "noble monastery," to which king Oswald's bones were taken, and just afterwards referring to the monastery, "quod vocatur Peartaneu." Partenay was near its parent house, but ancient writers are silent as to its origin. [C. H.]

DEFENSOR (1) First bishop of Angers. Nothing certain is known either of his origin or age. The *Acts of St. Julian* relate that that saint converted the person who held the civil office of defensor at Le Mans, whom some identify with this Defensor. Others held that the Defensor who was the first preacher of the Gospel in Anjou, is he whom Sulpicius Severus and Fortunatus enumerate amongst the bishops who in vain endeavoured to prohibit St. Martin from the see of Tours. In *Gallia Christiana* the latter opinion is with a little hesitation preferred. The name of Defensor does not occur amongst those of the patron saints of the church of Angers. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 545; *Vita S. Juliani Episc. Cenomani*, ascribed to Lethaldus the monk; *Patrol. Lat.* cxxxvii. 781.) [D. R. J.]

(2) A monk of the monastery of Ligugé (Locociagense monasterium), which St. Martin founded on the river Clain (ad Clenum amnem), not far from Poitiers. He lived about the end of the 7th century, or the beginning of the 8th. Defensor, having embraced the monastic life at Ligugé, made study one of his principal occupations, and became so learned that he won for himself the title of Grammarian, which in ancient times was only applied to men of letters. He devoted himself more especially to the study of the Fathers, and at the advice of Dursinus, who directed his studies, he made extracts of the most edifying passages and formed them into a book, which he called *Scintillarum, seu Sententiarum catholicorum Patrum*.

In a short preface to that work, he says that he undertook it in order to spare his readers the trouble of reading a great number of volumes; that he had collected into this volume all that they could wish on the subjects which he undertook to treat; that to prevent any imputation of imposture, and for fear that his work might be considered apocryphal, he had carefully marked at the head of each sentence the name of the Father from whom he had taken it. These sentences are, as a rule, short; and the Fathers whom he cites are St. Clement, Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Augustine, Eusebius, a certain Josephus, not otherwise known, SS. Caesarius, pope Gregory, Isidore of Seville, and the Lives of the Fathers. The work is divided into eighty chapters, or seventy according to some manuscripts. It treats of the principal Christian virtues, such as charity, patience, the love of God and of one's neighbour, humility. It is evident from the preface that he was well instructed in the doctrine of St. Augustine, and that he had much modesty. The latest author he quotes is St. Isidore of Seville, who died about 536. In the same work he mentions that

he had been brought up and taught by Ursinus, who is none other than the prior or abbat of the same name who wrote one of the Lives of St. Leger, bishop of Autun, and lived about the year 682 or 683. Sixtus of Sienna, who must have read this work, since he quotes the first words, speaks of it with much praise. At the commencement of the 9th century it was found, without the name of the author, in the library of St. Riquier in Ponthieu. Mabillon having discovered a copy of it in the library of Montecassin, had the preface printed in the appendix to the second volume of his annals. He appears to think that the work had never been printed, but Possevin mentions three editions, one published at Antwerp, by Stelfus, in 1550; another at Venice, by Barthélemy de Albertis, in 1552; and the third at Cologne in 1554. (Defensor Locociagens, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 595; Mabillon, *Annal. O. S. Benedicti*, i. 10, ii. 704, § 23, i. 21, n. 12; *Spic.* iv. 484; Sixtus Siennensis, *Bib. lib. iv. p.* 24, 2; *Hist. Lit. de la Fr.* iii. 654, 655.) [D. R. J.]

DEGA. [DAIGH.]

DEGUI (Asser, *Gest. Aelfr.* in M. H. B. 488), bishop of Menevia. [DAVID, ST.] [C. H.]

DEICOLUS (DEICOLA, DEEL, DICHULLI), of Lure, abbat, commemorated Jan. 18. This saint is one of those who accompanied St. Columbanus (Nov. 21) from Britain to Burgundy, and, so long as St. Columbanus was at Luxeuil, the life of the monk is merged in that of his master, the abbat. There are many lives of St. Deicolus extant, based apparently upon the same outline of fact, but filled in with many mythical details, and dealing more in wonders to magnify the saint, than in distinct historical delineation. The most accurate and important life is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 115-27) and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jan. 18, tom. ii. 199-208), and belongs to the 10th century. Others are given by Vincentius, Petrus, Menard, Belfortius, and the Benedictines, while many ancient biographies are believed to be still extant in manuscript. His memoirs have also been often written in modern times, shewing his popularity, both in Britain and on the continent. [COLUMBANUS; GALLUS.] St. Deicolus was uterine brother of St. Gallus (Oct. 16), the apostle of Switzerland, and came to Gaul about A.D. 575, according to Baronius, or in A.D. 589 according to others. He was with St. Columbanus at Luxeuil, when that abbat was banished from Burgundy by Thierry II. at the instigation of the queen-mother, Brunchild, and would have accompanied him into exile had he not failed from bodily weakness, and been left, as was supposed, to finish his earthly pilgrimage among the brushwood near the monastery. By divine strength and guidance, however, he found his way through the forest, till reaching, under the pilotage, it is said, of some swineherds, the place where the town of Lutra or Lure now stands, in the province of Burgundy, and department of Haute-Saône, he built his cell there, which in course of time grew into a large and flourishing monastery, the centre of a busy population. He is said to have visited the Roman pontiff. At the end of about ten years at Lure, he saw death approaching, had his friend Columbinus appointed to the abbacy in his room, and then retiring into

greater seclusion died on Jan. 18, A.D. 625. His chief festival has always been Jan. 18. The Scotch writers, Dempster and Camerarius, have appropriated him as an Albanic Scot, and called him abbat of Sutrium in Etruria, but they err in both particulars. (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 184; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, ii. 348, 476-80, Edinb. 1861; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 13, § 1, c. 16, § 4; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, i. 271-2; Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, i. 280-83; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 301-19; Dempster, *Hist. Ecol. Gent. Scot.* ii. 211-12; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 87; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* i. 334-35.) [J. G.]

DEIFERUS, Welsh saint. [DIER.]

DEINIOLLEN, DEINIOL AB DEINIOL AIL, DEINIOL FAB, a Welsh saint of the 6th century, son of Deiniol first bishop of Bangor in Carnarvonshire. He was a member of his grandfather's monastery at Bangor Iscoed, and after the destruction of that house [DINOTHUS] he retired to his father's monastery at Bangor in Cardiganshire, succeeding him as second abbat, but whether he also succeeded his father in the bishopric of Bangor is left unexplained. It is stated that he founded the church of Llandeiniollen in Carnarvonshire in A.D. 616. The chapel of Llanddeiniol Fab, subject to Llannidan in Anglesey, has been called after his name. He was commemorated on November 23 (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 281). [C. H.]

DEINIOL WYN (DANIEL), a Welsh saint of the 6th century, son of the abbat Dunawd Fyr or Dinothus, whom he assisted in establishing the monastery of Bangor Iscoed on the Dee, and the father of Deiniollen. He is regarded as the founder of the monastery in Carnarvonshire called Bangor Deiniol and Bangor Fawr, which was raised by his patron Maelgwn Gwynedd, or Malgwyn, or Malgo Conan, a prince of North Wales, to the rank of an episcopal see, and Deiniol was the first bishop, consecrated, it is said, by Dubricius. On Ussher's chronology of his life see Rees, *Welsh Saints*, p. 258. He occurs in Stubbs, *Regist.* 157. Information about his monastery and notices of himself will be found in Tanner, *Notit.* Pref. 1, Carnarvon ii.; *Monast. Angl.* vi. 1297; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Britt.* x. 7; Stillingfleet, *Orig. Brit.* i. 184, 185; Camden, ed. Gough, ii. 429; *Annals of Ulster* (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 45); Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 124, 143; Ussher, *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* wks. ed. 1847, t. v. pp. 112, 115, 542; t. vi. p. 44, and Chr. Index; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 498. The *Annales Cambriae* record his death under A.D. 584, M. H. B. 831. He was buried in the island of Bardsey, and was commemorated on Dec. 10. The churches attributed to him are few and not disposed in such a way as to indicate the probable extent of his diocese on the principle of estimation adopted by Rees. Those founded by him were Llanddeiniol in Cardiganshire, Llanddeiniol or Itton in Monmouthshire, Hawarden in Flintshire, and Llanuwchllyn in Merionethshire. The chapels dedicated to him were Worthenbury in Flintshire (formerly subject to Bangor Iscoed, but now a separate benefice) and St. Daniel's, subject to Monkton in Pembroke (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 258-260). [C. H.]

He is counted among the Irish saints by Mar-

O'Gorman, Maguire, *Mart. Doneg.* and *Mart. Tallaght*, because he lived some years as a hermit upon Inis-aingin, now Inchinneen, or Hare Island, in Lough Ree, parish of Bunown, Westmeath, which must have been before his consecration by St. Dubritius (Colgan, *Tr. Thorum.* 175 n. 55; *Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 452 n. 2.) [J. G.]

DELPHIDIUS, husband of Euchrocia and father of Procula. He was a distinguished orator and poet of Gaul towards the end of the 4th century. He lived at Bordeaux (Burdegala), and died before his wife and daughter became involved in the Priscillianist troubles. (Ausonius, *de Profess. Burdegal.* carm. vi. Prosperi Chronicon, p. 2. Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, *Panegyric of, Panegyrici Vet.* xii. 29.) [M. B. C.]

DELPHINUS (1) ST., second bishop of Bordeaux. Nothing is known of his origin, his country, or when he succeeded to the bishopric. In the year 381 he was present at the council of Saragossa, and took an active part in the condemnation of Priscillianus, Salvianus, and Instantius, as heretics. He then hastened to his diocese, in order to prevent them from spreading their heterodox doctrines amongst his people, and when they arrived at Bordeaux, he compelled them to quit Aquitaine and betake themselves to Italy. In 385 Delphinus assembled a council at Bordeaux, in which Priscillianus and Instantius, who had been made bishops by their adherents, were again condemned. But Delphinus is more especially famed for having converted and baptized Paulinus, and for having been his first guide in his holy life, about 388 (*Martyrol. Rom.* ad d. 24 Dec.). Writing to him in 398, Paulinus mentions the existing pope Anastasius.

Delphinus is thought to have died in 404. Under him flourished at Bordeaux several writers praised by Ausonius: Minervius, Delphidius, Herculianus, and Arboreus. We may mention also Ausonius himself and Paulinus.

(*Gall. Christ.* ii. 787; Paulinus Nolanus, *Patrol. Lat.* lxi.; Ausonius, *Patrol. Lat.* xix.) [D. R. J.]

(2) Bishop of Lyons. [DALFINUS.]

DELPHINUS (3) or DELPHIUS, 7th abbat of St. Denis, Paris, in the reign of Childbert III. (*Gall. Christ.* vii. p. 341). [D. R. J.]

DEMETRIANUS (1) A magistrate at Carthage prominent in the persecution under Gallus. He had been able to visit Cyprian frequently and apparently as an inquirer; his accusations of the Christians as evoking Divine vengeance in plagues, &c. drew forth the angry, powerful treatise *ad Demetrium*. The elder commentators treated him as proconsul of Africa, but Pearson refutes this. He was aged, "sub ipso exitu," p. 196; and himself a persecutor: "admove . . . tua immanitas," c. 25 (22). May we not perhaps conclude that he was one of the five native primores who held himself still responsible for the execution of the decree of Decius when the persecution "of Gallus" began, A.D. 252? (*Cyp. Ep.* 43, iii.) [E. W. B.]

(2) Bishop of Antioch, succeeded Fabius as fifteenth bishop, according to a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Cornelius bishop of Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 46). In the first year of his episcopate, A.D. 252, the council was

held at Antioch which decided against the claims of Novatus (Mansi, tom. i. pp. 867, 871; Hard. tom. v. p. 1498). The length of his episcopate is uncertain. The *Chronicon* of Eusebius assigns him seven years, Scaliger six. According to an obscure tradition he suffered death as a martyr in the second year of his episcopate; but this is rendered very doubtful by the silence of his contemporaries, and by the fact that at the second synod of Antioch, called against Paul of Samosata, he is not so designated. He was the father of the next bishop but one, Domnus I. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. p. 705). [E. V.]

DEMETRIANUS (3) Martyr in Cyprus in the persecution of Galerius. The presbyter Aristocles had fled to a mountain cave, but came down one day to the church of St. Barnabas, and was entertained by Demetrianus the deacon and Athanasius the reader, and told them that he had been commanded in a vision to present himself at the metropolis of the island. They accompanied him, and were imprisoned, burnt, and beheaded with him, June 23 (*Men. Basil.*). [E. B. B.]

(4) Disciple of Lactantius, who dedicates to him his earliest Christian treatise, *On the Work of God*, and two volumes of letters. He praises his docility and modesty, and exhorts him not to devote himself so entirely to the public affairs with which he is charged, as not sometimes to think of heaven. In his treatise he seems anxious to obliterate any earlier impressions he may have made on Demetrianus. (Hieron. *Liber de Viris Illustr.* c. 80, *Patrol. Lat.* xxiii. 688; Lactant. *de Opific.* c. i., *Patrol. Lat.* vi.; vii. p. 1; Ceillier, ii. 1495.) [W. M. S.]

DEMETRIAS, a Roman virgin to whom Jerome wrote his treatise (*Ep.* 130, ed. Vall.) on the keeping of virginity. Her family was illustrious at Rome, her grandmother Proba (who is much praised by Jerome) having had three sons, all of whom were consuls. Demetrias had in early life wished to take the vow of virginity, but was afraid of her parents' opposition, they having intended to marry her. On hearing her intention, however, they fully approved it, and it gladdened all the churches of Italy. Her father having died just before the sack of Rome by Alaric, the family sold their property and went on board ship. They set sail for Africa, witnessing the burning of Rome as they left Italy; and on arriving in Africa fell into the hands of the rapacious Count Heraclian, who took away a large part of their property. Jerome exhorts Demetrias to a life of study and fasting; to care in the selection of companions; to the consecration of her wealth to Christ's service; and to working with her own hands. He warns her not to perplex herself with the difficult questions introduced by the Origenists; and recommends the study of Scripture. He exhorts her to prefer the coenobitic to the hermit life, and bears his testimony, as he had done thirty years before to Eustochium, to the excellence of the virgin-state, notwithstanding the attacks made upon it. [W. H. F.]

DEMETRIUS (1) a deacon of Vienne, to whom, according to Maximus (ii. 152), Irenaeus (p. 342) addressed discourses concerning faith,

from which Maximus gives some extracts; but no such discourses seem to have been known to Eusebius. (Massuet, *Diss.* ii. p. cv.) [G. S.]

DEMETRIUS (2) (of Alexandria) succeeded Julianus in A.D. 189, as eleventh bishop of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 22). He presided over the see for 43 years, and died A.D. 231-2 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26). He appears to have been a man of an energetic and imperious nature. He took an active interest in the Catechetical School, though there is no evidence that he had himself taken part in its work, like many other bishops of the city. He is said to have sent one of its early chiefs, Pantaenus, on a [second?] mission "to the Indians" on their own request (Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* 36 [PANTAENUS]); and after Clement had left Alexandria, he placed Origen at its head, c. A.D. 203 (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 5), and strenuously encouraged him to continue his work, when his indiscreet zeal had exposed him to misrepresentation (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 8). On a later occasion (A.D. 217) he despatched Origen in a mission to the Roman governor of Arabia, at the governor's earnest invitation (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). Origen fulfilled his mission satisfactorily, but not long afterwards Demetrius's friendship for him was interrupted. [ORIGEN.] According to a late, and not very trustworthy authority, Demetrius is reported to have written letters on the keeping of Easter, maintaining the view which was adopted at Nicaea (Euty-chius, *Ann.* pp. 363 ff.; Migne, *Patrol.* vol. cxi.). Other legendary stories of his life are given in the *Chronicon Orientale* (pp. 72 f. ed. 1685), and (after this) more briefly by Tillemont (*Mémoires*, Origène, art. vii. tom. iii. p. 225, ed. Bruxelles.).

The statement that Demetrius first changed the singular ecclesiastical arrangement of Egypt, by appointing three bishops in addition to the bishop of Alexandria, who had formerly governed the whole province, is probably correct, though the only direct authority for it is that of Euty-chius, patriarch of Alexandria, in the 10th century (comp. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 230). It is possible that this change was due to special views on church government, which may have influenced Demetrius in his harsh judgment on the ordination of Origen beyond the limits of his jurisdiction. [B. F. W.]

(3) One of the presbyters of Alexandria sent by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria and confessor (A.D. 247-265), during the persecution of Decius, to administer secretly to the faithful in that city. (Euseb. lib. vii. c. 11, *Patrol. Graec.* xx. p. 672, § 261; Ceillier, ii. 398.) [W. M. S.]

(4) African bishop. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 2, A.D. 252; Cyp. *Ep.* 57, *de Bapt.* 1, Cyp. *Ep.* 70, 7; *De Bapt. 3 Sentt. Epp.* 36; bp. of Leptiminus (Leptis minor), near Hadrumetum. [E. W. B.]

(5) One of the Egyptian bishops, to whom the emperor Gallienus wrote in A.D. 262, permitting them to return to the places of worship taken from them during the late persecution. (Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 13, *Patrol. Graec.* xx. p. 673, § 262; Ceillier, ii. 412.) [W. M. S.]

(6) Martyr at Thessalonica under Maximian, Oct. 26 (*Men. Basil.*).

DEMETRIUS (7) Martyr at Dabudenum under Maximin and Maximian, Nov. 15. (*Men. Basil.*) [E. B. B.]

(8) Centurion, presented Tarachus, Probus, and Andronicus, martyrs, afresh before the tribunal of Numerianus Maximus at Tarsus in Cilicia, May 21, A.D. 304, under the persecution of Diocletian. (Ruinart, *Act. Sinc. Mart.* p. 423; Ceillier, iii. 32.) [W. M. S.]

(9) A heretic, correspondent of Nilus of Sinai, about the close of the 4th century. (*Nil. Epist.* 253; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxix. 176; Ceillier, viii. 217.) [W. M. S.]

(10) Bishop of Pessinus in Galatia Secunda and metropolitan, a faithful friend and supporter of St. Chrysostom. He was one of the forty bishops who rallied round Chrysostom when the synod of the Oak was sitting, and was chosen, with others, to convey Chrysostom's reply to its citation (Pallad. pp. 13, 15, 70). He was also one of the bearers of Chrysostom's letter to Innocent I. and the Western bishops (*ib.* 10, 11, 27), and after its favourable reception travelled through the East to publish the intelligence of his acquittal by the bishop of Rome and his brethren. We find him again in Rome, in A.D. 405, when he and his companions received a letter from Chrysostom, thanking them for their services, and recommending to their kindly notice John, a presbyter, and Paul, a deacon, who were proposing to join them there as a refuge from the persecutions they were exposed to at Constantinople (*Epist.* 148). He accompanied the Western deputation to Constantinople, and shared in the ill-treatment they met with on their arrival. On the unsuccessful issue of their embassy, Demetrius was banished to one of the Egyptian oases, but died of brutal treatment on the road (Pallad. pp. 30-34; 194). [E. V.]

(11) Monk, contemporary of John Chrysostom. Chrysostom dedicates to him the first book of his work *On Compunction*, according to his request that he would write on the subject. Demetrius is represented as having gained a high degree of holiness, but described himself as still creeping on the earth; he often said to Chrysostom, kissing his hand and watering it with tears, "Help me to soften the hardness of my heart." (*Patrol. Graec.* xlvii. 393; Chrysost. *de Compunct. ad Demetr.*; Ceillier, vii. 23.) [W. M. S.]

(12) ST. In *Gallia Christiana* the name only of this saint is given as the first bishop of Gap, but nothing is said about him. He lived in the beginning of the 5th century, and was succeeded by St. Constantius. He is celebrated on Oct. 15. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 452.) [D. R. J.]

(13) Bishop of Philippi (A.D. 533-536), sent with Hypatius, archbishop of Ephesus, in A.D. 533 by the emperor Justinian I. to Rome, with a letter on the subject of the Nestorians, in which he begged pope John II. to fortify himself and the patriarch with letters against certain unsound monks. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. p. 1742; Ceillier, xi. 116.) [W. M. S.]

(14) Bishop of Naples, A.D. 587. Addressed by pope Gregory the Great, who exhorts him to receive with much gentleness those who, having doubted, desired to be received into the church. Three years afterwards he was deposed for his

crimes. (Greg. *Epist.* i. 14, ii. 6, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. pp. 459, 542, §§ 500, 572; Ceillier, xi. 481, 487.) [W. M. S.]

DEMIURGUS, the artificer, in the system of Valentinus, the title given to the framer of the world. Common to all the Gnostic sects, and springing out of the idea of the essential evil of matter, is the doctrine that the world was made not by the Supreme God, but by some inferior or even hostile agency. Orthodox Judaism had admitted the theory that God had used the instrumentality of angels in the making of the world; and in the Timaeus of Plato the Supreme Creator (to whom the title Demiurgus is given) commits to subordinate deities the task of carrying out the work of creation that he had commenced. The transition was easy to the doctrine that angels had made the world without the will or against the will of the Supreme. In several, and these apparently the earliest, of the Gnostic systems, the making of the world is attributed to a plurality of angels. So Irenaeus tells (i. 23, 1) of the system of Simon, (23, 5) of the system of Menander, (24, 1) of the system of Saturninus, in which the number of these angels is reckoned as seven, and (25) of the system of Carpocrates. Again, in his report of the system of Basilides (24, 4), we are told that our world was made by the angels who occupy the lowest heaven; but special mention is made of their chief, who is said to have been the God of the Jews, to have led that people out of the land of Egypt, and to have given them their law. The prophecies are ascribed not to the chief but to the other world-making angels. In the Ophite system described (ch. 30), which has many affinities with that last mentioned, the making of the world is also ascribed to a company of seven angels, whose names are given, but their chief, Ialdabaoth, comes into still greater prominence. A long myth is related concerning his origin and history; he is the God of the Jews, and the giver of their law, and we have again the statement that the prophecies came from the other six angels, with a detailed account which prophecy came from which angel. The Latin translation, confirmed by Hippolytus (*Ref.* vii. 33, p. 256), makes Irenaeus state that according to the system of Cerinthus creation was made by a power quite separate from the Supreme God and ignorant of Him. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* ii. 3), who here copies Irenaeus, turns this into the plural number "powers," and so Epiphanius (28), and apparently Philaster (36), represent Cerinthus as agreeing with Carpocrates in the doctrine that the world was made by angels. There remain two systems, in which the work of creation is ascribed to a single power; that of Marcion, in which the title God is given to the maker of the world, who is distinguished from the higher good God; and the system of Valentinus. It is in the latter system that the name **DEMIURGUS** is used, which occurs nowhere in Irenaeus except in connexion with the Valentinian system; and we may reasonably conclude that it was Valentinus who adopted from Platonism the use of this word. When it is employed by other Gnostics it may be held either that it is not used in a technical sense, or that its use has been borrowed from Valentinus. But it is only the name that can be said to be specially Valen-

tinian; the personage intended by it corresponds more or less closely with the Ialdabaoth of the Ophites, the great Archon of Basilides, the Elohim of Justinus, etc.

According to the Valentinian theory, from Achamoth three kinds of substance take their origin, the spiritual (*πνευματικόν*), the animal (*ψυχικόν*), and the material (*ὕλη*); to the second kind the Demiurge belongs. He is ignorant of all that is spiritual, but he is king over the other two provinces. The word Demiurgus properly describes his relation to the material; he is the *father* of that which is animal like himself. He frames the seven heavens, as well as all material and animal things, according to forms furnished by his mother; working however blindly, and ignorant even of the existence of the mother who is the source of all his energy. So he ignorantly supposes that he has made the world of himself, and makes the false claim "I am God, and there is none other." He is besides the maker, out of the appropriate substance, of an order of *spiritual* beings, the devil, the prince of this world, and his angels. But the devil as being spiritual is able to recognise the higher spiritual world, of which his maker the Demiurge, who is only animal, has no knowledge. The devil resides in this lower world, of which he is the prince, the Demiurge in the heavens; his mother Achamoth in the middle region, above the heavens and below the Pleroma. But though previously ignorant the Demiurge learned from the Saviour; and his reward will be that in due season he will ascend to the middle region inhabited by his mother, though, for want of a spiritual nature, he is incapable of attaining to the Pleroma. We are told also (*Hipp. Ref.* vi. 32, p. 191), that the Demiurge is of a fiery nature, the words of Moses being applied to him, "the Lord our God is a burning and consuming fire," a text used also by Simon (*Ref.* vi. 9, p. 163). The Ialdabaoth of the Ophites is also described as a fiery God (*Ref.* v. 7, p. 104). The name God is given to the Demiurgus by Valentinus himself (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* iv. 13, p. 603). The account of the Demiurge's ignorance of a superior is strictly parallel to what is told of Ialdabaoth (Irenaeus, *I.* xxx. 6, p. 110). But the closest resemblance to the Valentinian system is found in the account given by Irenaeus (*I.* xxix. 4) of the Barbeliot system. We have the story of the fall of Sophia, the origin of the Demiurge, who is here called Proarchon, his framing the world, and himself inhabiting the firmament, his ignorance of a superior, and his claim to be "God alone, beside whom there is no other." It is impossible to doubt that there is a connexion between the two systems; and it seems to us that the Valentinian is the later.

If there is reason to think that the Demiurge of Valentinus is to be identified with the Ialdabaoth of the Ophites, and that he again is but the chief of seven creative angels of an earlier system, it follows that the Gnostic Demiurge is not historically connected with the *σοφία* of the Book of Wisdom or the Logos of Philo. For Gnostic speculation appears to have started not with the idea of a single creative principle, but with a plurality of agents supposed to be employed in making the world, it being only as the myth grew that attention was concentrated on

the leader of the band, and his brethren lost sight of. [VALENTINUS.] [G. S.]

DEMOCRATES, rhetorician at Carthage, under whom Augustine of Hippo studied with success in A.D. 370. (*August. Confess.* III. iii. 6, *Patrol. Lat.* xxxii. p. 685; Ceillier, ix. 2.)

[W. M. S.]

DEMONOLOGY, or the science of demons, was a popular study both in Greece and Rome, as well as Judaea, when the gospel began to be preached. It had become popular in Greece and Rome, as it invested the worship of idols with a reality that was at once novel and mysterious, and spiritualised forms and ceremonies that were becoming intolerable to enlightened minds. The idol was no longer a senseless and helpless image of metal, wood, or stone: it was the habitual abode of a spirit, inferior indeed to God, but superior to man, and a regularly accredited medium of communication between God and man. Socrates had, from the description given by him of his own case, suggested the further inference that everybody was through life watched over by his attendant demon, who frequently saved him from harm, if nothing more. Apuleius devoted a special treatise to this branch of the subject (*De Deo Socrat.*). Plotinus, Jamblichus, and Porphyry made demonology the corner-stone of a new system out of old materials. For the Jews the subject had a more practical interest. If idolatry was always a crime to them under any circumstances, it was a greater crime than ever when associated with beings whom their vulgate, or Greek version of their Scriptures, never mentioned but in opposition to the true God, and distinguished by name from His favoured messengers. The light in which they are regarded throughout the New Testament and by Josephus, shews plainly that the Jews could never have been familiar with their name but in a sinister sense. The Scribes, according to St. Mark, said of our Lord: "He hath Beelzebub: and by the prince of the devils casteth He out devils" (iii. 22): meaning, as the evangelist interprets them (v. 30), that He "had an unclean spirit." Further, we learn from other passages of the New Testament that there were then regularly appointed officials among the Jews, called "exorcists," whose business it was to free men from their influence (*Acts* xix. 13; comp. *St. Matt.* xii. 27). Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 2. 5) describes the casting-out of a demon in the presence of the emperor Vespasian, his sons, and his nobles, by a man of his own tribe named Eleazar, which he witnessed himself. Persons labouring under their influence, who had to be thus operated upon, were called by a special name: demonised demoniacs, or energumens.

Thus much for the fact of their existence, which was believed by everybody who then professed any belief in the unseen. It was grounded on traditions as old as the hills. Hesiod had, in a passage of singular beauty, dramatised its best side:

Τρίς γὰρ μύριοι εἰσὶν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι,
Ἰδάνατοι Ζηνὸς, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, etc

(*Op. et D.* 252-5; comp. 120 sqq.); and Plato (*de Rep.* v. 15) was indebted for most of his ideas of it to him. It was the association of demons with image-worship alone that was new; and this led to further speculations on their

origin and nature tending to dogmatism, from which the fathers themselves are not wholly free. "The followers of Plato," says St. Augustine, "distinguished three classes of beings endowed with reason: gods, men, and demons. Of these, demons held a middle position every way between gods and men: having the air for their abode, and being gifted with passions like men, but immortal bodies like gods" (*De Civ. D.* viii. 14). Some, probably the greater number, of them had once been men; others, who constituted a more exalted class, watched over men (*Apul. de Deo S.* p. 688-90). "The remaining multitude of invisible beings," says Porphyry, "are what are called indiscriminately demons by Plato. Such of them as have received names from men get honour and service paid them everywhere like the gods. Others, whose names have never got into general vogue, are known and served nowhere but in a few obscure towns or villages. The rest go by the name of demons. And there is this general persuasion about them all: that they can harm those who provoke them by defrauding them of their accustomed service; and benefit those who propitiate them by prayers, sacrifices, and the like" (*De Abst.* ii. 37). In what follows, he distinguishes them into two classes: good and bad; but it is on the bad—their malevolence, sensuality, and duplicity—that he dwells most. On the origin of their connexion with idols, Hermes Trismegistus, quoted by St. Augustine (*De Civ. D.* viii. 23), taught that they had made images their abode on the invitation of man, becoming as it were their souls, and being attached to them ever afterwards in each case by a tie that could not be broken as long as the image remained. There, their votaries might always count on finding them, ready to be propitiated by gifts, ready to befriend any that came to them for aid. The spell indeed was supposed to be dissolved on anything happening to the image, as we learn from Porphyry (*ap. Euseb. Praep. Ev.* v. 15); and Hermes, in very remarkable terms, prophesied the impending extinction of the idolatrous worship then practised in Egypt, his own country. All these statements are passed under review, and criticised exhaustively by St. Augustine in his best manner. His opponents and he were both agreed that the worship of idols throughout the Roman empire was, in reality, the worship of demons: that demons arrogated divine honours in their own right, and were really potent for good and for evil in a way that appeared miraculous to man. The issue which he, in common with the rest of the fathers, raised against his opponents was this: that it followed from hence, that no demons were, nor ever *could* be, morally speaking, but evil: first, from the licentious and inhuman rites with which they allowed themselves to be served; and secondly, because they arrogated honour that was due to God alone. There were no differences of opinion between him and his opponents about the facts; there were no differences of opinion between him and the rest of the fathers about the main corollary which they deduced from them, and upheld as being also the unequivocal teaching of Scripture. In Scripture, the beings entrusted with messages from God to man repudiate divine honours, and are never called demons. In Scripture, the beings to whom the Gentiles are charged with offering sacrifice—

and such sacrifice as is invariably mentioned with reprobation as degrading to man—are never called angels. If on some points the fathers may be thought to have speculated in excess of their facts, or dogmatised in excess of their authorities, this at least was not one of them, where they drew the line sharply between angels and demons in point of character. On their origin they were no less agreed. Both, they affirmed unanimously, and with a confidence that was brought into strong relief by the hesitating tone of their opponents, had been created equally with themselves; and were still equally dependent upon the will of Him by Whom all things exist. When they were created, where they dwelt, and how they became bad, were points which divided the fathers themselves, as they could not be made plain from Scripture. Scripture revealed to the descendants of Adam a good deal about themselves. It went back to their primeval state; chronicled their origin, together with that of the creatures over which they ruled, and on which they lived; explained how their manifold imperfections had been brought about, and how they might all be cancelled in a future state. But of other subjects in which they were less interested, and of other beings inhabiting other worlds, in particular, it told them next to nothing at all. It threw a veil over their existence at first, it let their character appear only by snatches for some time; till, latest and fullest of all, it proclaimed their hostility to man. When the fathers dogmatised on the obscure hints contained, or thought by them to be contained, in Scripture on the two first points, the results were such as might have been anticipated. They failed in making Scripture speak plainly, where Scripture was designedly reserved or mute. Taking *Gen. vi. 2 sqq.* for his text, St. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii. 5) described demons as the fruit of an illicit intercourse between the sons of God and the daughters of men, or between angels and women; and declared that the names given by them to their progeny were those which poets and mythologists in after times attributed to the gods of Greece and Rome. Athenagoras (*Apol.* c. 25), Tertullian (*De Virg. Vel.* c. 7, and *Apol.* c. 22, with the note of the Oxford Tr.), and others shared his opinion; not but that he may have derived it from Josephus (*Ant.* i. 3). Lactantius (*Divin. Inst.* ii. 15) improved upon it by characterising the event in question as the sin by which angels fell; attributing the fall of Satan himself (*ib.* c. 9) to a higher and earlier cause. Origen, in all probability, with a full perception of the difficulties involved in these positions, abstains from advocating any view but what he calls the common one. "Videamus," he says in his work on *Principles* (i. 7), "quae sint de quibus disserere convenit secundum dogma nostrum: id est, secundum Ecclesiae fidem. Omnes animae, atque omnes rationabiles naturae factae sunt vel creatae: sive sanctae sint, sive nequam . . . quoniam quidem omnia a Deo per Christum facta sunt, sicut generaliter Joannes docet in Evangelio (St. John i. 1-3). Per species autem et numeros ordinemque describens ea quae facta sunt, Paulus apostolus disserit hoc modo, quo omnia ostendat facta esse per Christum dicens: 'Et omnia in Ipso creata sunt, quae in coelis sunt, et quae in terrâ' . . . (Col. i. 16). Quodd ergo sunt, non est proprium,

nec sempiternum, sed a Deo datum . . . (ib. ii. 9). Est etiam illud in ecclesiasticâ prædicatione, esse angelos Dei quosdam et virtutes bonas, qui Ei ministrant ad salutem hominum consummandam: sed quando isti creati sint, vel quales, aut quomodo sint, non satis in manifesto designatur . . . De diabolo et angelis ejus contrariisque virtutibus ecclesiastica prædicatione docuit, quoniam sunt quidem hæc; quæ autem sint, aut quomodo sint, non satis clarè exposuit. Apud plurimos tamen ista habetur opinio, quòd angelus fuerit iste diabolus, et apostata effectus, quamplurimos angelorum secum declinare persuaserit, qui, et nunc usque, angeli ipsius nuncupantur . . . (Præf. §§ 10 and 6). Unde constat, quòd execrabiles illos fecit prævaricatio, non natura,"—as he says elsewhere (in *Exod. Hom.* viii. 2). Other fathers expressed themselves with less reserve. According to St. Chrysostom (in *Gen. i. Hom.* ii. 2), Moses had deliberately refrained from saying anything about the creation of angels. SS. Ambrose (in *Psal. i. 2*), Basil (*Hexæm.* i. 5), and Jerome (in *Tit. i. 2-9*, and *Vallars. ad l.*) maintained that they were created ages before the creation described by him. "Six thousand years are not yet completed of our time," says St. Jerome, "and how many limitless periods, what number of previous times, how many beginnings of ages, must we picture to ourselves in which angels, thrones, dominions, and other powers have served God, and without changes or qualifications of seasons subsisted at his command?" St. Augustine contended for the opposite view with more success. He pleaded that the Psalmist (Ps. cxlviii. 2, sqq.) would never have placed angels at the head of the created universe described by Moses, had they not been created at the same time themselves. Nor, again, could it have been said in Job (xxxviii. 7), "Quandò facta sunt sidera, laudaverunt Me voce magnâ omnes angeli Mei," had their creation not preceded that of the stars on the fourth day. Taking his stand, then, on *Gen. i. 1-5*, or the work of the first day, and contrasting the creation of *light* then, with the creation of *lights* on the fourth, he pronounced that it was not the material light, but the immaterial, or angelic host, that was called into being, when God said: "Let there be light." Accordingly God bore testimony to this light, as it started into being, that "it was good." But He bestowed no such approval on what followed: "God divided the light from the darkness," it is said; "and God called the light day, and the darkness night:" but neither act elicits any comment. The separation between the material light and darkness three days afterwards, on the other hand, was accompanied by just the declaration which is wanting here, "God saw that it was good" (v. 19). St. Augustine thus made this contrast his ground for concluding that it must have been the separation between the elect and fallen angels that was chronicled in the former case, so that the sin of angels, like that of man, happened on the day of their birth. Again, remarking that the day on which their creation and sin happened, is called "one day," *not* the first, in the LXX., he concluded once more that it was meant to be kept distinct from the rest—whether the rest are to be considered ordinary days or not—as having neither date nor duration assigned to it (*De Civ. D.* xi. 9-33; *De Gen.*

imp. Lib. § 20-28). This, of course, was all speculation with him, and might be criticised in detail: *μὴ σαββατων*, for instance, St. Matt. xxviii. 1, is rightly translated "*prima sabbati*;" still it is, substantially, the view which has obtained most credence; and was, according to some, raised to the rank of a dogma by the third Lateran council, A.D. 1215 (can. i.; comp. the commentators on Lombard's *Sentences*, ii. 2 sqq.).

We may now pass to the question what their sin was. Bishop Bull has shewn conclusively (*Def. Fid. Nic.* iii. 5, 1 sqq., Oxf. transl. 1852) that several of the ante-Nicene fathers, including Tertullian and Lactantius, St. Athanasius himself and others in later times, attributed to the Son of God "a certain nativity," dating from the creation of all things, and quite distinct from His eternal generation. He was called "first-born of every creature," by St. Paul (Col. i. 16) on the same principle: "for by Him were all things created," as it is expressly stated in the next verse. Thus the occasion to which they refer is His coming forth (*προέλευσις*) from the Father to create the world, and His manifestation to the world just made. Or, to quote from St. Paul again—and in terms still more to the point—"When He bringeth in the first-begotten into the world He saith, 'And let all the angels of God worship Him'" (Heb. i. 6). St. Paul is here quoting the 7th verse of the Psalm "*Dominus regnavit*" (96 or 7). We must conclude, therefore, that he considered the whole Psalm a glowing commemoration of that event. And thus, whether envy—which was the opinion of Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* ii. 9, with Dufrenoy's note)—or pride—which was the opinion of the fathers in general—constituted the sin of angels, it was evoked in any case by their having to do obeisance to the Son of God on their creation, according to the teaching of the church at large, splendidly drawn out by our great national poet (*Par. Lost*, v. 600 sqq.). Finally, that it began with one, and spread to the rest through him, is a point on which there never have been two opinions in the church. To the problem of heathen philosophy—*ποθέν τὸ κακόν*; Christianity was unanimous at the outset in collecting from the books of the New Testament this practical answer—Satan was the original sinner. His sin, caused exclusively by his own spontaneous act, introduced evil into the world. He first communicated the disease to angels, and then to man: God having created both upright, and punished neither till they had each done wrong. If it was asked who Satan was, it replied unhesitatingly that he had been identified by Christ Himself as chief of those demons, with whose characteristics all were familiar, and who were then worshipped with idolatrous rites (St. Luke ix. 14-20). St. John had further characterised him as the "serpent" and "devil" of the Old Testament (Rev. xx. 2), and added emphatically that the purpose for which Christ had come was to destroy his works (i. 3, 9).

What he had actually lost by his sin was less obvious at first sight; yet the fathers were persuaded that they found it explained to them in Scripture with tolerable precision. St. Gregory the Great (*Moral.* xxiv. 23 sqq.) understands both what is said of Behemoth, "Ipse est principium viarum Dei" (Job xl. 14), and what is said of Leviathan, "Non est super terram po-

testas, quæ comparatur ei" (*ib.* xli. 24), of him literally. "Quamvis enim internæ felicitatis beatitudinem perdidit, naturæ tamen suæ magnitudinem non amisit, cuius adhuc viribus humana omnia superat." He has only the same explanation to offer of the verse which says: "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord: and Satan came also among them" (*ib.* i. 6). "Valde quaerendum est, quomodo inter electos angelos Satan adesse potuerit, qui ab eorum sorte, exigente superbâ, dudum damnatus exivit. Sed rectè inter eos adfuisse describitur, quia etsi beatitudinem perdidit, naturam tamen iis similem non amisit: et si meritis prægravatur, conditione naturæ subtilis attollitur" (*Moral.* ii. 4). If bad and good angels were thrown together at one time in the courts of heaven, bad and good men are thrown together in the church militant on earth still. But there are some positive grounds for assuming his condition under the Gospel to have changed materially from what it had been under the Law. The kingdom of Christ has been established in heaven as well as on earth; and in heaven of course, with most grandeur, of the two. When our Lord, therefore, said in laying its foundations, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," it was the simple fact that He was enunciating, as St. Cyril says: "For before the Incarnation of the Saviour, Satan had dominion over the world, and was worshipped by almost everybody. But he fell like lightning at last, when from having been worshipped by the multitudes he had enthralled, he came to be trodden under foot by his very worshippers" (*in S. Luc.* x. 18). This is a point to which we shall have to recur again, and pursue much further. There is another point demanding our attention which should be brought out first. The fact enunciated by our Lord was a distinct fulfilment of prophecy. The prophet Isaiah had apostrophised Lucifer falling from heaven ages before; and in his fall the fathers with one consent saw the fall of Satan foreshadowed. In the words of St. Augustine: "What is here written in figure of the king of Babylon, and said, either of, or to him in the letter, is to be understood of the devil" (*De Doct. Christ.* iii. 37). "Unde et Salvator ad discipulos loquitur: 'Videbam Satanam quasi fulgur de coelo cadentem,' " adds St. Jerome (*in Is.* vi. 14, 12). This, again, will account for St. Jude speaking of him and his in plain terms, as "the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation" (v. 6); and for St. Paul styling him "the prince of the power of the air" (*Eph.* ii. 2); and them "the rulers of the darkness of this world" (*ib.* v. 12), &c.

Such designations are for the first time given them in the New Testament; just as in the Old Testament the ordinary name for him is the "Devil" or slanderer: not "Satan," or the adversary—never the "Tempter"—never the "Evil one"—and for them "demons," never "unclean spirits." We might string together a list of passages from the New Testament warning the individual Christian against their assaults, and assuring him of his perfect ability through Christ to overcome them all. It would be difficult to select one passage from the Old Testament of this character. Under the Law, he and they are represented as being served by

men with idolatrous rites: under the Gospel, he and they are represented as being impotent to cope with any Christian who is true to his profession. Thus a contrast is observable between the condition of the fallen angels under the Law, and since the Law, indirectly recognised everywhere by the fathers, yet hardly brought out by them into such prominence as it deserves—a contrast apparently dictated by the special features of each dispensation in succession, and marking under both periods a correspondence between the true and false systems too regular and elaborate to have been undesigned. What St. Paul says of the tabernacle that it was "a figure of the time then present" (*Heb.* ix. 9) might have been said equally well of both dispensations, and of the false system in both cases as well as the true.

The Law, for instance, was from beginning to end a system of external observances and material sacrifices, as St. Paul there characterises it. People satisfied their duties, when their offerings were ceremonially faultless, and offered at the proper time and place. By comparison, their prayers were few and optional. When difficulties arose, they enquired of the Lord through the priest or prophet; and if they came with good dispositions, replies were vouchsafed them, betokening supernatural foreknowledge. We know from the books of the Old and New Testaments when this system began and ended. We know from other sources that, during the same period, a ceremonial which was the exact pendant to it prevailed all over the Gentile world. Temples, altars, sacrifices, priests, oracles, were just as indispensable to the false religions of Egypt, Assyria, Phœnicia, Greece, and Rome, as to the true religion of the Hebrew Lawgiver, with this one difference; namely, that images, which had divine honours paid them under the former, were absolutely condemned in the latter. Then, as they closed respectively, there was another contrast brought to light, which, though it had existed all through, had hitherto been hid or unheeded. The Law was explained to have been "received by the disposition of angels" (*Acts* vii. 53), or to have been "spoken by angels" (*Heb.* ii. 2), though it prohibited any worship except to One, who was no angel, but Jehovah. Under the idolatrous system opposed to it a multitude of demons, differently named in different places, but everywhere subordinate to a chief of their own class, and whose name varied as much as their own, were the recognised deities, one and all. Heaven was considered to be their abode in the one case, and of the angels who waited upon Jehovah in the other. Both systems—at least in every place where they had ever opposed each other—came to an end simultaneously, making way for a true and false system of another kind. And, just at their close, a new phenomenon, strangely similar, appeared in both. They who had been served with idols possessed themselves in many cases of the bodies of men: He who had been worshipped as Jehovah became man. Then it was, that their mutual relations began to be made patent to man. There never was any collision, properly speaking, between them. They were the first to proclaim His Divinity, and their own impotence to resist His commands. Similarly, the part which they were to play in future was in many respects the

reverse of what they had played hitherto. Their abode was to be no longer heaven, where Christ was about to reign with His saints; and they were to be vanquished where they had been previously worshipped on earth, as St. Cyril says. Churches were to be erected where their temples had stood; images of martyrs and confessors were to take the place of their idols. Pagan manners and literature were to be displaced by Christian. All this it would be beyond their power to avert. Their action was to be limited, in future, to the individual. They might tempt him to do wrong—Christians were guaranteed heaven under the system which displaced the Law, through the indwelling of the Spirit, if they remained true to their engagements. But whether they would remain true to their engagements or not, was a point which from first to last rested with themselves. They were not compelled to accept—they were free to the last to reject—the heaven which had been won for them. The only path that would conduct them thither had not been traced by themselves, and was a rugged one. It was, indeed, easier for them to break, than to keep, their engagements. There was no period of their lives when they could say they were proof against relapse—such relapse, too, as precluded recovery. Then, in order that nothing might be wanting to their probation in this life, power was given to “the devil and his angels” to “sift them as wheat”—to endeavour to undermine their resolutions, and frustrate the work of the Spirit of Christ in their souls, though nobody could fall a victim to them but by his own fault.

Such, then, is the full account of this matter. The struggle between good and evil under the Christian dispensation was to be waged by spiritual agencies exclusively—with spiritual, too, not carnal weapons. There was the spiritual society called the church, with her invisible means of grace and invisible Head, assailable through her members, on one side; on the other, those formerly called demons, but now “unclean spirits,” with the devil, or Satan, the Tempter, or Evil One, for their leader: all equally concealed from view. But the issues of the contest had been decided in advance by Christ in His own Person, and the final triumph of His elect people foretold by Him and His apostles in the plainest terms.

It only remains to substantiate these positions in detail from the fathers. 1. For the general principle involved in them we may refer to the first and last of the seven rules of Tichonius—“De Domino et Ejus corpore,” and “De Diabolo et Ejus corpore,” respectively—for interpreting Scripture, commended by St. Augustine (Migne, *Patrol.* xviii. 15 sqq.), and to the last twelve books of his own great work (*De Civ. Dei*, xi. 1 sqq.) where the rise and progress of the two rival cities are sketched. 2. That “the things which the Gentiles sacrificed they sacrificed to demons”—in the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 20)—“The worship of demons,” Origen tells Celsus, “is the worship of those who are called gods: ‘omnes enim dii gentium daemonia,’ as the Psalmist says (xcv. 5, sec. lxx.). . . . Hence we avoid the service of demons as a pest: designating by that name all the accustomed service, with altars, images, or temples, paid to the gods by the Greeks” (c. *Cels.* vii. 69). And again:

“Celsus makes his next point what both the Jews and Christians affirm with one mouth, when called upon to explain why they abstain from meats offered to idols; saying that they who have devoted themselves to the God of all must not banquet with devils” (*ib.* viii. 31). It was on this account that abstinence from meats offered to idols was enjoined by the apostles themselves (*ib.* c. 29).

“You renounce the devil . . . and all his pomp,” says St. Cyril; “now by the pomp of the devil are meant theatres, horse-racing, hunting with hounds, and all such vanities . . . all the dainty dishes exhibited at idolatrous gatherings . . . common and indifferent in themselves, but which on the demons being invoked over them become tainted. After this you renounce all his worship. Now the worship of the devil is prayer made before idolatrous shrines: all that is done in honour of dumb idols; the lighting of lamps, the burning of incense by springs and rivers, which some, deceived by dreams or by the demons themselves, have been led to frequent, hoping to get cured of their bodily pains and the like. Go not after any such. Augury, divination, omens from sounds, amulets, inscriptions on leaves, enchantments, and occult arts of every sort, all such are services of the devil” (*Cat.* xix. 6–8). Hence, “they who know the Christian literature both of the Old and the New Testament,” says St. Augustine, “are far from imputing it as a crime to the heathen, that they build temples, inaugurate priesthoods, and offer sacrifices: their crime being that they honour idols and demons with such. . . . When God is thus served, agreeably with His own inspiration and direction, it is true religion; when demons are thus served, to gratify their impious pride, it is baneful superstition. . . . Hence it is plain enough to perceive that it is not immolating in the abstract, but immolating to idols and demons, which true religion condemns in the Gentile ritual. . . . Nor can the Gentiles excuse their sacrilegious rites and images, by investing them with a poetic meaning; for it is creature-worship that is at the bottom of them all, in flagrant opposition to the worship that is due to God alone” (*Ep.* cii. § 18–20, *ad Deogr.*).

Several of the earlier fathers, as St. Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Origen, Arnobius, and even some contemporaries of St. Augustine, as St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Jerome, went so far as to credit demons with a literal appetite for rich meats and savoury smells. “Daemones indigere cibo, attrahere nidores, satiari sanguine, delectari suffitu, constans est Origenis opinio,” says Delarue (*in Orig. Exhort. ad Martyr.* c. 45). Indeed he believed they had bodies like men. But St. Augustine started a truer and deeper account of the matter. He taught that they desired sacrifice for no other reason than because they knew it to be due to the true God. “What they relished, in reality, were not, as Porphyry says, and as others think, sacrificial odours but divine honours. . . . They, then, whose aspiration is to be thought divinities, are charmed with the mind of the suppliant infinitely more than any number of smoking victims; that having obtained possession of it, they may stand between it and the true God, and so prevent man from becoming His sacrifice,

while sacrificing to another than Him" (*De Civ. D.* x. 19). "Atque adeo Scripturae sanctae stupri vocabulo utuntur in idolatriae exprobratione," as Tertullian puts it (*De Idolat.* c. 1). "Fraudis conditio ea est . . . si quis alienum rapiat, aut alii debitum deneget. Et utique erga hominem admissa fraus maximi criminis nomen est. At enim idolatria fraudem Deo facit, honores illi suos denegans, et conferens aliis, ut fraudi etiam contumeliam conjungat." There was a time formerly, when idolatry was not, he continues: "Previously to the development of that monstrosity, there were temples without images, as indeed is still evident from what remains of them here and there. It was idolatry nevertheless in fact, though not in name: just as it needs neither idol nor temple to be so still. But after that the devil had imported into the world makers of statues, images, and the like, the evil acquired a name and a celebrity from idols which had been wanting to it in its ruder stage . . . and which was the reason of all such arts being forbidden under the Law. For Enoch had foretold long before, that all the elements, and all the animate portion of the world in sky, sea, and earth, would become idolatry in the hands of the demons or fallen angels, that they might be worshipped as God, instead of the Lord" (*ib.* c. 4). Hence, whether it commenced in element, animal, or hero worship, was, and had long been, a mere antiquarian question: "Idolatry, non propter personas quae assumuntur, sed propter officia ista damnata est, quae ad daemones pertinent" (*ib.* c. 15). According to Lactantius, astrology, soothsaying, augury, the so-called oracles, necromancy, magic, and whatever evil devices were practised by men in public or secret, had originated with the demons (*Div. Inst.* ii. 17); indeed the prophets of the Old Testament had intimated as much. From this standpoint the fathers in general could account without difficulty for the action of a superhuman power in the system opposed to them, when pressed with evidences of it which they could not dispute. "Every spirit is winged," says Tertullian, "demons as well as angels. They are thus everywhere in a trice. For them the whole world is one spot; and what happens in every part of it is both known to, and made known by them with the same ease. Thus their speed is taken for omniscience, their nature being unknown; and every now and then they get credited with having brought to pass what they announce" (*Apol.* c. 22). St. Augustine supplements this by a further consideration: "Accessit etiam daemonibus per tam longum tempus quo eorum vita protenditur, rerum longè major experientia, quàm potest hominibus propter brevitate vitae provenire" (*De Div. Daem.* c. 3). By way of preface to his tract on this subject, he tells us he was sitting at his own house, surrounded by a number of lay friends, in Easter week, conversing on the great controversy between Christians and pagans, when, incidentally, questions having been started on the divination of demons, one of the party maintained that the destruction of the temple of Serapis at Alexandria, which had just taken place, had been foretold by somebody some time before (*comp. Soc. E. H.* v. 16-17). To this St. Augustine replied that it was not more surprising that demons should have the means of knowing and

predicting the destruction in store for their own temple and image, than the various other things which within certain limits they were permitted to know and to foretell. It was the discussion that ensued which suggested this treatise. We may infer, therefore, that the views there expressed were such as average laymen of the 5th century would be ready to adopt as their own. The decline of paganism in general, and of the oracles in particular, wherever the gospel was preached, was another prolific topic with the fathers, as well as a most certain fact. "Formerly," says St. Athanasius, "the world was filled with oracles and their frauds; and the responses of Delphi, Dodona, Boetia, Lycia, Libya, Egypt, and the Cabiri, together with the Pythian priestess, occupied a high place in the imagination of men. But now since Christ has come to be preached everywhere, their madness has ceased, and they have not a diviner left. Formerly demons practised upon mankind by spectres and enchantments; and by getting possession of fountains and streams, and wood and stone, drove the weakminded out of their senses. But now, since the manifestation of the Divine Word, all this has stopped. . . . Formerly, men worshipped heroes, and the beings called Zeus, Cronos, and Apollo by the poets. . . . But now, since the Saviour appeared, they have been exposed in their true character as mortal men; and Christ alone has been recognised among men as the true God—the Divine Word, and God as well. Lastly, why should I speak of the art of magic that was so highly prized, seeing that before the Word became incarnate it was in high force and repute with the Egyptians, Indians, and Chaldeans, to the amazement of all beholders, but has now by the manifestation of the Word, and the presence of truth, been convicted and utterly swept away?" (*De Incarn.* v. c. 47). "Who can fail to see that the teaching of the Saviour is increasing everywhere, and every species of idolatry, and all that is opposed to His faith, decreasing and tottering to its fall?" (*ib.* c. 55). Eusebius confirms this by the express testimonies of Plutarch and Porphyry (*Praep. Ev.* v. 16-17).

Φαίβοις μαντεύοντο Θεῶν λόγον οὐκ ἐΐς ἰστέον,

says St. Gregory Nazianzen (*Carm.* II. 2. 7. 253), alluding to the oracles and Sibylline prophecies that, no less than the true prophets, had foretold their fall. "Hoc autem significat," as St. Jerome writes of Isaiah (*Comment.* XII. 41), "quòd post adventum Christi omnia idola continerint: uti Apollo Delphicus, et Loxias, Deliusque et Clarius, et caetera idola, futurorum scientiam pollicentia, quae reges potentissimos deceiverunt."

There was another fact akin to this, and in truth explicable by it alone, to which the fathers were unanimous in appealing, and appealing in such a way, that, to believe they misrepresented it, would be tantamount to maintaining that there was a conspiracy between heathenism and Christianity to deceive mankind, all the time they were waging war to the knife with each other. It was that demons had to comply with any summons addressed to them by Christians invoking the name of Christ, or making the sign of the cross. Tertullian thus openly challenges his opponents: "I will not argue the question any further in words; there is a speedier way of demonstrating on which side the truth lies. Let

one be brought before your tribunal, confessedly possessed with a demon. Then let that spirit be commanded to speak by any Christian, and he will profess himself a demon with as much truth as he professes himself a god elsewhere with falsehood. Similarly, let one be produced of those who are thought to be acted upon by a god . . . unless they all confess themselves to be demons, not daring to lie to a Christian, let the blood of the adventuresome Christian be shed on the spot" (*Apol.* c. 23). Another African, Minucius Felix, says: "Believe them to be demons on their own shewing, and confessing the truth about themselves. For no sooner are they adjured by the only true God, than involuntarily the wretched bodies of which they have gained possession are set in a tremor all over, and either they take themselves off at once with a rush, or steal away by degrees, according to the effect produced by the faith of the patient or the grace of the operator" (*Octav.* c. 27). If Tertullian and Minucius had spoken thus alone, it might have been set down to temperament; but when the same thing is stated, as a fact with which all were familiar, by such witnesses, and so widely separated from each other by age, country, language, and even theological views, as St. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii. 6 and c. *Tryph.* c. 30), Theophilus (*ad Autol.* ii. 8), Origen (*c. Cels.* i. 6), Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iv. 27), Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* iii. 6), and St. Athanasius (*De Incarn.* v. c. 47-8), to name no more; and when the veneration of such miracles is allowed honestly by writers of no less credit in after times, we should have literally no alternative left us in reason but to admit the fact as we find it stated, even if it stood alone; but it comes to us trebly confirmed, when we find it alike explaining, and explained by other contemporaneous phenomena, for which there is at least as much heathen as Christian evidence.

Lastly, with respect to the part played by demons under the Christian dispensation. "You must beware," says St. Cyprian, "of their subtle and more clandestine machinations, and not merely those which are plain to all. For can any thing evince greater craft or subtlety than the game played by our adversary, who on finding himself detected and overthrown by the coming of Christ, and by the salutary flood of light thus shed over all lands for the saving of mankind, and beholding his own idols and shrines deserted by reason of the increasing shoals of believers, struck out a new method of attack, and served himself of the very profession of Christianity to deceive the unwary, by inventing schisms and heresies: hoping by these means to subvert the faith, corrupt the truth, and disserve unity" (*De Unit. Eccl.* c. 3). We find the same sentiment expressed in almost every chapter of ecclesiastical history treating of heresies or their authors. "About the same time," says Eusebius, "Manes, or the madman, as his name imports, common also to the demoniacal heresy founded by him, commenced his reprobate career, the demon and adversary of God, Satan himself, urging him on to the destruction of many" (*E. H.* vii. 31). In the same spirit Constantine conjured Arius and Alexander, on hearing of their dispute, "to withdraw from the temptations of the devil while they could" (*Soc.* i. 7).

Persecutions, again, were regarded as his work,

in primitive times, no less than heresies, and on grounds no less obvious. For Christians were then persecuted on no other grounds than for being Christians, and when arrested the alternative was invariably proposed to them of sacrificing to demons, that is, to the heathen gods. Hence, Tertullian, in his soul-stirring address to the martyrs: "Domus quidem diaboli est carcer, in qua familiam suam continet. Sed vos ideo in carcerem pervenistis, ut illum etiam in domo sua conculcetis, jam enim eum foris congressi conculcaveratis" (c. 1).

"The greatness of our troubles here," say the Christians of Lyons and Vienne in their affecting letter to their brethren in Asia (*Euseb. E. H.* v. 1), and the intense wrath of the Gentiles against the saints, and what our blessed martyrs have gone through, are past words to describe: the adversary having put forth all his strength by way of giving us a foretaste of what his uncompromising opposition is to be. For he has gone every length in practising and disciplining his emissaries against the servants of God, excluding them from all places of public resort alike, and not allowing them to shew themselves abroad anywhere. But he has been opposed by the grace of God mightily working in our behalf, by which the weak have been delivered, and those possessed of powers of endurance like rocks, called to the front, to draw off the whole brunt of his assault upon themselves, and they have withstood him to the death." This is prefatory to a long list of martyrdoms under Verus. There is a similar preface to the martyrdoms under Diocletian by Eusebius himself (*ib.* viii. 4), and both should be read side by side with the edicts of Maximinus (*ib.* ix. 7, and *De Mart. Palest.* c. 9), and Julian (*Soz. E. H.* v. 16), issued with the avowed object of upholding heathenism. At the same time this view was not held without qualification even in those days: as we find Eusebius confessing, almost in the same breath, that the last of the persecutions recorded by him was occasioned, at least in part, by the backslidings and internal dissensions, consequent on success, of the Christians themselves (*E. H.* viii. 1).

Nor was this qualification, in general, absent from the minds of the fathers in dealing with psychological questions. The devil was neither supposed by them to tempt Christians to sin in every case, nor to be able to force them to sin in any. Consequently, the guilt of their sin in every case rested with themselves alone. They could always resist, and overcome him if they pleased, and there were times frequently, when he could not even be charged with having suggested sin to them in any way. St. Chrysostom says no less nobly than truly, "Sin is, of the two, more formidable than the demon . . . nor is it so great a matter to be freed from the demon as from sin. The demon is no real impediment to our getting to heaven, but rather contributes to it, by adding to their virtue whom he tempts. Whereas sin excludes from heaven" (in *Act. Hom.* xli. 3-4). St. Augustine thus strikes the balance between ourselves and him. "The corruption of the body which weighs down the soul is not the cause, but the punishment of the first sin, nor was it the corruptible body that made the soul sin, but the soul the body: and although from

this corruption of the flesh a number of incentives to vice spring, and such desires are themselves vicious, still we must not make the flesh responsible for all the vices we commit, as though we charged no portion of them upon the devil, who is distinct from the flesh." (*De Civ. D.* xiv. 3.) As St. Leo says, "He is always on the alert, ready to transform himself into an angel of light, to lay his snares here there and everywhere, and leave no stone unturned to corrupt the faith of those who believe. He is well aware whose desires are inflammable, whose besetting sin is gluttony, whose fondness for luxuries he may work upon, where he may instil envy, whom he may break with sorrow, deceive with joy, prostrate with fear, cajole with flattery. He is conversant with the habits of all, ventilates their cares, scrutinises their affections, tries his worst to do mischief wherever he finds the greatest desire to do good." (*Serm. in Nat. D.* vii. 3.) But all in vain, if he is resisted as he should be. "Let it be granted," says St. Augustine, "that the devil makes suggestions to us occasionally, far from his forcing the unwilling, everybody becomes his of their own accord. For he neither seduces nor entraps any body, between whom and himself he has not already discovered a likeness. Sometimes he encounters one who lusts, and his lust opens a door by which the suggestion of the devil enters. Sometimes it is one who fears, and the devil tells him to avoid what he knows inspires him with fear: another he bids get possession of what he knows he covets. Thus he enters by these two doors of fear and desire. Close them, and you fulfil what you have just heard read in the epistle: 'Neither give place to the devil.' For there the apostle wished to shew that though the devil may enter and take possession, it is man in every case who lets him in" (*Serm. de Script.* xxxii. 11).

In conclusion, as St. Chrysostom says, "It is not in this case, as with athletes. For there you must prostrate your adversary, or you have not conquered. Here you conquer, merely by keeping your footing. . . . There two strive for the mastery, so that one is crowned, only when the other is laid on his back. Here it is otherwise, all that the devil is anxious about being our defeat. I have conquered therefore, when I have defeated his purpose. . . . Though I have not succeeded in throwing him down, still, if I have not been thrown myself, I am victor. To be sure, the victory of victories is, when he has been trampled under foot, as he was by St. Paul. . . . Let us imitate the apostle, then, and try to be superior, or at least to give him no handle. Riches at once furnish him with a handle. Money and vain-glory not merely set him up, but render him furious. Why strive with him at all? Once come to close quarters, and it is uncertain what the issue will be. Trample him under foot, and your victory is assured. Be it ours therefore to trample the power of the devil under foot, first our sins, then all that relates to this life—wrath, arrogance, concupiscence, all the affections and lusts—that when we go hence, we may not be found to have betrayed the power given us by God, nor forfeit the reward that is in store for us. If we have failed in this, who will entrust greater things to our keeping? . . .

If we have not vanquished him who has been put under us so completely, with what assurance can we present ourselves at the house of our Father?" (*in Eph. c. vi.*; *Hom. xxii.* 5).

Such, in general, is the teaching of the fathers respecting the devil and his angels of the New Testament: and the demons, gods of the nations, or idols of the Old. Nor can it be denied that it is on the whole consistent and intelligible, based upon facts, and in accordance with Scripture. When our Lord told the Seventy, on their re-joining Him (*St. Luke x.* 18), "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven"; and when he told St. Paul, in appearing to him (*Acts xxvi.* 18) that He sent him "unto the Gentiles . . . to turn them from the power of Satan unto God," there can be no dispute but that He gave utterance to what has since become fact. The worship of idols has ceased, wherever it has crossed the path of the Gospel from east to west; and Christ is and has long been worshipped where Satan and his angels have been dispossessed. Tempter is the highest office which Satan can fill in Christian lands, and even in this he cannot succeed with any who resist him. People have come to doubt of his existence, from seeing so little of his power, where he was once worshipped as God. These facts have neither diminished in breadth, nor lost in importance, since patristic times; and the spirit of confidence and agreement with which the fathers expatiated on them in their infancy is much the most surprising part of their theory. Whatever opinions any of them put forward that were peculiar have been tacitly abandoned, and are therefore entitled to no notice, where the antiquarian point of view would be out of place. Similarly, neither is this the place for unravelling the mazes of gentile mythology, nor for enumerating the oracles, and other modes of divining then in vogue, nor for distinguishing between those Sibylline books which had a heathen, and those which had a Christian origin.

On all these points, and others bearing upon the subject in general, see Lewis, *Heb. Republ.* v. 17; Torreblanca, *de Mag.*; Peucer, *de Divin.*; G. Voss, *de Idolat.*; and I. Voss, *de Sibyll. Or.*; Dale, *de Oracl.*; Eugub. *de Per. Philos.* lib. iii. et seq.; Potter, *Greek Ant.* vol. i.; Bull, *de Jes. X. Divin.* iv. 12; Maréchal, *Concord. S. Pat.*; *Dict. of the Bible*, articles DEMON and SATAN; and DIABOLUS in this dictionary. [E. S. Ff.]

DEMOPHILUS, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 370; expelled 380; died 386; formerly bishop of Berea. He was born of good family in Thessalonica (*Philostorg. H. E.* ix. 14). Liberius, however, in a letter from his exile in Thrace (*Hilarius Pictav.* vol. ii. frag. 6, *Patrol.* x. 690; Baronius, ad ann. 357), mentions one Demophilus, whom he speaks of as a brother bishop, and who appears to have taken part in persuading him to sign the creed adopted at the synod of Sirmium. If this is the same Demophilus, the Berea of which he was bishop was probably in Thrace. He was present at the council of Rimini in 359, and was one of the Arian bishops who were deposed at the council (*Soc. H. E.* ii. 37), though the sentence does not appear to have been carried into effect.

On the death of Eudoxius in 370 he was elected by the Arians to the bishopric of Con-

stantinople (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 14; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 13). Theodorus, bishop of Heraclea, appears to have taken the chief part in his ordination as holding the exarchate of Thrace. The people, however, were much divided in opinion, so that many substituted the cry "unworthy," ἀνάξιος, for the common formula ἕγιος with which the declaration of an election was usually received (Philostorgius, *H. E.* ix. 10). The orthodox party chose Evagrius for their bishop, and he was ordained by Eustathius, the deposed bishop of Antioch. This was the signal for an outburst of fury on the part of the Arians.

Eustathius and Evagrius were banished by Valens, and their followers bitterly persecuted. It is recorded that eighty presbyters, who had gone to Nicomedia with a petition to the emperor, were by his orders put on board a ship, as if to be conveyed to exile in Thrace, but at the entrance of the Propontis the ship was set on fire and abandoned by her crew, so that the prisoners perished in the flames (Soc. *H. E.* iv. 14, 16; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 13, 14). Demophilus, soon after his accession to the throne of Constantinople, went to Cyzicus in conjunction with Dorotheus, or Theodorus, of Heraclea, afterwards bishop of Antioch, the same who took the principal part in his ordination, in order to procure the election of an Arian bishop, the see having been vacant since the banishment of Eunomius. But the people of Cyzicus refused to acknowledge them till they had anathematised Aetius, Eunomius, and their followers. When the patriarch and his friends had given this proof of their orthodoxy, they were permitted to ordain a bishop chosen by the people. It is added that the bishop who was ordained straightway and clearly taught the consubstantial faith (Philostorgius, *H. E.* ix. 13).

In 380 changed times came for the patriarch, and for the Arians, not merely of Constantinople, but of the neighbouring cities. It is for this that the reign of Theodosius and the patriarchate of Demophilus are so memorable. The emperor Theodosius offered to confirm him in his see, if he would subscribe the Nicene Creed. Demophilus refused, and was immediately ordered to give up his churches. He then called his followers together, and, standing upright in their midst, repeated the text, "If they persecute you in one city flee into another," saying, "Since the emperor excludes us from the churches, we will henceforth hold our assemblies without the city," and then retired, with Lucius of Alexandria and some others, to a place of worship without the walls (Soc. *H. E.* v. 7). The churches of Constantinople, which had for forty years been in the hands of the Arians, were now restored to the orthodox. This change of possession went on in the churches of other cities, and made disturbances. This was, in fact, the general disestablishment of Arianism and the re-establishment of Catholicism. It was a grand event in the history of the church, and the leading point in the career of Demophilus. Philostorgius (*H. E.* ix. 19) adds that he went to his own city, Berea. But this must have been some time afterwards, or he must have returned from exile, for he represented the Arian party at the synod held in Constantinople, A.D. 383 (Soc. *H. E.* v. 10; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 12).

Philostorgius says that Demophilus was wont

to throw everything into confusion, especially the doctrines of the church. He gives a passage from a sermon preached by him at Constantinople, in which he compares the human nature of the Saviour as lost in the divine, in the same manner as a glass of milk poured into the sea. (Philostorgius, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxv.; Sozom. and Socr. *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii.) [P. O. and C. H.]

DEMOPHILUS, a monk, addressed in the 8th letter which appears under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. (*Patrol. Graeca*, iii. p. 1083; Ceillier, x. 552.) [W. M. S.]

DEMOSTHENES, the superintendent of the kitchen of the emperor Valens, who had wormed himself into his master's confidence, and arrogated the right of being a judge in theological controversies. When Valens was on his way to Caesarea, A.D. 371, Demosthenes was sent before him, to endeavour by his menaces to reduce Basil to submission to the emperor's wishes. His failure, and the quiet contempt with which, on a second occasion, Basil bade him be content with his culinary art, and not meddle with theology, are narrated in an earlier article (BASIL THE GREAT). If he is the same person with the Demosthenes, who four years later held the office of vicar of Pontus, we have in him one of the many examples presented by the history of the Eastern empire of the manner in which base arts raised the meanest persons to the highest dignities. This Demosthenes proved the great enemy of the orthodox, and, though quite ignorant of the outlines of the faith, espoused the cause of the semi-Arians, of whom he summoned a council at Ancyra, on which occasion he endeavoured to secure the arrest and imprisonment of Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, on the charge of the malversation of some church funds (Basil, *Epist.* 264, 385, 405). [GREGORY NYSSEN.] In the spring of 276 Demosthenes summoned another synod of the religious enemies of Basil and Gregory, at Nyssa, at which Gregory was deposed, and an Arian put in his place (*Epist.* 10, 264). Theodotus, the orthodox bishop of Nicopolis, having died, he endeavoured to force on the church of that place a bishop consecrated by Eustathius of Sebaste. This attempt was unsuccessful (*Epist.* 192). [E. V.]

DEMOSTRATUS, a writer whose works were in circulation among some heretics, opposed by Plotinus (Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus*, 16).

[G. S.]

DENEBERHT, the ninth bishop of Worcester. He was consecrated, according to Florence of Worcester, in 798, and made his profession of obedience to Aethelheard, archbishop of Canterbury. This document, which is preserved (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 525), is remarkable as containing a considerable portion of the Athanasian creed. Denebert appears as attesting charters from 801 to 817, and died, according to Florence, in 822. Several acts of his, later than A.D. 800, appear among the Worcester charters in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, i. cf. *Ang. Sac.* i. 471. [S.]

DENEFRITH, the fifth bishop of Sherborne; his name is found attached to charters from 794 to 796, and he is possibly the unnamed bishop

of Sherborne, who made his profession to archbishop Ethelheard (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 529; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 620). [S.]

DENEHAEH, or **DENEHEAH**, abbat of Reculver, who received a grant from Eadbert of Kent by a charter of A.D. 747, considered spurious or doubtful. (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 1004; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 62; *Monast. Anglic.* i. 454.) [C. H.]

DEOBYTA, or **LEOBYT**, of the 8th century, addressed in his third letter by Lullus, archbishop of Mainz. It is a letter of consolation. (Lullus, *Epist. in Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. p. 820; Ceillier, xii. 131.) [W. M. S.]

DEOCARIUS, the seventh bishop of Antipolis, was present at the council of Châlons, in the time of king Clovis, A.D. 644, or according to Sirmundus 650. (Cointius, *Annal.* tom. iii. p. 173; Mabillon, ad ann. 658, §§ 63 and 64; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1148.) [D. R. J.]

DEOCARUS, ST., abbat of Hasenrietanum, Hernriadum, or Heidenheim, in the diocese of Eichstädt. Very little is known of St. Deocarus, except that he lived in the 8th century.

In 1316 his body, which had been buried in the chapel of St. Mary, afterwards a Capuchin monastery, was raised, and some relics therefrom were translated to the church of St. Lawrence, Nürnberg. In 1482 the body was translated to a new chapel at Herried, and through its virtue many blind, lame, and sick were supposed to have been cured. It is not known when St. Deocarus died, but he is commemorated on the 7th of June (*AA. SS. Bolland. Jun. ii. ad diem, 7*; Migne, *Encycl. Théolog.* xl. 737).

[D. R. J.]

DEOCHAIN. As we find erumther or priest used as an appellation in the Irish calendars, so we have also such entries as "Deochain Aedh, of Cuil-maine, Jul. 10 and Aug. 31," "Deochain Menn, of Cluainarathair, April 25" (standing possibly for Nenn or Nennius), and "Deochain Reat, March 3," where the ecclesiastical title of deacon is employed to designate the saint.

[J. G.]

DEODATUS (1), ST., abbat, Blois, was born at Bourges, and became a monk under St. Phaletrus in the monastery of Issoudun in Berri.

His legend is given as follows in a MS. of Rouen. With the permission of his abbat, he left the monastery, and went in quest of a solitude adapted to his wishes. He fled by night in company with a presbyter named Baudomirus, who had arrived there a few days previously. So swiftly did they run that they arrived at their destination (Blois) the same night. There Deodatus built for himself a cell, in which he lived alone. The fame of his sanctity and good works soon spread far and wide, and he was visited by king Clovis, who happened to be then at Vinodocinum during a campaign against the Goths, according to one of the saint's biographers, but the Bollandists say that it is the *bellum Alamanicum* which must be referred to. That expedition having at length proved successful, the king attributed his success to the prayers of Deodatus, whom he rewarded by giving him some extensive lands in the neighbourhood of his cell, and

also 26 lbs. of gold and silver, that he might have the means of feeding the poor and supporting his disciples. Having done these things, king Clovis went to St. Remigius and received holy baptism. With the means thus placed at his disposal by the bounty of the king, Deodatus established a cloister, which harboured in his time as many as forty monks. He died in peace in the 6th century, and is commemorated on the 24th April. (*AA. SS. Boll. April, iii. p. 273*; Migne, *Encycl. Théolog.* xl. 737.) [D. R. J.]

DEODATUS (2), or ADEODATUS, tenth bishop of Mâcon, ordained St. Eligius presbyter, and was present at the council of Châlons A.D. 644, and the seventh year of the reign of king Clovis II. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 1042; Audouen, *Eligii Vita*, cap. ii. in *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. p. 477; Ceillier, xi. 754.) [D. R. J.]

(3) ST., or DIEUDONNÉ, or DIÉ, bishop of Nevers, and founder of the monastery of Jointures in the Vosges. His life was written in the 10th or 11th century by Valcandus, a monk of the abbey of Moyaumontier, and is given in the 151st volume of Migne's *Latin Patrology*, page 611.

Deodatus is said to have been born towards the beginning of the 7th century, from one of the most illustrious families of western France. About the year 655 the people and clergy of Nevers, who knew his gifts, talents, and spotless life, chose him with one voice to be their bishop. He was present in 657 with St. Eloi, St. Ouen, and St. Amand at the council of Sens.

Although eminently successful in the government of his flock, he felt attracted to a solitary life, asked his diocesans to choose a successor, and departed to the Vosges mountains, which were in the diocese of Toul. St. Bodon, bishop of Toul, allowed him to build cells for himself and his disciples. At Romont, a nobleman named Asclepas is said to have been so struck by a wonderful deed of Deodatus, that he built a monastery, where Deodatus left two of his disciples, Villigot and Martin, who became patrons of the priory of Romont.

Bishop Deodatus then passed to a place called Argentile, now Sainte-Hélène, where he began the foundations of a monastery. But the country people looked askance at his enterprise, and forced him to leave it incomplete.

He accordingly took to the mountains between Lothringen and Elsass, and having made his way into the forest of Haguenau, he settled in that part which is called Heiligenforst, the Holy Wood. Here he made acquaintance with St. Arbogaste, at that time leading a solitary life, and afterwards bishop of Strasburg.

But his neighbours again expressed their opposition to his residence, and he moved on to an island called Novientum, afterwards Ebersmünster, where had been formed since 661 a little settlement of solitaries, who received bishop Deodatus with joy. His reputation soon attracted a large number of followers; and the liberality of king Childeric II. enabled him to build a church in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, in which he placed the relics of St. Maurice, which he had obtained from Ambrose, abbat of St. Maurice in Valais. He dedicated the church himself with much solemnity in the midst of a large concourse of Christians.

The government, however, of such a large community as Ebersmünster left him little time for contemplation. He gave up his office, and retired to a place near the town of Ammerschwir, in the highlands of Elsass, whence he was for the third time driven away by the boorish population.

A lord of that country, named Hunus, touched by his misfortune, offered him one of his estates. But Deodatus replied that he had not quitted his bishopric to enter on other domains. He determined to find a place so deserted that none could feel jealousy at his presence.

Accordingly about the year 669 he returned to the Vosges, and stopped in a glen near the Meurthe, which he named Vallis Galliaea, and which is still called Val-de-St.-Dié. But this valley, then uninhabited, was soon thronged by numbers of devout persons desirous to place themselves under his guidance; and the solitude of the cell which he had built and the chapel which he had dedicated to St. Martin, where he lived in peace, eating only herbs and wild fruits, afforded him no longer the tranquillity for which he craved. He therefore built, at some distance from his cell, the monastery of Jointures, so called from the junction of the Rothbach with the Meurthe. The bishop of Toul expressed his consent, and Numerian, bishop of Treves, metropolitan of the province, granted bishop Deodatus the privilege of exercising episcopal functions in his monastery. He gave his monks the discipline of St. Columbanus.

Two leagues from Jointures was the monastery of Moyenmoutier, founded, after the example of Deodatus, by Hidulphus, formerly bishop of Treves. A very close intimacy sprang up between these two prelates. As Deodatus grew older, he redoubled his austerities. Feeling his end approach, he assembled all the community round his cell, gave them his last advice, and received the emblems of communion from the hands of his friend Hidulphus. He died in his friend's arms on June 19, A.D. 679.

His body was buried by his friend in the church of the Virgin. The chest which contained his bones was burned by the Swedes in 1635. The abbey of St.-Dié, round which grew up a town which bore its name, was in the middle of the 10th century made collegiate, and became a celebrated chapter of canons. In 1777 pope Pius VI. erected it into a bishopric. In 1802 this episcopal see was suppressed, but in 1821 it was restored by pope Pius VII. (*Migne, Encycl. Théolog.* xl. p. 745; Valcandi, *Vita S. Deodati*, *Patrol. Lat. cli. p. 611.*) [W. M. S.]

DEODATUS (4), 28th bishop of Chartres, succeeded Gambertus, in the latter half of the 7th century. He consented to the founding of a new monastery by his mother Adrebertana, the deacon Chrotcharius being appointed first abbat. He is buried at St. Martin's-in-the-Vale (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1101). [D. R. J.]

(5) Bishop of Amiens, was 13th in succession, and lived in the latter half of the 7th century (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 1156). [D. R. J.]

(6) Or THEODATUS, ST., 38th bishop of Vienne. The biographers of this saint have filled many pages, if not volumes, with discussions about the exact year in which he succeeded

to the bishopric and the year in which he died, the difference being after all very small, if not unimportant, except as it bears upon the general history of the period in which he lived. Of the personal history of Deodatus very little is recorded, but he is said to have been a man of great abstemiousness and frugality, justice and mercy. He became bishop of Vienne the year Theodoric died, which is variously stated to have been in 688, 690, or 691, the last of which is most probably correct. It may be safely stated that it was at the end of the reign of Theodoric or at the beginning of the reign of his successor Anastatius, Pippin being mayor of the palace under Sigebertus, king of Austrasia. As an additional clue to the date, it may also be mentioned that when Deodatus ruled the church of Vienne Claudius was bishop of Besançon, St. Audoenus bishop of Rouen, Audomarus bishop of Tarbes, Damianus bishop of Paris, Theodorus archbishop of Canterbury, Mansuetus bishop of Milan.

At this time also St. Leodegarius was cruelly persecuted and afterwards beheaded by Ebroinus, his brother Gerinus and others being punished in various ways. Deodatus died in 707 or 708, and is commemorated on the 15th October. (*AA. SS. Boll. Oct. vii. 55; Gallia Christ. xvi. 34; Ado, Martyrologium; Patrol. Lat. cxxiii.; Du Saussay, Martyrol. Gallic.*) [D. R. J.]

DEODATUS (7), 24th bishop of Beauvais, is mentioned in the 11th epistle of pope Zacharias, sent about the year 745 to the bishops of Gaul. Le Cointe thinks that he sat until the year 752 (*Gallia Christ. ix. 696; Patrol. Lat. lxxxix. 948.*) [D. R. J.]

(8) Bishop of Soissons. Nothing is recorded of him except his name, which is given 31st in the series (*Gall. Christ. ix. 339.*) [D. R. J.]

(9) 38th bishop of Bourges, ruled that diocese from A.D. 774 to 783, according to the conjecture of Le Cointe; but nothing more is known about him (*Gall. Christ. ii. 20; Cointius, Ann. Eccl. Franc.*). [D. R. J.]

(10) Eighth bishop of Evreux, from about A.D. 619 to 640, and succeeded St. Landulfus. He occurs in a diploma of Clotaire II. (*Gall. Christ. xi. 567.*) [D. R. J.]

DEODEFRIDUS, 42nd bishop of Paris, succeeded Madalbertus about the middle of the 8th century. In the year 757, that being the sixth year of the reign of Pippin, he subscribed to the charter granted to the monastery of Gorze. Ten years afterwards, i.e. in 767, a council was held at Gentilly, near Paris, to discuss the sculpture and painting of images of the saints, their use in churches, etc.; also concerning the *filioque*, on the occasion of the message sent from the East from the emperor Constantinus to king Pippin. As this council was held in the diocese of Paris, the conjecture that Deodefridus was present is not unreasonable (*Gall. Christ. vii. 29.*) [D. R. J.]

DEOGRATIAS (1), a presbyter who had submitted to Augustine six questions, mainly relating to pagan objections or difficulties. 1. Will our resurrection be like that of Lazarus or that of Christ? 2. How is it that Christianity appeared in the world so late? 3. Why do Christians

condemn sacrifices and *incense*, which have been in use from time immemorial? 4. How can infinite duration of punishment be consistent with the words "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again"? 5. Did not Solomon say that God had no son? (Prov. xxx. 4.) 6. What ought we to think of the incredible story of Jonah? To the first question he answers that the difference in origin between Christ's body and ours will not forbid a similar resurrection. He speaks of his eating and of his scars. It is from this passage that Milton has drawn (*P. L.* v. 434 sq.). To the second his answer is twofold. The fathers believed on Him that was to come, as we on Him who is come; and He chose to come when He knew that men should and would be prepared to receive His doctrine. The Semi-Pelagians made use of this last saying, and Augustine touches on it in his *Retractions*, and thus recasts it in his book on *Predestination*, "He appeared when and where He knew that there were those who had been elected in Him before the foundation of the world." To the third he replies that since the shedding of the blood of Christ, the only true sacrifice, a change in the kind of sacrifices had been divinely sanctioned. To the fourth he answers, that a measure is different from that which is measured; our will is the measure; and that which has desired eternal enjoyment of sin may justly meet eternal severity of punishment. For the fifth, he quotes Prov. viii. 25. For the sixth he maintains the historical truth, and brings out the allegorical meaning of the story. (*Aug. Ep.* 102 [49], vol. ii. 370.)

This Deogratias may be the same as the deacon of Carthage, who about A.D. 400 was charged with instructing catechumens, a work at which other people thought him peculiarly successful, and he found himself greatly at a loss. He wrote to Augustine for hints on the subject. "In what order should he present the articles of the faith? Should he use any exhortation at the end of his narrative, or only give precepts, by observing which his hearers might know that Christian life and profession were retained?" Augustine answers at length in a book *De Catechizandis Rudibus* (Migne, vi. 309-343). The first point, according to Augustine, is to teach joyously, but this is God's gift. For the order, it is best to go through the main facts of the scripture history in their chronological sequence, showing how all led up to the coming of Christ, and how His love to us demands the return of our love to Him. "The New Testament is hidden in the Old, the Old manifested in the New." The great foe of love is pride: "proud man is a great misery, but a humble God a greater mercy."

Then he gives directions (ch. v.) for inquiring into the motives of catechumens (from others, if possible, if not their own answers must be accepted, and made the base of exhortations), and for passing from the narration of past revelations, to admonitions concerning the future. He then suggests that a somewhat different method would have to be adopted with educated inquirers, who are likely already to have made themselves acquainted with the faith to which they ask to be admitted (ch. vii.). Grammarians and orators are especially to be warned against taking offence at the rude style of Scripture, or

of preachers, and to be taught to look for mysteries below the surface.

He next gives six causes of tiresomeness in catechising, with suggestions for obviating the difficulties. He recommends that the catechumens should be allowed to sit down, not compelled to listen standing. He also recommends that the catechist should inquire whether they are already familiar with what he is telling them.

He finally gives two examples of discourses in preparation for baptism, the one longer, the other briefer.

One passage of this work is cited by Facundus (in *Morian*, p. 578), that, namely, in which Augustine recommends inquiry as to the books from which more educated inquirers have drawn their knowledge of Christianity, as the books may have been heretical, or unguarded statements of orthodox fathers may give rise to heresies. (The book is noticed by Augustine in his *Retractions*, ii. 14; compare Ceillier, ix. 264; Alzog, 403.) [E. B. B.]

DEOGRATIAS (2) Elected, after a long vacancy to fill the see of Carthage, by permission of Genseric, at the instance of Valentinian, A.D. 454. When Genseric returned from the sack of Rome with hosts of captives, and parents and children, wives and husbands, were severed as they were sold into slavery, Deogratias sold all the plate of the churches to redeem them, and as there were no buildings in the city large enough to house them he furnished two great churches with beds for the purpose. This created the envy of the Arians, who thought to kill him, but God took him to Himself after three years' episcopate. (Ceillier, x. 450, from Victor Vitensis.) [E. B. B.]

DEORA. [DIOIRA.]

DEORAI DH. [DIRAI DH.]

DEOTIMUS, 36th bishop of Orleans, before A.D. 788. He succeeded Nadatimus, probably after being a monk of Fleury, for no catalogue makes him abbat of that monastery. His donations of certain estates were confirmed by Hugh Capet and Robert. (Charter VII. of the Church of Orleans, A.D. 990; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1419, 1487.) [W. M. S.]

DERBHFRACH, of Drui m Dubhain, commemorated April 4. In Colgan (*Acta SS.* 713, c. 4, n. 11) there is given among the saints of the family of the Orghielli and race of Colla Dach-rioch, "St. Derfroechea, alias Darercha, daughter of Eochaidh, son of Crimthann, son of Fiac, &c., 11th Nov. or 23rd Mar." This is Derbhfrach or Dearfraich, mother of St. Tighearnach (Apr. 4), bishop of Cluain-eois, now Clones, in Monaghan [TIGHERNACH] (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 95). Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, 348) is of opinion that she flourished towards the close of the fifth century, and quotes the following curious note from the *Felire of Aengus*, relating to her wooden Duirtheach or church at Drui m Dubhain, near Clogher, in Tyrone: "Derbhfrach, the mother of Tighearnach of Cluain Eois. She is called Coechdamair of Drui m Dubhain here, for having refused to split the timber at the erection of her Duirtheach." [J. G.]

DERBILEDH. [DARBILE.]

DERCHAIRTHINN, of Uachter-aird, Mar. 8. Of the race of Colla Uais, king of Ireland, she is given among the saints of the family of St. Maedhog (Jan. 31), of Ferns, as "Dercharthania filia Ennii, filii Trenii," &c. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 71; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 222, c. 4). She probably belonged to the church which was founded at Uachter-aird (now Oughteraid, in the barony of South Salt, co. Kildare), in the sixth or seventh century by a St. Brigida, who is different, however, from the saint of Kildare (Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 404).

[J. G.]

DERFEL or **DERFEL GADARN**, a Welsh saint of the 6th century, brother of Rhytud, Sulien, and Cristiolus, other Welsh saints, was the founder of the church of Llandderfel in Merionethshire, from whence his image, made of wood, was taken and burnt at Smithfield at the time of the Reformation; commemorated on April 5. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 221.) [C. H.]

DERMITIUS. [DIARMAID.]

DERMOR, daughter of Maine, of Airiudh Baine, July 6. This is the entry in *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 189), where she is kept distinct from Ethne and Cumman, who were both virgins and sisters, daughters of Cormac, son of Aiillil, of the race of Cathair Mor, king of Ireland. But in Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 184 n. 270, col. 1), and *Mart. Tallaght* (by Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* p. xxviii.), these three are classed as sisters, all daughters of Maine or Manius, of Airiudh-bainne [CUMMAN (1).]

[J. G.]

DERUVIANUS, mentioned with Faganus, who are called the first bishops of Congressbury, A.D. 167, in the 'Glastonbury Chronicle,' quoted by Wharton (*Angl. Sac.* i. 553). [CUNGAR.] He is evidently the Duvianus said to have been sent with Faganus by pope Eleutherus, at the request of Lucius, to preach the Christian faith to the Britons. Matthew of Westminster names this papal missionary Deruvianus and Deruvianus (*Flor. Hist.* ed. 1570, lib. i. p. 112). [DUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

DERWA, ST., a name only preserved in Mertherderwa, i.e. "the martyr Derwa," in the parish of Camborne in Cornwall. The old chapel existed till late in the middle ages (*Munimenta Academica*, ed. Anstey, p. 559), as well as a "bridge of Derwa." The name is now corrupted into Menadarva. The name Dervanus occurs in the story of king Lucius's message to pope Eleutherus. The prefix Merther is more common in Wales than in Cornwall. [C. W. B.]

DESIDERATUS (1), ST., twelfth bishop of Besançon, lived in the 4th century, and is commemorated on the 27th July. But little or nothing is known of him except the tradition that his parents, who were of noble rank, had a divine revelation, in which they were promised a son destined to adorn the episcopate by his brilliant virtues, and that Desideratus more than realised the sanguine hopes of his family by the purity of his life and the admirable manner in which he discharged his episcopal functions. Upon the death of Fronimius, the clergy and people unanimously elected Desideratus bishop, whereupon, says Chiffletius, he immediately

CHRIST. BIOGR.

began to sow the word of God in the hearts of believing minds, and to heal those languishing in body, to redeem the captives and prisoners; to take care of widows and the poor, and to rightly govern the people entrusted to him by the Lord; and because he was such an admirable bishop, he left many disciples as his successors in the priesthood. St. Desideratus was buried in the church of Lyon le Saunier, but his bones were translated, or, which is more probable, newly enshrined in the same place in the time of Carolus de Novocastro, archbishop of Besançon (*AA. SS. Boll.* July, vi. p. 432). [D. R. J.]

DESIDERATUS (2) addressed in the 5th century by Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, in a letter which asks him to come and console the husband and father of a lady named Phylimatia, who had died; he consults him also about an epitaph which he had composed for her. (Sidon. Apol. *Ep.* lib. ii. num. 8 *Patrol. Lat.* lviii. p. 482; Ceillier, x. 384.)

[W. M. S.]

(3) ST., ninth bishop of Verdun, was born of a noble race of the Alemanni in Thuringia, and succeeded St. Vitonus in the bishopric. He was married before he was made bishop, and had a son named Siagrius. During his episcopate he suffered much persecution from king Theodoric, through the machinations of a certain Sirivaldus, whom Siagrius, after the death of the king, slew in revenge for his father's wrongs. Thereupon Desideratus, who had long been in exile, returned to his diocese. Finding it reduced to extreme poverty, Desideratus petitioned Theodebert, the son of Theodoric, for help. The king favourably received his petition, and sent the prelate a large grant of money to be distributed amongst his people. Some time afterwards Desideratus offered to refund part of that money to the king, who, however, refused to accept it, saying that he thought himself sufficiently rewarded in having been the means of succouring a miserable people. In the year 535 St. Desideratus subscribed to the council of Auvergne, and in 549 to that of Orleans. His episcopate lasted twenty-five years, and he died in the year of our Lord 554, according to the ancient lists of bishops, and the obituaries of the monastery of St. Vito (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 1166).

[D. R. J.]

(4) ST., presbyter of Châlons. Gregory of Tours says that he had seen him in the monastery of Gurthunum, "a man of magnificent holiness, who often cured colds, toothaches and other diseases by prayer. He was so complete a recluse that he never left his cell; whoever wished saw him there. He left the world ennobled by his unusual virtues. The blessed bishop Agricola, hearing of his death, sent his archdeacon to bury the blessed man in the cemetery of the city; but the monks resisted, and the archdeacon was unable to fulfil his commission. Later on the bishop built a leper-house in the suburbs, and, collecting the citizens and all the clergy, transferred the blessed body to the chapel of the new institution." As bishop Agricola died about 580, the death of Desideratus may be placed about 570. (Greg. Tur. *de Gloria Confessor.* cap. 86, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi.; *AA. SS. Bolland.* April 30, p. 778.)

[W. M. S.]

3 G

DESIDERATUS (5) Eighth bishop of Alby, succeeded St. Salvius in the year 586. Gregory of Tours says of him: "Post obitum Sti. Salvii, hoc anno Desideratus Albigenensis episcopus datus est" (Greg. Tur. lib. 8, *Hist.* cap. 22; *Gall. Christ.* i. p. 5). [D. R. J.]

(6) Fourteenth bishop of Digne, was present at the council of Narbonne in the year 791, but nothing else is recorded of him except the order in which he stands amongst the other bishops of his diocese (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 513, and vi.; *Instrumenta*, col. 3). [D. R. J.]

(7) ST., bishop of Clermont, is placed nineteenth in succession. But although so many writers call him bishop there is no proof that he ever was of that rank. In the *Liber de Altariis Ecclesiæ Claramont.* there is mention of a St. Desideratus buried in the church of Illidium, and it is agreed that in that church many canonised persons were buried who were not bishops (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 243). He lived about the end of the 6th century, and is commemorated on February 11 (*AA. SS. Boll.* Feb. ii. 552). [D. R. J.]

(8) Otherwise DIDO, fifteenth bishop of Châlons, lived in the reign of king Clotarius, and succeeded St. Gratus in the bishopric, about the middle of the 7th century. He is mentioned in *Gallia Christiana* as Desideratus, known by the name of Dido, of whom hardly anything has been reported except the charges made against him (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 873). [D. R. J.]

DESIDERIUS (1) [DIDIER], presbyter in Aquitaine. Desiderius and Riparius, or Didier and Ripaire, as they are commonly called, were two learned priests who had charge of neighbouring parishes in the diocese of Comminges in Aquitaine, in the 4th century, and the beginning of the fifth. It was at their joint instigation that St. Jerome wrote his treatise against Vigilantius, who was a neighbour of theirs. They wrote a common letter on the subject, which they sent to St. Jerome by Sisinius, who was then going to Palestine and Egypt. The subject of this article is supposed by many to be the same Desiderius alluded to in terms of praise by St. Jerome in many of his writings. But Tillemont is of opinion that St. Jerome had several friends of the same name, and that they all come in for a share of his notice.

It seems more likely that it was another Desiderius, whom in one of his letters St. Jerome invites with his sister Serenilla, both living at Rome, to pay him a visit in Palestine, writing both in his own name and that of St. Paulinus. The other Desiderius was also probably he at whose suggestion Jerome began the translation of the *Pentateuch*.

It cannot be decided whether it was to him of Aquitaine or to the other that, in 396 or 397, St. Sulpicius Severus dedicated his *Life of St. Martin*, bishop of Tours.

The same difficulty occurs as to the identity of the Desiderius to whom St. Paulinus addressed his epistles. Desiderius had written to ask St. Paulinus to explain to him the blessings which Jacob, when dying, gave to the twelve patriarchs. St. Paulinus, instead of complying with his request, tells Desiderius that he must

develop for himself those mysteries hidden for so many preceding ages; that being a man blessed of God, a pure vessel, and fit to approach God, his mind being all the more enlightened because his body was so chaste, he might obtain by faith all that he asked of Paulinus. St. Paulinus afterwards asked Rufinus for the same explanation which he himself had hesitated to give to Desiderius. [DESIDERIUS, 2 and 3.]

(Hieron. *Praefatio in Pentateuch. Patrol. Lat.* xxviii. p. 147; Hieron. in *Vigilant.* cap. 2, 121 b; *Patrol. Lat.* xxiii. 339; Hieron. *Ep.* num. xlvii.; *Patrol. Lat.* xxii. 492; Paulin. *Nol. Epist.* num. 43; *Patrol. Lat.* lxi. 382; Sulpicius Severus, *Patrol. Lat.* xx. 159; Till. tom. xii. p. 288; *Hist. Litt de la Fr.* ii. 86 et sq.) [D. R. J.]

DESIDERIUS (2). It is believed that several correspondents of Jerome had the name Desiderius. It is therefore impossible to fix the identity of each in the several letters. There was at any rate a presbyter who, towards the close of the 4th century asked Jerome to translate the *Pentateuch*. Jerome writes to him about the enterprise, and speaks of this letter as a prologue (Hieron. *Patrol. Lat.* xxiii. 241).

He is said to be not the same Desiderius as he to whom Jerome addressed a letter about A.D. 394 (*Epist.* num. xlvii.; *Patrol. Lat.* xxii. 210), asking him to come to Jerusalem, and offering him copies of his works, in particular the *De Viris Illustribus*; this second Desiderius is described as a man of reputation, eloquent, and known to the public by several works of distinction; he lived with his sister Serenilla at Rome. Which Desiderius was the correspondent of Paulinus bishop of Nola (*Patrol. Lat.* lxi. 382; *Epist.* xliii.), or which the correspondent to whom Sulpicius Severus addressed his book on the *Life of St. Martin* (*Patrol. Lat.* xx. 159), is undetermined (Ceillier, vii. 551, 619; viii. 78, 116; *Hist. Littéraire de France*, ii. 86, etc.). [W. M. S.]

(3) (DIDIER), St., seventh bishop of Nantes, is much spoken of in the writings of the Fathers of the Church in France. He is probably the same as Desiderius (1), presbyter in Aquitaine, the correspondent of Jerome, to whom Paulinus Nolanus, and Sulpicius Severus may also have written. Bishops Leo of Bourges, Eustochius of Tours, and Victurius of Le Mans, addressed to him the synodical letter of the council of Bourges in 451. [DESIDERIUS, Presbyter in Aquitaine.] (Ruinart, *Histoire Abrégée des Evêques de Nantes*; Le Brun des Marettes, *Epistolæ S. Paulini*; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 796.) [D. R. J.]

(4) ST., bishop of Langres, placed third in succession. That he was bishop and slaughtered by barbarians is sufficiently established by the documents of the church of Langres, the breviaries, the lists of prelates, and a number of churches dedicated to him; the martyrologies of Ado and Usuard (*Patrol. Lat.* cxxiii., cxxiv.); the writers on the persecution of the Vandals, the Acts of St. Antidius, bishop of Besançon, and the Chronicon of Siegebert (*Patrol. Lat.* clx.). All the rest is uncertain, and De Tillemont thinks that the popular legend must have confused with this bishop some saint who is no longer known.

The legend is as follows. Desiderius was a poor peasant, and worked in the fields. When towards the end of the 4th century the bishop of Langres died, the people took him from the plough and unanimously elected him bishop. Desiderius, although he had not sought or coveted the honour, recognised in the voice of the people the will of God. He therefore responded to the call, and discharged the office of bishop very efficiently, and with much honour to himself. He ended his career by dying a martyr, under the emperor Henricus, when the Vandals overran France and laid waste the country with fire and sword, especially one small town in Champagne, which took the name of Saint-Dizier, from the name of the bishop-martyr St. Desiderius (*Gall. Christ. iv. 510*; S. Warnaharii, *Vita S. Desiderii*; *Patrol. Lat. lxxx. 195*). [D. R. J.]

DESIDERIUS (5) Seventh bishop of Châlons. SS. Joannes, Desiderius, and Flavius, all three bishops of Châlons, are commemorated on the same day as St. Desideratus, a presbyter of Châlons, viz. on the 30th of April. Desiderius was succeeded by St. Agricola. (*AA. SS. Bolland. April 30, p. 778*; *Gall. Christ. iv. p. 864*). [D. R. J.]

(6) Bishop of Fréjus (Forojuliensis), was the seventh bishop of that diocese. In the year 541 he was represented at the fourth synod of Orleans by a priest of Grenoble, of whom it is said: "Missus a domino Desiderio episcopo Forojuliensis consensit et subscripsit." (*Gall. Christ. i. 423*). [D. R. J.]

(7) Fifth bishop of Toulon, ruled his diocese in the latter half of the 6th century. His name occurs amongst the subscribers in the fourth council of Paris (A.D. 573), and he subscribed by proxy at the second synod of Mâcon (A.D. 585). (*Gall. Christ. i. p. 742*). [D. R. J.]

(8) Tenth bishop of Helosa, or Elusa, commonly Eause, formerly metropolis of the province of Novempopulana in Gaul; after the destruction of Eause, the dignity was transferred to Auch (Auscium).

On the death of bishop Laban, in the time of king Childebert II., who had subscribed the second council of Mâcon in 585, king Childebert sold the see, and it was obtained by Desiderius, a layman. Gregory of Tours says that king Childebert had sworn never to appoint a layman to a bishopric, but was induced by the accursed thirst for gold. (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc. lib. viii. cap. 22*; *Patrol. Lat. lxxi*.) [W. M. S.]

(9) ST., twenty-ninth bishop of Vienne, was born of a noble family at Autun, and from his boyhood was so passionately devoted to the study of literature, that he was subsequently rebuked in a letter by pope Gregory, who hearing that he not merely studied but taught grammar, vehemently reproved him, and told him that the praises of Jove did not go well in the same mouth with the praises of Christ. In his youth he was sent to Vienne, where he was adopted and brought up as a son by St. Naamatus, then archbishop. After the death of Naamatus Desiderius continued his discipleship under his three successors, viz. SS. Philippus, Evantius, and Verus III., the last of whom he himself succeeded

as archbishop in the time of pope Gregory. It was then that the pope sent him that rebuke about his devotion to profane literature.

At that time the infamous queen Brunehildis contracted an incestuous marriage with Meroveus, the son of Chilpericus, her brother-in-law, her own husband king Sigebertus having lately been assassinated in an expedition which he was making against that same brother, with a view to wresting his kingdom from him. When Chilpericus heard of his son's abnormal marriage, he was naturally indignant, and had the young man shut up for the rest of his life in a monastery. But Desiderius was not content with that. He acted the part of John the Baptist, and rebuked the wicked queen for her conduct, whereupon she began to act the part of Herodias, and instituted against her admonitor a persecution which ultimately cost him his life. To give a sort of pretext to her persecution she got some prelates who were on her side to hold a synod at Châlons, on the Saône, in the year 603, in order to try the bishop who had dared to rebuke her, and the result was that Desiderius was deposed and banished to an island, which is thought to have been Levisium or Barbe, near Lyons, or possibly one of the Hebrides. In the MSS. of Chiffletius it is said that the queen stirred up against the saint all the people, high and low, rich and poor, bringing against him false witness and false accusations.

In the course of four years the queen recalled him from his banishment, in the hope of gaining him over to her side, but Desiderius remained as firm as ever, and treated her with as much severity as before. She then ordered him to return to his diocese. Some time afterwards he was sent for by prince Theodoric, who wanted to consult him on the subject of concubinage. Desiderius persuaded him to banish harlots from the palace, and settle down in lawful marriage with Ermenburga, a maiden of high rank. The queen was again enraged with the bishop, as she supplied the king with lawless pleasures that she might be able to keep in her own hands the reins of government. She had not forgotten the old wound, and this time determined to get rid of him altogether. She ordered three base knights, named Began, Gasifred, and Boto, to arrest him at the doors of the church. The mob was then incited against him, and the holy bishop was stoned until he was all but dead, when he was despatched by being stabbed in the neck, A.D. 608; but the dates are variously given from 607 to 612. He is commemorated on the 23rd of May. (*AA. SS. Boll. May, v. p. 251*; Chosier, *Histoire de Dauphiné, ix. § 17*, and *Antiq. de Vienne. Greg. Mag. Ep., Patrol. Lat. lxxvii. §§ 831, 832, 1019, 1140*; Labbe, *Concil. v. 1216, iv. 40*; *Patrol. Lat. lxxi. §§ 605, 609*; Aimoinus, *de Gestis Francor. iii. 89*; Ado Vienn. *Passio S. Desiderii, Patrol. Lat. cxxiii*; Hermannus Contractus, *Patrol. Lat. cxliiii. 56*; *Gall. Christ. xvi. 28*.) [D. R. J.]

DESIDERIUS (10) Third abbat of Saint-Germain, Paris, which he ruled sixteen years in the beginning of the 7th century (Aimoinus, *de Gestis Francorum, lib. iii. cap. 91*; *Gall. Christ. vii. 420*). [D. R. J.]

(11) ST., nineteenth bishop of Auxerre. The anonymous author of the *Acts of the Bishops of*
3 G 2

Auxerre, which are given by Labbe in his *Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum*, and by Migne in the 138th volume of his *Latin Patrology*, has a long biography of this bishop.

It appears that he was of Aquitaine, son of Nectaria, who was buried in the monastery of St. Amantius of Cahors, a man of the highest rank and greatest influence, nearly related to queen Brunehild and her sons the kings of the Burgundians and the Franks. By their munificence he had immense wealth and possessions, which he transferred liberally to churches and monasteries. The witnesses of his liberality were his cathedral church of St. Stephen, the basilica of St. Germain, the basilica of St. Amator, the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, the basilica of St. Julian, the nunnery of St. Martin, the basilicas of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius, of St. Columba and St. Leo at Sens, of St. Ursinus of Bourges, of St. Amantius of Cahors, of St. Saturninus at Toulouse, and the cathedral of Cahors. There was hardly any notable church of Burgundy or Aquitaine which had not received farms from Desiderius.

This princely person held the see eighteen years, and died in November about A.D. 622. He was buried near his predecessor St. Aunacharius, in the basilica of St. Germain. (*Patrol. Lat.* cxxviii. 236; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 268.)

[W. M. S.]

DESIDERIUS (12) Bishop of Cahors early in the 7th century. He was born at Alby of a noble family, and being early sent to court became the trusted minister and treasurer of Clothaire II. and his son Dagobert I. His brother Rusticus, who preceded him as bishop of Cahors, having lost his life in a popular tumult, Desiderius, though still a layman, was, at Dagobert's instance, ordained, and raised to the episcopate. He died on a visit to his paternal property at Alby, A.D. 652. A biography, with a long catalogue of miracles, is to be found in Migne (*Patrol.* vol. lxxvii. pp. 217-267). Two books of letters are extant, printed by Migne (*ibid.*). Book I. contains letters from Desiderius to the monarchs and bishops, &c. of his day, and Book II. letters from them to Desiderius. They supply very little of interest for the history of the time. The biography contains two letters to him from his mother Herchenefreda, the former of which apprises him of the violent death of his brother Rusticus, and calls upon him to bring the murderers to justice. Desiderius was a munificent benefactor to the city of Cahors, in which he erected several churches and monasteries. (*Bibl. Max. Patr.* tom. viii. p. 579; Canisius, *Lect.* i. 631; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 580.) [E. V.]

(13) Sixth bishop of Rennes, gave his approbation to the privilege accorded to the monks of Fontenelle about the year 682; but the exact date of that charter is uncertain, some assigning to it the year 687. Bollandus and others say that he was put to death near Besançon, and reckon him amongst the martyrs. (*Rev. Gallic. Script.* iii. 618; Deric, *Hist. Ecol. Bret.* ii. 135; AA. SS. *Boll. Vita S. Auberti*; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 741, 742.)

[D. R. J.]

(14) Thirteenth bishop of Evreux (Ebroicum), in the province of Rouen. In the 11th chapter of the *Life of Leufred* occurs the following: "About this time Desiderius held the see of

Evreux, from which place the cell of Leufred was distant about two leagues. The bishop, hearing the fame of the recluse, and the number of his saintly followers, overcome with envy and hatred because he had dared to build a monastery and guest-house in his own diocese without consulting him, went one day with his officials to the cell of the man of God. After grievous words of reproof, he determined to take him back with him to his episcopal city to punish him heavily. But as he was returning he fell from his horse and was hurt. Taking this as a rebuke for his wrath, he bade Leufred return to his cell, and thereafter diligently cultivated his friendship. This occurred when Ansbert was archbishop of Rouen, between A.D. 689 and 695." (*Gall. Christ.* xi. 568.) [W. M. S.]

DESIDERIUS (15), duke of Tuscany, succeeded Aistulf in the kingdom of Lombardy, A.D. 756, by an election in which pope Stephen II. and king Pepin concurred (*Anastas. vi. Concil.* p. 1628). Desiderius bound himself to restore certain towns to the Roman church. Pope Stephen died the same year, and was succeeded by his brother pope Paul I., whom we find complaining (*Anastas. vi. Concil.* p. 1679) in letters to king Pepin of the bad faith of the Lombards.

In A.D. 768 Desiderius lent troops to Christopher, primitarius of the Roman see, to expel the intruding pope Constantine from Rome, after the death of pope Paul I. In A.D. 769, after the death of Sergius, archbishop of Ravenna, Desiderius maintained a whole year in that see the intruder Michael (*Anast. vi. Concil.* 1711).

In A.D. 770 pope Stephen III. heard with the greatest dismay that Desiderius proposed an alliance with the Frankish royal family; his daughter was to marry Charles or Carloman, and his son Adelgis was to marry their sister. It was of course the interest of the popes to prevent any connexion between the Franks and Lombards. Pope Stephen wrote a most extraordinary letter (*Patrol.* xeviii. 255-62) to the Frankish princes, warning them against pollution with the blood of that "faithless and most unsavoury nation," "whence the race of lepers was known to have its source." Charles, unmoved by the denunciations of eternal fire, and by the consecration of the eucharist on the tomb of St. Peter over the pope's letter, repudiated his wife, and married the daughter of Desiderius; but within a year he insulted his new ally by repudiating her in turn, and marrying Hildegard, a Swabian. Stephen was badly used by Desiderius, for he forced him, when prisoner in the Vatican, to write a lying letter to Charles, saying that the towns were restored.

In A.D. 772 pope Stephen III. was succeeded by pope Adrian I.; Desiderius tried to entice him to pay him a visit at Pavia, but the invitation was refused. Desiderius, in revenge, ravaged the borders of the papal territory. Adrian appealed to Charles, who, disregarding the family of Carloman, had united the whole of the Frankish dominions under his own rule. Charles was glad to oblige the pope, because he had refused to crown the disinherited princes when Desiderius, who had espoused their cause through hatred of Charles, had asked him to do so. Charles offered Desiderius money if he would satisfy the pope; and

Adrian even offered to pay the rejected visit to Pavia if Desiderius would restore his rights. Desiderius, thinking that Charles would be occupied with his Saxon war, offered evasive answers; but in A.D. 773 Charles invaded Italy, besieged Pavia, overthrew the Lombard kingdom, and forced Desiderius to retire to a monastery at Liège, where he ended his days in penitence and works of piety. (Pagi, xiii. 101; Baronius, vols. xii. and xiii.; Robertson, iv. cap. vi.; Ceillier, xii. 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 134, 135.)

[W. M. S.]

DESIGNATUS (1), ST., 13th bishop of Liège, succeeded Ursicinus, who is supposed to have flourished about the end of the 5th century, but the exact date is uncertain, as it is not known how long either of the three bishops, St. Agricolus, Ursicinus, or St. Designatus, sat. The latter is commemorated on the Calends of December, although, according to the Belgian Chronicle, he died on the Ides of January (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 813).

[D. R. J.]

(2), ST., bishop of Utrecht, died in the year 525, or, as some say, in 508, others 511. The original seat of this diocese was at Tongres or Tongern, hence Designatus is described in ancient documents as bishop of Tongres (depositio S. Designati Tongrensis Episcopi et Confessoris, MS. Florarium); but about the time of Clovis I. the see, after having probably been vacant for some time, on account of the Huns, Vandals, Goths, and Franks, was translated to Utrecht. Very little is known of Designatus, except that he was the third bishop from Agricolus. There is a legend that he raised from the dead three soldiers, who gave their property to the church. By some writers, his mother is said to have been the daughter of a king of the Scots. He is commemorated on the 13th of Jan. (*AA. SS. Boll.* Jan. i. 814).

[D. R. J.]

DESINIANUS was second bishop of Orleans, and lived about the middle of the 4th century. He succeeded Diopeus, and was followed by St. Evurtius (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1410). [D. R. J.]

DEUDEDIT (1) Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 655-664. He was a native of Wessex (Beda, *H. E.* iii. 20), and, according to Elmham (p. 192), his real name was Frithonas, which was probably changed to avoid any offence that might be given by the elevation of a Saxon to the primacy for the first time. He was consecrated at Canterbury by Ithamar, bishop of Rochester, on March 26, A.D. 655 (Beda, *ut supra*). The history of the southern province is at this time most obscure; and there is only one official act, the consecration of bishop Damian, with which the name of Deusdedit can with any certainty be connected. He died, it is believed, on July 14, 664 (*H. E.* in. 20, 28; iv. 1), and was buried at Canterbury in St. Peter's porch (*Councils*, iii. 99), obtaining afterwards a place in the calendar on July 15. A short account of Deusdedit was compiled by Goscelin, but it is of no value (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 261-2). This is abridged in Capgrave and the *Acta SS.* July, iv. 48, and is verified in a MS. in the Lambeth library. [J. R.]

At this period there were eight bishoprics in the heptarchy: two in Kent, at Canterbury and

Rochester; one among the East Saxons; one in Mercia; one among the East Angles at Dunwich; one over the Northumbrians at Lindisfarne. The principal see of the West Saxons was at Dorchester, and for a brief interval there was a second at Winchester (see Stubbs, *Regist.* 3). The magnitude of these bishoprics for the most part, as compared with the Canterbury diocese or even with all the kingdom of Kent; the circumstance of their being nearly all filled, and vigorously worked by bishops of Celtic or foreign consecration, unconnected in their origin with Canterbury (Hook, *Abps. of Cant.* i. 127), or in their working with one another, shew but slight consolidation in the church, or rather the churches, of England, and prove how much in the shade the successor of Augustine must now have been. No less than six or seven of the consecrations of Deusdedit's time were by Celtic or French bishops, and only one by the archbishop of Canterbury. When Wilfrid was to be consecrated he went to France. Ceadda indeed sought consecration in Kent, but the archbishop was then dead. It must have been a mere flourish of Elmham to talk of his having greatly increased the church, especially by ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons (ed. Hardwicke, 193). The council of Whitby in A.D. 664, so important in its bearings on the future of the English church, was held without him, and neither his voice nor his sentiments are heard of. The South Saxons, his immediate neighbours, were now the only nation without a bishop or a church, and he does not appear as taking any measures for their conversion. But it should here be noticed that Damian, the only bishop of his consecration, was a South Saxon (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 20). Once he is discovered beyond the limits of Kent, at the consecration of Medeshamstede in the kingdom of Mercia (*A. S. C.* ad an. 657). Another glimpse of him is seen in the consecration of the 70 nuns who were settled at St. Mary's in the Isle of Thanet (Sim. Dun. *G. R. A.* in M. H. B. 649). Hook considers that another glimpse of him is to be found in Eddius (*Vit. Wilf.* c. 57), and that the archbishop is there alluded to as putting himself in communication with the Celtic party with a view to an understanding with them. When to all this we add that there was an interregnum of a year and a half before his accession, and another long interregnum after him, we may conceive the depression to which the chair of Augustine had arrived half a century after its establishment, and we can appreciate all that Theodore did to revive its importance, and place it supreme over the English church, when it had reached its lowest ebb.

Deusdedit was the sixth archbishop, succeeding Honorius. After him his chaplain Wighard was elected, but Theodore sat. Deusdedit commenced the line of English archbishops, which was only once broken, and that by his successor. The first English archbishop was consecrated ten years after the first English bishop, who was Ithamar, and Ithamar the first English bishop consecrated the first English archbishop. Bede places Deusdedit's ordination on March 26, and the year by calculation is A.D. 655. But that day was a Thursday, and some error may be suspected. Bede says he governed his see nine years, seven months, and two days (*H. E.* iii. 20), which space

does not tally exactly with the dates; Elmham says nine years, four months, and two days (p. 193, ed. Hardwicke). The Kentish reign in which he lived was that of Earconbert, and both the king and archbishop died on the same day (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 1; *Flor. Wig. Chron.* ad an. 664). It was the year of the eclipse says Bede, and the year of the pestilence, and besides the heads of the church and state in Kent, bishops Tuda at Lindisfarne, and Cedda at Lastingham, died that year. No charters with Deusededit's signatures are known. Elmham (*ib.*) says he was buried with his predecessors in the church of the monastery, and gives his metrical epitaph. Stevenson quotes as an authority for his Anglo-Saxon name the *Chron. Cant.* in Trinity Hall, Camb. (note ad Bed. *H. E.* iii. 20, cf. Smith, ad Bed. iv. 1). [C. H.]

DEUDEDIT (2) Keeper of the judicial archives at Ravenna in the 6th century. The extreme importance of the office is shewn by the letter of Cassiodorus, chancellor and prime minister of Theodoric, king of Italy, which exhorts Deusededit to probity and caution. (Cassiod. *Epist.* lib. xi. num. 21, *Patrol. Lat.* lxi. 871; Ceillier, xi. 220.) [W. M. S.]

(3) **ST.**, was sixth bishop of Rodez, but nothing is known of him except from the following inscription on an ancient slab of white marble:—**DEUDEDIT EPISCOPUS INDIGNUS FECIT FIERI HANC ARAM**, and from an old document, dated A.D. 1275, referring to the above inscription, which states that it was found with relics 700 years old or more. If, as the Benedictines remark, that be the case, then Deusededit must have been bishop of Rodez before A.D. 599. (*Gall. Christ.* i. p. 200.) [D. R. J.]

(4) Bishop of Milan, elected by the clergy and people, A.D. 600, after the death of Constantius. Pope Gregory the Great writes to the people and clergy of Milan, consenting to their nomination, provided that Deusededit was a fit person. Deusededit was at the time a deacon (Greg. *Epist.*, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. 1094, 1095). In writing afterwards to this bishop (Greg. *Epist.*, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. 1206, 1238), he allows the bequest by a bishop of goods acquired before his episcopate. (Ceillier, xi. 520, 528.) [W. M. S.]

(5) Pope. A Roman by birth, consecrated 19th October, according to Pagi; 13th November according to Fleury, A.D. 615, to the see of his native town; died December 3, A.D. 618. "C'est le premier pape, dont on ait des bulles scellées en plomb" (*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, i. 249). A doubtful, or, more likely, spurious letter of his is given and commented upon in Mansi, x. 536-8. [E. S. Ff.]

(6) Bishop of Cagliari (A.D. 649), present at the council of the Lateran, Oct. 5, 649, in which he took a leading part against the Monothelites. (Tom. vi. *Concil.* p. 75, etc.; Ceillier, xii. 927, etc.) [W. M. S.]

DEUTERIUS (1) Metropolitan of Caesarea in Mauritania, addressed by Augustine of Hippo (*Epist.* num. cxxxvi., *Patrol. Lat.* xxxiii. p. 1033) in a letter which warns him against Victorinus the Manichee, who, pretending to be

Catholic, had got himself ordained deacon of the church of Mallianum, and had been doing great mischief at Hippo. He is to be refused pardon unless he discloses all the Manichees at Mallianum. The letter describes the difference between the Auditores and the Electi amongst the Manichees. (Ceillier, ix. 184.) [W. M. S.]

DEUTERIUS (2) Bishop of the Arians at Constantinople. Theodorus, reader of the church of Constantinople in the 6th century, in the time of the patriarch Timothy, a historian, relates that Deuterius, when baptizing a man named Barbas, used the words, "Barbas is baptized in the name of the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit." (Theodor. lib. ii. *Hist., Patrol. Graec.* lxxvi., part i. p. 195; Ceillier, ix. 104.) [W. M. S.]

(3) Third bishop of Lodeve, was present with other bishops at the council of Auvergne during the reign of Theodebert, A.D. 535, not in 541, as Plantavitius and the Sammarthani say. (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 528; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1805.) [D. R. J.]

DEUTHERIUS, also called Deotherius and Deotharius, was the seventh bishop of Vence. He was present in the year 541 at the fourth synod of Orleans, and subscribed at the fifth synod of Arles in 549, the second of Mâcon in 585, and that of Embrun in 588. (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* lib. ix. c. 24; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1214.) [D. R. J.]

DEVENICK, Confessor, commemorated Nov. 13. The legend of this saint, whose name is not found in any of the Irish lists, is given at length in *Brev. Aberdon.* (pars aestivalis, f. clx. a), and in the *View Dioc. Aberd.* (in *Coll. Sh. Aberd. and Banff*, 267 sq.), but it is evidently devoid of chronological accuracy. It represents him as an old man at the time St. Columba and St. Machar or Mauricius were preaching in the north-east of Scotland, and then as dividing the work between himself and St. Machar, he going to Caithness, while St. Machar remained as bishop at Aberdeen. In consequence of a prior compact entered into between the two saints, the body of St. Devenick was brought back to Aberdeen and buried at the neighbouring church of Banchory-Devenick. Boece calls him archdeacon, but King and others style him bishop. And though the legend represents him as a contemporary of St. Columba, the Scotch annalists place his death in A.D. 887, in the reign of Soluathius. But the Scotch kings named Selvach, latinised Soluathius, were both in the eighth century, and thus the time of the saint is left in utmost uncertainty, though the balance of authority or general acceptance would lean to the sixth century. He had dedications at Banchory and Methlic, both in the diocese of Aberdeen, and also at Creich in Sutherlandshire, where he is known as St. Teavneck. Bishop Forbes asks whether he may not be the same as St. Dewednack, to whom the church of Landewednack is dedicated, but the only relation appears to be a resemblance of names. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 323-4; Boethius, *Scot. Hist.* B. ix. c. 30; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 20-1; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 198; King, *Calend.* Nov. 13.) [J. G.]

DEVIL. [DEMONOLOGY; DIABOLUS.]

DEWI (*Annal. Camb.* ad an. 458, M. H. B. 830), bishop of Menevia. [DAVID, ST.] [C. H.]

DEXIANUS, bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, and metropolitan. He was present at the council of Ephesus, in A.D. 431, when he took the Eastern side, and remonstrated against beginning the proceedings before the arrival of John of Antioch. He sat in the *concoliabulum*, and joined in the act of deposition of Cyril and Memnon (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iii. col. 598), for which he was excommunicated by Cyril and his party (*ibid.* col. 654). While a presbyter he had been guardian of the church of St. Thecla, at Seleucia, in which capacity he had displayed great zeal, for which he is much commended by Basil of Seleucia. (Basil Seleuc. *de Mirac. St. Theclae*, ii. 17; 13, 14, 30; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. col. 1013.) [E. V.]

DEXTER, son of Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona (circ. A.D. 360-390). Under the emperor Theodosius he was administrator of the Domain, A.D. 387. Under Honorius he was prefect of the Praetorians, A.D. 395. To him Jerome dedicated his book of ecclesiastical authors. Jerome speaks of a history by Dexter, a medley. In A.D. 1620 a chronicle was published under the name of Flavius Dexter, said to betray the hand of a Spanish Jesuit, Jerome de Hyguera. (Hieron. *de Viris Illustribus*, cap. 32 and 106, *Patrol. Lat.* xxii. 603; Ceillier, v. 157, vi. 279.) [W. M. S.]

DIABOLUS, in the system of Carpocrates, an angel, subordinate to the chief of the angels who made the world, whose office it is to conduct departed souls to this chief for the purpose of being examined by him (Irenaeus, i. 30; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 27).

In the system of Valentinus, a spirit of wickedness formed by the Demiurge from the grief of Achemoth; prince of this world, where he has his abode; able on account of his spiritual nature to attain a knowledge of the higher spiritual world, of which his maker the Demiurge, who is only animal, is incapable (Irenaeus, i. 5, p. 27; see also Heracleon *ap. Origen* T. xiii. *in Joan.* iv. 225). In the account of Hippolytus (i. 33, p. 192), Diabolus, who presides over the Hyle, or material world, is distinguished from Beelzebub, the chief of the demons, these last being formed, not like matter from the grief of Achemoth, but from her perplexity.

In the Gnostic systems generally the devil has either no place or a very subordinate one, the principle of evil being ascribed to matter or to the being supposed to have formed it. It seems to be this being, not the devil, who in the system of the Peratae (Hipp. *Ref.* v. 16, pp. 133, 136) is spoken of as the "prince of this world," and "murderer from the beginning." [See PERATAE.]

Epiphanius (*Haer.* 42, p. 304), unsupported by the other authorities, represents Marcion as holding the devil to be a third principle intermediate between the good God and the Creator, but this seems to be a mistake of Epiphanius. [See MARCION, PREPON.]

In the Clementine Homilies (19, 20), the nature and origin of the devil are treated of. The result arrived at is that he is a being whose disposition, resulting from the combination of the elements of which his body is composed, is to rejoice in evil. This disposition fits him to carry out the will of God in the punishment of

the wicked. God has therefore made him ruler over the present world, and uses him as his left hand in smiting those who deserve affliction. As doing the will of God in afflicting lawfully, he neither deserves nor receives punishment in Tartarus, for however severe the punishment to the souls of men who are forced to dwell with him there, the place causes no pain to him whose nature it is to delight in darkness. And at the end of the world a change of his disposition may take place, so that he will thenceforth cease to rejoice in evil. This theory concerning the punishment of the wicked reproduces what has been stated in an earlier part of the book (Hom. ix. 9), but there concerning demons. The doctrine concerning demons appears to have been fully treated of in the earlier work on which the homilies are founded; the discussion concerning the devil to be an addition of the later writer. [DEMONOLOGY; SATAN.] [G. S.]

DIACONANUS (DIACONIANUS), C. and M. Dec. 23. The *Martyr. Aberd.* supplies us with the name of St. Diacananus at Keig, a parish in Aberdeenshire; "Eodem die Sancti Diacanani confessoris apud Keg Aberdonensis diocesis." But beyond the name and designation he remains an unknown Scotch saint. His usual feast is Dec. 23, but on Sept. 23 Camerarius has "S. Diocnanus martyr." (Gordon, *Monast.* i. 102; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 177; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* vi. 225; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 137, 324.) [J. G.]

DIADOCHUS, a bishop of Photice, in Epirus Vetus, c. A.D. 450, highly commended by Victor Vitensis, who boasts of having been his pupil. He was the author of a work "*De Perfectione Spirituali*," in 100 chapters, preceded by ten "*Opae* or *Definitiones*," giving the definitions of the ten chief Christian virtues: faith, hope, charity, patience, chastity, &c. The work is praised by Photius (*Cod.* 201) as one drawn from experience not from theory, useful not only to those who are seeking to attain perfection, but to those who have made considerable progress towards it. (*Bibl. Patrum*, Lugdun. 1677, tom. v. p. 884; Fabric. *Biblioth. Graeca*, lib. v. c. 14; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 442.) [E. V.]

DIANIUS or **DIANAÆUS**, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, for more than twenty years, a saintly man much venerated in the early church, notwithstanding his somewhat doubtful orthodoxy. He may be almost certainly identified with the anonymous bishop who baptized Basil the Great on his return from Athens, and ordained him lector (Basil, *de Sp. Sancto*, 29, p. 357). Basil speaks of him in terms of the most affectionate respect, expressing the reverence and love he had entertained for him from his earliest years, and describing him as a man remarkable for his virtues, frank, generous, and attractive from his amiability, venerable both in aspect and in character (*Epist.* 51, (84)). We see him, however, in the history of these troubled times weak and undecided, led by his peaceful disposition to deprecate controversy, and by his feebleness to side with the strongest; destitute of any strong theological convictions, and wanting the clearness of thought to appreciate the subtleties of doctrine. He was, therefore, too often found on the semi-Arian

side of the church. If, as Tillemont^a holds, he is the same with the Danius who heads the list of bishops to whom pope Julius directed his dignified reply to the insolent letter addressed to him from Antioch, Dianius took a leading part in the synod held at that city in the early months of A.D. 340, by which the deposition of Athanasius was confirmed, and George of Cappadocia placed on the throne of Alexandria (*Epistola Julii*, apud Athanas. *Apolog.* ii. p. 239).

He also took part in the famous synod of Antioch, in *Encaeniis*, A.D. 341, and was present at Sardica, A.D. 347, where, according to Hilary (p. 29), he joined in the anathema against Julius and Athanasius. His weakness of character was still more fatally shewn, when after the council of Constantinople, A.D. 359, the formula of Rimini was sought to be imposed on the church by the authority of the emperor. To the intense grief of Basil Dianius yielded to the pressure, and signed the heretical document. Basil felt it impossible any longer to hold communion with one who had so far compromised his faith, and fled to Nazianzum. It was reported that he had anathematised his bishop, but this he indignantly denies (Basil, *Epist.* 51, (84)). Dianius keenly felt the absence of his eloquent and able young counsellor, especially when Julian endeavoured to re-establish paganism. After two years he recalled Basil, and declared that he had signed the creed of Rimini in the simplicity of his heart, in the hope of restoring peace to the distracted church, without any idea of impugning the faith of Nicaea. Basil was satisfied with Dianius' explanations, and returned to his former post of adviser of the bishop till his death, which was not long delayed. It may probably be placed A.D. 362.

[E. V.]

DIARMAID, latinised DERMITIUS, was a very common name in Ireland, and borne by many of the saints: some of these are simply placed upon a day in the calendars, with or without their father's name and the place of dedication, while others have a few particulars preserved by history or tradition.

(1) Son of Mechair, bishop, of Airthearmuighe in Tuaith-ratha. Commemorated Jan. 16. Colgan conjectures that it was either this saint or another bishop of the same name, venerated on Oct. 12, who was the Diermitius whose soul was one day carried into heaven by the angels, as we read in St. Adamnan (*Vit. St. Columb.* iii. c. 8). But as that is said to have taken place in East Oriel, Armagh, he could scarcely have been Diarmaid of Armo, co. Antrim, or of some other place similarly named in Toora, co. Fermanagh (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 204, and *Ecol. Ant.* 80; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 388 n.¹²; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 19).

[J. G.]

^a Montfaucon, in *loc.*, identifies the Danius of Julius's letter with the Arian bishop of Nicaea, Diognius, otherwise known as Theognius or Theognes. But the names are not sufficiently alike for this identification, and Tillemont's view is the more probable. We have followed Hefele in distinguishing the Antiochene council, by which the insolent letter was sent to pope Julius, from the celebrated council in *Encaeniis* of A.D. 341, with which Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 5) and Socrates (*H. E.* ii. 8-10) corroborate it.

DIARMAID (2) Bishop, grandson of Aedh Roin, of Disert Diarmada in Leinster. June 21. He was of the race of Fiatach Finn, king of Ulster, and had his cell at Disert-Diarmada, which is now better known as Castledermot, in the baronies of Kilkea and Moone, co. Kildare. O'Donovan says he erected his monastery about A.D. 500 (referring to Archdall), but this date must be far too early, and probably an error for A.D. 800. *The Book of Lecan* traces his genealogy up to Muiredach Muinderg, king of Ulster. But there were two kings of Ulster, called Aedh Roin, and of the same race, whose deaths the *Four Masters* place in the years 649 and 732. Diarmaid is usually regarded as son of the later, and thus as belonging to the end of the 8th century. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 175, 400 n.; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 265, 331, 462 n.^c; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 202; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 314, 3rd ed.)

(3) Bishop of Glenn-Uissen, in Ui-Bairrche, July 8. This saint is mentioned by Colgan, Archdall, Harris, and Lanigan, and the truth in their guesses is put in a clear light in few words by Dr. Reeves (*Adamnan*, 163 n.):—"S. Diarmaid of Killeeshin was seventh in descent from Daire Barrach, who was second son of Cathair Mor, king of Leinster, and afterwards of Ireland, in the early part of the second century, and whose descendants occupied Ui-Bairrche, now Slieve-margy, on the S.E. of the Queen's County, near Carlow, and were represented in after ages by the family of Mac Gorman." From his relationship to Daire Barrach in the second century, he must have lived long before the saint of the same name and place, whose obit is given by the *Four Mast.* (by O'Donovan, i. 521) in A.D. 874. He was also called Modimog, and his descent from Cathair Mor is given in eight generations inclusive, by Dr. Todd. (*Book of Hymns*, Fasc. ii. 291, from *Sanctilog. Geneal.* in *Book of Lecan*, fol. 49^b, col. 1; *Book of Rights*, by O'Donovan, 194 n.^c.)

(4) Bishop of Inis-clothrann, in Loch-Ribh, Jan. 10. He was of the race of the Hy-Fiachrach, and his father was Lugna, son of Lugaidh, who traced his descent to Dathi, son of Fiachra, son of Eochaidh Muighmeadhoin. His mother was Deidi, or Dediva, or Editua, daughter of Trian, son of Dibhthach h-Ua Lughair, and having a family of six sons and a daughter, saints. He was a very learned man, and perhaps left, with other small works, a collection of prayers in the form of a litany, which was extant in Colgan's time, though from the later names in it, it was evidently interpolated by other hands. So pure and conciliatory was he, that one was counted happy who enjoyed his spiritual friendship; such especially were St. Ciaran of Clonmacnois (Sept. 9), whose spiritual father he was, and St. Senan of Inis Cathay (March 1), who was bound to him probably by the same spiritual tie, and with whom as a neighbour he ever lived on a most friendly footing. He built his monastery on Inis-Clothrann, now Inish-cloghran, in Lough Ree, in the Shannon, where many became famous for learning and piety. It is said that "ex monacho factus est sacerdos, ex sacerdote abbas, ex abbate episcopus," but he is usually styled only priest and abbat. The year of his death is unknown, but as he is said to have

being descended in the seventh generation from Dathi king of Ireland, who was killed about the year 427, Colgan and Lanigan believe that he must have lived about, or even later than, A.D. 540. There is a tradition, which has a place even in Icelandic legend, that no female of man or beast could live in his island; the truth probably is that, while alive, he secluded himself, like his neighbour St. Senan and so many other saints, from the remotest contact with female society, and after his death this prohibition has remained as a memorial of him. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 51-2 for his memoir, 248, c. 2, 527, c. 23; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 13, 401; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 10, § 3; *Ulst. Journ. Arch.* iv. 128; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 152-58.)

DIARMAID (5). When St. Patrick was in Meath, he is said to have founded a church at a place called Druiim-Chorcothri, and left there his nephew Dermittius, son of Restitutius [DARERCA]. He is called "episcopus Drumensis." (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 130, c. 6, 231, col. 1, 266, col. 1.)

(6) Jan. 15. The eldest brother of St. Corbmac (March 26), son of Eoghan, son of Muredach, in Munster, was Dermittius or Diarmaid, who like his brothers left his native place in Ireland for the propagation of the faith [CORBMAC (5)]. He went northward to the coast of Connaught, and built his church in the district of Cairbre, now Carbury barony, in the county of Sligo. It was first called Rosredheadh, but afterwards, when his brothers came to him, it was called Kill-mac-neogain, or church of the sons of Eoghan: by a chieftain of the Hy-Fiachrach, called Flann Dubh or Dubh Flann, it was richly endowed, and this pious act brought much blessing on him and his seed. Thus we read of Diarmaid in Colgan's memoir of St. Corbmac taken from an ancient Irish MS. (*Acta SS.* 731, c. 4), and in his note (*ib.* 755 n. 9) Colgan adds that in his day there was still a church in the diocese of Elphin that was known as Kill-mac-neogain, yet he is not sure as to the actual day of dedication; that is, whether the brother of St. Corbmac is the Diarmaid of Jan. 15, or of Oct. 12, and, he might have added, of Dec. 12 or Dec. 20 (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 219).

(7) Aug. 2. "Dermittius was held in great honour by St. Columba. He was abbat in Iona, and was celebrated in the Hebrides" (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 165). There seems a confusion here, as the Dermittius, who was contemporary with St. Columba, was either his attendant, of whom we know nothing but the name, or the father of Aedh, who was a consenting party to the granting of Kells to St. Columba (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 42). But the person honoured in the Hebrides was St. Dermittius or Diarmaid, the twentieth abbat of Hy, during whose primacy the Columban monastery under his charge suffered great affliction from the pirates, and gave St. Blathmac and his companions to martyrdom [BLATHMAC.] He was also called Dalta Daighre, but for what reason we do not know (DALTA). He succeeded Kellach in A.D. 815, and after A.D. 831, was in turn succeeded by Indrecht. The *Four Mast.* (by O'Donovan, i. 429) have the entry at A.D. 816, "Diarmaid, abbat of Ia Colum Cille, went to Alba (Scotland)," but in the edition used by Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 500, col. 2), there was

added "cum scriiniis divi Columbae," probably for their greater safety, as afterwards in the year 831 he took them to Ireland. He has some dedications in Dumbartonshire. (Reeves, *Adamnan*, 388-9; Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 20, § 11, c. 21, § 2; Grub, *Ecccl. Hist. Scott.* i. 125-7; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 323.) [J. G.]

DIATIMUS, bishop of Lymirus in Lycia, who, with other of the Lycian prelates, wrote to St. Basil in 375, expressing their desire to separate themselves from the heterodox Asiatic bishops, and to enter into communion with him (Basil, *Epist.* 403, 420). [E. V.]

DIBRIC (*Annal. Camb.* ad an. 612, M. H. B. 831 n.), bishop. [DUBRICIUS.] [C. H.]

DICASIUS, bishop of Tabia in Galatia Prima (circ. A.D. 314-325), present at the council of Neocaesarea, circ. A.D. 315. (Labbe, *Concilia*, i. p. 1488; Ceillier, ii. 640.) [W. M. S.]

DICHLETHE O'TRIALLAIGH. In his genealogies of the Hy-Fiachrach, M'Firbis gives an account of the descendants of Eochaidh Breac, son of Dathi, and, amongst others, of Fearamhla, the mother of the three O'Suanaighs of Raithin [FIDHAIRLE]. She was mother also of Dichlethe O'Triallaigh, who, according to the legend left Tirawly, co. Mayo, and settled at Disert O'Triallaigh, now Dysert in the barony of Clanmaurice, co. Kerry, and lying south-west of Listowel. His kindred and dedication are otherwise unknown. (*Gen. Hy-Fiachrach*, by O'Donovan, 34, 39-41.) [J. G.]

DICHOLL. [DIUCHOLL.]

DICHU, son of Trichem, of Sabhall, April 29. This saint is closely connected with St. Patrick and his preaching in Ireland, as he was his first Christian convert in Ulster, and continued faithful to the end. His father, Trichem, was a chief of Uladh or Ulster, and of the race of Fiatach Finn, who was ancestor of the Dal Fiatach; besides Dichu, he had six sons who were saints (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 114 n.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 60, c. 2; but see Lanigan, *Ecccl. Hist. Ir.* i. 213). It is said that when St. Patrick landed at the mouth of the Slany, or at the entrance of one of the branches of Strangford Lough, in what is now the barony of Lecale, he hid his boat and proceeded to explore the country. The first to see him was a swineherd, who, mistaking him and his companions for robbers, ran and informed his master. This was Dichu, who came at first to protect his property, but was so struck with the words and appearance of the apostle of Ireland, that he soon gave in his entire submission to the faith, and was the first to believe and be baptized. In the later Lives a fearful picture is drawn of his atrocity, and wonders are multiplied; as when Joceline calls him "vir viribus robustus, statura giganteus, animo atrox," and relates how he was miraculously stayed from killing St. Patrick. On St. Patrick's return from attempting to convert his former master Milchu, he was with St. Dichu for a time at Magh-innis (now Lecale, as said above, a barony in co. Down beside Strangford Lough, and anciently belonging to the family of the Macgenises), where he is said to have given to St. Patrick a tract of land, and a barn or granary,

which was converted into a church, and known as "Sabhal Patraic," or in its Latin form "Zabulum" or "Horreum Patricii," and now Saul, of which to adopt Dr. Reeves's words (*Ecol. Ant.* 40), "this church was the first founded by St. Patrick: its ground the first offering: and its owner, Dichu, the first convert to Christianity in Ulster." Colgan and Ussher place the conversion of St. Dichu in A.D. 432. Lanigan is of opinion that the "Sabhall Padruic" was a real barn or granary, given up by the convert to his master, while others think that it was only so called from the church having been built in the form and position of St. Dichu's barn; but Reeves is more inclined to believe that the word Sabhal or Horreum was an ecclesiastical technical term for a church possessing some peculiarity, such as this which deviated from the usual position in that it stood north and south, yet built, it may be, in imitation of the original Sabhal, of Dichu. Having been thus early given to St. Patrick, Saul continued to be his favourite retreat, and was the scene of his departure to the Lord. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum. passim*; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 405-6; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* Tr. i. c. 5, § 2; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 344-45, 407-9; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 108, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

DICTINIUS, a Priscillianist authority. Leo the Great, in his letter to Turribius, devotes a section to the writings of Dictinius, and condemns them. Dictinius had repented and recanted, and was recovered to the Catholic faith. His Priscillianist treatises, however, though disowned by their author, are described by Leo as still circulating among the Priscillianists, and held in reputation by them (S. Leo, *Ep.* xv. 16). [M. B. C.]

DICUL, one of the two presbyters to whom Furseus, the apostle of East Anglia, associating his brother with them, left the charge of his monastery at Cnobheresburg and the care of souls attaching to it, when he retired. (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 19.) For the period see FURSEUS. [C. H.]

DICULLUS, a monk of the Scottish nation, in charge of a very small monastery of five or six brothers at Bosanham in Sussex, a spot encompassed by the sea and woods. The existence of this mission comes to light in the history of Wilfrid, who on his arrival among the pagan South Saxons found that it had made no impression among the natives. (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 13.) [C. H.]

DIDA was the seventh abbess of the Benedictine monastery of St. Peter, Lyons, and ruled in the time of Fulcoaldus, bishop of Lyons. With the consent of Fulcoaldus, Proculus, bishop of Auvergne, translated by his legates the body of his predecessor St. Bonitus from the church of this monastery to Auvergne. Dida at first resisted this proceeding, but at length consented, retaining as a relic a part of the amphibalum or head-covering of the saint (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 284). [D. R. J.]

DIDANUS, or **DIDOCUS**, a subregulus, who about A.D. 727, on the death of his wife Safrida, founded a nunnery at Oxford for twelve religious virgins of noble birth under the government of his daughter Frideswida. (*Monast. Angl.* ii. 134; Tanner, *Notit.* ed. Nasmith, Oxf. xxiii.) [C. H.]

DIDO (1) was twenty-sixth bishop of Poitiers, and uncle to St. Leger, bishop of Autun and mayor of the palace of Francia; he stood in the same relationship also to Gerinus, count of Poitiers. After the death of king Sigebert, bishop Dido lent himself to the ambitious schemes of Grimoaldus, mayor of the palace. By his counsel Grimoaldus caused the young prince Dagobert, his ward, son and heir of Sigebert, to be tonsured; and by his instrumentality, Grimoaldus sent him in perpetual banishment to the Scots. (*Sigeberti Gemblacensis Vita Regis Sigeberti, Patrol. Lat.* clx. p. 730.)

Dido got into very bad odour through his friendship with the perfidious Grimoaldus, but when the latter and his son Chilbert, the pseudo-king, were deposed, Dido again gained considerable favour with the royal family. The anonymous author of the life of St. Leger, relates that Leger became greatly improved under the tutorship of his uncle Dido, who is described as celebrated for sagacity and wealth. When Leger was twenty, Dido ordained him deacon; then after a short time he made him archdeacon, and shared with him the government of his diocese.

About the year 663 he subscribed to the privilege which Bernefridus, bishop of Amiens, conceded to the monastery of Corbie, on the petition of king Clotaire. It is not known for certain how long Dido ruled. He probably succeeded to the bishopric A.D. 673, or thereabout, if the statement be true that he lived up to the time of king Theodoric, who reigned after the death of his brother Childeric. Some say that Dido was sent into exile with St. Leger by Ebroinus, the rage of Ebroinus against St. Leger extending itself to the uncle.

(*Spicil.* t. iv. p. 448; Ursinus, *Leodegarii Vita Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. 335; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1152, 1153; Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 780; Anonym. *Leodegari Vita Patrol. Lat.* xcvi. 346; Mabillon, ii. 651, Venice, 1733.) [D. R. J.]

(2) or DODO, thirty-second bishop of Nogent, lived in the 8th century, but nothing else is known of him (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 986). [D. R. J.]

(3) or BIDO, thirty-seventh bishop of Tours, succeeded Guntrannus II. According to the *Chronicon Turonense* he was bishop of that diocese from the year 742 to the year 744, and was succeeded by Raganbertus. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 32; Mabill. *Annales Ord. S. Bened.*, tom. ii. p. 30.) [D. R. J.]

DIDYMIA, fourth abbess of the monastery of Sainte-Croix de Poitiers, in the 6th century. It was in this same monastery that the rebellion took place which was headed by the nuns Chrodiels and Basina, in the time of the abbess Leubovera. Didymia succeeded Justina, who had followed Leubovera, the successor of Agnes, the first abbess under St. Radegonde, the queen who had founded the monastery. Didymia and the other sisters of the community requested Bandonivia, a nun who had been brought up under the eyes of St. Radegonde, to commit to writing the facts which had come within her personal knowledge in the life of that saint. Bandonivia at first excused herself on the plea of incapacity, but the abbess Didymia required her obedience, so she wrote a continuation of the life of St.

Radegonde which had been already written by St. Fortunatus. The latter work is to be found in vol. lxxxviii. of *Patrol. Lat.* and with the continuation by Bandonivia in vol. lxxii. (col. 651) of the same work. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 1301; Ceillier, *Hist. Gén. des Auteurs sacrés*, i. 194.)

[D. R. J.]

DIDYMUS and DOMITIUS, to whom Dionysius of Alexandria wrote a letter, setting forth a table for eight years of the time of Easter, and shewing that it must be later than the vernal equinox. The letter was written from Paretonia, and gave some account of the persecution of Valerian, and of Dionysius' flight. Ceillier (ii. 409) thinks there were two letters of Dionysius to this pair, one on Easter, another on the persecution; but a comparison of Eus. *H. E.* vii. 10 and 20 seems to point to an opposite conclusion.

[E. B. B.]

DIDYMUS, head of the catechetical school of Alexandria in the 4th century. He was born in 309 or 314 (Tillemont, *Mém.* x. 387). When only four years old he lost his sight from a disease in the eyes; and in consequence was never taught, as he himself declared, even the usual rudiments of learning. But his extraordinary force of character and intense thirst for knowledge triumphed over all the disadvantages entailed by this great privation. He prayed for inward light, "but added studies to prayers." (Rufin. ii. 7.) He learned the alphabet by and off wooden tablets, feeling with his hands the letters engraved on them. He became acquainted with words and syllables by great efforts of attentive listening. In this way he taught himself grammar, rhetoric, logic, music, arithmetic, geometry; and became so thoroughly master of these sciences as they were then known and cultivated, that in discussing the subjects connected with them he was a match for all who had studied them in books (Soc. iv. 25; Soz. iii. 15; Theod. iv. 26). He attained a truly wonderful familiarity with the Scriptures; and it was, we may say, characteristic of the discernment of Athanasius that he placed the blind scholar in the presidency of the catechetical school, as a fitting successor of Pantæus and Clement. According to Philip of Side, who lived early in the next century, he was the twelfth who occupied that chair. Two anecdotes of his earlier manhood are connected with the name of Antony, who, when visiting Alexandria in order to support the Catholic cause against the Arians, entered Didymus' cell, and in spite of his modest reluctance obliged him to offer up prayers in his hearing (Roswey, *Vit. Patr.* 944, 539, ed. 1617). At the same time he asked Didymus whether he was sad on account of his blindness. After the question had been twice repeated, Didymus answered that he did feel the affliction painfully. "Do not be distressed," rejoined the saintly hermit, "for the loss of a faculty enjoyed by guats and flies, when you have that inward eyesight which is the privilege of none but saints." This latter incident is recorded by Jerome (*Ep.* 68, cf. Soc. iv. 29), who probably heard it from Didymus's own lips, at a time when he stayed for a month at Alexandria in 386, mainly, as he tells us (*Prolog. in Eph.*) in order to see Didymus, and to have Scripture difficulties explained by him, motives which had led many others to visit

the Egyptian capital (Soz. l. c.). "In many points," wrote Jerome in A.D. 400 (*Ep.* 84), "I give him thanks. I learned from him things which I had not known; what I did know, his teaching has helped me to retain." Rufinus was also, and for a much longer time, a pupil of Didymus. Another anecdote is told by Palladius (Roswey, *Vitæ Patrum* l. c.), who visited him four times, and heard him say that he was one day mourning over the "miserable life of Julian," and the sufferings of the church under his reign. He abandoned himself to sorrow, and tasted no food. At last, worn out with depression and anxiety, he fell asleep in his chair, and dreamed that he saw four horsemen on white steeds, hurrying in different directions, and calling aloud to each other, "Tell Didymus, 'To-day, at the seventh hour, Julian died: arise, therefore, and eat, and send word to the house of bishop Athanasius.'" On awaking, he took note of the exact time specified in the dream, and found afterwards that it tallied with that of the emperor's death in his Persian expedition.

Sozomen says that in arguing for the Nicene faith, Didymus was successful by his extreme persuasiveness: he seemed to make every one a judge of the points in dispute (iii. 15).

Testimonies to his great ability are quoted from Isidore of Pelusium, who wrote to him as to one who was an "acute and thoughtful inquirer, who could not be ignorant of anything" (*Ep.* i. 331), and from Libanius (*Ep.* 321) to Sebastian the Manichean, a "dux" of Egypt, who took part in the persecution of Alexandrian Catholics at the time of Athanasius's fourth exile. [ATHANASIUS.] "You cannot surely be unacquainted with Didymus, unless you are unacquainted with the great city where he has been pouring out his learning, for the benefit of others, night and day."

Our fullest information about him is derived from Jerome, who frequently refers to him as his old teacher, and affectionately describes him as "my seer," in allusion to the contrast between his physical blindness and his keenness of spiritual and intellectual perception. He translated into Latin Didymus's treatise "On the Holy Spirit," and prefixed to it a preface, in which he spoke of the author as having "eyes like the spouse in the Song of Songs," as "unskilled in speech but not in knowledge, exhibiting in his very speech the character of an apostolic man, as well by luminous thought as by simplicity of words." Writing in 392 (*De Viris Illustr.* 109), he gives a short biographical account of Didymus: "Blind from childhood, and therefore *elementorum ignarus*, he made himself an object of universal wonder by entirely mastering even dialectics and geometry . . . He has written many admirable works;" then follows a list of them:—"On all the Psalms," "On the Gospels of Matthew and John," "On Dogmas," "Against the Arians," two books; "On the Holy Spirit," one book, "which I have translated into Latin;" "On Isaiah" [that is, as we learn from Jerome's Prologue to his own work on that prophet on the latter part, ch. xl.-lxvi.] eighteen tomes; "On Hosea," writing to me, three books; "On Zechariah," at my request, five books (see too, *Prolog. in Zach.*); "On Job," and others innumerable, "some of which he elsewhere mentions—e.g. on the first Ep. to Corinthians (Jerome, *Ep.*

49) on the Galatians (*Ep.* 112, Prolog. in *Galat.*), on odd numbers (*Ep.* 48), on Jewish versions of the Old Testament (*Adv. Ruf.* iii. 34), and also a reply to Rufinus's question about the death of infants (*ib.* iii. 28), and comments on Origen, "de Principiis" (*ib.* i. 6). Jerome does not mention his comments on the Catholic Epistles, nor his treatise against Manichæism. He adds, "He is still alive at this day, and has passed his eighty-third year." Didymus died in 394 or 399 (cf. Tillemont, x. 796). One characteristic of Didymus as a theological writer was his zeal in defending the theological reputation of Origen; and it was this which, after his death, exposed his own name to some unfriendly judgments. We find Jerome himself speaking of Didymus as a defender of Origen, and as careful to put a good sense upon Origen's questionable language (*Ep.* 84), or as he more fully expresses himself in his *Apol. adv. libros Rufini*, written six years after the death of Didymus—"Didymus is a most avowed champion of Origen"; (i. 6) "certainly on the subject of the Trinity, he is Catholic"; and Jerome adds that his notes on Origen put forward an orthodox interpretation of Origen's language on that point, but that on other matters he openly expresses Origen's words, and defends as pious and Catholic "what all churches condemn" (ii. 16). Again, further on in the same work Jerome writes, "In Didymus we extol his great power of memory, and his purity of faith in the Trinity; but on other points, as to which he unduly trusted Origen, we draw back from him" (iii. 27).

The extent to which he may be called an Origeniser has been matter of question. See Mingarelli's "Commentarius" prefixed to his edition of Didymus's *De Trinitate* (Bologna, 1769). In his extant writings there is no assertion of Origenian views as to the pre-existence of souls, and he affirms, more than once, the endless nature of future punishment; but he seems to have believed that some of the fallen angels occupied a midway position between angels and demons, and would be ultimately forgiven. It is remarkable that neither Epiphanius nor Theophilus, nor indeed any one before the 6th century except Jerome, laid Origenism to his charge. And with regard to the alleged condemnation of his memory by the Fifth General Council, as he is never named in the Acts, the utmost that can be made of such a statement is, that the condemnation of Origen in that synod's eleventh anathema (Mansi, ix. 383) was somewhat largely construed as carrying with it, by implication, the condemnation of other writers who were more or less identified with his school of thought. See Tillemont's "comparison of Didymus with St. Gregory of Nyssa" (x. 396).

With regard to Didymus's work "On the Holy Spirit," we see clearly that it was a protest against Macedonianism. He begins by dwelling on the reverence due to the subject. (See Tillemont, x. 393.) He treats of it, he says, because errors are abroad as to the Person of the Divine Comforter, whom he proceeds to set forth as absolutely apart from all created beings, as immutable, together with the Father and the Son; as holy by essence, not by participation; as the source of holiness and other moral excellences, to angels and to men. He proves His Godhead from the Apostolic benedic-

tion, from the case of Ananias and Sapphira, from the sending forth of Paul and Barnabas, from St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. iii. 16, &c.; he distinguishes between Him and all ministering spirits; he speaks of Him as "put forth from the Son, that is, proceeding from the Truth"; he interprets "the Lord is the Spirit" as spoken of the Son, who there takes the Spirit's name because of their community of nature; he notices one or two objections (dealing with them somewhat in the tone of Athanasius), and concludes by exhorting his readers to purge their minds from all moral hindrances to the perception of sacred truth.

His comments on the Catholic Epistles are extant, as translated by Epiphanius Scholasticus (see Galland. *Bib. Vet. Patr.* ii.). They were first printed in 1531. The same translators, it may be added, gave a Latin version of Didymus's commentary on the Proverbs, which was mentioned by Cassiodorus. His notes on 1 Peter shew a dislike of Chiliasm, as a carnal and frivolous theory; he asserts free will, opposes Manichæans, admits the possibility of faults on the part of angels being cleansed through Christ, and in words which are very characteristic of the indomitable student and teacher, addresses a rebuke to Christians who neglect sacred studies, and attend only to practical life (on 1 Peter iii. 15). He comments briefly on 2 Peter, but sets it aside as spurious and "not in the canon," although, Mingarelli remarks, in the *De Trinitate* he cites it as Petrine. The chief features of his remarks on St. John's three Epistles are, (1) the earnestness against Docetism, Valentiniæism, all speculations injurious to the Maker of the world, (2) the assertion that a true knowledge of God is possible without a knowledge of His essence, (3) care to urge the necessity of combining orthodoxy with right action. In the notes on Jude, he says that Christ is called the only Sovereign because He is the only true God: for, on the one hand, the fact that Jesus is sovereign does not deprive the Father of sovereignty, nor does the Father's Divinity make the Son external to true Godhead. He speaks of the doom of those who turn away absolutely to evil as hopeless.

His treatise "Against the Manichæans" (published by Combesius in his *Auctuarium Novum*, 1672) begins with logical formulae, intended to disprove the existence of two unoriginated Principles. From the blame and punishment attached to evil, he infers that Satan and his followers are not evil by nature; he discusses the terms, "by nature children of wrath" (which he understands to mean, "really children of wrath"), "children of this world," "son of perdition," "generation of vipers," with the aim of shewing that they do not contravene the great moral facts of free will and responsibility. (There is no sufficient reason against identifying him with the Didymus who is reported, Soc. iv. 23, to have said, "Keep the thought of providence and of judgment ever before your mind, for nearly all men stumble in these matters.") The devil, he urges, was created good, and became a devil by his own free will. If it be objected, why then did God make a being who was to become so pestilent? the objection really lies against the whole plan of God's moral government, which intends His rational creatures to become good by choosing goodness, and therefore leaves them capable of

hoosing evil, and drawing on themselves the result of such a choice. In this work he also asserts the transmission of original sin: a Saviour born of an ordinary generation would have incurred the sin in entailed on Adam's whole posterity. His three books "On the Trinity" have not reached us in a perfect state. They are interesting as exhibiting the Athanasian character, so to speak, of his thought in presence of Anomeans and of Macedonians. He discusses the question of "generation by will," uses the analogy of light and of radiance, dwells on such texts as John 1 sq., Rom. ix. 5, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, Gal. i. 1, Phil. ii. 6, 7, 1 John v. 20. Occasionally he quotes texts with some verbal inexactness. He more than once adduces the "mighty God" of Isa. ix. He admits 2 Peter as genuine: perhaps when he wrote this work, the opinion which he had formerly held as to the non-canonicity of that epistle had been reconsidered. He is very earnest, almost in the style of the "Athanasian Creed," on the co-equality of the Divine Hypostases (he uses that term in the sense which the younger generation of Catholics had adopted since the earlier days of the Arian strife). He enforces the perpetuity of Christ's Kingdom (as if he were in controversy with Marcellians), and he speaks of the Virgin Mother as Theotocos (ii. 4). He bestows much time and pains on the Macedonian controversy. Occasionally he kindles and glows with strong devotional fervour, and concludes an eloquent passage on the glory of the Holy Trinity with a thrice-repeated Amen. Shortly before this passage, it is right to add, he invokes the archangels, and expresses his belief in the intercession of the saints (ii. 7).

Some fragments of his lost works have been preserved in "Catenae" or "Anecdota." One passage from the commentary on the Psalms is translated by Dr. Pusey in his *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, p. 442, where he mentions the fact that "Card. Mai proposed to publish fragments on the Holy Eucharist from Didymus's Commentary on Proverbs." [W. B.]

DIER (DIEUFYR, DEIFERUS), a Welsh saint, placed by Rees among those who flourished between A.D. 566 and 660, brother of Tyfrydog, Tudur, Twrno, and Marchell, other Welsh saints, and founder of the church of Bodfari in Flintshire. He is mentioned by the name of Deiferus in the legend of St. Winefred, near whose monastery at Gwytherin in Denbighshire he lived a recluse life. Cressy, who places her death in A.D. 664, says she was commemorated on March 7. (Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Brit.* xvi. 9; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 276.) [C. H.]

DIERA. [DIOIRA.]

DIGAIN, Welsh saint of the 5th century, brother of Erbin another Welsh saint, of the family of Cystennyn Gorneu. To him is attributed the foundation of Llangerni, or the "Church of the Cornishmen," in Denbighshire. Commemorated November 21. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 134.) [C. H.]

DIHEUFYR, Welsh saint. [DIER.]

DIMA (DIMMA, DIOMA, with the latinised DIMANUS, DIMMANUS, and DIMAUS, and the Irish diminutive DIMMOG). Under its various forms, this name is of frequent occurrence in

ancient Irish history, and found occasionally in the Scotch, while Diuma, first bishop of Mercia, had probably only a different form of the same name [Diuma].

DIMA (1) March 9. O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 73) says "There is a Dioma, bishop, son of Senach, of the race of Eochaidh Fionn-fuathairt, of which is Brigit," and Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 613, c. 3), without deciding between March 9 and 22, gives him as "St. Dimanus, episcopus, filius Senaci," among the saints belonging to the family of St. Brigida, of Kildare.

(2) June 27. On this day O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.*) commemorates "Dioman, priest." When St. Patrick built the church of Fothrath during his first visit to Dalriada, he gave it in charge to two of his disciples, "Cathbadio praesbytero, et Dimano monacho," and Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 146, c. 130, 182 n. 196) thinks this Diman the priest is one of those commemorated on June 27 and Nov. 3.

(3) July 19. Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 164) places St. Dimannus Abbas at July 19, and says he died in the Scotch province of Strathnavernia (Strathnairn) in A.D. 670. Whether the same person or not, but probably not, a "St. Dimaus, St. Sigenii discipulus," is given by Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 201) as one of those bishops, who, being attached to no one church, preached throughout Scotland, and drew the people to the faith and virtue by the sanctity of their lives; he flourished in A.D. 664, and is commemorated on Nov. 16. From the place and date given him by Boethius, Leslaeus, Dempster, and Camerarius, he is in all likelihood Dimaus, bishop of Connor, who died A.D. 658 or 659, and was one of those ecclesiastics of the north of Ireland whom the newly elected pope John addressed in his well-known Paschal letter [CRONAN (11) and DIMA (5)]. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jul. 19, tom. iv. 580) take occasion under this saint's name to rebuke the uncritical habits of the Scottish and Irish hagiologists:—"Et mirantur Scoti aequae ac Hiberni nos in eorum sanctis admittendis paulo morosiores." (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scot. Saints*, 219, 236, 324; Boethius, *Hist. Scot.* lib. iv. f. 176; Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 151; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 105, 201.)

(4) Dimma, son of Cas, May 12. In the *Life of St. Declan* given by Ussher (*Eccl. Ant.* c. 16, wks. vi. 335 et al.) St. Declan is said to have been, at the age of seven, put (A.D. 360) under the charge of Dymma, "a religious man and wise, and proved in the faith of Christ," along with another boy called Carpre or Coirbre, son of Coluim, who afterwards became a holy and venerable bishop. And in the table of the *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 403) there is the note at Dimma or Diomma, son of Cas. "He is patron of Cill-Dioma in Caenraige of the county and diocese of Limerick, and has a holiday, a festival, and a station. He was also the master of Declan and Coibre, son of Colman, bishop, as we read in the *Life of Declan*; and he was in the Desi of Mumhain." But as it is certain that St. Declan did not belong to the fourth century [DECLAN (2)], and as it is more than probable that if St. Declan was under a St. Dimma, it was under Dimma Dubh [DIMMA (5)], the writer

of the note is evidently in error, when thus connecting the son of Cas with St. Declan. What he calls "Cill-Dioma in Caenrighe" is now the parish of Kildimo in the barony of Kenry and county of Limerick, and by attaching "in the county of Limerick, patron," to Dimmog, of Cluain-caoin (April 26), he plainly thought that the latter was only the diminutive form of Dimma. (O'Flaherty, *Ogygia*, ii. pt. 3, c. 79, p. 292; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 159-60).

DIMA (5) Dubh, bishop, of Condeire (Connor), Jan. 6. Dima or Dimma Dubh (the black, from his dark hair or complexion) has his memoir given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 16, on Jan. 6), and was son of Aenghus, son of Cairthenn Finn, &c. (*Mart. Doneg.*), of the race of Cormac Cas, son of Oilill Olum; he thus was a native of Munster and of the Dalcassian line of the royal house there. He was also cousin-german of St. Breacan (May 1) of Ara, son of Eochaidh, son of Cairthenn Finn [**BRECAN (5)**]. In youth he was committed to the care of St. Colman Ela (Sept. 26) for education at the monastery and school of Lynamly, in King's County, where he made such progress in learning and piety as in course of time to become abbat of Lynamly and bishop of Connor. In the *Life of St. Cronan* (Apr. 28) of Roscrea, there is a story related of a Dima who copied the book of the Gospels for Cronan in the space of forty days and nights, without food or rest; this is supposed by some to have been St. Dima Dubh, but others, like Lanigan, with greater reason doubt Dima Dubh's being the Dima there spoken of, and his having in any way given a semblance of foundation to the myth. He appears, however, in authentic history as Dimanus or Dimaus, one of the bishops in the north of Ireland to whom in A.D. 640, John, when pope-elect, addressed the famous letter upon the Paschal question, urging them to conformity with Rome and the rest of Christendom, and also upon the Pelagian heresy [**CRONAN (11)**]. He is in all probability the St. Dima "vir religiosus, et sapiens, atque probatus in Christi fide," who was entrusted with the education of St. Declan, who was also a native of Munster, but this must entirely militate against the early date of St. Declan [**DECLAN**]. We have no account of the time of his birth, but he is said to have died at a very advanced age in A.D. 659 (*Ann. Tigh.*), and as St. Colman Ela, who died A.D. 611, was succeeded by him as abbat before that time, he could not have been born later than A.D. 570. The *Annals of Ulster* call him Domaingert, but this is a mistake by O'Connor, as the true reading there is Dimma Niger. The beautifully illustrated copy of the Gospels, written by the scribe Dimma for St. Cronan of Roscrea about the close of the 6th century is now preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, and, being known as the 'Book of Dimma,' is classed A, 4, 23 in the MSS. collection of that library. (Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 324; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 149, 240; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* ii. 201, iv. 53; Betham, *Ir. Ant. Researches*, i. 43 sq.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 15, § 11; O'Hanlon, *Ir. Saints*, i. 73-9; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 207-9; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 269; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* iv. 273-74.) [J. G.]

DIMANUS, DIMIANUS, missionary to Britain. [**DUVIANUS**.] [C. H.]

DIMOERITAE. This was another name for the followers of Apollinarius (*see* under that name), and is probably to be explained by the help of a passage in a letter written by Gregory of Nazianzum to Nectarius of Constantinople (*Ep.* 202, al. *Or.* 46). Gregory, when speaking of Apollinarius's book, mentions that it affirmed that, He Who had come down from above had no *vous*, but that *την θεότητα του Μονογενοῦς την του νοῦ φύσιν ἀναπληρώσασαν, μέρος γενέσθαι του ἀνθρωπείου συγκράματος τὸ τριτομόριον, ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον περὶ αὐτὸν ὄντων, νοῦ δὲ μὴ ὄντος, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐκείνου τόπον τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου ἀναπληροῦντος*. Since then the Apollinarians maintained that our Lord assumed only (*διμοῖρία*) two of the three parts (*σῶμα, ψυχὴ, νοῦς*) of which perfect humanity consists, they were called by Epiphanius Dimoeritae.

Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxvii.) is the chief existing reporter of their views. They were divided into ramifications both numerous and subtle; some asserting one tenet more definitely than another, and all outpacing their leader. As Epiphanius says: "It is quite impossible to believe that so learned and good a man as Apollinarius ever held all the views which are put forward by those who bore his name. For example, some denied especially the perfect Incarnation of Christ; some asserted His body consubstantial with His divinity; some emphatically denied that He had ever taken a soul; others not less emphatically refused to Him a mind."

The sect appears to have included many who were both respected and honoured by their contemporaries, and the means taken to restore them to the church were both wise and kind. St. Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory of Nazianzum all adopted the plan of treating them gently. They instructed others to follow the plan which they themselves adopted, and which proceeded upon the principle of distinguishing between the individual and the opinion held by him, much as Christ had taught them to distinguish between the sinner and his sin. "State firmly," was their advice, "and definitely the teaching of the church on the points in question, in order that you may arrest proselytism: tell them that their opinions are not those of the Church Catholic, nor their thoughts those of the Fathers of the church" (Athanas.); but that done, kindness and gentleness were to do the rest. "We must pray," says Epiphanius, "that he who holds these views be not separated from the church of Christ, nor from the sweet communion of the entire brotherhood, but that he may put away his habit of controversy, and listen to Him Who appeals to him: 'Return, return, that we may look upon Thee' (Cant. vi. 13)."

The views of the Apollinarian party seem to have both shrunk in intelligence and developed in subtlety when Epiphanius became acquainted with them. These views professed to be based on texts of Holy Scripture, such as St. John iii. 15 and 1 Cor. xv. 47; but the interpretation of these passages was so forced, or the passages themselves so divorced from their contexts, that it was an easy task to expose the weakness of the foundations. "When the Lord came, He took not our flesh, nor one like it, but one wholly different," was one man's argument. A second persisted: "If He did take our body, yet,

His nails, His flesh, His hair, and every member were different," utterly reckless that he was reproducing an exploded Valentinian conception. They needed Epiphanius's rebuke: "Do not pass by the faith delivered by Prophet, Evangelist, and Apostle for the sake of introducing fabulous and sophistical ideas."

Among the leaders of the Dimoeritae was one Vitalius. Both Gregory of Nazianzum and Epiphanius came in contact with him; the former while Vitalius was, it would seem, a presbyter, the latter when he had been made a bishop of the sect. Vitalius was a man of irreproachable character, but thoroughly imbued with the principle of reservation. He agreed with his opponents in the accepted interpretation of certain frequently-quoted passages of Scripture; and, by so doing, he left the impression both upon Gregory and pope Damasus that he was himself orthodox; but when the doctrines logically deducible from those passages were pressed, then it became only too evident how much Vitalius had reserved. Gregory found it necessary to withdraw his previous approval of Vitalius, and his followers took their revenge in abuse; τὸ δὲ ἰσχυρὸν προσκυνεῖν μὴ ἄνθρωπον Θεοφόρον, ἀλλὰ θεὸν σαρκοφόρον. It was an age of profane abuse and nicknames, in which neither party spared the other. Because the orthodox belief asserted that Christ assumed perfect humanity, the Apollinarians taunted the Catholics with being "Anthropolatrians," or worshippers of a man; the Catholics, with equally bad taste, twitted the Apollinarians with being "Sarcolatrians," or worshippers of one who had taken the flesh alone, and not the other parts of perfect humanity: the Apollinarians retorted by the profane sneer that Christians who believed that the Lord's body was born of the Virgin Mary believed not in a Trinity but in a Quaternity.

When Epiphanius was at Antioch, he had a long discussion with Vitalius on his opinions. The bishop Paulinus had produced a profession of faith countersigned by Athanasius: in this the belief in the Trinity in Unity was confessed, and the true and proper Incarnation asserted (ὅτι δι' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ἐκ τε τῆς ἁγίας πατρὸς καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος γεννηθείς. οὐτε γὰρ ἔψυχον, οὐτε ἀνασθητὸν, οὐτε ἀνόητον σώμα ἔλχεν ὁ σωτήρ). At first, as point after point was raised, discussed, and agreed upon, pleasure and satisfaction were evinced by all present; but when the crucial question was put: "You admit the Incarnation, do you also admit that Christ took a mind (νοῦν)?" The answer, "No," at once destroyed the value of the previous concessions. Epiphanius persisted: "In what sense then do you call Christ τέλειος?" and Vitalius replied: "τέλειον ἄνθρωπον λέγομεν εἶναι, εἰ τὴν θεότητα ποιήσμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν; ὡς εἶναι τέλειον ἄνθρωπον ἐκ σαρκὸς, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ θεότητος ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦ." The point was debated without results. Epiphanius urged that not only was nothing gained by excluding mind, as we understand it, from the nature of Christ; but also that by such exclusion much was lost which made His nature, character and actions intelligible. Vitalius and his followers either could not or would not meet Epiphanius's arguments; they avoided them by reverting to their favourite texts. "We have the mind of Christ"

(1 Cor. ii. 16) was a passage sufficient in their opinion to prove indubitably that the mind of Christ must have been different from the ordinary mind; and the Catholic and usual interpretation of St. Paul's words may almost have been said to have been set aside by them, because not sufficiently subtle.

Other tenets held by the Dimoeritae, not perhaps generally, but by detached sections of the sect, are given by Epiphanius. Some were due to the teaching of Apollinarius, others were imported from other systems. (a) A distorted interpretation of 1 Cor. ii. 8 was put forward in support of the view that the Divinity of our Lord suffered: to which Epiphanius could not avoid making the half-humorous reply that "these people, not understanding the passage, wish to be very sophistical," though it might have been pleaded in their behalf, that there was about this time a very dangerous tendency, even among those whose orthodoxy was unquestioned, to talk about God being born, God dying, &c.; language never harmless to the best, and fatal to such as the Dimoeritae. (b) Some held that the Virgin Mary lived with Joseph as her husband after the birth of Jesus Christ. To such men as Epiphanius, this tenet was apparently very offensive. His comment upon it is one of incredulous amazement: "I wonder if they do say this." (c) The Chiliasm notions entertained by Apollinarius were extended and defined. Some believed that after the first Resurrection, they should live for 1000 years the life they were then living; that marriage, circumcision, strict attention to the law would continue in the new life as in the old. This and other Judaistic conceptions were severely rebuked both by Gregory of Nazianzum and Epiphanius.

The Dimoeritae probably existed, as a sect, for a few years only, either under their own name or as Vitalians, Synusiasts, Polemians, Valentinians, recording the name of some favourite leader or favourite opinion. Then they died out, or merged themselves into other bodies holding views similar to their own, or were brought back again to the church. The books, psalteries, and hymns composed and issued by Apollinarius and his principal followers were met, and their effects counteracted by books and hymns such as have given to Gregory of Nazianzum a name among ecclesiastical song-writers; the animosity of the emperor Theodosius, extended to them in common with Arians, Manicheans and Macedonians, must have shaken the steadfastness of many; and the decisions of the councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon would throw additional discredit as well as anathema upon opinions which attempted to explain with mathematical precision the inscrutable 'mysteries' of God. The speculative tendency of the Eastern church had originated these opinions, and that same tendency killed them or suffered them to give place to other and newer speculations. For a time, but by God's providence for a time only, Apollinarianism did unquestionable harm. It was, as Epiphanius sorrowfully puts it, the work of that adversary "who ever troubles the human race, mingling with excellent food his deleterious poison, and infusing bitterness even into honey."

Athanasius's letter to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, and two books against Apollinarianism; Gregory of Nazianzum's letter to Nectarius,

bishop of Constantinople (sometimes called *Orat.* 46, see Migne's edition, iii. col. 329, &c.); do. two letters to Cledonius (sometimes called *Orat.* 50, 51; see Migne, iii. col. 175, &c.); Basil, *Letters*, 264, 265; Epiphanius, *Panaria*, iii. 11; *Haer.* lxxvii. (ed. Dindorf, iii. 1, p. 454); Oehler, *Corpus Haeresiolog.* ii. 330, &c.; and the usual Church histories, e.g. Neander, Niedner, Hase, Robertson, s.v. 'Apollinarianism,' should be consulted with reference to this subject. [J. M. F.]

DIMPNA (DYMPNA), virgin and martyr, commemorated May 15. Of this saint Messingham (*Florileg. Insul. Sanctor.* 345-50) gives a legend or life and martyrdom, a sequence, and also a short memoir extracted from John Molanus (*Natales Sanctorum Belgii*). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Maii 15, tom. iii. 475-95) give the life published by Messingham, with the addition of many miracles, some of which are ancient and some of more recent date; the Bollandists think she belongs to the 7th century. The latest is *The Life of St. Dymrna, Virgin, Martyr, and Patrons of Gheel*, by the Rev. John O'Hanlon, M.R.I.A., Dubl. 1863. Some would identify her with St. Damhnat, but it is most probable that Damhnat was a different person [DAMHNAT]. St. Dimpna was the daughter of a heathen king in Ireland, and, having been secretly baptized, devoted herself body and soul to the service of Christ. From the unnatural advances of her father she fled to Belgium under the guidance of the priest Gerebern, the martyr and patron of Sonsbeck. Having pursued and discovered the fugitives, her father, who was still repelled by his daughter, first put Gerebern to death, and then St. Dimpna. Her relics were preserved with great care and reverence at Gheel. May 30 is the day of her death, and May 15 that of her translation. But her date is very uncertain. To meet the conditions of the legend, she must have lived very early, and thus Lanigan places her birth about A.D. 500. It is more probable, however, that she belongs to the 7th century (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 713, c. 4, col. 2; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 243, May 15; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist.* Ir. ii. c. 16, § 13). Adam King (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 152) gives her a much later date: "S. Dymrna, virgin dochter to ye king of irland marteriseid be hir alwin father vnder leo ye 3 A.D. 720." [J. G.]

DINAN, missionary to Britain. [DUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

DINCOMALUS or **VINCOMALUS** (*Graecè* Βινκομάλος), one of the nineteen great officers of state present at the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. He was Master of the Sacred Offices (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 78, etc.; Ceillier, x. 683).

[W. M. S.]

DINERTACH, of Cluain-mór, Oct. 9. He is entered on this day in the *Martyrology of Donegal and Tallaght*, and Colgan (*Acta SS.* 597, n. 1^o) mentions him among several others belonging to Cluain-mór-Maethog in Leinster, while he refers also to another Cluain-mór in Muskerry. There are two places in Leinster called Clonmore, "one," says O'Donovan (*Four Mast.* by O'Donov. i. 379, n. x) "near the river Slaney, in the barony of Bantry and co. of Wexford, and the other in the barony of Rathvilly and co. of Carlow. There is at the latter a holy well called Tobermogue, and the editor (O'Donovan) is of opinion that it is Cluain-mór-Maethog." [J. G.]

DINGAD AB NUDD HAEL, Welsh saint of the 6th century; but no churches are ascribed to him. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 269.) [C. H.]

DINGAD AB BRYCHAN, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of the churches of Llandinagad in Carmarthenshire and Llanigad or Dingatstowe, Dingestow, or Dynstow, in Monmouthshire; commemorated on November 1. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 140.) [C. H.]

DINOCRATES, brother of Perpetua, martyr. He died at the age of seven. Her Acts relate that when in prison she had a vision of him in suffering, and after she had prayed for him, a second vision in which she saw him refreshed (Ruinart, *Act. Sinc.* 96). Augustine of Hippo, in the first of his four books *On the Soul and its Origin*, says that the account is not canonical, and that it cannot be used as an argument about unbaptized children, because it does not say whether the boy had been baptized or not (August. *de Animâ*, i. 10, *Patrol. Lat.* xlv. 475; Ceillier, ix. 468). [W. M. S.]

DINOOTH, DINOTHUS (DUNAWD, DUNAWD FAWR, DUNAWD WR, DUNOD FYR, abbat of Bangor Iscoed, a Welsh saint, placed by Rees among those who flourished between A.D. 500 and 542. He was originally a North British chieftain, whom the Triads call one of the three pillars of his country in battle; but reverses drove him into Wales, where he found a protector in Cyngen, son of Cadell, prince of Powys, who had given an asylum to his father Pabo under similar circumstances. Following the example of many other British chieftains of that period on losing their lands in the progress of the Saxon arms (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 207), Dunawd embraced a life of religion, and under the patronage of Cyngen he founded, in conjunction with his sons, Deiniol, Cynwyl, and Gwarthan, the monastery of Bangor on the Dee, of which he was the first abbat. The mention of his name by Bede, in his narrative of the second conference at Augustine's Oak, seems valuable as fixing a date in the uncertain chronology of the Welsh saints. That the historian here (*H. E.* ii. 2) gives his own authority for the abbat's having been alive then is universally assumed; whereas the passage cautiously says, "tempore illo Dinoot abbas praeuisse narratur." Bede, who wrote a century and a quarter after Augustine's time, shews no special acquaintance with the internal affairs of the Britons, and we cannot help suspecting that the same uncertain chronology which is now found besetting Welsh hagiology existed when he wrote. A later statement, besides making the founder of Bangor alive in A.D. 602 or 603, brings him to the conference itself, though he must have been in the extremest old age, and to get there he would have had a mountain journey from the Dee to the lower Severn (see *Dict. of Ch. Antiqu.* AUGUSTINE'S OAK; also Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 40, 41 on Augustine's journey); while it even reports the speech which he is said to have made in the name of the British church in answer to Augustine. An account of the document which conveys this information may be seen in Haddan and Stubbs (*Councils*, i. 122), where the answer is quoted in the original Welsh with Spelman's Latin translation. Two copies of the original MS. exist in the Cottonian collection. It is accepted as genuine by Leland (Tanner, *Biblioth.*

1748, art. 'Dinotus,' p. 228), Stillingfleet (*Orig. Brit.* i. 536), Lappenberg (*Hist. of Eng.* i. 135). On the other hand it may be observed that the document does not mention the name of Augustine, nor does it make any allusion to one subject of the conference which is markedly noted by Bede, the evangelisation of the Anglo-Saxons. In fact it contains no name whatever, but the gist of it is a firm and temperate repudiation of papal authority, and an assertion of the supremacy of "the bishop of Caerleon upon Usk" over the British church. For any internal evidence to the contrary, the "Answer" might have been penned in reply to some demand made upon the British church by the see of Canterbury centuries after Dinooth. It bears upon that subject, and that alone. Moreover, if St. David removed the see to Menevia, how comes Caerleon upon Usk in the abbat's mouth?

Dinooth is after all a shadowy personage, and we know less about him than of his famous monastery. This stood upon the right bank of the Dee, ten or twelve miles from Chester. The name of Bangor ys y coed (Bangor under the wood) distinguishes it from other Bangors, especially that of Caernarvonshire, where the son of Dinooth founded another monastery, which was soon afterwards made the seat of a bishopric [DEINIOL]. So numerous were the monks of Bangor Iscoed that, as Bede puts it, on their being divided into seven parts with a ruler over each, none of those parts consisted of less than 300 men, who all lived by the labour of their hands. The Triads say it contained 2400 monks, who took their turn, 100 each hour, to perform divine service day and night without intermission (Camd. ed. Gough, ii. 429). Another tradition is that "there were seven chancels in Bangor Iscoed, and 300 devout monks, men of learning, in each chancel, praising God day and night without ceasing" (E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 548). It thus corresponded in magnitude with the Irish Bangor [COMGALL], and from the learned men mentioned by Bede as residing there it must have been as much a college as a monastery, a circumstance hardly in keeping, however, with the military antecedents of its founder. It was not against this institution in particular that Augustine's prediction was levelled, but the British church and people at large; nor was it beyond the reach of his own sagacity to have made a prediction that "if they would not preach the way of life to the English nation they should at their hands undergo the vengeance of death." It is not so certain that the British church was neglecting its missionary duties as it is that it refused to prosecute them in conjunction with Augustine. This conjunction ("una cum nobis," Bede) involved, in fact, their ecclesiastical submission, and should not be lost sight of in the narrative of the conference. "Dinot's Answer," in recognising this as the sole object of Augustine, was so far to the point, and may have appeared to some one in after times a sufficient ground to assign the document to this occasion. The judgment fell about ten years afterwards, A.D. 613 (*Ann. Cambr.* and *Ann. Tighern.*, preferable to earlier dates, as 603 of Flor. Wig. and 606 or 607 of A. S. C., cf. Haddan and Stubbs, i. 123), when Ethelfrid, the pagan king of Northumbria, invaded the Britons at Chester. Being about to

CHRIST. BIOGR.

give battle, he observed their "priests," who were there to pray for the soldiers, drawn up apart in a place of greater safety, and under the military protection of prince Brocmail. They had come chiefly from Bangor, after a three days' fast. This spiritual body had not been brought upon the field like chaplains of a modern army, and the invader, naturally regarding them as a contingent of his enemy, attacked them first and slew about 1200, only 50 of them escaping. We may suppose either that Bede here uses the term "sacerdotes" and "monachi" as synonymous, or that the priests were in charge of the monks, leading their devotions. It was a disastrous blow to Bangor, and was naturally handed down as a fulfilment of Augustine's words; but we do not hear that the monastery itself was attacked. Some 60 years later the annalists record "Combustio Bennchoriae Britonum" (Hadd. and St. i. 125), probably referring to this Bangor of the Dee. Malmesbury (*G. R.* ed. Hardy, i. 66) describes the extensive ruins of the place in his day—"tot semirutae parietes ecclesiarum, tot anfractus porticum, tanta turba rudum, quantum vix alibi cernas;" the credibility of which description has been sometimes almost destroyed by translating the first clause, "the ruined walls of so many churches." The remains had nearly disappeared in the time of Camden, who (as well as Bede's editor, Smith, after him) suspected that they had belonged in reality to the Roman Bovium, but probably without reason (Camd. ed. Gough, ii. 422, 429; Smith, ad Bed. *E. H.* ii. 2; Tanner, *Notit.* ed. Nasmith, Flint, ii.). The spot is now to be found on the road between Wrexham and Whitechurch, about five miles from each, in that detached portion of Flintshire which lies on the right bank of the Dee between Cheshire and Salop. Its modern state and surviving vestiges are described in Lewis (*Topog. Dict. of Wales*, art. 'Bangor'). Leland's description will be found in his *Itinerary* (vol. v. p. 30, 2nd ed. Hearne). [C. H.]

DIOCLES, correspondent of Gregory of Nazianzum, circ. A.D. 382. The letter of Gregory is about a marriage in which Diocles is interested, and recommends modesty and the absence of buffoonery at wedding feasts. (*Patrolog. Graec.* xxviii. *Ep.* 232, col. 375; Ceillier, v. 266.)

[W. M. S.]

DIOCLETIAN (DIOCLES, DIOCLES, CAIUS VALERIUS DIOCLETIANUS JOVIUS), A.D. 284-305. The acts that make the reign of this emperor memorable in the history of the church belong to its closing years. Had he died before A.D. 303 he would have taken his place among the rulers whose general tolerance helped Christianity to obtain its victory. As it is, his name is identified with the most terrible of its persecutions. For three centuries men reckoned from the commencement of his reign as from the aera of martyrs;^a and the date is still recognised in the Coptic church as the basis of its chronology.

The earlier years of Diocletian need be noticed here only so far as they connect themselves with

^a The received Christian aera, introduced by Dionysius Exiguus in A.D. 527, did not take its place in general use till the 7th or even the 8th century (Nicolas, *Chronology of History*, pp. 3, 12).

the struggle which came to a head when his work seemed nearly over. Elected by the soldiers in Bithynia at the age of 39, after the murder of Numerianus, he was formally installed at Nicomedia. In A.D. 286 he chose Maximianus as his colleague, gave him the title first of Caesar and then of Augustus, and sent him to command in the West, while he remained in the East, residing chiefly at Nicomedia, and doing all in his power to make it, by lavish outlay on its buildings, as a new capital for the empire. It was symptomatic of his intention to uphold the religion of the state that he assumed the surname of Jovius, and gave to his colleague that of Herculeus. There are no traces in him either of the philosophical eclecticism which had distinguished some of his predecessors, or of the tendency to Oriental rites which had characterised others. His earlier acts, on the other hand, shew something of the syncretic temper that looks on all national religions as things to be patronised and defended. Thus in his address to the legions on his accession he appeals not to Jupiter but to the "all-seeing sun" as bearing witness that he was guiltless of the death of Numerianus. So we find among the buildings with which he embellished the various provinces of the empire, temples of Zeus, Apollo, Nemesis, Hecate, at Antioch, of Isis and Serapis at Rome, of Isis again at Phylae, of Mithras (here also we trace sun-worship) at Vindobona. Even his choice of epithets for himself and his colleague may have indicated a purpose to defend the *cultus* of the gods against the forces that threatened it, as Jupiter and Hercules had together resisted the rebellious Titans. He consulted haruspices and augurs as to the success of his enterprises. In more difficult emergencies he sent to the oracle of the Milesian Apollo at Branchidae (Lactant. *de Mort. Persec.* c. 10-11). The decree in A.D. 295 against "malefici et Manichei" is in the tone of one who partly as a politician, partly from reverence, wishes to revive and reorganise the religion which he had inherited, and so to win the favour of the gods (*Cod. Greg.* v. 1, xiv. 4, ed. Haenel. quoted in Preuss. *Kaiser Diocletian und seine Zeit*, p. 134).

The appointment of Constantius Chlorus and Galerius in A.D. 293 as Caesars under the two Augusti, introduced new elements into the history of Diocletian's reign. Each of them was called on to prove his loyalty to the system into which he was adopted by a new marriage. Constantius divorced Helena and married Theodora, the step-daughter of Maximianus. Galerius, also repudiating his former wife, received the hand of Valeria, the daughter of Diocletian and Prisca. To Constantius was entrusted the government of Gaul and Britain, to Galerius the provinces between the Adriatic and the Euxine. Diocletian kept the provinces of Asia under his own control. Maximianus had those of Africa and Italy.

The edict of Gallienus, A.D. 259, had placed Christianity in the number of *religiones licitae*, and there had been no formal persecution since that date. Diocletian and Maximian began by adopting the same policy; and the martyrdoms which are referred to the earlier years of their reign, like those of St. Maurice and the Theban Legion, at Martigny (Octodurum), of St. Victor at Marseilles, of SS. Cosmas and

Damian and others in Cilicia, if they are more than legendary, must be referred to special causes, and not to a general policy of persecution against Christians. The somewhat cloudy rhetoric with which Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 1) describes the condition of the church of this time indicates that the last struggle between it and the old religion of the empire could not long be averted. The most trusted and influential eunuchs of the king's household, Dorotheus and Gorgonius, were avowedly Christians, and as such were excused from attending at heathen sacrifices (Euseb. viii. 1). The letter of Theonas, bishop of Alexandria, to Lucianus the chamberlain of Diocletian,^b shews that he had been promoted to a high place in the emperor's favour, and had it in his power to promote others. Theonas counsels him to use the opportunities thus given him for the furtherance of the good cause, and hints that if he could get a Christian appointed to take charge of the imperial library, there might be an opening for working upon the mind of the emperor himself, for naming Christ and urging His divinity. As it was they gained considerable influence over Prisca the wife and Valeria the daughter of Diocletian, and though their rank and the emperor's policy kept them back from an open profession of faith, their absence from all sacrifices became noticeable and made men look on them with suspicion (Lactant. *de Mort. Persec.* c. 15). So it was that churches were built in every city and crowded with worshippers. Buildings that had met the wants of a former generation were now found too small and had to be enlarged. The church of Nicomedia was the most conspicuous edifice in the city. The adherents of the old system had good reason for alarm. They saw in every part of the empire an organised society that threatened it with destruction.^c

Symptoms of the coming conflict began before long to shew themselves. Malchus, the disciple of Plotinus (better known as Porphyry), wrote against the religion of the Christians while maintaining a tone of reverence towards Christ himself, and so became in their eyes their most formidable opponent. Hierocles, first as *Vicarius* of Bithynia and afterwards, probably, as prefect of Egypt, fought against them with the pen as well as with the sword, and published "Words of a Truth-lover to the Christians," in which He whom they worshipped was compared with Apollonius of Tyana. Within the imperial circle itself there were those who were impatient of the tolerance of Diocletian. The mother of Galerius, who gave sacrificial banquets almost

^b The letter is to be found in D'Achery's *Spicilegium* iii. 297, and Galland's *Biblioth. Patr.* iv. It does not name the emperor of whom it speaks, nor the see of which the writer was bishop. Neander, however, may be held to have proved that it applies to Diocletian more than to any later or earlier emperor. Euseb. (*H. E.* vii. 32) names a Theonas as having presided over the church of Alexandria from A.D. 287 to 300.

^c The inscription said to have been found at Clunia in Spain (Gruter, pp. 280, 283) in honour of Diocletian and Maximian: "Deleto Christianorum nomine qui rempublicam evertebant," is of doubtful authenticity (cf. Hübner *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*, vol. ii. p. 26*). But the feeling with which the pagan population of the empire looked on the persecution has its analogue in that which pervaded Catholic Europe after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

daily, was annoyed because Christian officers and soldiers refused to come to them. The case of Maximilian of Theveste, in proconsular Africa, who in A.D. 295 had refused to serve as a soldier and take the military oath, on the ground that it was incompatible with his allegiance to Christ, that of Marcellus (A.D. 298) who at Tingis in Mauritania solemnly renounced his allegiance to the emperor rather than take part in festivals which he looked on as idolatrous, had probably alarmed Galerius himself. How was military discipline to be maintained, how was the empire to be defended, unless decisive measures were taken? (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, pp. 309, 312).

Occasions were soon found.^a Diocletian, who seems to have had a devout belief in the old methods of divination, had offered sacrifice, and the haruspices were inspecting the entrails of the victim to see what omens were to be found there. The Christian officers and servants of the emperor were present as part of their duty, and satisfied their conscience by making the sign of the cross upon their foreheads. The diviners were, or pretended to be, struck with amazement at the absence of any signs such as they expected. They sacrificed again and again with the same result. At last they declared that their work was hindered by the presence of profane persons. The emperor's rage was roused. His personal attendants, all who had any office in his palace, were ordered to sacrifice under penalty of being scourged if they refused. Letters were sent to military officers bidding them to compel the soldiers under them to a like conformity under pain of dismissal from the service. Soon there was another step taken. The mother of Galerius was, as has been said above, in the habit of giving almost daily banquets of a sacrificial character to which the officers of the army and household were invited. She was irritated at the persistent absence of the Christians and incited her son to take more active measures against them. They urged the emperor on, and found but a feeble resistance. He deprecated the slaughter that was sure to ensue; he wished to confine the edict to those who were servants of his household or soldiers in his army. He would take counsel with his friends. He would consult the gods. One of the haruspices was accordingly sent to the oracle of the Milesian Apollo at Branchidae. And the answer came, not from the priestess only, but, as it were, from the god himself speaking from the recesses of his cave, telling him that the presence of the self-styled "just ones" on the earth made it impossible for the oracles to speak the truth. This turned the scale and the emperor gave way. All he asked for was that bloodshed might, if possible, be avoided. Galerius had wished to condemn to the flames all who refused to sacrifice.

After many divinations the Feast of the Terminalia (Feb. 23rd) of A.D. 303 was chosen as the fit day for issuing the edict which was to set limits to the progress of the new society. At break of day the prefect attended by officers and secretaries went to the church of Nicomedia while Diocletian and Galerius watched the proceedings from the palace. The doors were broken

open. Search was made for the image of the Christian's God, which, strange as it may seem, they still expected to find there. All the books of the church were burned, all its fittings sacked. The fear of the fire spreading made Diocletian shrink from burning the church itself, but a body of pioneers with their axes and crowbars brought it in a few hours to the ground. The next morning an edict was issued ordaining that (1) all churches were to be demolished; (2) all sacred books were to be burnt; (3) all Christian men who held any official position were not only to be stripped of their dignities, but to be deprived of civil rights, and therefore rendered liable to torture and other outrages; while Christian men who were not officials were to be reduced to the condition of slaves. A Christian who had the temerity to tear it down, with the sarcastic exclamation, "More triumphs of Goths and Sarmatians!" was seized, tortured, and burnt alive at a slow fire. Shortly after this a fire broke out in the palace and suspicion fell upon the Christians, notably upon the eunuchs in the palace. The use made of the occurrence to work upon Diocletian's fears justified the impression left on the minds of Christian writers that it was a device contrived by Galerius and executed by his slaves. Enquiries were at once set on foot and all who were suspected examined by torture; within a fortnight there was another alarm of the same kind, and now there was no limit to the old man's fury. His wife and daughter were compelled to free themselves from suspicion by joining in sacrifice. The eunuchs of his household, before so trusted, Dorotheus, Gorgonius, Petrus, were put to death. The persecution raged throughout the province. Some were burnt, some drowned, some thrust into dungeons. Altars were set up in every court of justice, and both parties to a suit compelled to sacrifice before they were allowed to plead. A second edict ordered that all the clergy of the church, without option of sacrifice, should be imprisoned [ALBANUS]. Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, was beheaded (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 6). Hierocles carried on his two-fold work as author and as magistrate, and silenced by torture those whom he failed to convince. Letters were sent to Maximianus and Constantius in the West, urging them to adopt like measures there. The former was but too willing an instrument. The latter, more humane and disposed to a policy of toleration, was compelled to join in destroying the buildings of the Christians, and was glad if he could save their lives. (Lactant. *de Mort. Persec.* cc. 12-16).

It would be out of place to enter here upon the narratives of individual martyrdoms. They are to be found with more or less fulness in the *Acta Sincera* of Ruinart, in the *Annals* of Baronius, in most Church Histories, notably in Fleury, viii. and ix. What we have to remember is the extent, the continuance, and the ferocity which distinguished it from all others. In Syria and Palestine, in Egypt and Western Africa, in Italy and Spain, the passions of men were let loose against those whom they feared or hated, and they raged without restraint. Ingenuity was exhausted in devising new forms of torture for Christian men. For Christian women there was always the ready punishment of outrage and indignity. In Gaul and Britain only

^a The treatise ascribed to Lactantius, already quoted, and Euseb. *H. E.* b. viii. are the chief authorities for the narrative that follows.

was there any safety. Constantius was said (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* i. 16) to have shewn a marked preference for those who were true to their religion, and refused to sacrifice. Elsewhere every town in the empire witnessed acts of incredible cruelty. The wish to destroy all the sacred books of the Christians, and all the accessories of their worship, led men to seize on the deacons, readers, and others connected with the churches, and put them to the torture till they gave them up.

In the December of the same year, A.D. 303, Diocletian went to Rome to celebrate with Maximian the twentieth anniversary of his accession. He seldom visited Rome, but in the previous year he had celebrated with unusual magnificence the last triumph that Rome was ever to witness. At the Vicennalia the licence of the people offended him, and he left after two weeks for Ravenna. There he was attacked by a severe illness, which detained him for some months. Slowly he made his way to Nicomedia. He became worse on his arrival. Prayers were offered for his recovery in all the temples. It was rumoured that his death was concealed till the arrival of Galerius. When he appeared to contradict the rumour, he was so altered that he could hardly be recognised. His mind, it was said, was seriously affected. Galerius came, but it was to press on the emperor the duty and expediency of resigning. Maximianus had been already persuaded to consent to take that step. After a feeble resistance, Diocletian yielded. The two Caesars were to become Augusti. He would fain have named Maxentius, the son of Maximian, and Constantine, the son of Constantius, to take their place; but Galerius used the mastery he had gained, and coerced or persuaded him to appoint Maximin and Severus, in whom he hoped to find more submissive instruments. When the formal acts had been completed, the emperor laid aside his official names, Diocletianus and Jovius, and returned to the simple Diocles, which he had borne in youth.

The history of the year that followed will be found under other heads (GALERIUS, CONSTANTINE, LICINIUS). The retired emperor settled at Salona, on the coast of Dalmatia, and occupied himself with building and gardening. He lived to hear, in July, A.D. 306, of the death of Constantius, and the succession of Constantine. In A.D. 307 Galerius came to consult him, and the two met once more at Carnuntum. Maximian, too, was present at the conference, and urged him to return to take the reins of government; but Diocletian pointed to his cabbages, and refused to abandon them for the cares of state. Three years afterwards Maximian, after vainly struggling against the growing power of Constantine, was compelled to end his life by his own hands. In the following year (A.D. 311) Galerius died in the agonies of a loathsome and horrible disease, and before his death confessed, by an edict of toleration, that the attempt which he had made to crush Christianity had failed. Diocletian survived to witness the alliance between Constantine and Licinius, to receive and decline an invitation to a conference with them at Milan, to hear that Constantine had charged him with conspiring first with Maxentius and then with Maximin, and had ordered his statue

and that of Maximian to be thrown down in every part of the empire. In A.D. 313 the end came, some said through poison (Aurel. Vict. *Epist.* 39), to avoid a worse fate at the hands of Constantine and Licinius, some through the general failure of health, which had led to his resignation (Lactant. c. 42). It was characteristic of his fate as representing the close of pagan imperialism, that as he was the last emperor who celebrated a triumph at Rome, so was he also the last who received the honour of apotheosis at the hands of the Roman senate (Preuss, p. 169).

The fate of the two members of Diocletian's family, who at one time seemed likely to have taken their place openly among the converts to Christianity, deserves a passing notice. Their tendency to it seems to have drawn them together, and after Diocletian's abdication, his wife resided altogether with her daughter Valeria. It is possible that they exercised some influence over Galerius, and this may be the explanation of the fact, that though he was the author of the whole scheme of persecution, the provinces over which he ruled presented hardly any of the instances of martyrdom which were conspicuous in Egypt and in Syria. On the death of Galerius, they fell into the hands of Maximin, who, after vainly suing for the hand of Valeria, confiscated all they had, and banished them to Syria. Thence they managed to communicate with Diocletian, and he in vain tried to secure their liberation. When Licinius became master of the East, on Maximin's death, they went to him at Nicomedia, and were courteously received by him. The murder of Candidianus (a natural son of Galerius, whom Valeria had adopted), and that of the children of Severus, alarmed them, and they made their escape. For fifteen months they wandered in disguise and abject poverty through the provinces in which they had once lived in imperial state. At last they were detected at Thessalonica, executed, and their bodies flung into the sea (Lactant. *de Mortib. Persec.* cc. 39-41, 50, 51). [E. H. P.]

DIODORIADES, a presbyter who sided with Manes, according to the author of the *Libellus Symodicus* published by Pappus. (See Fabricius, *Hippolytus*, Appendix, p. 196; Routh *Rel. Sac.* v. 33.) [G. S.]

DIODORUS (1) presbyter of Diodoris, Acta Archelai (is wrongly called Trypho by Epiphanius). Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* vii. 332) says, "*Trypho*, Origenis discipulus, Epiphanius tom. ii. p. 176; Photius, lib. i. § 15, contra Man. In Actis Archelai Diodorus potius appellatur." See ARCHELAUS. [E. B. C.]

(2). [CLAUDIUS (1).]

(3) Presbyter of Antioch, and c. A.D. 379, bishop of Tarsus, one of the most deservedly venerated names in the Eastern church, for learning, sanctity, courage in withstanding heresy, and zeal in defence of the truth. Diodorus has a still higher claim on the grateful remembrance of the whole church as, if not the founder, the chief promoter of the rational school of scriptural interpretation, of which his disciples, Chrysostom and Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret, were such distinguished representatives.

Diodorus was of a noble family of Antioch, in which city he passed nearly the whole of his life until he became a bishop (Theod. *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 24). He studied philosophy or secular learning at Athens, where he may not improbably have been an associate of Basil and Julian the future emperor. (Facund. lib. iv. c. 2, p. 59.) Basil speaks of him as "a nursing," (θρέμμα) of Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus, but whether at Tarsus, or before Silvanus's elevation to the episcopate, at Antioch, is not specified. (Basil, *Epist.* 81, p. 151.) On his return to his native city, Diodorus and his friend Flavian, also of noble birth (subsequently bishop of Antioch), embraced a religious life. The epithet *μωδ(α)ν*, applied to him by Suidas, indicates that at one period of his career at least he was living under monastic rule, and we learn from Socrates and Sozomen that Diodorus and another friend named Carterius presided over a place of ascetic retirement, in or near Antioch, in which Chrysostom and his companions Basil and Theodorus were initiated in asceticism (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 3; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 2).

While still laymen at Antioch, during the reign of Constantius, Diodorus and Flavian exerted themselves energetically for the defence of the orthodox faith against the assaults of the Arians, which were covertly supported by Leontius, the bishop of the city, c. 350. They were indefatigable in their exhortations to the orthodox laity to adhere to the faith, gathering them even by night around the tombs of the martyrs, to join in the antiphonal chanting of the Psalms, which, Theodoret tells us, was first instituted or revived by them, as a means of kindling religious zeal, after the model ascribed by tradition to the martyred bishop of their church, the holy Ignatius (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 8; Theod. *H. E.* lib. ii. c. 24). These services became even more influential when Leontius, unwilling either to sanction or to forbid them, sought to check their ardour by desiring that they might be transferred to the church, and they contributed much to strengthen the faithful to meet the persecutions which were sent to try their fidelity so severely. The weight of Diodorus and Flavian at Antioch was proved, when in 350 their threat of withdrawal from communion induced Leontius to suspend the infamous Aetius from the functions of the diaconate to which he had ordained him (Theod. *u. s.*) [AETIUS]. On the accession of Julian, his insane attempt to rekindle the vitality of an expiring Paganism, of which Antioch was one of the chief theatres, provided a new field for the energies of Diodorus. Both his pen and his tongue were active in denouncing the folly of a return to an exploded superstition, to an extent that called forth the scurrilous jests of Julian, who, in his letter to the heresiarch Photinus, upbraided the "Nazaraei magus," as he blasphemously termed him, with having deserted the philosophy he had learnt at Athens for the boorish theology of fishermen, and turned against the celestial gods the learning he had acquired in their most favoured home. He taunted Diodorus with the consumptive weakness which had been induced by his labours and austerities, ascribing his wrinkles and pallid cheeks, and emaciated frame, to the vengeance of the offended deities, whose majesty he had defied. (Facundus, in *Defens. trium Capitul.* lib. iv. c. 2, p. 59.)

The persecution of the catholic cause instituted by the Arian Valens recalled Diodorus, who had by this time become a presbyter, to his former championship of the Nicene faith. During the frequent banishments of Meletius, the spiritual instruction of his diocese was chiefly entrusted to him and Flavian, and he, in the words of Theodoret, saved the bark of the church from being "submerged by the waves of misbelief." (Theod. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 4.) Valens having forbidden the Catholics to meet within the walls of cities, Diodorus gathered his congregation in the church in the old town to the south of the Orontes. Immense numbers—Chrysostom says "the whole city"—assembled and were "fed by him with sound doctrine," from "a tongue flowing with milk and honey," themselves meanwhile supplying his necessities by their gifts. (Chrysost. *Laus Diodori*, § 4; tom. iii. p. 749.) When forcibly driven out of this church he gathered his congregation in the soldiers' exercising ground, or "gymnasium," and exhorted them from house to house. The texts and arguments of his discourses were chiefly furnished by Flavian, and were clothed by Diodorus in a rhetorical dress. His oratory is compared by Chrysostom to "a lyre" for melody, and to a "trumpet" for the power with which, like Joshua at Jericho, he broke down the strongholds of his heretical opponents. He also held private assemblies at his own house for the exposition of the faith, and the refutation of heresy. (Theod. *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 25; Chrysost. *l. c.*; Facundus, lib. iv. c. 22.)

It is not to be supposed that such dauntless championship of the faith failed to provoke persecution. The life of Diodorus was more than once in danger, and he was forced to seek safety in flight (Chrysost. *l. c.*). The title of a "living martyr," however, which Chrysostom applies to him is rather based on his self-inflicted mortifications than on his sufferings for the faith. Once at least when driven from Antioch he joined his spiritual father Meletius at his place of exile, Getasa in Armenia, where on one occasion, in A.D. 372, he met Basil the Great. (Basil, *Epist.* 187.) The intimate terms on which Diodorus was with Basil are seen from the tone of Basil's correspondence, in which he speaks of the strengthening affection he feels towards him, both personally as a pupil of Silvanus, and for the grace given him in the exposition of Scripture, by which so many were reformed. In one of his letters he very unceremoniously criticises two books Diodorus had recently sent for his perusal. One he says he likes because it is short, and its style so simple and to the point. This he retained, and intended to get copied as soon as he could meet with a transcriber. The other he pronounces to be both too long and too flowery; demanding too much time to peruse, and too much labour to comprehend, and he concludes by giving him some very seasonable advice in composition. (Basil, *Epist.* 165, p. 187.) In another letter Basil expresses his conviction that a letter, put into his hands, bearing Diodorus's name, must be a forgery, because it sanctions marriage with a deceased wife's sister. (*Epist.* 197.)

Great as were the services rendered by Diodorus by his undaunted defence of the catholic faith, it is not on these that his chief claim on

the gratitude of the church rests. As the head of the theological school at Antioch he pursued himself and taught others to pursue a healthy common-sense principle of exposition of Holy Scripture, which discarding allegorism on the one hand and coarse literalism on the other, sought by the help of criticism, philology and history, and other external resources, to discover and develop the true meaning of the sacred text, as intended by the authors. If the tendency of the principle of exegesis introduced by Diodorus and followed by his pupils, was to some extent rationalistic, yet as employed by him and his great disciple Chrysostom—and we should probably be able to add Theodorus of Mopsuestia if we had larger remains of his commentaries—it did not go beyond the limits of a healthy rationalism, recognising the human element as well as the divine in Holy Scripture, and repudiating the notion of inspiration which would reduce its authors to mere automata, and firmly holding the truth of a gradual development in revelation, and a steady advance in the moral standard and spiritual intuition of its subjects in successive ages. This rationalistic tendency is asserted to have been carried to unsound lengths by his great pupil Theodorus of Mopsuestia, whose language in connexion with Nestorian doctrine has been used to disparage the teaching of his master. But even if Theodorus's teaching on the subject of the Incarnation deserves the heretical brand fastened on it by the envenomed bitterness of controversy, we may not improperly think of his other great pupil, and ask with the calm and moderate Dupin, "should not the faith of St. Chrysostom rather serve to justify Diodorus than the error of Theodorus to condemn him?" (Soer. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 3; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 2; Hieron. *de Vir. Illust.* No. 119.)

On the restoration of Meletius to his diocese in A.D. 378, one of his first acts was to appoint Diodorus bishop of Tarsus and metropolitan of the then undivided province of Cilicia (Facundus, lib. viii. c. 5). His career as bishop, according to Jerome (*de Vir. Illust.* No. 119), was less distinguished than as presbyter. He took part in the great council of Antioch A.D. 379, which ineffectually attempted to put an end to the Antiochene schism, as well as in the second oecumenical council at Constantinople in A.D. 381. At this council, according to Sozomen, he was the author of the elevation of the layman Nectarius, himself of Tarsus, to the episcopal throne of Constantinople on the resignation of Gregory Nazianzen (Soz. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 8). By the decree of the emperor Theodosius, July 30, A.D. 381, Diodorus was named as one of the orthodox Eastern prelates, communion with whom was the test of orthodoxy (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. i. 3; t. vi. p. 9). Meletius having died during the session of the council, Diodorus, in violation of the compact made with the view of healing the schism, united with Acacius of Beroea in consecrating Flavian as bishop of Antioch, for which act both the consecrating prelates were excommunicated by the bishops of the West (Soz. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 11). Once certainly Diodorus visited the former scene of his labours (c. 386) when Chrysostom was in the zenith of his fame as a preacher. Diodorus was in feeble health, but he mounted the pulpit and delivered an elaborate

panegyric on his former pupil, to which Chrysostom responded in a few days by a similar eulogium, recounting his former labours and sufferings in behalf of the truth (Chrysost. *Laus Diodori*, u. s.; Facundus, lib. iv. c. 22). Diodorus was followed to Tarsus by another of his celebrated pupils, Theodorus, afterwards bishop of Mopsuestia, who was ordained presbyter by him and remained at Tarsus till the death of his master, whose successor he is said to have aspired to be. Phalerius appearing as bishop of Tarsus at a council held at Constantinople in A.D. 394, the date of Diodorus's death is approximately fixed. We are told by Facundus and others that he died full of days and glory, revered by the whole church and honoured by its chief doctors. Facundus, in his elaborate defence of his orthodoxy, quotes the eulogistic expression addressed to him and employed of him, by Basil, Meletius, Theodoret, Domnus of Antioch, and even by the chief impugner of the soundness of his faith, Cyril of Alexandria. The letters of Athanasius quoted by Facundus seem to be proved by Tillemont to refer to another Diodorus, the bishop of Tyre. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* viii. 912; *Athanase*, note 98, to whom Epiphanius dedicated in very honourable terms his treatise, *De Duodecim Gemmis*, which had been written at his request.)

The high credit enjoyed by Diodorus in the church was disturbed by the controversies which broke out in the succeeding century on the subject of Nestorianism. His rationalising spirit had led him to express himself on the Incarnation in language containing the principles of that heresy afterwards more fully developed by his disciple Theodorus. So that, not without justice, he has been deemed to have been the virtual parent of Nestorianism, and has been called "a Nestorian before Nestorius." It was Diodorus's repugnance to the errors of Apollinarianism which led him to the opposite errors of Nestorianism. His sense of the importance of the truth of Christ's manhood caused him to insist on its distinctness from His Godhead in a manner which gradually led to its being represented as a separate personality. He drew a distinction between Him Who according to His essence was Son of God—the eternal Logos—and Him Who through divine decree and adoption became Son of God. The one was Son of God by nature, the other by grace. The son of man became Son of God because He was chosen to be the receptacle or temple of God the Word. It followed therefore that Mary could not be properly termed "the mother of God," nor could God the Word be strictly called the son of David, that designation belonging, according to human descent, to the temple in which the Divine Son tabernacled. Diodorus therefore distinguished two Sons, the Son of God and the son of Mary, combined in the person of Christ. When, then, the great Nestorian controversy set in, Cyril clearly saw that, apart from the watchword *Θεοτόκος*, which had not yet arisen in the days of Diodorus, what men called Nestorianism was in fact substantially nothing else than the doctrines of Diodorus as developed by Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and that if Nestorianism were to be crushed the object could only be fully accomplished by obtaining a condemnation of the doctrines of Diodorus as the fountain head. This

condemnation it was most difficult to obtain. No name was held in so much reverence throughout the East as that of Diodorus. To impugn his teaching was to cast a slight on the centre of orthodoxy, the maintainer and promulgator of the apostolic faith handed down by the Fathers. Cyril, however, was of far too determined a spirit to shrink from such a step. If orthodox views of the Incarnation were to be established, the authority of Diodorus must, at any cost of enmity and unpopularity, be destroyed. Every means was therefore taken by him and his party to enforce, by the aid of the emperor and the patriarch Proclus, his condemnation, together with that of his still more heretical pupil Theodorus. Cyril himself, in a letter to the emperor, described them in the harshest terms as the fathers of the blasphemies of Nestorius (Theodoret, tom. v. p. 854), and in a letter to John of Antioch denounced them as "going full sail, as it were, against the glory of Christ." It is not surprising that Diodorus began to be looked upon with suspicion by those who had been accustomed to regard him as a bulwark of the faith, inasmuch that Theodoret, when himself accused of Nestorian leanings, did not venture to quote the words of Diodorus in his defence, though he regarded him with reverence (σέβω), as "a holy and blessed father," because his enemies looked upon them as heretical as his own (Theod. *Epist.* 16). In the hope of rehabilitating his credit, Theodoret wrote a treatise to prove the orthodoxy of Diodorus, the result of which was to lead Cyril to a persual of them, and to pronounce them categorically heretical (*ib. Epist.* 38, 52). All that was done, however, to depreciate the authority of Diodorus, both by Cyril and Rabbulas of Edessa, only exalted him in the estimation of the Nestorian party, and the opposition contributed to the formation of the independent Nestorian church, still existing in melancholy isolation, which looks upon Diodorus and Theodorus with the deepest veneration as its founders. The presbyter Maris of Haddaschir, in Persia, translated the works of Diodorus into Persian, and we are told that they, together with those of Theodorus, were also translated into Armenian and Syriac and other Oriental tongues (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. pp. 209, 284; Clark's transl. *Liberat. Breviar.* c. 10). Diodorus was naturally anathematised by Eutyches and his followers. Flavian III., also bishop of Antioch, was compelled by the Monophysites to pass an anathema on the writings of Diodorus and Theodorus in A.D. 499. The controversy respecting the orthodoxy of the writings of Diodorus was revived in the sixth century by the interminable disputes about "the Three Articles." There is a full defence of his orthodoxy by Facundus in his "*Defensio Trium Capitulorum*" (lib. iv. c. 2). Photius asserts that Diodorus was formally condemned by the fifth oecumenical council held at Constantinople A.D. 553, but it does not appear in the acts of that council. Diodorus was a very copious author, the titles of between twenty and thirty distinct works being enumerated in various catalogues. Of these, to the grievous loss of the church, the whole have perished, with the exception of some fragments, no less than sixty having been burnt, according to Ebed-Jesu, by the Arians. His writings were partly exegetical,

partly, and that mainly, controversial. He wrote comments on the whole of the books of the Old and New Testament, excepting the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles (1 John however being commented on), and the Apocalypse. In these, according to Jerome (*de Vir. Illust.* No. 119), he imitated the line of thought of Eusebius of Emesa, but fell below him in eloquence and refinement. The reason alleged for this inferiority, his deficiency in secular learning, is hardly consistent with what Julian says of his studies at Athens. Perhaps Jerome looked on Diodorus with somewhat prejudiced eyes, as an adherent of Meletius. Fragments of these comments are frequent in the Greek Catenae, but they are not always accurately distinguished from those of Theodorus of Mopsuestia.

The controversial writings of Diodorus embrace a very wide field. He was ready to wield his pen against any one, pagan, Jew, or heretic, by whom the truth was impugned. Heathen philosophers—Plato and Aristotle—later assailants of the faith—Porphyry—heretics of every name and hue—Sabellius, Photinus, Marcellus, the Manicheans, Eunomians, Apollinarians (*συνουσιασται*) all in turn came under his review and had their errors exposed and confuted. Controversy occupied so much of his thoughts that his contributions to direct dogmatic theology seem to have been comparatively trifling. The following list of his works, derived from Suidas and Photius, etc., is given by Fabricius (*Biblioth. Graec.* lib. v. c. 24):—(1) *Contra Fatum*, a work in eight books and fifty-three chapters, in which he refutes the follies of judicial astrology, and proves, against Bardesanes and others, that the world had a beginning and was created, that man is endowed with free-will, that God is not the author of evil, and that the world is governed by Divine providence. Of this work we have an elaborate summary by Photius (*Cod.* 223). (2) *Contra Platonem de Deo et Diis* (Theod. Lect. apud Suidam). (3) *Adversus Photinum, Melchionem, Sabellium et Marcellum* (Theodoret, *de haeret. fab.*, lib. ii. c. 11). (4) *Chronicon*, in which some chronological errors of Eusebius are corrected. (5) *De eo quod unus sit Deus in Trinitate*, a work directed against the Eunomians (Ebed-Jesu; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III. i. 28). (6) *Adversus Melchisedicitas*. (7) *Contra Judaeos*. (8) *De resurrectione mortuorum*. (9) *De anima adversus varias haeticorum opiniones*. (10) *Capita ad Gratianum Imper.* (11) *De Sphaera et quinque Zonis et contrario astrorum motu*. (12) *De Sphaera Hipparchi*. (13) *De Prudentia* (called by Ebed-Jesu *liber Politicorum*). (14) *De natura et materia, et de eo quod justum est*. (15) *De Deo et falsa Graecorum materia*. (16) *Naturas invisibiles de nihilo factas esse*. (17) *Ad Euphronium philosophum*. (18) *Contra Aristotelem de corpore coelesti*. (19) *Quomodo opifex quidem semper, opera vero ejus non semper permanent*. (20) *Quomodo velle et nolle sit in Deo aeterno*. (21) *Contra Porphyrium de animalibus et sacrificiis*. (22) *Contra Manichaeos* (in twenty-five books, of which Photius remarks that he is not quite successful in overthrowing the "living gospel" of the Manichees, but is quite successful in shewing the true meaning of the passages of scripture misinterpreted by them), (Phot. *Cod.* 85; Theod. *Haeret. fabul.* i. cap. ult.). (23) *De Spiritu Sancto*, directed

against the Macedonians. (Photius remarks that he detected the Nestorian taint already infecting this book) (*Cod.* 102; Leontius *de Sectis*, p. 448).

(24) *Adversus Synusistas*, i.e. the Apollinarians. Fragments of this work, which was the chief ground of charging Diodorus with Nestorian views (Cyril, *Epist. ad Succensum et Acacium*; Liberatus, c. 10), are extant in Leontius Byzantinus, *de Sectis, contra Nest. et Eutyph.* lib. iii.; *Bibl. Patrum*, Lugdun. pp. 448, 704. (25) *Adversus Contentiosum*. (26) To these must be added the *Commentaries on Holy Scripture*, already spoken of. It is possible that some of his writings may be still extant among the Nestorians (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* III. ii. 24). Diodorus is accredited with a liturgy, the use of which, according to Renaudot, was prohibited "in Synodo Diamperensi." The liturgy named by Bona (*Rer. Liturg.* i. 9) is probably that of Theodorus, the two names being very often confounded. At present Renaudot says of the Nestorians, "liturgiam ejus" (Diodori) "nomine nullam habent." [E. V.]

DIODORUS (4) bishop of Tyre, 381, correspondent of Epiphanius of Salamis. Diodorus had asked Epiphanius to explain the twelve stones of the breast-plate of the Jewish high priest. This was the origin of the treatise of Epiphanius, *De Gemmis*, which we have probably in an abridged form. (S. Epiphanius *de Gemmis*, *Patrol. Graec.* xliii. 294; Ceillier, vi. 420.) [W. M. S.]

(5) Praedestinatus invents two bishops of this name, a bishop of Crete (i. 12) who opposed the Secundiani, and a bishop of Nicomedia (i. 58) who opposed the Metangismontae. [G. S.]

DIOGA. Bishop of Leptis magna (Leptimajus) in prov. Trip., Colonia Victrix Julia, on river Cinyphus. Voted by proxy through Natalis, 85th suffrage, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii.; the rare name of Dioga occurs, Gruter's *Inscr.* p. 1254, n. 6, in S. Crucis in Hierus. at Rome, with another bearing the African name *Namphamo*. [E. W. B.]

DIOGENES (1) presbyter of Alexandria in the 4th century. The Anomaeans reproached Basil bishop of Ancyra with having caused Diogenes, one of their party, to be flogged as he passed by Ancyra, as well as with having taken from him his papers. (Sozomen. iv. 24, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 1189; Ceillier, iv. 321.) [W. M. S.]

(2) Bishop of Genoa, attended the council of Aquileia, and joined in the condemnation of Palladius and Secundianus (Ambrose, iii. 821-843). [J. L. D.]

(3) A liberal friend of Chrysostom, who sent him a considerable sum of money during his exile at Cucusus, A.D. 404-5, by the hand of Aphraates. Chrysostom desired at first to return the present, but on the refusal of Aphraates to take it back, he begged Diogenes to devote it to the missions in Phoenicia. (Chrysost. *Epist.* 50, 51.) [E. V.]

(4) Bishop of Seleucobelus in Syria Secunda, who though a "digamus" was consecrated by Alexander of Antioch (Theodoret, *Epist.* 110). He attended the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, when he joined the Oriental party, and was

excommunicated by Cyril (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iii. col. 599, 654). [E. V.]

DIOGENES (5) a bishop who had been twice married, but was ordained by Alexander bishop of Antioch, and Acacius bishop of Beroea. Theodoret, in a letter to Domnus bishop of Antioch, instances Diogenes amongst others as an example of this fact. (Theodoret, *Epist.* 110; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxxiii. 1305 (1180); Ceillier, x. 23.) [W. M. S.]

(6) Bishop of Cyzicus (A.D. 449-451), metropolis of the Hellespont, present at the rejected council of Ephesus A.D. 449; and at the council of Chalcedon A.D. 451, where he subscribed the confession of faith. (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 118, 601; Ceillier, x. 677 and 692.) [W. M. S.]

DIOGENIANUS, third bishop of Alby, who flourished about the year 406, is named by Gregory of Tours as one of the most illustrious bishops of his age. Quoting the words of Paulinus, presbyter, he brings forward Diogenianus amongst other most notable prelates of Aquitaine. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 3; Gregor. Turon. *Hist.* lib. ii.) [D. R. J.]

DIOGENUS (1), ST., first bishop of Geneva, lived, according to some writers, about the end of the third century, while others maintain that he is the same Diogenus who was present at the council of Aquileia in the year 381, when St. Ambrose presided. In the acts of that council the Diogenus who was present is styled "Genuensis episcopus," but for "Genuensis" some have read "Genevensis." In the ancient chart known as *Tabula Peutingeri*, as well as in the Martyrology of Ado and other writings, the confusion of names was very common, e.g., Gennaua for Geneva, or Genna, therefore it is hardly to be wondered at if we here and there find St. Diogenus of Geneva described "Genuensis episcopus." (Labbe, *Conc.* t. ii. col. 976; Mansi, t. iii. col. 602; *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 377.) [D. R. J.]

(2) ST., second bishop of Grenoble, succeeded St. Dominus about the end of the fourth century, but nothing is known of him except his name. Some think that he is the Diogenus who is supposed to have been about that time bishop of Geneva, and that therefore Geneva was within the diocesan boundaries of Grenoble. But this conjecture is overthrown by the acts of the council of Geneva, in which Diogenus, bishop of Geneva, is stated to be sitting next to Dominus of Grenoble. (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 219.) [D. R. J.]

DIOGNETUS. [EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.]

DIOMEDES, a Christian physician of Tarsus, who came to Nice in the days of Diocletian. The soldiers, sent to summon him before the emperor, found him dead, so they cut off his head and brought that. Diocletian ordered the head to be restored to the carcase. There is a legend that the soldiers had been struck blind, but, on returning the head to the trunk, recovered their sight (*Menol.* Aug. 16). [E. B. B.]

DION, proconsul of Africa in A.D. 295, under whom suffered Maximilian. Dion tried to persuade him to enlist and serve in the army; but

at last, as he persisted in refusing, had him beheaded. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc. Martyr.* p. 300; Ceillier, ii. 479.) [W. M. S.]

DIONYSA, mother of Euthymius the Solitary, wife of Paul, of Melitene on the Euphrates. She bore a son in the 4th consulship of Gratianus, A.D. 375, and dedicated him to divine service, as she had long been barren, and had prayed with her husband for a child. (Zacharias, *Vita Euthymii*; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxxvi.; Ceillier, xi. 272.) [W. M. S.]

DIONYSIA (1) virgin martyr at Lampsacus, A.D. 250. Seeing Nicomachus suddenly seized with madness and dying in horror, after having denied the faith under torture, and sacrificed to the heathen gods, Dionysia cried out, "Miserable and most wretched man! Why, for one hour's respite didst thou take to thyself unceasing and indescribable punishment!" The proconsul Optimus hearing, had her brought to him, and asked if she was a Christian. "Yes," she answered, "and that is why I weep for this unhappy man, who loses eternal rest by not being able to suffer a moment's pain." The proconsul dismissed her with a brutal order. But next day, having succeeded in maintaining her chastity, she escaped her guards, and joined Andrew and Paul, two Christians who were being stoned to death; "I wish to die with you here," she said, "that I may live with you in heaven!" Optimus, hearing what had happened, ordered her to be taken from Andrew and Paul, and beheaded. The sentence was executed May 15, A.D. 250, the second year of Decius. (Ruinart, *Act. Sinc. Mart.* p. 159; Ceillier, ii. 118.) [W. M. S.]

(2) At Alexandria A.D. 251, mother of many children, but not having loved her own children more than her Lord, died by the sword, along with the venerable old lady Mercuria, without having been tried by torture, as the prefect had succeeded so ill with Ammonarion that he was ashamed to go on torturing and being defeated by women (Dion. Alex. *ad Fab. ap. Eus. H. E.* vi. 41). [E. B. B.]

(3) ST., a Christian martyr in the 5th century. According to the narrative of Victor Vitensis, her contemporary, she was a lady of rare beauty in Africa, who preferred tortures, shameful indignities, and death to renouncing her faith; a victim of the persecution of the orthodox or Catholic Christians by Hunneric, son and successor of Genserich, king of the Vandals. Hunneric commenced his reign with clemency and toleration, but soon became a fierce persecutor of the opponents of Arianism. Dionysia was stripped and scourged before the gaze of the populace; and with her dying breath encouraged her son, Majoricus, to endure his tortures bravely, saying, "Let us keep our wedding-garment undefiled, that the Lord of the Feast may be well pleased." She is commemorated in the Roman calendar on December 6.

Baronius calls Victor, the author of the history of this persecution, bishop of Utica (*Ann. Eccles.* viii. p. 463); but Pagius in his notes on the Annals, and Chiffetius in his commentary on Victor's work (*Elucidationes ad Vit.*) make him bishop of Vita in the province of Byzacum (*ad loc. cit.*). Lizon (*ad Vit.*) denies that Victor the

historian and Victor the bishop are one and the same person. Victor himself speaks of himself as writing sixty years after the irruption of the Vandals. As that invasion was A.D. 429, the date of his book is A.D. 488 or 489. The date assigned for the martyrdom of this Dionysia is 484.

See Victor Vitensis, *de Persecutione Africanâ*, V. c. 1; ap. Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.* lvii.; Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique* (tom. xvi.), Paris, 1701, 4to.; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (tom. viii. p. 463), Lucae, 1741, fol.; Moroni, *Dizionario Ecclesiastico* (s. v.), Venezia, 1843, 8vo.; Rohrbacher, *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique*, Paris, 1868, 4to. [I. G. S.]

DIONYSIUS (1) PSEUDO-AREOPAGITA. Under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite there has passed current a body of remarkable writings, which it will be the object of the present article to discuss. But before entering on the main question, whether the author of these writings was the Dionysius converted by St. Paul (Acts xvii. 34), it will be convenient to clear the ground by discriminating each of them from a third Dionysius, the St. Denys of France. The identity of all three, as is well known, was a matter of popular belief for many centuries; and even at this day it is maintained by some writers, with as much zeal, if not as much acrimony, as the possession of the true relics of Dionysius was once contested between the monks of St. Denys and those of St. Emmeran of Ratisbon.

Was, then, the convert of St. Paul at Athens the first apostle of France? The answer would not seem doubtful from the following considerations:—(1) The antecedent improbability that a bishop of Athens, as Eusebius declares the Areopagite to have been, should be afterwards sent on a missionary journey into Gaul. (2) The fact that, when Dionysius of Corinth is writing to the Athenians, and citing the example of his namesake, their first pastor, he makes no allusion to his mission to that country, or his martyrdom there. (3) The statement of Sulpitius Severus, that the earliest martyrs for the faith in Gaul were to be found under the reign of Aurelius ("ac tum primum intra Gallias martyria visa," *Sacr. Hist.* ii. 46), i.e. after A.D. 160. (4) The circumstance that neither the old martyrologies, nor the old French chroniclers, contain any hint of the identity of the two. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. 30) fixes the coming of St. Denys into France as late as the reign of Decius, or subsequent to A.D. 250; while Usuardus, who wrote his *Martyrologium* for Charlemagne, shews the opinion prevalent in his own time, by assigning one day (Oct. 3) to the memory of the Areopagite, and another (Oct. 9) to that of the patron saint of France. Nor is it any objection to this that, in the Roman missal, the passage from Acts xvii. relating to the Areopagite is appointed as the lesson for the latter festival, as though this implied a recognition of the identity of the two. For the same reasoning, applied to the Festival of the Assumption, from which the gospel is taken from St. Luke x. 38-42, would of course imply the identity of Mary of Bethany with the Virgin Mary. In short, before the compilation of abbat Hilduin's *Areo-*

pagitica, in the reign of Louis le Débonnaire (A.D. 814-840), the identification of the two seems to have been almost undreamt of. From that period indeed the notion was eagerly accepted by French ecclesiastics, as flattering to national vanity; and Abelard, himself a monk of St. Denys, narrowly escaped with his life for opposing the popular theory. The 17th century, a century that witnessed the challenging of so many accepted traditions, was prolific in writers on both sides of this question; and it is interesting to learn that it was the very last which occupied the mind of Pascal. A dissertation on the subject has been found in manuscript among his papers (quoted by l'abbé Darraas, in the work cited below, p. xiii. n.), in which he lays down the principles that ought to guide all such discussions. Yet, even to the present hour, the associations of Montmartre and St. Denys seem to bias the judgment of Pascal's countrymen; and the conclusion of one of them respecting Dionysius, which deserves to be quoted for its epigrammatic point, may be taken as a representative of many:—"Né dans Athènes, Lutèce d'Orient, il meurt à Lutèce, Athènes d'Occident; successivement époux de deux Églises, dont l'une possédera son berceau, et l'autre, sa tombe. Montmartre vaudra la colline de Mars." (L'abbé Dulac, *inf. cit.* p. 13.)

If it has been seen from the above how extremely slender is the evidence for identifying Dionysius the Areopagite with St. Denys of France, the reasons for believing the latter to be one and the same person with the author of these writings will appear equally slight.

In the first place, their style and subject-matter all betoken a philosophic leisure, not the active life of a missionary in a barbarous country. A residence in the East is implied in the very titles of the persons to whom they are addressed: Timothy, bishop of Ephesus, Polycarp of Smyrna, St. John in Patmos, and the like. This is admitted on all hands. The attempted explanation is, that they were composed before Dionysius left Athens to seek his new commission from Clement of Rome. Let us see what this supposition leads to. From the Scholia of St. Maximus on the 10th letter, as well as from the doubtful 11th letter itself (see Dion. *Op.* ed. Migne, vol. ii. col. 574 and 700), we learn that the author was twenty-five years of age, when, in company with Apollonphanes, he witnessed at Heliopolis the supernatural darkness of the Crucifixion. Now in the *Div. Nom.* iv. § 12, he quotes the famous saying of Ignatius, when on his way to martyrdom, *ὁ ἐμὸς ἑρως ἐσταύρωται*. If we fix the martyrdom of Ignatius in A.D. 109, Dionysius must then have been at least 101 years old before he laid down the pen. But further, in the closing sentence of the treatise in which these words occur, he announces his intention of undertaking another work, on *Theologia Symbolica*. This was accordingly still in the future. In the beginning of his epistle to Titus (*Ep.* ix.), he speaks of it as finished, and sent to Timothy. A still further space of time must therefore have elapsed before Dionysius had abandoned his literary labours. And we should be thus required to suppose, if we accepted the once prevalent tradition, that the author of these writings, when now considerably more than a hundred years old, left his abode

and occupation in the East to seek at the hands of Clement (who, according to the best authorities, must have been dead some time) authority to proceed as a missionary into Gaul. Such a theory requires only to be stated for its own confutation.

After this preliminary inquiry we may approach the study of the writings themselves, considering them, for convenience, under the following heads:—(1) Their external history; (2) their nature and contents; (3) the different theories as to their date and origin; (4) their influence on later authors.

(1) It is now generally admitted that the first unequivocal mention we have of these writings is to be found in the records of the conference held at Constantinople in A.D. 532. In that year the emperor Justinian had invited Hypatius of Ephesus, and other bishops of the orthodox side, to meet in his palace the leaders of the Severians. During the course of the debate, these alleged writings of the Areopagite were brought forward by the latter party in support of their Monophysite views; and the objections made to them by Hypatius have been preserved. If genuine, he asked, how could they have escaped the notice of Cyril and others?—"illa enim testimonia, quae vos Dionysii Areopagitae dictis, unde potestis ostendere vera esse, sicut suspicamini? si enim ejus erant, non potuissent latere beatum Cyrillum," etc. So Innocentius of Maronia represents him as speaking (*Concilia*, ed. Mansi, tom. viii. col. 821); and the question put by Hypatius has never been satisfactorily answered. Supposed traces of them have been pointed out in Origen, in Dionysius of Alexandria, in Gregory Nazianzen; ingenious reasons, on the other hand, have been given to explain the concealment in which, for five centuries, they are imagined to have lain; but these have alike been confuted again and again. Still, whatever their parentage, from this appearance at Constantinople they are never lost sight of. Writers of the school which had at first objected to them soon found how serviceable to their own cause these writings might be made. And thus a chain of testimony begins to be attached to them in unbroken continuity. They are cited by Ephraem, patriarch of Antioch, who died in A.D. 546. His contemporary, John of Scythopolis, wrote scholia upon them, now confused inextricably with those of Maximus; while Leontius of Byzantium also bore witness to them towards the end of the same century. The names of Sophronius of Jerusalem (c. 629); of St. Maximus the Confessor, who died in 662, persecuted by the very sect which had at first adduced these writings; of Anastasius of Sinai (c. 680); of John of Damascus (c. 740); of Michael Syngeles, or Synellus (c. 820), the author of a Life of Dionysius; may be briefly quoted out of a much longer list, as bearing testimony to the acceptance of the Dionysian writings in the Eastern church, down to the point where the concurrent stream of evidence comes in from the West.

In the Western church we first find these writings mentioned by pope Gregory the Great (c. 590); but his manner of citing them leaves it doubtful whether he had seen or only heard of them. In his Homily on St. Luke xv. 1-10 (*Hom.* xxxiv. § 12), after comparing the nine

pieces of silver, which the woman in the parable had *not* lost, to the nine orders of angels; the tenth, or missing one, being mankind; he proceeds to quote the substance of a passage in the *Celest. Hierarchy* (vii. § 3), introducing it with the words, "Fertur vero Dionysius Areopagita, antiquus videlicet et venerabilis pater, dicere," etc. The first word here employed, *fertur*, may perhaps have been meant to convey (as a modern editor thinks) not so much a doubt about the contents of the writings themselves, as about the author's title to the name he had assumed. On the whole, it seems most natural to conclude that Gregory only knew them by report. In any case, they did not become generally known in the West till after A.D. 827. In that year Michael the Stammerer sent a copy of them to Louis le Débonnaire, the son of Charlemagne. The abbey of St. Denys, near Paris, was thought to be the most fitting receptacle for such a treasure; and its abbat, the superstitious and unprincipled Hilduin, who afterwards joined in Lothaire's rebellion against his father, had the office of compiling a collection of *Areopagitica* in honour of the event. This work, which the writer professed to have based on documents then extant, has been thought worthy of being printed; but its contents are described in equally unfavourable terms by Sirmond and by Cave. In the next reign, that of Charles the Bald, a Latin translation of all the Dionysian writings was made by the great scholar Joannes Erigena, the one who did most, after Alcuin, to keep the flame of true learning alive at the court of France. His translation is first publicly mentioned by pope Nicholas I., in a letter to Charles in A.D. 861, and is warmly praised by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in 865. "Mirandum est," the latter writes to Charles, "quomodo vir ille barbarus . . . talia intellectu capere, in aliamque linguam transferre valuerit." Not that Erigena's translation, though the only one in use for some centuries, has any pretensions to elegance, or even minute accuracy. As he himself wrote, in a metrical epistle to his royal master:—

"Mihi sat fuerit, si planos carpere sensus
Possem tardiloquus, pragmata sola sequens."

Still, no other translation was attempted till that of Joannes Sarraenus, the friend of our John of Salisbury, about A.D. 1170. This was followed, half a century later, by that of Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, only a portion of which has been printed; and later on we have the versions of Thomas, abbat of Vercelli (c. 1400), of Ambrosius the Camaldolite (c. 1436), of Picinus (c. 1492), Joachim Perionius (1555), Lamsel (1615), and Corderius (1634); the last of which is that retained in the modern edition of the Abbé Migne, Paris, 1857. When it is added that the first edition of the collected works, in the original Greek, was that which issued from the Juntine press at Florence in 1516, enough will have been said upon the external history of these writings.

(2) When we come to examine the Dionysian writings themselves, we find them to consist of four extant treatises, followed by a collection of ten letters, or fragments of letters. As they stand in the order commonly given, these are:—

A. Περὶ τῆς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας, *On the Heavenly Hierarchy*, in xv. chapters, addressed

by Διονύσιος ὁ Πρεσβύτερος to his συμ-
πρεσβύτερος, Timothy.

B. Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, in vii. chapters, to all but the first of which is appended a Θεωρία, or spiritual contemplation of the sacred rites described: similarly addressed.

C. Περὶ Θεῶν ὀνομάτων, *On the Names of God*, in xiii. chapters, also addressed to Timothy.

D. Περὶ μυστικῆς θεολογίας, *On Mystic Theology*, in v. chapters, addressed as before.

After these come four letters addressed to Γάιος θεραπευτής, one to Δωρόθεος λειτουργός, one to Σωσίπατρος ἱερεὺς, one to Πολύκαρπος ἱεράρχης, one to Δημόφιλος θεραπευτής, one to Τίτος ἱεράρχης, and a tenth and last to Ἰωάννης θεόλογος, i.e. the Apostle St. John. An eleventh letter, addressed to Apolophanes, is only found in a Latin version, said to be by Erigena, and its genuineness is all but universally denied.

Now this list of writings, from one point of view, is not only complete as an exposition of the Dionysian system, but is also in its proper order. For we may take, as an epitome of that system, the words of St. Paul with which the first sentence in the volume concludes:—"For of Him and to Him are all things" (Rom. xi. 36). God, the centre towards which all tend, and at the same time the all-embracing circumference within which all are included; the constant streaming forth from Him, like rays from the visible sun, of divine influences whereby men are purified, illumined, and drawn upwards to Himself; man's powerlessness to know the real nature and being of God, while yet he may be drawn near to Him, in the mystic communion of a loving faith: such is, very briefly, the burden of the Dionysian strain. And it is plain that, if we take the *De Divinis Nominibus* as the central portion of the writings, and treat the two *Hierarchies* as one consecutive whole (which indeed they are), we have enough to fill up the outline sketched above. In the *Celestial* and *Ecclesiastical Hierarchies*, with their ninefold orders of heavenly and of earthly ministrations, we have the means, the machinery (so to speak), whereby God communicates Himself to man. In the *Divina Nomina* we have disclosed to us, so far as can be seen through veils and shadows, the Fountain-head of all light and being, the object of all thought and desire. In the *Mystic Theology*, we have the converse of the path marked out in the *Hierarchies*, the ascent of the human soul to mystic union with God. The three great sections of the Dionysian writings, as we thus see, answer very strikingly to the three elements of which he makes his hierarchy to consist:—τάξις, ἐπιστήμη, and ἐνέργεια πρὸς τὸ θεοειδὲς ἀφοιουνμένη (*Ecol. Hier.* iii. § 1).

At the same time, we are made aware by the author of the existence of a series of treatises, still more numerous than the preceding, to one or other of which he refers in various places, as if he thought them necessary for the completion of his design. These are:—

a. Περὶ τῶν θείων ὕμνων, *On Divine Hymns* (referred to in the *Cel. Hier.* vii. § 3).

b. Συμβολικὴ θεολογία, *Symbolic Theology* (*Cel. Hier.* xv. § 6, and elsewhere).

c. Περὶ νοητῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν, *On the Objects*

of *Intellect and Sense* (*Ecol. Hier.* cap. ii. *Contempl.* § 2).

d. Θεολογικὰ ὑποτυπώσεις, *Theological Outlines* (*Div. Nom.* i. § 1).

e. Περὶ ψυχῆς, *On the Soul* (*Div. Nom.* iv. § 2).

f. Περὶ δικαίου καὶ θεοῦ δικαιοτηρίου, *On the just Judgment of God* (*Div. Nom.* iv. § 35).

To these are added by Sixtus Senensis and others—

g. Περὶ τῶν ἀγγελικῶν ιδιοτήτων καὶ τάξεων, *On the Properties and Orders of Angels* (*Div. Nom.* iv. § 2), which is probably only his *Celestial Hierarchy* under another name; and

h. Ἡ κατὰ νόμον ἱεραρχία, *The Legal Hierarchy* (supposed, apparently by some misunderstanding of the text, to be cited in *Ecol. Hier.* iii. § 10).

The question of these missing treatises is one of the most perplexing of all connected with the subject. Did they ever exist? If so, what has become of them? Peter Lamsel, in 1615, recorded the fruitlessness of his own search for them. Are they, from first to last, mere inventions of the author, designed to parry attacks on his own weak points, and to suggest the filling up of deficiencies which in reality he left unsupplied? It seems very probable; as, in point of fact, something like what might be implied in d. and f. is greatly needed, to supply the defects of Dionysius's teaching on such matters as the Incarnation, and the nature and destiny of Evil. But, if this be the true account of the case, while our respect for the intellectual completeness of the author's mind is increased, our opinion of his moral straightforwardness must be diminished. However, as he is certainly entitled to the credit of his conception of such a theological system, whether all the parts be duly filled in or not, we may set down the whole list of works, extant and missing, according to Hipler's theory of their classification; merely observing that, with the exception of a hint that the *Theological Outlines* was meant to precede the *Names of God*, and the *Symbolic Theology* to follow that treatise (*Div. Nom.* i. § 1 and xiii. § 4), there is next to nothing to shew what order was contemplated by the writer himself. Hipler's order is:—

- α'. *Mystic Theology*—an exposition of intuitive or spiritual, as opposed to dogmatic, theology.
- β'. *Theological Outlines*—including the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation.
- γ'. *On the Names of God*—the doctrine of God's being and attributes.
- δ'. *Symbolic Theology*—continuation of the preceding, with special reference to the mystical names of God found in the Bible.
- ε'. *Heavenly Hierarchy*—angelology.
- ε'. *On the Soul*—anthropology.
- ζ'. *On the Objects of Intellect and Sense*—cosmology.
- η'. *On the Legal Hierarchy*—cosmogony, and the Old Testament scheme of redemption.
- θ'. *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*—New Testament scheme of redemption.
- ι'. *On the just Judgment of God*—eschatology, and vindication of the ways of providence.

If we could consider the author as having

mapped out such a cycle as this at all completely in his own mind, he would certainly be entitled to the praise which Hipler bestows upon him, of having not only anticipated, but surpassed, the *Scientiæ Fons* of John of Damascus, that "Aquinas of the Eastern church."

It would be impossible, within the limits of this article, to attempt anything like a minute analysis of the extant works. The *Heavenly Hierarchy* opens with what sounds almost like the keynote of the whole, the text *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθῆ, κ.τ.λ.*, of St. James i. 17. The language, by the way, in which the simple words of the Apostle are expanded and paraphrased in this passage will convey no bad idea of the generally turgid style throughout:—*ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσα Πατροκινήτως φωτοφανεῖας πρόοδος, εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀγαθὸς φοιτῶσα, πάλιν ὡς ἐνποῖς δύναμις ἀνατακτικῶς ἡμᾶς ἀναπληροῖ, καὶ ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς τὴν τοῦ συναγωγῷ Πατρὸς ἐνότητα καὶ Θεοποιὸν ἀπλότητα* (*Cel. Hier.* i. § 1). To bring us to Himself, God graciously makes use of signs and symbols, and of intervening orders of ministers, by whose means we may be gradually raised to nearer communion with Him. Such an organisation is what he calls a Hierarchy,—“a sacred order, and science, and activity, assimilated as far as possible to the godlike, and elevated to the imitation of God proportionately to the Divine illuminations conceded to it” (*Cel. Hier.* iii. § 1, tr. by Westcott). The members of the Heavenly Hierarchy are the nine orders of Angels;—the term Angel being sometimes used alike of all the orders, and sometimes, in a more proper and restricted sense, of the lowest of the nine. The names of the nine orders appear to have been obtained by combining with the more obvious Seraphim, Cherubim, Archangels, and Angels, the five deduced from two passages of St. Paul, Eph. i. 21 and Col. i. 16. In each of these passages four names are mentioned, of which three (*ἄρχαι, ἐξουσίαι, κυριότητες*) are common to both, while one is peculiar to each, *δυνάμεις* to the former, *θρόνοι* to the latter. Thus, five are obtained from St. Paul; and these, blended with the four above-mentioned, make the mysterious nine. These nine are subdivided into triads, ranged thus in descending order:—

1.	Seraphim	Σεραφίμ.
	Cherubim	Χερουβίμ.
	Thrones	Θρόνοι.
2.	Dominations ..	Κυριότητες.
	Virtues	Δυνάμεις.
	Powers	Ἐξουσίαι.
3.	Principalities ..	Ἀρχαί.
	Archangels ..	Ἀρχάγγελοι.
	Angels	Ἀγγελοι.

The same list is given by Gregory the Great in the Homily above referred to (*Hom.* xxxiv. § 7), with one trifling variation in the order: a variation easily explained by a comparison of Eph. i. 21 with Col. i. 16, but which was thought of sufficient importance by Dante to be introduced into the *Divina Commedia* (*Par.* c. xxviii.). Though there is a due gradation in ministerial office, yet all the members of the Heavenly Hierarchy have the same common object, that of raising men through ascending stages of purification, illumination, and perfection, *εἰς μετοχὴν ἱερὰν καὶ μετὰδοσιν καθάρσεως ἀμυγῶν, καὶ*

θελου φωτός, καὶ τελεστικῆς ἐπιστήμης. (*Cel. Hier.* vii. § 2.) Each is as a mirror inclined to the rays of the sun, receiving light from above, and reflecting it on objects below. The light thus transmitted shines alike on all, though all have not a like capacity for receiving it. And here comes in what is one of the weak points of the Dionysian system, or rather, one of the unsatisfactory consequences of his theory. It professes to maintain the freedom of the human will (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡναγκασμένην ἔχομεν ζῶν, κ.τ.λ., *Cel. Hier.* ix. § 3); but those who accept not the divine illumination are represented as doing so, not in any active spirit of hostility, but by reason of the unfitness of their nature: ἡ τῶν νοερῶν ὕψων ἀνομοιότης τὴν ὑπερλήρη τῆς πατρικῆς ἀγαθότητος φωτοδοσίαν . . . ἀμέτεκτον ποιεῖ (*ib.*). If such a plea be admitted, if the dull earth cannot by virtue of its nature receive or reflect the light like the clear glass, the question may well arise: *Who hath resisted His will?* The problems thus introduced, of the nature of evil, and man's responsibility, though partly discussed (the former of them, at least) in a following treatise, are almost unavoidably left unsolved by one starting with the conception of Dionysius.

The *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* is the counterpart and continuation on earth of the *Celestial Hierarchy* in heaven. Its orders form indeed but the lower rounds of the same heavenly ladder, whose summit reaches upwards to the throne of God. The same triple and ninefold distinctions run through them both. What the primal Godhead is to the Celestial Hierarchy, Jesus is to the Ecclesiastical: Ἰησοῦς, ὁ θεαρχικώτατος νοῦς καὶ ὑπεροβισίος, ἡ πάσης ἱεραρχίας τε καὶ θεωργίας ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία (*Ecol. Hier.* i. § 1). And it is observable that, even in this relationship, the human name of our Saviour is always used. As was the case with the heavenly orders, but in a still greater degree, owing to their partly corporeal nature, men stand in need of signs and similitudes for their instruction. These signs and symbols, like the teaching by parables of our Lord, serve a twofold purpose; being a medium for conveying a knowledge of the truth to the holy, and a veil to hide it from the profane. Our knowledge of them is derived partly from the Scriptures, partly from oral tradition (διὰ μέσον λόγου, σωματικοῦ μὲν αὐτοτέρου δὲ ὅμως: *ib.* i. § 4). The three symbolic acts, or sacraments, of Christianity, forming the first and highest triad of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, are Baptism (ἡ ἱερὰ θεογενεσία), Communion (κοινωνία τε καὶ σύναξις), and the Consecration of the Holy Chrism (μύρον τελετή). These are discussed in chapters ii. iii. and iv. respectively. The highest rank is given to the Holy Chrism, partly because of its use being necessary in other sacred rites, and partly because of its more immediately representing to us the office of the Anointed One, Χριστός. Hence the three correspond severally to the three stages of ascent to God: Baptism setting forth our washing, or purification; Communion, our enlightening; the Holy Chrism our perfecting. In chapter v. the three orders of the sacred ministry, forming the second triad, are described, together with the manner of their consecration. The next chapter contains an account of the three orders of the last, or lowest, triad; namely, the monks, who

are in a state or process of perfection; the initiated, or holy lay people, who are in a state of illumination; and the catechumens, who are in the probationary state of purification. The seventh, and last chapter, is occupied with a description of the rites of the holy dead.

It is in this treatise that the forced and inflated style of the author is most noticeable, from the fact that the subject under treatment had its own recognised terminology. The ordinary terms are everywhere discarded, and new ones, often suggestive of the ancient mysteries, are introduced. Thus he describes Christian people as τοὺς τῆς ἱερᾶ μυσταγωγίας τὴν τελετὴν ἐξ ἱεραρχικῶν μυστηρίων καὶ παραδόσεων τετελεσμένους (*Ecol. Hier.* i. § 1). The common words for bishop, priest, and deacon are replaced by ἱεράρχης, ἱερεὺς, and λειτουργός; and in the first of these, as Casaubon remarked, he has not been content with substituting ἀρχιερεὺς for ἐπίσκοπος, but has used the inverted form ἱεράρχης. The adoption of ἱερεὺς is still more remarkable, if we suppose the titles of the various works to be genuine; for in them Dionysius writes to Timothy as πρεσβύτερος τῷ συμπρεσβυτέρῳ. In the terms also chosen to express the three stages of spiritual ascent, καθάρσις, μύσις, τελείωσις, and especially in the use of the word ἐποπτεύεσθαι (ἡ πρὸς μόνων αἰέσις τῶν πανίρων . . . ἐποπτευομένη, *Ecol. Hier.* iv. § 4), we are reminded of the heathen initiations, from which the proverbial ἐποπτεύει μοι δοκῶ had its rise. As his great preceptor, Dionysius refers in this book to Hierotheus, said by tradition to have been a convert of St. Paul in Spain (*Mariana, Annal. Hisp.* iv. 3). What precise period is indicated by the ritual thus disclosed to us is a matter beyond our limits to discuss. It may suffice to say that the best authorities consider it to point to the sixth century.

The long and important treatise *On the Names of God* (Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων) has for its subject the inquiry into what may be learnt of the being and attributes of God from the names under which He is revealed to us in holy Scripture. These names, like all other outward channels for the communication of spiritual knowledge, can reveal His real nature to us but very imperfectly. Even this knowledge is not attainable by us without prayer; which, like the golden chain of Homer, lifts us up to heaven while we seem to be drawing it down to earth; or which, like the rope thrown out to mariners from a rock, enables them to draw their ship nearer to the rock, while they pull as if they would draw the rock to them (*Div. Nom.* iii. § 1). To those who thus approach the study of God, the first thing revealed is His goodness, the far-reaching effulgence of His being, which streams forth upon all, like the rays of the visible sun (*ib.* iv. § 1). Akin to this is His divine beauty (κάλλος), which attracts and calls (καλεῖ) all things to itself. Hence its name: ὡς πάντα πρὸς ἑαυτὸ καλοῦν, ὅθεν καὶ κάλλος λέγεται (*ib.* iv. § 7). Then comes the question how—if God be so good, so beautiful, so lovely, and if these divine influences permeate all created things to their utmost—there can exist anything evil? How can that Good One have had the will to introduce it: πῶς ὁ ἀγαθὸς αὐτὸ παραγαγεῖν ἡβουλήθη; or how can there be a multitude of

demons (δαίμονια πλῆθος) inaccessible to good influences, and a cause of all evils to themselves and others? (*ib.* iv. § 18). These questions are answered consistently, if not satisfactorily. Evil is nothing real and positive, but a defect, a negation only: Στέρησις ἡρὰ ἐστὶ τὸ κακὸν, καὶ ἑλλειψις, καὶ ἀσθένεια, καὶ ἀσυμμετρία, κ.τ.λ. (*ib.* iv. § 32). As what we call cold, is but a deficiency of heat; or darkness, of light; so what we call evil is a deficiency of goodness. When the sky grows dark, as evening sets in, that darkness is nothing positive, superadded to what existed before: we are conscious of gloom merely from the disappearance of the light, which was the true existence (*ib.* iv. § 24). This subject is pursued, in a very noble train of thought, to some length, and is followed by a discussion of still other names and titles, adapted to the infirmity of human understanding, under which God's attributes are made intelligible to us. That the author is conscious of his theory of evil not being logically complete, appears manifest from his briefly referring to another supposed treatise, Περὶ δικαίου καὶ θείου δικαιοτηρίου (*ib.* iv. § 35), for a settlement of the question how far evil, being such as is described, deserves punishment at the hands of God.

Of two legends, widely known in connexion with the name of Dionysius, from their insertion in the Breviary of the Latin church, one must be briefly noticed here, as the passage containing it is found in the present work. It is to the effect that when Dionysius was present with Timothy, to whom he is writing, and James ὁ ἀδελφόθεος, and Peter, ἡ κορυφαία καὶ προεβούτῃ τῶν θεολόγων ἀκρότης, and other disciples, "for the spectacle of the body which was the beginning of life and recipient of God" (ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν τοῦ ζωαρχικοῦ καὶ θεοδόχου—*al.* φωτοδόχου—σώματος (*ib.* iii. § 2), no one but the apostles surpassed Hierotheus, his preceptor, in the inspired hymns and praises to which he gave utterance. This is commonly assumed to refer to a gathering of the apostles round the death-bed of the Holy Virgin. But the vagueness of the language will be noticed. The whole passage comes in with singular abruptness, as a sequel to one on the power of prayer. In the paraphrase of Pachymeres, the names of the apostles are left out altogether. And hence the explanation of it given by Barradas (quoted by Hipler, *ubi inf.* p. 48 n.), far-fetched as it may seem, is perhaps deserving of consideration: namely, that the gathering round the θεοτόκος really represents the assembly of believers for the reception of the Holy Eucharist, bending (as the words of one liturgy express it) "ante splendida et theodocha signa cum timore inclinati."

The short treatise on *Mystic Theology* may be described in few words, as indicating to us the means of approaching more nearly to God, previously set forth under the *Divine Names*, by reversing the procedure adopted in the Hierarchies. In them we saw a succession of manifestations, gradually becoming more symbolic and more corporeal as they descended, in indulgence to the weak and corporeal nature of man. But now, he who would aspire to a truer and more intimate knowledge of God, must rise above signs and symbols, above earthly conceptions and definitions of God, and thus advance by negation, rather than by affirmation, κατ' ἀφαί-

ρεσιν, not κατὰ θέσιν. Even in the Hierarchies (*Coel. Hier.* ii. § 3) Dionysius had spoken of ἀπόφασις as a surer way of penetrating the divine mystery than κατὰφασις. And he now enforces the same truth by an illustration which, if not taken directly from Plotinus, presents a striking parallel to one used by him—that of the sculptor, who, when striving to fashion a beautiful statue, realises his conception by chipping away the outer marble, and removing what was in fact an obstruction to his own ideal (*Myst. Theol.*, c. ii., compared with Plotinus *de Pulchritudine*, ed. Creuzer, 1814, p. 62).

Of the *Letters*, the first two are little more than detached notes on points of the *Mystic Theology*; on our ἀγνώστια of God, and His transcendent nature. The third is a short fragment on the meaning of the word ἐξαίφνης in Mal. iii. 1, "The Lord . . . shall suddenly come to his temple," and the application of that text to the Incarnation. The fourth, addressed, like the three previous ones, to the monk Caius, treats briefly of the Incarnation, and the nature of that human body with which Christ could walk upon the waters (*cf.* *Div. Nom.* ii. 9). The fifth, to Dorotheus, is on the meaning of the divine darkness (ὁ θεῖος γνόφος) spoken of in the *Mystic Theology*. The sixth, to Sosipater, teaches the important lesson, that labour is better spent in establishing truth than in confuting error. The seventh is a much longer letter, addressed to Polycarp, in which he bids him answer the taunts of the Sophist Apollonphanes, by recalling to his memory the days when he and Dionysius were fellow-students at Hierapolis, and his own remark when they beheld the darkness of the Crucifixion: ταῦτα, ὡ καλὲ Διονύσιε, θεῶν ἀμοιβὰς πραγμάτων. The exclamation attributed to Dionysius himself, as it appears in the Latin Breviary, *Aut Deus naturæ patitur, aut mundi machina dissolvitur*, or, as it is given by Syngelus in his Life, Ὁ ἄγνωστος ἐν σαρκὶ πάσχει Θεός, κ.τ.λ., is not found in the Dionysian writings themselves. The eighth letter, to a monk Demophilus, is on the duty of gentleness and forbearance; and the topic is illustrated by the recital of a dream which St. Carpus had once had in Crete. The passage in which the dream is related is one of the most striking in all Dionysius, and may be found, in an English dress, in Mr. Westcott's Essay, referred to below. The ninth, also a long letter, addressed to Titus, bishop of Crete, refers to the matters treated of in the *Symbolic Theology*. Many points are discussed in what to some would appear a strangely neologic spirit. The anthropomorphism of the Old Testament, the bold metaphors of the Song of Songs (τὰς τῶν ἁγμάτων προσόλους καὶ ἑταιρικός πολυπαθείας), and the like, can only be understood, he says, by the true lovers of holiness, who come to the study of divine wisdom divested of every childish imagination (πᾶσαν τὴν παιδαριώδη φαντασίαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν συμβόλων ἀποσκευάζομενοι). In this letter we seem to see before us a disciple of Philo. The tenth, and last, is a mere fragment, addressed to St. John the Divine, an exile in Patmos, foretelling his approaching release from confinement.

(3) *Theories as to date and authorship.*—After what has been said before, it may seem hardly necessary here to recapitulate the arguments against the genuineness of these works. The

absence of all mention or quotation of them by nearly writers, especially Eusebius and Jerome; the inflated style of language, very far removed from apostolic simplicity; the developed state of church ritual and government described in them; the allusions to later persons or events, as the martyrdom of Ignatius (*Div. Nom.* iv. § 12), and "Clement the Philosopher" (*ib.* v. § 9), who can hardly be any other than Clement of Alexandria; the alleging of "ancient tradition" (*πρὸς τῆς ἀρχαίας μνησθέντες παραδόσεως*, *Ecol. Hier.* vii. § 11) in his account of infant baptism; the use of theological terms, compounds of *obscure*, and the like, which did not come into circulation till after the council of Ephesus; these and similar reasons have been adduced by writers of opposite religious schools, and possess a cumulative force which would seem irresistible. Yet some minds are still found unconvinced by them. The late ill-fated archbishop of Paris prefixed to his translation of the writings an elaborate defence of their Dionysian origin. Still later writers have followed his steps with arguments that must sometimes provoke a smile. What can be thought of reasoning like that of the editors of the *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique* (tom. iii. 1868, p. 26), who try to obviate the conclusion drawn from the writer's use of long compound words, by pointing out that in the *Vulgate version* of the Lord's Prayer we may find a similar one: "panem nostrum *supersubstantialem* da nobis hodie!"

Passing briefly in review some other theories, in the order of the time to which they point, we may notice (1) that of Baumgarten-Crusius, who places the writer in the 3rd century, and thinks he took the name of Dionysius, as other hierophants took the name of their special divinities, to introduce the spirit of the Dionysiac mysteries into Christianity; (2) that of Baratier, who thought the author was Dionysius of Alexandria. Lequien briefly disposes of this by observing that Dionysius of Alexandria died A.D. 260, while Manicheism, which did not spring up till 277, is plainly attacked in cap. iv. of the *Div. Nom.*; (3) Pearson, influenced by a belief that a passage from these writings, and not, as is commonly thought, from Athanasius, is cited by Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* xxxviii.), places the writer in the latter part of Eusebius's time, i.e. before A.D. 340; (4) Laurentius Valla has left it on record that some Greek scholars among his contemporaries thought the writer to be Apollinaris. This opinion is quoted by Ussher and Cave, without its being settled which Apollinaris is meant. Lequien shews that he could not have been Apollinaris the elder (c. 360), as he denied a proper human soul to Christ; nor yet the younger (c. 370), who advanced millenarian theories: both of these being at variance with the teaching of Dionysius; (5) La Croze, comparing such expressions as the *πυγύλας θεότητες* of Synesius with the *πηγὴ πηγῶν ἀπασάνων* of Synesius (c. 410), concluded him to be the philosophical bishop of Ptolemais. This opinion is refuted by Brucker; (6) Lequien, after demolishing various other theories, propounds as his own the identification of him with Peter Gnapheus, or Fullo, who was made patriarch of Alexandria in A.D. 485. One of his reasons is drawn from the prominence given to the recitation of the Creed in cap. iii. of the *Ecol. Hier.*, compared

with what Peter Fullo is known to have ordained with regard to such recitation in his own see; (7) lastly, Mr. Westcott, observing that the name of Hierotheus came into prominence at Edessa towards the end of the 5th century, through the abbat of a monastery there, Bar Sadaili, composing or quoting some writings under that name, thinks that the present works "were composed A.D. 480-520, either at Edessa or under the influence of the Edessene school." The coincidence of name is, perhaps, too precarious a support to rest much upon. But the conjecture of Edessa receives some countenance from the acquaintance with Persian learning, implied in what Dionysius says about Mithras (*Ep.* vii. § 2). Gieselser pronounces the writings to have been composed in Egypt towards the close of the 5th century. Whether Alexandria or Edessa were the place, there would seem little doubt that the author was one of that philosophical band whom the edict of Justinian drove for ever from their haunts, and who had learned in the Christian faith a truer philosophy than Proclus or Damascus could teach him.

(4) *Influence on later Authors.*—To follow out this subject thoroughly would require a volume. A few brief indications must suffice. In one sense Dionysius may be called the father of scholasticism, from the influence he exercised on John of Damascus in the Eastern, and on Aquinas in the Western, church. As regards the latter, more particularly, Corderius has filled several columns (*Op.* ed. Migne i. pp. 88-96) with references only to the passages of Dionysius cited by Aquinas; adding that the angelic doctor "totam fere doctrinam theologiam ex purissimis Dionysii fontibus hausisse." The Abbé Darboy goes so far as to say that, if the writings of Dionysius were to be lost, they might be recovered piecemeal from the various works of St. Thomas. By Peter Lombard (c. 1170) he is quoted as the chief authority for the angelic orders. Hugo of St. Victor (c. 1120) wrote a commentary upon him, as did our own Robert Grosseteste a century later; the libraries of Lincoln and Corpus Christi colleges, Oxford, still possessing many of the bishop's writings on Dionysius which have never seen the light. His name was invoked by Thomas à Becket in his dying moments. Albertus Magnus, who commented upon him in the 13th century, Dionysius Carthusianus in the 15th, who calls him "theologorum principem," Tauler, Savonarola, Ficino, Pico della Mirandola—these, and many other great ones, occur to the memory at once as his disciples. In our own country, besides Grosseteste, Colet, dean of St. Paul's, was so struck with these writings that he has left a full abstract of two of them; and Grocyn, probably at his instance, lectured on them in St. Paul's Cathedral. But it is chiefly through the great poets of modern times that the influence of Dionysius is now felt. How they should come under the spell is not difficult to see. His speculations on the host of heaven would have a charm for the loftiest imagination; and so Dante sang of

"That taper's radiance, to whose view was shewn,
Clearliest, the nature and the ministry
Angelical."—*Par.* c. x.

More especially was this effect increased by the

blending in men's minds of his theory of the angelic orders with the once commonly accepted one of the concentric spheres. That these ideas did become so blended is shewn by many indications; by their sequence in the account of creation with which the great Nuremberg Chronicle begins, or by the woodcuts which adorn the *Utriusque Cosmi Historia* of the Englishman Robert Flud. Starting, as Pococke thinks, from the Sabaeans, caught up by Plato, and from him transmitted through Philo and Macrobius and a long line of others, the belief prevailed that the heavenly orbs were the seat of intelligences, easily identified with the angelic orders of Dionysius. And thus a correspondence was established between the revolving spheres of mediaeval astronomy and the ninefold hosts,

"Who in broad circle, lovelier than the rainbow,
Girdle this round earth in a dizzy motion."

Spenser, when he connected the "mighty shining christall wall," in his *Hymne of Heavenly Beautie*, with the angels who

"in their trinal triplicities

About Him wait, and on His will depend,"

bears witness to the same blending of ideas; as did that still greater poet, when, in what Hallam considers "the most sublime passage, perhaps, in Shakspeare," he described the orbs of heaven

"Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims."

But the name of Milton may suffice as one last example, patent to all, of the enduring influence of the angelic conceptions of Dionysius. Whatever other power may be exercised on modern theology by that "Tenebrio," and "Lucifuga," as Brucker and others contemptuously call him; whatever effect (and some think a great effect is to be looked for) may still ensue from these speculations of the early Greek church; there can be no doubt that the thoughts of Dionysius have been brought home to myriads who never heard his name, through him who wrote of

"Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Pow'rs."

Authorities.—Casaubon (Isaac), *de Rebus sacris Eccl. Exercitt. xvi.*, 1615 (for coincidences between Hermes and Dionysius); Hakewill (G.), *An Apologie*, 1630, pp. 208–226; Launoy (Jean), *Varia de duobus Dionysiis*, 1660; Dallaens (J.), *de Scriptis quae . . . circumferuntur*, 1666; Gale (Thos.), *Notae in Iambl. Libr. de Mysteriis*, 1678 (for coincidences between Iamblichus and Dionysius); Chifflet (P. F.), *Opuscula quatuor*, 1679; Ussher, *Dissertatio de Scriptis* . . . appended to his *Historia Dogmatica*, 1690; Morinus (J.), *Prolegomena to his Commentarius de sacris Eccl. Ordinibus*, pars ii. § 2, 1695; Lequien (M.), *Dissertatio Secunda*, prefixed to tom. i. of *Ioannis Damasceni Op.* 1712; Oudin (Casimir), *Comment. de Script. Eccl.* 1722, tom. i. pp. 48 sqq. and 1354 sqq.; Baraterius (J. P.), *Disquisitio Chronologica* (Dissert. iii.), 1740; Cave, *Script. Eccl. Hist. Literaria*, 1740; Brucker, *Hist. Crit.* tom. iii. 1766; Mosheim (J. L.), *Commentatio de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, 1767; Fabricius (J. A.), *Biblioth. Graeca*, tom. vii. 1801; Engelhardt (J. G.), *de Dionysio Areop. Plotinizante*, 1820; Baumgarten-Crusius (L. F. O.), *Opuscula Theologica*, No. xi. 1836; Meier (A.), *Areop. et Mysticorum . . . doctrinae*, 1845; Darboy (l'Abbe), *Oeuvres de St. Denys l'Areopagite*,

1845; Montet (L.), *Des Livres du Pseudo-Denys*, 1848; Gieseler (J. C. L.), *Compend. of Theol. Hist.*, tr. by Davidson, vol. ii. 1848; Pertz (G. H.), *Monumenta Germanicae Hist.* tom. xiii. 1850; Pearson (J.), *Vindiciae Epist. S. Ignatii*, 1852; Milman (Dean), *Latin Christianity*, vol. vi. 1855; Corderius (Balthasar), Notes of, with those of Halloix, Lamsel, &c., in Migne's edition of *Dionysii Op.*, 1857; Hello (E.), Article in the *Revue du Monde Catholique*, 6 Oct. 1861; Hipler (Dr. Franz), *Dionysius der Areopagite*, Regensburg, 1861; Darras (l'Abbe), *Saint Denys l'Areopagite*, 1863; Dulac (l'Abbe), *Oeuvres de Saint Denys*, 1865; Westcott (B. F.), Essay on Dionysius the Areopagite in the *Contemporary Review*, May 1867; Rohrbacher and Chantrel, *Histoire Univ. de l'Eglise Catholique*, tom. iii. 1868; Colet (Dean), *On the Hierarchies of Dionysius*, 1869; Fowler (J.), Essay on the works of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, in relation to Christian art, in the *Sacristy*, Feb. 1872. [J. H. L.]

DIONYSIUS (2) ST., apostle of France, and first bishop of Paris. Concerning his identity and era there are three principal opinions.

1. That he was Dionysius the Areopagite, formerly bishop of Athens, who came to Rome and was sent by Clement, bishop of Rome, to preach in Gaul. This is the tradition of the Greek church, and of the churches of Gaul, Germany, Spain, and Italy. The corresponding legend, shortly narrated in the Paris Martyrology, states that the companions of Dionysius were Rusticus a presbyter and Eleutherus a deacon, and that all three were put to death by the sword under Sisinnius Fescenninus, prefect of Gaul. This is the opinion of Flavius Lucius Dexter, who died in 444 (*Chronicon, Patrol. Lat.* xxxi. 270); of Hilduinus the abbat, who died in 840, and at the request of Louis the Pious wrote the life of Dionysius (*Patrol. Lat.* civ. 1327, cvi. 9); of the writer of the *Passio SS. Dionysii, Rustici, et Eleutherii*, which has been attributed wrongly to Venantius Fortunatus of Poitiers, the contemporary of Gregory of Tours, and is printed with his works (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 578); and of Hrotswitha the Nun of Gandersheim, in her poem entitled 'Historia Passionis S. Dionysii' (*Patrol. Lat.* cxxxvii. p. 1117). She died in the 10th century, and is only quoted to shew the popular opinion of her time.

2. That, although he was not the Areopagite, he was sent by Clement or the successors of the apostles. This opinion adopts the other details of the legend. It is that of the writer of a poem in honour of Dionysius which is attributed with some probability to Venantius Fortunatus of Poitiers, who had written a poem on the same subject committing himself to no opinion (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 72, 98). It is also supported by Petrus de Marca, archbishop of Toulouse and Paris, and by Pagius in his notes on Baronius.

3. That he was sent from Rome in the 3rd century, and suffered martyrdom about A.D. 250. This is the account of Sulpicius Severus, who died A.D. 410, and of Gregory of Tours who died in 595. Sulpicius says, "Under Aurelius, son of Antoninus, raged the fifth persecution. Then first were martyrdoms seen in Gaul, for the religion of God was late in coming over the Alps" (*Severi Chronicon*, ii. 32, *Patrol. Lat.* xx.

147). Gregory, in the 28th chapter of the first book of his History of the Franks, speaking of the Decian persecution, quotes the *Historia Passionis Sancti Martyris Saturnini*: "Under the consulship of Decius and Gratus, as is held in faithful recollection, the state of Toulouse began to have a bishop, St. Saturninus, her first and chief. These were the men sent: to Tours, Gatianus the bishop; to Arles, Trophimus the bishop; to Toulouse, Saturninus the bishop; to Paris, Dionysius the bishop, etc. Of these the blessed Dionysius, bishop of the Parisians, afflicted with many pains for the name of Christ, ended this present life under the sword." It is probable therefore that he died under the emperor Aurelian in A.D. 272. (Cf. *Gall. Christ.* vii. 4.)

[W. M. S.]

DIONYSIUS (3) bishop of Corinth, probably the successor of PRIMUS in that see, placed by Eusebius in his Chronicle under the year 171, as a sacred man celebrated at that time (see also Eus. *H. E.* ii. 25, iii. 4, iv. 21, 23, 35; Hieron. *Catal.* 27). He is known as the writer of certain pastoral letters, which gained so much authority in his own lifetime that heretics, as he complains, found it worth their while to put into circulation copies falsified by interpolations and omissions. Eusebius mentions having met with eight of these letters, viz., seven which he calls "Catholic Epistles," addressed to churches which are enumerated as follows: Lacedaemon, Athens, Nicomedia, Gortyna and other churches in Crete, Amastris and other churches in Pontus, Cnossus, and Rome; and one to an individual, "his most faithful sister Chrysophora." It is likely that the letters had already been collected into a volume, and that they are enumerated by Eusebius in the order in which he found them there, else he would probably have mentioned the two Cretan letters consecutively. Nothing remains of these epistles, but the short account of their contents given by Eusebius, and a few fragments of the letter to the Roman Church which, though very scanty, throw considerable light on the state of the church at the time.

The titles of the letters sufficiently indicate the unity of the Christian community. Eusebius praises Dionysius for having given a share in his "inspired industry" to those in foreign lands, as well as to those under his own immediate charge. It might not surprise us that a bishop of Corinth should consider Lacedaemon and Athens as under his metropolitan superintendence, but that he should send letters of admonition to Crete, to Bithynia, and to Paphlagonia, not only proves the reputation of the writer, but shews that the Christian churches scattered over the whole world, formed a single body. And a still more interesting proof of this is furnished by the letter to the Roman Church, which would seem to be one of thanks for a supply of money, probably brought back by some of the Corinthians who had visited Rome; and in which he speaks of it as a hereditary custom of that church from the earliest times, to send supplies to the churches in every city to relieve the poverty of the needy, and to support the brethren who were condemned to work in the mines, "a custom not only preserved, but increased by the blessed bishop of Soter, who administered their bounty to the saints, and with blessed words

exhorted the brethren that came up as an affectionate father his children." The epithet here added to the name of Soter, is usually applied to those deceased in Christ; but there are instances of its application to living persons, and Eusebius speaks of him as still bishop, when the letter of Dionysius was written. This letter is remarkable also as containing the earliest testimony that St. Peter, like St. Paul, suffered martyrdom in Italy, and at the same time.

The letters indicate the general prevalence of the episcopal form of government at the time when they were written. In the majority of them the bishop of the church addressed is mentioned with honour; Palmas in Pontus, Philip and Pinytus in Crete, Soter at Rome. The letter to the Athenians reminds them of a former bishop Publius, who had suffered martyrdom during persecutions which reduced that church to a very low condition, from which it was revived by the zeal of Quadratus, the successor of Publius. And this form of government was then supposed to date from apostolic times, for in the same letter Dionysius the Areopagite is counted as the first bishop of Athens. But the importance of the bishop seems to be still subordinate to that of the church over which he ruled. The letters, including that to Rome, are each addressed to the church, not to the bishop; and Soter's own letter, like Clement's former one, was written not in his own name, but that of his church (*ὁμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν*). The letters indeed of Dionysius himself were written in his own name, and he uses the first person singular in the passage where he speaks of them, but as if to soften any appearance of assumption adds that his letters were written at the request of brethren. Eusebius has preserved the names of two, Bacchylides and Elpistus, at whose instance the letter to the churches of Pontus was written.

The letters also illustrate the value attached by Christians to their sacred literature. Dionysius informs the Church of Rome that the day on which he wrote, being the Lord's day, had been kept holy, and that they had then read the letter of the Roman Church, and would continue from time to time to read it for their instruction, as they were in the habit of reading the letter formerly written from the same church by the hand of Clement. In the passage where he speaks of the falsification of his own letters, which he says the "apostles of the devil" had filled with "tares," he adds "It is no marvel then that some have attempted to tamper with the scriptures of the Lord, since they have attempted it on writings not comparable to them (*οὐ τοιαύταις*)."

Thus we learn that it was then customary to read sacred books in the Christian assemblies; that this practice was not limited to our canonical books, that attempts were made by men regarded as heretics to corrupt these writings, and that such attempts were jealously guarded against. It would seem that the value attached by Christians to writings was regulated rather by the character of their contents, than by the dignity of the writer; for while there is no trace that the letter of Soter thus honoured at Corinth passed beyond that church, the letter of Dionysius himself became the property of the whole Christian community. But we learn the pre-eminent authority enjoyed by certain books, called the Scriptures of the Lord, which we can-

not be wrong in identifying with some of the writings included in our New Testament. The language of Dionysius in the very brief fragments remaining, shows traces of an acquaintance with the Gospel of St. Matthew, the Acts, the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, and the Apocalypse. There is, therefore, no reason for limiting to the Old Testament the "expositions of the divine scriptures," which Eusebius tells us were contained in the letter of Dionysius to the churches of Pontus.

In speaking of attempts to corrupt the Scriptures, Dionysius probably refers to the heresy of Marcion, against which, we are told, he wrote in his letter to the Church of Nicomedia, "defending the rule of truth." We are not informed in what way he dealt with this heresy, for we cannot lay much stress on a rhetorical passage where Jerome (*Ep. ad Magnum*, 83) includes Dionysius in a list of those who had applied secular learning to the refutation of heresy, tracing each heresy to its source in the writings of the philosophers. Dionysius had probably also Marcionism in view, when he exhorted the Church of Gortyna "to beware of the perversion of heretics," for we are told that Philip, the bishop of the church addressed, had himself found it necessary to compose a treatise against Marcion. And we may suspect that we see traces of the same heresy in the subjects treated of in the letter to the churches of Pontus (the home of Marcion), to which he gave instructions concerning marriage and chastity (marriage having been proscribed by Marcion), and which he also exhorted to receive back those who returned after any fall, whether into irregularity of living or into heretical error. But the rigorist tendencies here combated were exhibited also, not only among the then rising sects of the Encratites and Montanists, but also by men of undoubted orthodoxy. In his letter to the Cossians, Dionysius exhorts Pinytus the bishop, a man highly commended by Eusebius for his piety, orthodoxy, and learning, not to impose on the brethren too heavy a burden of chastity, but to regard the weakness of the many. Eusebius reports Pinytus as replying with expressions of high respect for Dionysius, which were understood by Rufinus to imply an adoption of his views. But it would rather seem that he persevered in his own opinion, for he exhorts Dionysius in return to impart to his people some more advanced instruction, lest if he fed them always with milk instead of with more solid food, they should continue to the end of their days in the state of children.

We are not told anything of the time or manner of the death of Dionysius. It must have been before the Paschal disputes in A.D. 198, when we find Palmas of Pontus still alive, but a new bishop (Bacchylus) at Corinth. The Greek Church counts Dionysius among martyrs, and the Meneae name the sword as the instrument of his death; but there is no earlier authority for his martyrdom than Codrenus, who lived at the end of the 11th century. The Roman Church only counts him among confessors. The abbey of St. Denis, in France, claimed to be in possession of the body of Dionysius of Corinth, alleged to have been brought from Greece to Rome, and given them in 1215 by pope Innocent III. The pope's bull is given by the Bollandists under April 8th.

[G. S.]

DIONYSIUS (4), ST., sixth bishop of Vienne. He is said by Ado (*Patrol. Lat.* cxlii. 24), bishop of Vienne, who died in 875, to have lived until the reign of Helvius Pertinax, A.D. 193. But great doubt is felt about the early bishops of Vienne, Ado being the only authority. The statements of Sulpicius Severus and Gregory of Tours that Christianity was not introduced into Gaul till the 3rd century are directly contradictory to Ado. Nothing can be determined. He is commemorated on the 9th of May, according to the Bollandists. According to the MS. *Florarium Sanctorum* he is commemorated on the 7th, according to Bade on the 8th. (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 9; *A.A. SS. Bolland.* May, ii. 361.) [W. M. S.]

(5) (Cyp. *Ep.* 50.) A Novatianist who accompanied NICOSTRATUS and NOVATUS to Carthage. [E. W. B.]

(6) OF ALEXANDRIA. This "great bishop of Alexandria" (ὁ μέγας Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπίσκοπος, Euseb. *H. E.* vi.), *Praef.* and "teacher of the catholic church" (τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλος, Athan. *de Sent. Dion.* 6), was born, apparently, of a wealthy and honourable family (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11, and Valesius *ad loc.*). The date of his birth may be fixed in the last decade of the second century. He was an old man in A.D. 265 (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 27), and already ordained presbyter in A.D. 233 (Hieron. *de Vir.* iii. 69). His parents were Gentiles, and he was himself led to examine the claims of Christianity by private study (*Ep. Dion.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 7).^a His conversion cost him the sacrifice of "worldly glory" (δόξα κοσμική, ἔπαινοι ἡγεμονικοὶ καὶ βουλευτικοί, Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11);^b but he found in Origen a teacher who was well fitted to direct and determine his inquiries (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 29); and Dionysius remained faithful to his master to the last. In the persecutions of Decius he addressed a letter to him *On Persecution* (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46), doubtless as an expression of sympathy with his sufferings (c. A.D. 259); and on the death of Origen (A.D. 253), he wrote to Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea, in his praise (Steph. Gob. ap. Phot. *Cod.* 232).

Dionysius, being then a presbyter, succeeded Heraclas as head of the Catechetical School, and, as the words of Eusebius imply, at the time when Heraclas was made bishop of Alexandria on the death of Demetrius, A.D. 232-3 (Euseb. *l. c.*). He held this office till he himself was raised to the bishopric, on the death of Heraclas, A.D. 247-8, and perhaps retained it up to his death, A.D. 265. His episcopate fell during troubled times. A popular outbreak at Alexandria (A.D. 248-249) anticipated by about a year (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 41) the persecution under Decius (A.D. 249-251). Dionysius fled from Alexandria after a few days' stay; and, being afterwards taken by some soldiers, he was rescued by the timely courage of a friend, and escaped in an obscure retirement from further attacks.^c In the per-

^a The *Chronicon Orientale* (p. 94, ed. 1685) mentions the epistles of St. Paul as leading him to embrace Christianity, and states that he received baptism from Demetrius.

^b He has been spoken of as "a rhetorician," from a confusion with another Dionysius of Alexandria. Comp. Dietrich, p. 2 n.

^c *Ep. ad Domit.* et *Did.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11. This

secution of Valerian, A.D. 257, he was brought before the praefect, and banished; but he continued to direct and animate the Alexandrian church from the successive places of his exile. His conduct, on these occasions, exposed him to ungenerous criticism, and Eusebius has preserved several interesting passages of a letter (c. A.D. 258-9), in which he defends himself with great spirit against the accusations of a bishop Germanus (*H. E.* vi. 40; vii. 11). On the accession of Gallienus, A.D. 260, Dionysius was allowed to return to Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 13, 21), where he had to face fresh calamities, war, famine and pestilence, of which he has left a lively account (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 22). In A.D. 264-5 he was invited to attend the synod at Antioch, which met to consider the opinions of Paul of Samosata. His age and infirmities did not allow him to go; and he died shortly afterwards (A.D. 265) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 27, 28; Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* 69).

Dionysius took an active part in the controversies of his time, and in every case he bore himself with the same wise prudence which he shewed in meeting persecution. In this spirit he was anxious to deal gently with the "lapsed" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 42), and pressed upon Novatian^d the duty of self-restraint, for the sake of the peace of the church, A.D. 251 (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 45; Hieron. *l. c.*); and, with better results, counselled moderation in dealing with the question of the re-baptism of heretics, in a correspondence with popes Stephen and Sixtus (A.D. 256-7) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 5, 7, 9). His last letter (or letters) in the matter of Paul of Samosata, would seem to have been written in a similar strain. He charged the assembled bishops to do their duty, but he did not shrink from appealing to Paul also, as still fairly within the reach of honest argument (Theod. *Haer. Fab.* ii. 8*). In one instance at least the temperate measures of Dionysius met with immediate success. He has left under his own hand a remarkable narrative of a discussion which he held with a party of Chiliasts, in which he brought his opponents to recognise and abandon their error (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 24). His own orthodoxy, however, did not always remain unimpeached. In controverting the false teaching of Sabellius, he laid himself open to the charge of tritheism, which was brought against him by some Sabellian adversaries, and entertained at first by his namesake Dionysius of Rome. The discussion which followed brought to light one ground of the misunderstanding in the ambiguity of the words used to describe "essence" and "person," which the two bishops took in different senses. Thus Dionysius of Rome regarded the word *ὁπόστασις* as expressing the essence of the divine nature; Dionysius of Alexandria as expressing the essence of each divine person. The former

therefore affirmed that to divide the *ὁπόστασις* was to make separate gods; the latter affirmed with equal justice that there could be no Trinity unless each *ὁπόστασις* was distinct. The Alexandrine bishop had, however, used other phrases, which were seized by Arians at a later time as favourable to their views. Basil on hearsay, as it has been supposed (Lumper, *Hist. Patrum*, xiii. 86 f.), admits that he sowed the seeds of the Anomoean heresy (*Ep.* i. 9), but Athanasius with fuller knowledge vindicated the perfect orthodoxy of his predecessor. One subsidiary question of interest is connected with the dispute. It has been the fashion to represent the Alexandrine bishop as recognising the supremacy of Rome in the defence which he made. He replied indeed to the written inquiries of his namesake (Athan. *de Sent. Dionysii*, ἐπέστειλε Διονυσίῳ δηλῶσαι . . . for the use of ἐπιστέλλω see Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 46, &c.), but the fragments of his answer shew the most complete and resolute independence; and there is nothing in the narrative of Athanasius which implies that the Alexandrine bishop recognised, or that the Roman bishop claimed, any dogmatic authority as belonging to the imperial see. The synod which is said to have been held upon the subject at Rome is, as it appears, an imaginary and incorrect interpretation of the facts.^f

Dionysius was a prolific writer. Jerome (*l. c.*) has preserved a long but not exhaustive catalogue of his books, from which it appears that they were for the most part called out by special circumstances. Some important fragments remain of his treatises *On Nature* (Euseb. *Præf. Ev.* xiv. 23 ff.), and *On the Promises*, in refutation of the Chiliastic views of Nepos (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28, vii. 24, 25); of his *Refutation and Defence*, addressed to Dionysius of Rome, in reply to the accusation of false teaching on the Holy Trinity (Athan. *de Sent. Dionysii*; *de Synodis*, c. 44; *de Decr. Syn. Nic.* c. 25); of his *Commentaries on Ecclesiastes* and on *St. Luke*, and of his books *Against Sabellius* (Euseb. *Præf. Ev.* vii. 19). The fragments which have been referred to his treatise *On Martyrdom* are probably by a different hand. (Comp. Dittrich, p. 37 f.)

The fragments of the letters of Dionysius are, however, the most interesting memorial of his work and character which remains. These give a most lively picture both of the writer and of the time; and Eusebius, with a true historical instinct, has made them the basis of the sixth and seventh books of his history.

The following rough list will shew the wide ground which his correspondence covered:—

A.D. 251.—To Domitius and Didymus. Personal experiences during persecution (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11).

A.D. 251-2.—To Novatian, to the Roman Confessors, to Cornelius of Rome, Fabius of Antioch,

^f Comp. Athan. *de Sent. Dionysii*.

^g This treatise was addressed, Τιμोधέῳ τῷ παιδί (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 26), and in the account of his escape from Alexandria Dionysius speaks of οἱ παῖδες (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 40). It seems most natural to understand the word *παῖς* literally in both cases, and to believe that Dionysius was married. Comp. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, s. v., note 1. Dittrich, p. 4, maintains that the word simply describes "a scholar," and that some of his "scholars" may well have lived in his house.

letter is referred by Eusebius to the later persecution under Valerian, but evidently by mistake. Comp. Vales. *ad loc.*

^d The text of Eusebius has here, by a common error, *Novatus* for *Novatian*, but the true name is preserved by Jerome, and by Eusebius himself, vii. 8. The notion of Rufinus that two letters were written in identical terms to Novatus and Novatian is a clumsy solution of the difficulty.

^e The long letter printed in the editions of the councils (Coleti, l. 874 ff.) is certainly not authentic.

Conon of Hermopolis; and to Christians in Alexandria, Egypt, Laodicea, Armenia, on the question of discipline and repentance, with pictures from contemporary history (Euseb. vi. 41, and vii. 45).

A.D. 253-7.—To Stephen of Rome, the Roman presbyters Dionysius and Philemon, Sixtus II. of Rome on Rebaptism (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 4, 5, 7, 9).

A.D. 258-263.—To Germanus: incidents in persecution. Against Sabellians. A series of festal letters, with pictures of contemporary history (Euseb. vii. 11, 22 ff. 26).

A.D. 264.—To Paul of Samosata (vi. 40).

To these letters, of which in some cases only the titles remain, must be added an important canonical letter to Basilides, of uncertain date, in which Dionysius discusses various questions of discipline proposed to him, and especially points connected with the Lenten fast. (Comp. Dittrich, pp. 46 ff.)

All the fragments of Dionysius repay careful study. They are uniformly inspired by the sympathy and large-heartedness which he shewed in practice. His criticism on the style of the Apocalypse is perhaps unique among early writings for clearness and scholarly precision (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 25).

Dionysius is commemorated in the Roman Church on Nov. 17 (other authorities give Dec. 27), and in the Greek Church on Oct. 3.

The fragments of Dionysius were collected by Simon de Magistris (Romae, 1796); but the most accessible and complete collection of the remains of Dionysius is in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, x. pp. 1233 ff., 1575 ff., to which must be added Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.* i. 15 ff. A full monograph on Dionysius has been published by Dittrich (Freiburg, 1867), which supplements the articles in the general works of Tillemont, Marchal, Lumper, Moehler. [B. F. W.]

DIONYSIUS (7) bishop of Rome; a Greek by birth, consecrated July 22nd, A.D. 259, on the death of Xystus, in the persecution of Valerian.

Nothing is recorded of him, except his efforts against heresy. When Dionysius of Alexandria was accused of holding doctrines akin to those of Sabellius, the Roman Dionysius wrote to him, and extracted a defence of himself so satisfactory that he was declared purged of suspicion (Athanas. *Ep. de Sententiâ Dionysii*, *Opp.* i. 252). In A.D. 264, the Alexandrian and Roman Dionysii acted together with the council of Antioch, in condemning and degrading Paul of Samosata. Five years later (A.D. 269), when the same Paul was condemned again by a council at Antioch, we find a synodic letter addressed by the bishops present to the then occupants of the sees of Rome and Alexandria. The Alexandrian Dionysius had been succeeded by Maximus; Dionysius of Rome died at the end of this year (Dec. 26th, A.D. 269). [G. H. M.]

(8) One of the seven sleepers of Ephesus. (*Men. Bas.* Oct. 23.) [E. B. B.]

(9) Of Tripoli, martyr under Diocletian, one of the six young men, who, hearing of a great show at the amphitheatre of Caesarea, where Christians condemned to death were to fight, joined hands, came forward when the governor Urbanus was taking his place in the building, and

confessed themselves Christians. They were thrown into prison, and beheaded with a second Dionysius and another, March 24, A.D. 304. (Euseb. lib. *de Martyr. Palaestinae*, cap. 3; Ceillier, iii. 6.) [W. M. S.]

DIONYSIUS (10), disciple of a certain Quadratus, and martyr at Corinth, probably in the Diocletian persecution. (*Men. Basil.* March 10.) [E. B. B.]

(11) Two of this name were martyred together at Caesarea, in the reign of Diocletian. (*Men. Basil.* March 15.) [E. B. B.]

(12) Fifteenth bishop of Mainz, succeeded Ignatius, and ruled the diocese twenty-six years, in the beginning of the fourth century. (*Gall. Christ.* v. 433.) [D. R. J.]

(13) A count, deputy of the emperor Licinius at the council of Tyre, A.D. 335. He was sent to keep good order, but domineered over the assembly, arranging everything his own way, and always in favour of the Arians. Accompanied by justices, apparitors, and soldiers, he kept the door to make the bishops come in, which was the office of the deacons. When he spoke, all were silent; all obeyed him. He prevented the exit of bishops who had no business to be there; and his soldiers forced to the council bishops who made a difficulty about coming. This is the account of Athanasius. (Athanas. *Apol. cont. Arian.*, *Patrol. Lat.* xxv. 116, 147, 149, 156; Ceillier, iii. 450.) [W. M. S.]

(14) (ST.), succeeded Protasius as bishop of Milan, A.D. 346. He is connected with some obscure proceedings which took place at the council of Milan, A.D. 335. Through the urgency of the emperor Constantius, he was induced to sign a document partially condemnatory of St. Athanasius; but his name was afterwards erased, it is said by Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli. [EUSEBIUS.] His conduct was so little satisfactory to the emperor that he was banished to Cappadocia. There he died, A.D. 374; and it is said that his body was sent back to Milan, under the sanction of St. Basil, and there received with honour by St. Ambrose. (Athanasius, *Ep. ad Solitarios*; *Lib. de Synodis*; Ambrose, iii. 920, 18. 1129, 1130.) [J. Li. D.]

(15) Bishop of Lydda or Diospolis, mentioned by Jerome as a confessor in his letter to Pamachius (*Epist.* 61, §75, ad fin.). He subscribed the acts of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. ii. p. 955; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. iii. col. 584.) [E. V.]

(16) One of the monks in the monastery of Basil, archbishop of Caesarea. Basil sends him with a letter to his mother, a widow, that her son may persuade her to enter a convent on the banks of the river Iris; circ. A.D. 361. (Basil, *Epist.* 10, *Patrol. Graec.* xxxii. 271; Ceillier, iv. 429.) [W. M. S.]

(17) Commander under the emperor Theodosius II. To him John bishop of Antioch sent for execution the law which he had obtained from the emperor, and according to which the four bishops Helladius, Maximian, Alexander, and Theodoret were summoned to choose either peace with John of Antioch or exile. (*Concil. Append.* p. 876; Ceillier, viii. 248.) Alexander of Hierapolis wrote to Dionysius, asking that if he must retire, the order might be

given secretly, that he might depart without noise. (Fleury, lib. xxvi. *Ecol. Hist.* p. 879; Ceillier, viii. 380.) He is possibly the same as the Duke Dionysius, who commands in Egypt in A.D. 457, and expels Timotheus Aelurus from Alexandria after his seditious ordination to that see. (Evang. II. viii.; Ceillier, x. 176.)

[W. M. S.]

DIONYSIUS (18), eleventh bishop of Tours, is said by Joannes Maan to have died in the year 513, but there has been much contention as to the exact year of his death. He is sometimes called Divinius, Dinisius, or Dinifrius. He was a native of Burgundy, and was appointed to the bishopric of Tours by king Clodomir, who, through Dionysius, richly endowed that church. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 17; Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* §§ 105, 123, 533, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi.) [D. R. J.]

(19) Surnamed EXIGUUS, so called not from smallness in stature, but from humbleness of heart, was a Scythian by birth, who became a monk in the Western church. He flourished under the emperors Justin and Justinian in the 6th century, and to him we owe the custom of dating events from the birth of our Saviour. That birth, however, he is now acknowledged to have placed four years too late. He likewise laid the foundation of canon law by his collection of canons. He knew Latin and Greek fairly: though it is easy to see that neither was his vernacular: and as he never seems to have composed in Greek, we can only gather the extent of his acquaintance with it from his Latin translations, which indeed form the bulk of his extant works. His original Latin, to judge from the specimens we have, was strictly classical and of easy flow. Cassiodorus speaks of him in terms of praise, morally and intellectually, which he well deserves, as is shewn by his performances.

Of these we must now speak in order. It will be seen that in each case they were not original discoveries, but improvements on them.

I. The period called after him was borrowed from Victorinus of Aquitaine, who flourished 100 years earlier, and is said to have been its inventor. It is a revolution of 532 years, produced by multiplying the solar cycle of 28, and the lunar of 19 years, together. It is called sometimes "recapitulatio Dionysii." A note to § 13 of the preliminary dissertation to *L'Art de vérifier les Dates* shews how he improved on his predecessor.

His cycle was published in the last year of the emperor Justin, A.D. 527. It began with March 25, now kept as the festival of the Annunciation, as December 25 is of the Nativity; and this is the epoch from which all the dates of bulls and briefs of the court of Rome are supposed to run (Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, Oct. 15: note to the Life of St. Teresa). His first year had for its characters the solar cycle 10, the lunar 2, and the Roman indiction 4, thereby proclaiming its identity with the year 4714 of the Julian period, which again coincided with the 4th year of the 194th Olympiad, and the 753rd of the building of Rome. It was this passage in his prefatory letter to bishop Petronius, that pleaded for its adoption in every Christian land.

"Quia verò sanctus Cyrillus primum cyclum

ab anno Diocletiani centesimo quinquagesimo tertio coepit, et ultimum in ducentesimo quadragésimo septimo terminavit, nos a ducentesimo quadragésimo octavo anno ejusdem tyranni, potius quàm principis, inchoantes, nolimus circulis nostris memoriam impii et persecutoris innectere: sed magis elegimus ab incarnatione D. N. Jesu Christi annorum tempora prænotare: quatenus exordium spei nostræ notius nobis existeret: et causa reparationis humanæ, id est passio Redemptoris nostri, evidentius eluceret." (Migne, *Patrol.* lxxvii. 20; comp. Hoffman's *Hist. Cycl. Dion.* § 10-12; *ib.* pp. 462-5.)

It was adopted in Italy soon after its publication: in France perhaps a century later: in this country between the 8th and 9th. Anyhow it was ordained A.D. 816, at the synod of Chelsea, that all bishops should in future date their acts from the Incarnation.

II. In his letter to bishop Stephen, to whom he dedicates his collection of canons, he admits the existence of an earlier Latin translation, whose defects he believes led to his being asked to undertake his own. Copies of this earlier version have been printed, and named, after his naming of it, *Prisca versio* by Justellus and others. We are not actually told by him, though his words may be held to imply, what is self-evident on comparing them, that his own was not a new, but a corrected edition of that earlier version, so far as it went. What he specifies as having been translated by himself are the 50 so-called canons of the Apostles, which stand at the head of his collection: it which he admits were not universally received then. What he specifies as having been appended by himself are the Sardinian and African canons, which he says were published in Latin, and with them his collection ends. The intermediate canons are those of the councils of Nicaea, Ancyra, Neo-Cæsarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Constantinople—165 canons in all—together with 27 of Chalcedon: all of them originally published in Greek: and all, with the exception of the Laodicean, already translated in the *Prisca Versio*. The Laodicean, it should be noted, are given in an abbreviated form, and not in full, like the rest. Again, the chronological order is interrupted to place the Nicene canons first. This collection of his as speedily displaced that of the *Prisca*, as his cycle displaced that of Victorinus. Cassiodorus, his friend and patron, writes of it within a few years of his decease: "Quos hodie usu ecclesiæ Romanæ complectitur." He adds further: "Alia quoque multa ex Graeco transtulit in Latinam, quæ utilitati possunt ecclesiasticæ convenire. . . Et ut vobis in regulis fidei nulla possit nocere subscriptio, legite quæ habetis in promptu, synodum Ephesinam et Chalcedonensem, necnon et encyclica, id est, epistolas confirmationis supradicti concilii." (*De Inst. Div. Litt.* c. 23.) It is to be regretted that these several pieces have never yet been collected and published in a separate form: if it was only to distinguish what really belongs to Dionysius, from what has been attributed to Marius Mercator, a Scythian, and bilinguist likewise, but of inferior stamp. To say nothing of other pieces of minor interest, it seems certain from what Cassiodorus says, that Dionysius either translated or revised an earlier translation of the official documents of

the 3rd and 4th Councils, as well as the canons of the 1st and 2nd.

III. Dionysius, finally, published all the decretal epistles of the popes he could discover from Siricius, who succeeded Damasus, A.D. 384, to Anastasius II., who succeeded Gelasius A.D. 496. Gelasius, he says himself, he had never seen in life: in other words, that he had never been at Rome up to Gelasius's death. By the publication of this work a death-blow was given to the false decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore, centuries before their appearance.

For this, and his frankness and integrity of purpose throughout, Dionysius has never been a favourite with the ultra-Romans, and it was an evil day for them that first saw him in print. His attestation of the true text and consequent rendering of the 6th Nicene canon they could not forgive: his translating the 9th of Chalcedon into plain Latin, after suppressing the 28th, which, as it was not passed in full council he could omit with perfect honesty, they could not understand. Worst of all, was his having been the first to give publicity to the canons against transmarine appeals in the African code, and to the stand made by the African bishops against the encroachments of pope Zosimus and his successors in the matter of Apiarius; to say nothing of the exposure of their misquotations by his previous exhibition of the Sardinian canons in due form, in the language in which he avers they were published. Aloisius Vincenzi, the last writer on papal infallibility (*De Sacra Monarchia*, etc. 1875), is quite willing to throw overboard the Sardinian canons, which he holds cheap: to be able to throw after them the African code, which is a thorn in his side. [E. S. Ff.]

DIONYSIUS (20), bishop of Ascalon, who attended the synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 536, and signed the sentence passed by Peter, bishop of Jerusalem, upon the Monophysite Anthimus (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. v. 286). Moschus mentions a discussion as to the validity of baptism with sand, in the absence of water, which he decided in the negative (*Prat. Spirituale*, c. 176; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. iii. col. 600).

[E. V.]

(21) Bishop of Seleucia Pieria in the middle of the 6th century. He ordained Symeon Stylites the younger a presbyter, to gratify the wish of his disciples to receive the Eucharist at his hands. He was present at the oecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, when he gave testimony respecting Sergius bishop of Cyrus, who in his zeal for Nestorianism had placed Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodore and Diodorus of Tarsus, on the list of saints, and Nestorius himself on that of martyrs, for which acts Sergius was deposed (Labbe, *Conc.* tom. v. col. 417). He joined in the anathema against Theodore, Theodore, and Ibas (*ib.* col. 582). He is much commended in the *Pratum Spirituale*, c. 79 (Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. col. 7791).

[E. V.]

(22) Of Telmera in Caria, a writer of the 7th century. He composed a Syriac Chronicle. The *Spicilegium Romanum* (x. 223) contains some extracts from it on the ridiculous order of the emperor Phocas in A.D. 617, for the baptism of all the Jews. This order was

carried out by the officers of Phocas and by Georgius, prefect of the province. (Ceillier, xi. 813.) [W. M. S.]

DIONYSIUS (23), an imaginary bishop of Jerusalem, who, according to Praedestinatus (i. 24), opposed the Melchisedeciani. [G. S.]

DIOPETUS, first bishop of Orleans, is said to have been represented by legates at the council of Cologne in the year 346, and to have laid the foundation of the church of St. Anianus; but many learned men doubt whether there was such a council, and the building of the church is also very doubtful. It is, however, pretty certain that Diopetus lived about the middle of the 4th century (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1410).

[D. R. J.]

DIOPHANTES, correspondent of John Chrysostom; one of the four presbyters of Antioch to whom he addressed his 22nd, 62nd, 66th, 107th, 130th, and 222nd letters, in one of which praising their sufferings in defence of the truth at that town. (Joh. Chrys. *Epist.*, *Patrol. Graec.* lii.; Ceillier, vii. 133.) [W. M. S.]

DIORA (DIERA, DEORA), the thirteenth bishop of Rochester. He subscribes charters from 775 to 781; he had several grants of land, which are recorded on the Textus Roffensis, especially at Bromley and in Rochester itself. (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 132, 135, cf. 143, 144; *Ang. Sac.* i. 331.) [S.]

DIOSCORIDES, one of three boy-martyrs of Rome. [CRESCENS.] [E. B. B.]

DIOSCORUS (1) patriarch of Alexandria, succeeded Cyril in the bishopric about midsummer, in A.D. 444, receiving consecration according to one report (Mansi, vii. 603) from two bishops only. He had served as Cyril's archdeacon. Liberatus says that he had never been married. It is difficult to harmonise the accounts given us of his character. On the one hand, Theodore, whose testimony in its favour cannot be suspected, declared in a letter to Dioscorus, soon after his consecration, that the fame of his virtues, and particularly of his modesty and humility, was widely spread (*Ep.* 60); on the other hand, after he had involved himself in the Monophysite heresy, he was accused of having gravely misconducted himself in the first years of his episcopate. It was said that he had, by means of false charges, extorted money from the heirs of Cyril, in order to win popularity by lending money without interest to Alexandrian bakers and vintners, that they might "supply the people, at a low price, with the purest bread and the costliest wine" (Liberatus, *Brev.* c. 10; cf. Fleury, b. 27, c. 3). A deacon named Theodore complained, at the council of Chalcedon, that Dioscorus, on coming to the see, expelled him from his clerical office merely because he had been patronised by Cyril. "He made it his aim," said Theodore, "to expel from Alexandria, or even to put to death, not only the relatives, but even the friends of Cyril. He is a heretic—has all along been an Origenist" (in these words we catch an echo of the violence with which Theophilus, in St. Chrysostom's days, persecuted the Tall Brothers for the alleged offence of Origenism); "he has not kept clear of

bloodshed, nor of cutting down trees, nor of incendiarianism, nor of destruction of houses; and he has all along led an infamous life, as I am ready to prove" (Mansi, vi. 1008). According to another deacon, Ischyriion, Dioscorus had laid waste property, inflicted fines and exile, bought up and sold at a high price the wheat sent by the government to Libya, appropriated and grossly mispent the money left by a lady named Peristeria for religious and charitable purposes, received women of notorious character into his house, persecuted Ischyriion as a favourite of Cyril's, ruined the little estate which was his only support, sent a "phalanx of ecclesiastics, or rather of ruffians," to put him to death, and, after his escape, again sought to murder him in a hospital; in proof of which statements Ischyriion appealed to six persons, one of whom was bath-keeper to Dioscorus (Mansi, vi. 1012). According to a priest named Athanasius, Cyril's nephew, Dioscorus, from the outset of his episcopate ("which he obtained one knows not how," says the petitioner), harassed him and his brother by using influence with the court, so that the brother died of distress, and Athanasius, with his aunts, sister-in-law, and nephews, were bereft of their homes by the patriarch's malignity. He himself was deposed, without any trial, from the priesthood, and became, perforce, a wanderer for years. According to a layman named Sophronius, Dioscorus hindered the execution of an imperial order which Sophronius had obtained for the redress of a grievous wrong. "The country," he said, "belonged to him rather than to the sovereigns" (τῶν κρατούντων). Sophronius averred that legal evidence was forthcoming to prove that Dioscorus had usurped, in Egypt, the authority belonging to the emperor. He added that Dioscorus had taken away his clothes and property, and compelled him to flee for his life; and he charged him, further, with adultery and blasphemy (Mansi, vi. 1029). Accusations of this sort were made with so much readiness in that age—as the life of St. Athanasius himself indicates—that some deduction must needs be made from charges brought against Dioscorus in the hour of his adversity, and that wrongs done by his agents may have been in some cases unfairly called his acts. Still, it is but too likely that there was sufficient truth in these denunciations to demonstrate the evil effects on his character of elevation to a post of almost absolute power; for such, in those days, was the great "evangelical throne." We find him, before the end of his first year, in correspondence with pope Leo the Great, who did not miss the opportunity of giving directions, as from the see of St. Peter, to the new successor of St. Mark. He wrote, on June 21st, 445, to Dioscorus, that "it would be shocking (*nefas*) to believe that St. Mark formed his rules for Alexandria otherwise than on the Petrine model;" therefore, what we know to have been observed by "our fathers we wish (*volumus*) to be retained by you also," as to holding ordinations early on Sunday morning, and not at any other time, and repeating the eucharistic celebration on great festivals, in the church, as often as a fresh congregation might make it necessary (*Ep.* 11).

In 447 Dioscorus appears among those who were intimating their suspicion of the theo-

logical character of Theodoret, who had in the preceding controversy been so much mixed up with the party of Nestorius. It was rumoured that the bishop of Cyrrhos, preaching at Antioch, had practically taught Nestorianism; and this charge came to the ears of Dioscorus by means, says Theodoret, of "some three or four, or at the most fifteen, persons." The bishop of Alexandria, who, whatever might be his personal feeling as against Cyril's favourites, deemed himself the lawful inheritor, so to speak, of Cyril's position as guardian of anti-Nestorian orthodoxy, wrote to Domnus, bishop of Antioch, Theodoret's patriarch, to state what he had heard; whereupon Theodoret wrote to him in remonstrance (*Ep.* 83): "I was pained (excuse me, my lord, if my sorrow forces me to speak) that your godly excellence did not keep one of your ears inviolate" (from calumny). He went on to express his belief, in orthodox language; referred to Theophilus and Cyril as sanctioning the doctrine of two natures in the incarnate person of Christ; observed that "Cyril of blessed memory had often written" to him (a statement, by the way, which goes some way towards proving the spuriousness of the offensive letter about Cyril's death, which has been attributed to him), and had even desired John of Antioch to shew to him, among other Eastern theologians, certain of his own writings; whereupon, he added, "I read and admired them, and wrote to Cyril, who replied to me, bearing witness to my doctrinal accuracy and my good will." The letter ended by an anathema against all who should deny the holy Virgin to be Theotocos, call Jesus a mere man, or divide the one Son into two, and by a request that Dioscorus would pray for him and write back to him. Dioscorus did write back, but in no friendly tone; he assumed the truth of the charge against Theodoret, as if it had been proved by torture (*Theod.* *Ep.* 86). Theodoret rejoined in "gentle terms," but in vain. Dioscorus allowed Theodoret's enemies to anathematise him in open church, and even rose from his throne to echo the malediction; and, Theodoret adds, insisted on the dignity of the throne of St. Mark, as if Antioch did not possess "the throne of the great Peter." It appears also from this letter of Theodoret to Flavian of Constantinople, that Dioscorus frequently inveighed against the Eastern bishops for having accepted a letter of Proclus (whom Flavian had recently succeeded), and thereby compromised the rights of the sees of Antioch and Alexandria. At the same time, Dioscorus thought it well to send some bishops to Constantinople by way of suppressing his quarrel with Theodoret.

So stood matters when, in the November of 448, the aged Eutyches, an archimandrite of Constantinople, and a vehement enemy of Nestorianisers, who had recently written to pope Leo, and received from him a reply, on the subject of the revival of Nestorianism (*Leo, Ep.* 20), was arraigned before a council, of which Flavian was president, on the ground of maintaining an opposite error. He clung tenaciously to the phrase, "one incarnate nature of God the Word," which Cyril had used on the authority of St. Athanasius; but neglected the qualifications and explanations by which Cyril had guarded his meaning. Thus, by refusing to admit that Christ, as incarnate, had "two

natures" (although he was brought to own that, as man, Christ was "coessential with us," and freely confessed that He was "made perfect man"), Eutyches appeared to his judges to have revived, in effect, the Apollinarian heresy—to have denied the distinctness and verity of Christ's manhood; and was thereupon deprived of his priestly office, and put under excommunication. He whispered to Florentius, the "patrician," after the council had broken up, "I appeal to the Roman, the Egyptian, and the Hierosolymitan councils" (Mansi, vi. 817). His patron, and Flavian's enemy, the emperor's chamberlain, Chrysaphius, applied to Dioscorus for aid: he would support him in all his designs, if he would take up the cause of Eutyches against Flavian (Niceph. xiv. 47). Eutyches himself wrote to Dioscorus, asking him "to examine his cause" (Liberat. c. 12), and Dioscorus, as officially zealous against all anti-Cyrilline tendencies in theology, and also, doubtless, as nothing loth to strike a blow against the see of Constantinople, wrote to the emperor, urging him to call a general council, in which Flavian's judgment might be reviewed. Theodosius, influenced by his wife and his chamberlain—not by his sister Pulcheria—issued letters (March 30th, 449), ordering that each of the chief prelates (patriarchs, as we may call them, and exarchs) should repair with a certain number of their dependent bishops to Ephesus by the 1st day of August next (Mansi, vi. 587). On May 15 he wrote again, directing that an archimandrite, Barsumas, should sit in the council as representing all the Eastern archimandrites (*ib.* vi. 593), and in a third letter, premising that some Nestorianisers were trying to get Theodoret invited to the council (contrary to his intentions), he conferred on Dioscorus the presidency of the council (Mansi, vi. 600).

This council of evil memory—on which Leo afterwards fastened the name of "Latrocinium," or gang of robbers—met on August 8, 449, in St. Mary's church at Ephesus, the scene of the third general council's meeting in 431. The bishops present were 150 in number. Dioscorus presided, and next to him Julian, or Julius, the representative of the "most holy bishop of the Roman church," then Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, and—his lowered position indicating what was to come—Flavian of Constantinople (Mansi, vi. 607). The respective bishops had their notaries or clerks to take down the proceedings: and it was afterwards affirmed that the clerks of Dioscorus had cheated those of the bishop of Ephesus, had rubbed out their notes and wrenched away their inkstands (Mansi, vi. 621). Dioscorus is said to have peremptorily asked the bishop of Smyrna after his arrival at Ephesus, why he had signed the sentence against Eutyches? "I signed," said the frightened prelate, "what they offered me" (Mansi, vi. 389). The archbishop of Alexandria, in fact, shewed himself throughout a committed partisan. He did indeed propose the acceptance of Leo's letter to the council, a letter written at the same time as, and expressly referring to, the famous "Tome," a doctrinal letter to Flavian which, Tillemont thinks (xv. 559) was presented along with it (Leo, *Ep.* 44); he is said to have "sworn seven times" that it should be read; but it was only handed in, not read, Juvenal moving that

another imperial letter should be read and recorded. The president then intimated that the council's business was not to frame a new doctrinal formulary, but to inquire whether what had lately appeared—meaning, the statements of Flavian and Eusebius on the one hand, those of Eutyches on the other—were accordant with the decisions of the councils of Nicaea and Ephesus,—"two councils in name," said he, "but one in faith. The Holy Spirit sat in those assemblies (*συνηδρευσε*); therefore whoever unsettles their decisions, makes void His grace." The council answered by plaudits—"Guardian of the Faith!" (Mansi, vi. 628). Eutyches was then introduced, and made his statement, beginning "I commend myself to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the true verdict of your justice." After he had finished his address, Flavian desired that Eusebius, who had been his accuser, should be called in and heard. Elpidius, the imperial commissioner, vetoed this proposal on the ground that the judges of Eutyches were now to be judged, and that his accuser had already fulfilled his task, "and, as he thought, successfully:" to let him speak now would be a cause of mere disturbance (Mansi, vi. 645). This view of the case, however inconsistent with ordinary judicial instincts, was supported by Dioscorus. Flavian was baffled, and the council resolved to hear the acts of the synod of Constantinople which had condemned Eutyches. The episcopal deputy of Leo, with his companion the deacon Hilarus, urged that "the pope's letter" (probably including the "Tome" in this proposal) "should be read first, but this was overruled; Eutyches openly expressed his suspicion that Julius and Hilarus had been tampered with by Flavian; Dioscorus moved that the "acts" should be first read, and then the letter of the bishop of Rome. The reading began (Mansi, vi. 649). At one point Eustathius of Berytus interrupted the reader by observing that Cyril's letter to John of Antioch must be interpreted by his language on "one nature incarnate." (Mansi, vi. 676.) When the passage was reached in which Basil of Seleucia and Seleucus of Amasia had said that the one Christ was in two natures after the incarnation, a storm of wrath broke out. "Let no one call the Lord 'two' after the union! Do not divide the undivided! Seleucus was not bishop of Amasia! This is Nestorianism." "Be quiet for a little," said Dioscorus, "let us hear some more blasphemies. Why are we to blame Nestorius only? There are many Nestoriuses." (Mansi, vi. 685.) The bishop of Smyrna objected to the report of his words as given in the acts. The reading proceeded as far as Eusebius's question to Eutyches, "Do you own two natures after the incarnation?" Then arose another storm: "The holy synod exclaimed, 'Away with Eusebius, burn him, let him be burnt alive! Let him be cut in two,—be divided, even as he divided!'" "Can you endure," asked Dioscorus, "to hear of two natures after the incarnation?" "Anathema to him that says it!" was the reply. "I have need of your voices and your hands too," rejoined Dioscorus; "if any one cannot shout, let him stretch out his hand." Another anathema rang out. (Mansi, vi. 737.) Another passage, containing a statement of belief by Eutyches, was heard with applause. "We accept this statement," said Dioscorus. "This is the faith

of the fathers," exclaimed the bishops. "Of what faith do you say this?" asked Dioscorus. "Of Eutyches: for Eusebius is impious" (ἁρετής, Mansi, vi. 740). Similar approbation was given to another passage containing the characteristic formula of Eutychianism: "I confess that our Lord was of two natures before the incarnation; but after the incarnation (i.e. in Him as incarnate) I confess *one* nature." "We all agree to this," said Dioscorus. "We agree," said the council (Mansi, vi. 744). Presently came a sentence in which Basil of Seleucia had denounced the denial of two natures after the incarnation as equivalent to the assertion of a commixture and a fusion. This aroused once more the zealots of the Alexandrian party; one bishop sprang forward, shouting, "This upsets the whole church:" the Egyptians, and the monks led by Barsumas, cried out, "Cut him in two, who says two natures! he is a Nestorian!" Basil's nerves gave way; he lost, as he afterwards said, his perceptions, bodily and mental (Mansi, vi. 636). He began to say that he did not remember whether he had uttered the obnoxious words, but that he had meant to say, "If you do not add the word 'incarnate' to 'nature' as Cyril did, the phrase 'one nature' implies a fusion." Juvenal asked whether his words had been wrongly reported; he answered helplessly, "I do not recollect." (Mansi, vi. 748.) He seems to have been coerced into a formal retraction of the phrase "two natures;" but he added "hypostases" as explanatory of "natures," and professed to "adore the one nature of the Godhead of the Only-begotten, who was made man and incarnate." (Mansi, vi. 828.) Eutyches declared that the acts of the Constantinopolitan synod had been tampered with. "It is false," said Flavian. "If Flavian," said Dioscorus, "knows any thing which supports his opinion, let him put it in writing." Flavian answered, "You have debarred me from making any just allegation." Dioscorus answered that he had done nothing of the kind: "No one hinders you, and the council knows it." "We want you to speak," said the bishop of Ancyra. "Even now," said Juvenal, "let him say whatever he wishes." Flavian then said that the acts had been scrutinised, and no falsification had been found in them; that, for himself, he had always glorified God by holding what he then held. Dioscorus called on the bishops to give their verdict as to the theological statements of Eutyches. They did so, acquitting him of all unsoundness, as faithful to Nicene and Ephesian teaching. Domnus expressed regret for having mistakenly condemned him. (Mansi, vi. 836.) Basil of Seleucia spoke like the rest. Flavian, of course, was silent. Dioscorus spoke last, affirming the judgments of the council, and "adding his own opinion:" the result was that Eutyches was "restored" to his presbyteral rank and his abbatial dignity. (Mansi, vi. 861.) His monks were then released from the excommunication which they had incurred at Constantinople. The doctrinal decisions of the Ephesian council of 431, in its first and sixth sessions, were then read. Dioscorus proposed that these decisions, with those of Nicaea, should be recognised as an unalterable standard of orthodoxy: that whoever should say or think otherwise, or should unsettle them, should be put under censure. "Let

each one of you speak his mind on this." Several bishops assented. Hilarus, the Roman deacon, testified that the apostolic see revered those decisions, and that its letter, if read, would prove this. No attention was paid to this suggestion. Onesiphorus, bishop of Iconium, whispered to the prelates who sat nearest to him that this decree was simply intended to promote the deposition of Flavian. "God forbid!" replied Epiphanius of Perga; "if any one is to feel the indignation of Dioscorus, it will be Eusebius. No one will be so mad as to attempt such a thing against Flavian." (Mansi, vi. 829.) But Onesiphorus was right. Dioscorus called in some secretaries, who brought forward a draft of a sentence of deposition against Flavian and Eusebius. The ground taken was, that the Ephesian council had enacted severe penalties against any one who should frame or propose any other creed than the Nicene. Flavian and Eusebius were declared to have constructively committed this offence by "unsettling almost everything, and causing scandal and confusion throughout the churches." The practical conclusion was, that they must be deposed. (Mansi, vi. 907.) When this document had been read, Flavian said briefly, "I decline your jurisdiction:" (one does not see, Tillemont observes, why he did not say so earlier). Hilarus uttered one word in his own tongue,—*contradictur*. Onesiphorus, with some others, went up to Dioscorus, clasped his feet and knees as in supplication, and passionately entreated him not to go to such extremities. "No, by the feet of your Piety! he has done nothing worthy of deposition . . . if he deserves condemnation, let him be condemned . . . You have priests of your own, you will not for a priest's sake condemn a bishop." "Do not," said Basil, "condemn what the whole world thinks." "It must be," said Dioscorus in answer; "if my tongue were to be cut out for it, I would still say so." They persisted, and he lost all self-command: starting from his throne, he stood up on the footstool so as to dominate the whole assembly by his voice and presence: "Are you getting up a sedition? where are the counts?" Military officers, soldiers with swords and sticks, even the proconsul with chains, entered at his call. He peremptorily commanded that the bishops should sign the sentence, and with a fierce gesture of the hand exclaimed, "He that does not choose to sign must reckon with *me*." A scene of terrorism followed. Those prelates who were reluctant to take part in the deposition of Flavian and Eusebius were threatened with exile, beaten by the soldiers, denounced as heretics by the partisans of Dioscorus, and by the crowd of fanatical monks (Mansi, vii. 68) who accompanied Barsumas, until they put their names, one after another, to a blank paper on which the sentence was to be written out; fifteen, who held out longest, were kept in the sacristy of the church until evening (Mansi, vi. 601 sq. 625, 637, 988). They afterwards protested that they had signed under terror and compulsion. Basil of Seleucia declared that he had given way because he was "given over to the judgment of 120 or 130 bishops; had he been dealing with magistrates, he would have suffered martyrdom." "The Egyptians," says Tillemont, "who signed willingly enough, did so after the others had

been made to sign" (xv. 571; cf. Mansi, vi. 601).

Flavian's own fate was the special tragedy of the Latrocinium. He had lodged in the hands of the Roman delegates a formal appeal to the pope and the Western bishops (not to the pope alone; see Leo, *Ep.* 43, Tillemont, xv. 374). It was nearly his last act. He was brutally treated, kicked and beaten, by the agents of Dioscorus, and even, we are told, by Dioscorus himself. (See Evagr. i. 1; Niceph. xiv. 47.) Barsumas, it is said, stood over him and cried, "Stab him" (Mansi, vii. 68). The blows and kicks which he received were not immediately fatal; he was thrown into prison, and then sent into exile, but died while in the hands of his guards, from the effect of his injuries, three days after his deposition. "Dolore plagarum," says Liberatus, *Brev.* 19, "migravit ad Dominum," August 11, 449. He was regarded as a martyr for the doctrine of "the two natures in the one person" of Christ. (See Alban Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Feb. 17.) Anatolius, who had been the agent (*apocrisiarius*) of Dioscorus at Constantinople, was appointed his successor.

Dioscorus, desiring to obtain the acquiescence of Hilarus, tried to frighten him into attending a second session of the council. But the sturdy deacon (as he himself tells the story in a letter to Pulcheria, Leo, *Ep.* 46) succeeded in getting away from Ephesus and came "per incognita et invia loca" to Rome. Julius appears to have been less conspicuously steadfast, but to have refused assent to the deposition (Leo, *Ep.* 48). Dioscorus and his council—as we may well call it—proceeded to depose Theodoret and several other bishops; "many," says Leo, "were expelled from their sees, and banished, because they would not accept heresy." (*Ep.* 93.) Theodoret was put under a special ban. "They ordered me," he writes (*Ep.* 140), "to be excluded from shelter, from water, from everything." "The feeble Domnus of Antioch gained nothing by having retracted his former condemnation of Eutyches; he too was deposed, and Maximus was substituted for him by Anatolius (Leo, *Ep.* 104) without any decree of the clergy or people of Antioch." (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 723.) But as Leo and the council of Chalcedon afterwards recognised him (Domnus, probably, making no claim for himself), it was said in that council that his appointment was the only act of "the so-called synod"—the Latrocinium—which could be regarded as valid (Mansi, vii. 257).

The "confusion and scandal," if we may so apply Dioscorus's words in Flavian's case, which now pervaded the Eastern churches, and which might be summed up in Tillemont's phrase, "Dioscore règne partout" (xv. 589), led necessarily to efforts for a new oecumenical council. It was impossible to acquiesce in the proceedings of the "Latrocinium." Leo bestirred himself to get such a council held in Italy: the imperial family in the West supported his request, but Theodosius persisted in upholding the late council. It was in the spring of 450 that Dioscorus took a new step, which was regarded as exceptionally audacious; being at Nicaea, on his way to the court, he caused ten bishops whom he had brought with him from Egypt on this second journey, to sign a document excommunicating pope Leo (Mansi, vi. 1009, 1148; vii. 104), doubtless on

the ground that Leo was endeavouring to quash the canonical decisions of a legitimate council. His cause however was ruined when the orthodox Pulcheria succeeded to the empire on the death of her brother, and gave her hand to Marcian; this event opened the way to the assembling of a new council at Chalcedon on the 8th of October, 451.

Dioscorus is named fourth among the bishops who attended. The deputies of Leo, as representing, come first, then Anatolius, then Dioscorus, then Maximus and Juvenal. At the outset of the proceedings, Dioscorus sat first among those bishops who were placed on the right hand of the chancel. (Mansi, vi. 580.) The Roman deputies came forward from their places on the opposite side, and desired in the name of Leo, and in virtue of his instructions, that Dioscorus should not sit in the council, but should forthwith go out. The magistrates, who acted as imperial commissioners (and were the *effective* presidents), asked what was charged against him? Paschasinus, the chief Roman delegate, answered, "When he comes in" (*i.e.* after having first gone out) "it will be necessary to state objections against him." The magistrates desired again to hear the charge. Lucenius, another delegate, said, "He has presumed to hold a synod without leave of the apostolic see, which has never been done." (Rome did not recognise the "second general council" of 381; which, in fact, was not then owned as general.) "We cannot," said Paschasinus, "transgress the apostolic pope's orders." "We cannot," added Lucenius, "allow such a wrong as that this man should sit in the council, who is come to be judged." "If *you* claim to judge," replied the magistrates sharply, "do not be accuser too." Then, instead of ordering Dioscorus to go out, they bade him sit in the middle by himself, and the Roman deputies sat down and said no more. Eusebius of Dorylaeum came forward and asked to be heard against Dioscorus. "I have been injured by him: the faith has been injured; Flavian was killed, after he and I had been unjustly deposed by Dioscorus. Command my petition to the emperors to be read." "Let it be read," said the magistrates. Eusebius sat down in the middle, near Dioscorus; his petition was read by Beronicianus, the secretary of the imperial consistency. It was to this effect: "at the recent council at Ephesus, this good (χρηστός) Dioscorus, disregarding justice, and supporting Eutyches in heresy,—having also gained power by bribes, and assembled a disorderly multitude, did all he could to ruin the Catholic faith, and to establish the heresy of Eutyches, and condemned us; I desire, therefore, that he be called to account, and that the records of his proceedings against us be examined." Dioscorus, preserving his self-possession, answered, "The synod was held by the emperor's order; I too desire that its acts against Flavian may be read." "This is my request too," repeated Eusebius. But Dioscorus added, "I beg that the doctrinal question be first considered." "No," said the magistrates, "the charge against you must first be met; wait until the acts have been read, as you yourself desired." The letter of Theodosius, con-voking the late council, was read. The magistrates then ordered that Theodoret should be brought in, because Leo had "restored to him

his episcopate," and the emperor had ordered him to attend the council. He entered accordingly. The Egyptians and some other bishops shouted, "Turn out the teacher of Nestorius!" Others rejoined, "We signed a blank paper; we were beaten, and so made to sign. Turn out the enemies of Flavian and of the faith!" "Why," asked Dioscorus, "should Cyril be ejected?" (i.e. virtually, by the admission of Theodoret.) His adversaries turned fiercely upon him: "Turn out Dioscorus the homicide!" Ultimately the magistrates ruled that Theodoret should sit down, but in the middle of the assembly, and that his admission should not prejudice any charge that might be brought against him. The storm, however, was not abated until the magistrates said, in grave reproof, "These outcries do not befit bishops, nor help either side. Allow everything to be done in due order." (Mansi, vi. 592.) The reading went on; at the letter giving Dioscorus the presidency, he remarked that Juvenal, and Thalassius of Caesarea, were associated with him, that the synod had gone with him, and that Theodosius had confirmed its decrees. Forthwith, a cry arose from the bishops whom he had intimidated at Ephesus. "Not one of us signed voluntarily. We were overawed by soldiers." Their attendant clerics swelled this cry; and the Egyptians answered, "These men signed before we did; this is a council of bishops, not of clerics; turn out those who have no place here" (*τοὺς περισσοὺς*). Stephen of Ephesus told how insolently the friends of Eutyches had treated him. Thalassius pleaded that he had urged moderation. Another bishop described the scene of coercion. The Egyptians scornfully interrupted: "A Christian, a Catholic, fears no one." Dioscorus coolly said that if the bishops had not understood the merits of the case, they ought not to have signed. The reading was resumed. Flavian being named, his friends asked why he had been degraded to the fifth place? and further altercation followed as to whether the "screaming" came from the clerks of Dioscorus—who, he said, were but two,—or from others. "Read on," said the magistrates. The next interruption was in reference to the suppression, at the Latrocinium, of Leo's letter. Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople, said it had not even been "received." "But," said Dioscorus, "the acts shew that I proposed that it should be read. Let others say why it was not read." "What others?" "Juvenal and Thalassius." "No, answer for yourself." "I have said already that I proposed that it should be read." Juvenal, on being questioned, said, "The chief notary told us that he had an imperial letter; I answered that it ought to come first; no one afterwards said that he had in his hands a letter from Leo." Thalassius (evidently a weak man, though holding the great see of St. Basil) said that he had not power, of himself, to order the reading of the letter (Mansi, vi. 617). At another point, the "Orientals," the opponents of Dioscorus, objected to the way in which the acts of Ephesus had represented their words. "We did not say that." Dioscorus replied, "Each bishop had his own secretaries: I had mine; Juvenal had his, &c. There were many other secretaries of bishops, taking down the speeches." Stephen of Ephesus then narrated the violence done to his secre-

taries; Acacias of Ariarathia described the coercion-scene. When the reader came to Dioscorus's words, "I examine the decrees of the fathers" (councils), Eusebius said, "See, he said, 'I examine;' and I do the same." Dioscorus caught him up: "I said, 'examine,' not 'innovate.' Our Saviour bade us examine the Scriptures; that is not innovating." "He said, Seek and ye shall find," retorted Eusebius (Mansi, vi. 629). One bishop objected to the record of "Guardian of the faith" as an acclamation in honour of Dioscorus, "No one said that." "They want to deny all that is confessed to be the fact," said Dioscorus; "let them next say they were not there." At the words of Eutyches, "I have observed the definitions of the council," i.e., the Ephesian decree against adding to the Nicene faith, Eusebius broke in on the reading: "He lied! There is no such definition, no canon prescribing this." "There are four copies," said Dioscorus calmly, "which contain it. What bishops have defined, is it not a definition? It is not a canon: a canon is a different thing." The bishop of Cyzicus referred to the additions made in the council of 381, to the original Nicene creed (e.g., "of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary"). The Egyptians disclaimed all such additions. (Cyril, in fact, had never acknowledged that revised version of the Nicene formulæ.) There was some further criticism of the profession of faith made by Eutyches; whereupon Dioscorus said, and the words are to be remembered, "If Eutyches has any heterodox opinion, he deserves not only to be punished, but to be burnt! My only object is to preserve the Catholic faith, not that of any man. I look to God, and not to any individual; I care for nothing but my own soul and the right faith" (Mansi, vi. 633). Basil of Seleucia described what had taken place as regarded his own statements. "If you taught in such a Catholic tone," said the magistrates, "why did you sign the deposition of Flavian?" Basil, as we have seen, pleaded the compulsory authority of a council of bishops. "See," said Dioscorus, "you are condemned out of your own mouth; on your own shewing, you betrayed the faith for fear of men." Others who had given way with Basil cried out piteously, "We all sinned; we all ask pardon." "But," said the magistrates, "you said at first that you had been forced to sign a blank paper." The "peccavimus" was reiterated (Mansi, vi. 639). When the reader came to the failure of Flavian's attempt to get Eusebius a hearing, Dioscorus threw the responsibility on Elpidius: so did Juvenal; the unfortunate Thalassius only said, "It was not my doing." "Such a defence," said the magistrates, "is no defence when the faith is concerned." "If," said Dioscorus, "you blame me for obeying Elpidius, were no rules broken when Theodoret was brought in?" "He came in as accuser." "Why then does he now sit in the rank of a bishop?" "He and Eusebius sit as accusers," was the answer; "and you sit as accused" (Mansi, vi. 649). Afterwards the magistrates recurred to this topic: "Eusebius, at Constantinople, when he was accusing Eutyches, himself asked that Eutyches should be present. Why was not a like course taken at Ephesus?" No one answered (Mansi, vi. 656). Further on, after Cyril's letter to John of An-

tiouch, "Laetentur coeli," had been read as part of the acts of Ephesus, the bishops of Illyricum cried out, "We believe as Cyril did! Cyril's memory is eternal!" Theodoret, by way of clearing himself, anathematised the assertion of "two Sons." All the bishops—so the acts of Chalcedon say expressly—cried out, "We believe as did Cyril; we did so believe, and we do. Anathema to whoever does not so believe." The opponents of Dioscorus then claimed Flavian as in fact of one mind with Cyril, as clear of Nestorianism. The "Easterns" added, "Leo believes so, Anatolius believes so." There was one universal protestation of agreement with Cyril; the very magistrates joined in the shouting, and answered, as it were, for Marcian and Pulcheria. Then came a fierce outcry against Dioscorus, his opponents having thus, as they thought, established their own orthodoxy. "Out with the murderer of Flavian—the parricide!" His suffragans tried to mend matters by a loyal shout, "Many years to the senate, to the emperors!" The magistrates asked, "Why then did you receive to communion Eutyches, who holds the opposite to this belief? why condemn Flavian and Eusebius, who agree with it?" "The records," answered Dioscorus, "will shew the truth." Presently, in regard to some words of Eustathius of Berytus, adopting Cyril's phrase, "one incarnate nature," as Athanasian, the Easterns cried, "Eutyches thinks thus, so does Dioscorus." Dioscorus replied in words which shewed that he was careful to disclaim, even with anathema, all notions of a "confusion, or commixture," of Godhead and manhood in Christ. The magistrates asked whether the canonical letters of Cyril, recently read (*i.e.* his second letter to Nestorius, Mansi vi. 660, and his letter to John, *ib.* 665, not including the third letter to Nestorius, to which the 12 anathemas were annexed) bore out the language cited as from Eustathius, Eustathius himself stepped forth into the midst of the church, and held up the book from which he had taken Cyril's language. "If I spoke amiss, here is the manuscript: let it be anathematised with me!" He repeated Cyril's letter to Acacius by heart, and then explained: "One nature" did not exclude the flesh of Christ, which was co-essential with us; and "two natures" was a heterodox phrase if (*i.e.* only if) it was used for a "division" of His person. "Why then did you depose Flavian?" "I erred" (Mansi, v. 677). Flavian's own statement, that Christ was of two natures after the incarnation, in one hypostasis and one person, &c., was then considered; several bishops, in turn, approved of it, including Paschasius, Anatolius, Maximus, Thalassius, Eustathius. The Easterns called "archbishop Flavian" a martyr. "Let his next words be read," said Dioscorus; "you will find that he is inconsistent with himself." At this point Juvenal, who had been sitting on the right side, went over to the left, and the Easterns welcomed him. Peter of Corinth, a young bishop, did the same, owning that Flavian held with Cyril; the Easterns exclaimed, "Peter thinks as does" (St.) "Peter." Other bishops spoke similarly. Dioscorus, undaunted by seeing them go over from right to left, said, "The reason why Flavian was condemned was plainly this, that he asserted two natures after the incarnation. I have passages

from the fathers, Athanasius, Gregory, Cyril, to the effect that after the incarnation there were not two natures, but one incarnate nature of the Word. If I am to be expelled, the fathers will be expelled with me. I am defending their doctrine: I do not deviate from them at all: I have not got these extracts carelessly, I have verified them." (Mansi, vi. 684. On this see the note in Oxf. ed. of Fleury, vol. iii. p. 348.) After more reading, he said, "I accept the phrase 'of two natures,' but I do not accept 'two'" (*i.e.* he would not say, "Christ has now two natures"). "I am obliged to speak boldly (*ἀναρχυρεῖν*); I am speaking for my own soul." Being accused of putting Eusebius in peril of his life, he replied that he would answer that to God. "Nay, but to the laws also; why else have I come here? why have you come, if not to meet charges?" "Was Flavian," asked Paschasius, "allowed such freedom of speech as this man takes?" "No," said the magistrates, significantly, "but then *this* council is being carried on with justice" (Mansi, vi. 692). Some time later, the Easterns denied that the whole council at Ephesus had assented to Eutyches's language; it was the language of "that Pharaoh, Dioscorus the homicide." Eustathius, wishing, he said, to promote a good understanding, asked whether "two natures" meant "two divided natures." "No," said Basil, "neither divided nor confused" (Mansi, vi. 744). Basil afterwards, with Onesiphorus, described the coercion used as to the signatures (Mansi, vi. 827). The reading went on until it was necessary to light the candles (Mansi, vi. 901), at last they came to the signatures; then the magistrates proposed that as the deposition had been proved to be unjust, Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius of An-cyra, Eustathius, and Basil, as having been of chief authority in the late synod, should be deposed; but this, it appears (Mansi, vi. 976, 1041), was a provisional sentence, to be further considered by the council. It was received with applause, "A just sentence! Christ has deposed Dioscorus! God has vindicated the martyrs!" The magistrates desired that each of the bishops should give in a carefully-framed statement of belief conformable to the Nicene "exposition," to that of the 150 fathers (of Constantinople, in 381), to the canonical epistles and expositions of the fathers, Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, and Cyril's two canonical epistles published and confirmed in the first Ephesian council, adding that Leo had written a letter to Flavian against Eutyches. So ended the first session (Mansi, vi. 935).

The second session was held October 10 (Mansi, vi. 937); Dioscorus was absent. After some discussion as to making an exposition of faith, which led to the reading of the creed in its two forms—both of which were accepted—and of Cyril's "two canonical epistles," and of Leo's letter to Flavian (the Tome), which was greeted with "Peter has spoken by Leo; Cyril taught thus; Leo and Cyril have taught alike," but to parts of which some objection was taken by one bishop, and time given for consideration, the usual exclamations were made, among which we find that of the Illyrians, "Restore Dioscorus to the synod, to the churches! We have all offended, let all be forgiven!" On the other hand, the enemies of Dioscorus called out for his banishment, and

the clerics of Constantinople said that he who communicated with him was a Jew (Mansi, vi. 976). In the third session, Saturday, Oct. 13, the magistrates not being present, a memorial to the council from Eusebius of Dorylaeum, setting forth his charges against Dioscorus, was read (Mansi, vi. 985). It then appeared that Dioscorus had been summoned, like other bishops, to the session; and had sent word that he was willing to come, but that his guards prevented him. Two priests were thereupon sent to search for him, but he could not be found in the precincts of the church. Three bishops were then sent, with a notary. They found him and said to him, "The holy council begs your Holiness to attend its meeting." "I am under guard," said he; "I am hindered by the officers" (*magistrati*), the subordinates of the "master of the offices," or "supreme magistrate of the palace," see Gibbon, ii. 326). At last, after consideration, he said he would not come unless the magistrates were present; if they were to be present, he would come and reply to Eusebius. This being reported in council, Eusebius said that Dioscorus (who is still called "the most pious bishop") was resorting to evasion. A second synodical summons was then sent by the hands of three other bishops. He pleaded that he was not well, and that he must stipulate for the presence of the magistrates; he had requested the emperor to grant this. "But," said the envoys, "this is a canonical question that is raised, and laymen have no business with it. To put off coming is to strengthen your accusers." "Let other bishops," said Dioscorus, "come with me; Eusebius attacks what we did in common." "No, he accuses you individually." When the envoys returned, the council resolved to hear the petitions framed against Dioscorus by the persons referred to, at the beginning of this article, as having complained of him (Mansi, vi. 1005). Then a third summons was sent to Dioscorus; but he positively and finally refused to come. He had nothing more to say than what he had said to former envoys. They begged him to reconsider it. "If your Holiness knows that you can answer the charges of Eusebius, and of those who have to-day presented charges against you, come and rid God's holy church of a blot." "The Catholic church," said Dioscorus sternly, "has no blot; God forbid!" "But if your Holiness knows that you are falsely accused, the council is not far off; do take the trouble to come, and refute the falsehood." "What I have said, I have said; it is enough." They desisted, and reported their failure. "What will your Holinesses do?" asked Paschasius, addressing the council. "Do you order that we proceed to ecclesiastical penalties against him?" "Yes, we agree." One bishop said bitterly, "When he murdered holy Flavian, he did not adduce canons, nor proceed by church forms." "Again I ask," said Paschasius, as chief president, "what is your pleasure?" "Whatever your Holiness pleases," said Maximus: "we will vote with you." Whereupon the Roman delegates proposed a sentence, to this effect: "Dioscorus has received Eutyches, though duly condemned by Flavian, into communion. The apostolic see excuses those who were coerced by Dioscorus at Ephesus, but who are obedient to archbishop Leo" (as president) "and the council;

but this man glories in his crime. He prevented Leo's letter to Flavian—(the acts of Ephesus say the letter to the council, *v. supra*) from being read. He has presumed to excommunicate Leo. He has thrice refused to come and answer to charges. Therefore Leo, by us and the council, together with St. Peter, the rock of the church, deprives him of episcopal and sacerdotal dignity" (Mansi, vi. 1045). Anatolius, Maximus, and the others, expressed their agreement. A letter was written to Dioscorus, announcing that he was deposed for disregarding the canons and disobeying the council; his clerics, in attendance on him, received information to the same effect, and were bidden to take charge of the property of the Alexandrian church until a bishop could be appointed. Dioscorus at first made light of the sentence, and said that he should soon be restored; the council, hearing of this, put forth a declaration that the sentence was irrevocable. They wrote to the two emperors, reciting his misdeeds: (1) he had hindered Leo's letter to Flavian from being read at Ephesus; (2) he had restored the heterodox and justly deposed Eutyches to his office, in contempt of Leo's letter on Eutyches's case; (3) he had done injury to Eusebius; (4) he had received to communion persons lawfully condemned; (5) he had endeavoured to excommunicate Leo himself; (6) he had disobeyed the citations of the council (Mansi, vi. 1097). There is little more to be told. The deposition of Dioscorus was confirmed by the emperor; he was banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, and died there in 454. Proterius, archpriest of Alexandria, who adhered to the council of Chalcedon, was placed in the see of St. Mark, but never gained the good will of his people as a body; they regarded Dioscorus, though *de facto* deposed, as their legitimate patriarch; and his deposition inaugurated the great schism which to this day has divided the Christians of Egypt, the majority of whom, bearing the name of Jacobites, have always disowned the council of Chalcedon, and venerated Dioscorus as "their teacher" (Lit. Copt. St. Basil), and as a persecuted saint (see Neale, *Hist. Alex.* ii. 6). As to his theological position, there is, perhaps, little or nothing in his own words—even including those which Le Quien cites as decisive against him—which might not be so interpreted as to be consistent with orthodoxy. He might have rejected the formula, "two natures after the incarnation," not only as then deficient in authority, but as, to his mind, suggestive of Nestorianism; he might not, after all, have advisedly rejected the great doctrine which since 451 it has enshrined, *i.e.*, that the Son of God, as personally incarnate, exists in two distinct spheres of being. He might have sympathised with Eutyches for his fidelity to a dictum of Cyril; and knowing, as he well did, the manifold persistency of Nestorianisers, he might have been honestly anxious lest Cyril's work should be undone; lest the belief in the one Christ, God and Man, should be virtually superseded by the notion of a close alliance between two Christs. But it is not his theological mistakes, whatever they were, which have determined his reputation. And even as to his conduct, the charges brought by the Alexandrian petitioners at Chalcedon are too deeply coloured by passion to command our full belief: a mere profligate

oppressor would not have secured so largely the loyalty of Alexandrian churchmen; nor do we know how Dioscorus would have answered his accusers, had the magistrates come to the third session of the council to ensure order and fair play. But when we look at his public acts in 449, we cannot but see in them the perversion of considerable abilities—of courage, resolution, clear-headedness—under the temptations of excessive power and the promptings of a tyrannous self-will. The brutal treatment of Flavian, which he practically sanctioned, in which perhaps he personally took part, has made his memory specially odious; and his name is conspicuous on a tragical but admonitory list, the list of the "violent men" of church history. [W. B.]

DIOSCORUS (2), one of the presbyters of Alexandria whom Dionysius, bishop of that see, sent secretly from his enforced retreat to his episcopal city to watch over the faithful under the Valerian persecution, circ. A.D. 258. (Euseb. vii. 11; Ceillier, ii. 398; *Patrol. Graec.* xx.)

[W. M. S.]

(3) A lad of fifteen, who was brought before the governor of Alexandria in the Decian persecution, A.D. 251, with Hero, Ater, and Isidore. He tried the lad first, and sought to deceive him with fair speeches as easy to bring over, and to compel him with torments as one who would readily give in. But Dioscorus neither was persuaded nor did yield. The governor sacrificed the others most cruelly, and as they held out, delivered them to the fire; but Dioscorus, who had done brilliantly in public, and made answer most wisely to his private inquiries, he admired and let go, saying he granted him a reprieve for repentance by reason of his youth. "And now," says Dionysius, "he is with us, waiting for a longer combat and a triumph more complete" (Dion. *ad Fab. ap. Eus. H. E.* vi. 41).

This may possibly be the same as the presbyter **DIOSCORUS (2)**, the subject of the preceding article.

[E. B. B.]

(4) The eldest of the four Nitrian monks, Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, known from their stature as the "Tall Brethren," who became so conspicuous in the early stages of Chrysostom's troubles. They were reluctantly induced by Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria, to leave the desert and to submit to ordination. Eusebius and Euthymius became presbyters, and Dioscorus was consecrated bishop of Hermopolis. Wary of city life and uncongenial duties, and shocked by the avarice and other vices which a closer acquaintance had discovered in Theophilus, Dioscorus and his brethren returned to their solitudes, to the great indignation of the patriarch, who endeavoured to deter them by violent menaces (Socr. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 12). As depositaries of dangerous secrets, the brethren had become formidable to Theophilus, who resolved to wreak his vengeance upon them. A pretext was afforded by their adherence to the mystic views of Origen on the Person of the Deity, and their decided opposition to Anthropomorphism, which Theophilus had originally shared with them. On this ground Theophilus had them ejected from their monasteries, and treated them with the utmost contumely and violence on their having ventured to

Alexandria to appeal against their expulsion (Pallad. p. 54). Having procured their condemnation at a packed synod at Alexandria, A.D. 401, Theophilus personally headed a night-attack on their monastery, which was burnt and pillaged, and Dioscorus himself treated with violence and indignity (Pallad. p. 57). Driven from Egypt, the "Tall Brethren" took refuge in Palestine, but being pursued by Theophilus's untiring animosity, they resolved to appeal for protection to the emperor and to Chrysostom in person. Chrysostom manifested much sympathy with their sufferings, but exhibited a wise caution in not attempting any authoritative interference in their behalf, contenting himself with writing to Theophilus, and urging him to be reconciled with them. Theophilus's only reply was an angry remonstrance against his harbouring heretics and interfering in matters relating to another see. He also sent emissaries to Constantinople to denounce Dioscorus and his brethren as magicians, heretics, and rebels. The monks then announced their intention of appealing to the secular power for a judicial investigation of the charges against them, and demanded that Theophilus should be summoned to answer for his conduct before a council. The superstitious reverence of the empress Eudoxia, all-powerful with the feeble Arcadius, secured for them what they desired, and Theophilus was ordered to appear at Constantinople. This appeal to the civil authority was displeasing to Chrysostom, who declined to interfere any further in the controversy.

The manner in which Theophilus turned the tables on Chrysostom, becoming the accuser instead of the accused, and securing his deposition, is detailed in other articles (**CHRYSOSTOM**; **THEOPHILUS**). His main object having been accomplished in the overthrow of his great rival, Theophilus no longer made any difficulty about reconciliation with the Nitrian monks, whom he publicly restored to communion on their simple petition. It was too late, however, for Dioscorus and Ammonius to profit by this act of grace, both having been removed by death not long before. (Socr. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 16; Soz. *H. E.* lib. viii. c. 17; Pallad. p. 157.)

[E. V.]

DIOSCORUS (5), a wealthy resident at Cucusus, perhaps a former acquaintance of Chrysostom's, who gave up his house as a residence for the exiled bishop on his first arrival, going to so considerable an expense to render it suitable for his delicate health, especially in the winter, that Chrysostom had to remonstrate against his liberality (Chrysost. *Epist.* 14, § 4).

[E. V.]

(6) Bishop of Armenia, at whose request Chrysostom is said to have pronounced an eulogy on St. Gregory the Illuminator at Cucusus (Ceillier, x. 345).

[E. B. B.]

(7) Wrote to Augustine, enclosing a number of questions on Cicero and philosophy. Augustine, who was just recovering from an illness, and overwhelmed with business, wrote him a long letter, first refusing his request, and telling him such questions are obsolete, as Christian heresies are now engaging men's thoughts. But he proceeds to give him the principles of his

own philosophy, much as in his letters to Coelestinus and Consentius.

This Dioscorus is probably the same as the chief physician of that name whose conversion and baptism one Easter are related by Augustine to Apollonius (*Ep.* 227 [67]). [E. B. B.]

DIOSCORUS (8) Presbyter of the church of Alexandria, with Chaeremon, deacon, presented a request to the legates of pope Anastasius II. at the end of the 5th century, at Constantinople, to receive their church back into communion (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1283). [E. B. B.]

(9) Deacon, legate of pope Hormisdas at Constantinople, A.D. 519, with others (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1417). [E. B. B.]

(10) Antipope to Boniface II., Oct. 15, A.D. 530, died Nov. 12 the same year. The anathemas against him, published by Boniface, were burnt by Agapetus, A.D. 535 (Ceillier, xi. 114, 118). [E. B. B.]

(11) A bishop of Crete, imagined by Pseudo-Dionysius (i. 26) as an opponent of the Archontici. [G. S.]

DIRAIDH (DEORAIDH). This name assumes several forms in Irish, and it is latinised. According to Dr. Reeves (*Adamnan*, 366) it signifies an "exile," "outlaw," "pilgrim," and in the last sense is commonly found in connexion with the saints. Yet, probably in the first sense, we find it applied to St. Carthage Mochuda. In both Ireland and Scotland it has long been used as a proper name, Durie, Dewar.

(1) Of Eadardruim. Jan. 13, July 27. Among those who are given as sons of Bracan or Brychan, an Irish prince who settled in Brecknock and gave his name to the district, and thus among those who are called brothers of St. Canoc (Feb. 11) of Gallen, and St. Dabhog (Jan. 1) of Lough Derg [CANOC and DABHOG], one is called Diraidh of Eadardruim in the diocese of Elphin, where, Colgan (*Acta SS.* 313 n.¹²) says, there was formerly a monastery and now a parish church, as he has been informed by his friend bishop Egan of Elphin from the list of churches in his diocese. But Lanigan (*Ecll. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 8, § 15) doubts both the relationships and the monastery, and Diraidh's name does not appear in Rees's *Account of Brychan of Brycheiniog*. At July 27 O'Clery's opinion is divided between Diraidh bishop of Ferns, and Diraidh of Eadardruim, as to the person commemorated on that day. The latter appears to have lived about the close of the 5th century. Eadardruim is now Drum, a parish in the barony of Athlone, co. Roscommon, but no remains of a monastery exist. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 15, 205; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 193, Jan. 13; Rees, *Cambr. Brit. Saints*, 602-8.)

(2) Bishop of Ferns, July 27. He succeeded Maldogar as bishop at Ferns, A.D. 677, and died according to the *Four Masters* (by O'Donovan, i. 295) in A.D. 690, but Tighernach and the *Annals of Ulster* erroneously place his death in A.D. 493. (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* ii. 217; Lanigan, *Ecll. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 18, §§ 12, 13; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 295; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 564 n.²; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 205.) [J. G.]

DIRDAN, Welsh saint of the 5th century,

but no churches are ascribed to him. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 162.) [C. H.]

DIRUVIANUS (Stubbs, *Regist.* 153), supposed bishop of Winchester. [DUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

DIRYNIG, son of Caw, a Welsh saint of the 6th century, and brother of several other Welsh saints. It is said that there was a church dedicated to him at York. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 228.) [C. H.]

DISCIPLINA ARCANI. [DICT. OF CHR. ANT. s. v.]

DISIBODE or DISEN. [DYSIBOD.]

DIUCHOLL. This is a name of many forms, such as Dicholl, Dichuill, Dichullus, Dicull, Diucholl, Duchoill, and Duichuill: probably also as Deicola and Deicolus (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 115 n.¹⁴⁸, and *Acta SS.* 91 n.⁶; *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, Index).

(1) Dicholl, son of Neman, Dec. 25. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 92 n.⁶) says he was venerated at Killmhic-Nemain, now Kilmacrenan, co. Donegal. But like Dicoll of Rath (Nov. 1), Dichuill son of Maeldubh, of Ailridh-muilt on Loch Erne (Feb. 28), Dichuill of Achadh-na-cro (June 12), Diucholl C. of Inis-eoghain (Inishowen in Donegal) and Hermit (Dec. 18), Diucholl (Nov. 21), and Duichuill or Mo-Dichu (Nov. 17), who are given in the calendars and noticed by Colgan, there is nothing further known of him.

(2) [DICUL.]

(3) [DICULLUS.]

(4) Diucholl, of Cluain-braein, May 1. Joceline (in his *Life of St. Patrick*, c. 140) tells, in a very simple form, of a bell being lost in a particular place by one of St. Patrick's servants, and then of St. Patrick's prophesying that it would not be found till a church was being built there; after a long time a church was built there by a *religieux* named Dicullus, and the bell was found and placed in the new church, where many miracles of healing were wrought by it. This story is very much amplified and embellished in the *Tripartite Life* (cc. 94, 95), and Dicullus is called "Abbas Ernatiensis." Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 96, 115 n.¹⁴⁸, 166) thinks that this "Dicullus Abbas Ernatiensis" is most likely to have been the saint of Cluain-braein, which was near the church of Louth, but of his date or life we know nothing farther than that it was "emerso multo tempore" after St. Patrick (Lanigan, *Ecll. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 7, n.⁴⁴).

(5) Diuchoill Derg, son of Nesson, of Inis-faith-lenn, Mar. 15. O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 77) calls him one of the three sons of Nesson, prince of the royal family of Leinster; and of these three with their brethren Colgan (*Acta SS.* 609) gives a very short account [BEAN (1)]. While the other brothers had each a church or monastery for himself, these three, Muinissa, Nesslugh, and Diuchoill Derg abode together, the last-named being apparently chief among the three. The *Life of St. Maedhog* of Ferns says St. Diuchoill was one of his disciples and abbat of a monastery, which was called Cluain-Dicholla Gairbh, or Dicholla Gairbir; it is now Clonmore, a parish in the baronies of

Bantry and West Shelmaliere, in the county of Wexford. The three brothers flourished in the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th centuries, and were specially venerated at Inis-mac-Nessan, or Inis-faithlenn, now Ireland's Eye, off Howth, co. Dublin. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 92 n. 6, 211, 217 n. 24, 609; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 14, § 10; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 95-6; Petrie, *Round Towers of Ireland*, 177-8; *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, pp. lvi-vii.; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 104, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

DIUMA (DWINA), first bishop of the Mercians, was a Scot (Irish) by birth, and was under bishop Finan at Lindisfarne; his name assumes a great variety of forms, like Dina, Duina, Dwina, Diuma, and Diurna. When Peada, eldest son of Penda, pagan king of the Mercians, had come to the court of Oswy the Northumbrian king, embraced the Christian faith, and married Alchfleda, Oswy's daughter, he carried back to Mercia four priests, three being Saxons, and the fourth Diuma a Scot. Afterwards when Penda was overthrown on the banks of the Aire, A.D. 655, and Peada ruled over Mercia under Oswy his liege-lord and father-in-law, the gospel spread, and Diuma was consecrated bishop of the Mercians, of the people of Lindsey, and of the Middle-Angles, by bishop Finan. During the short time he lived as bishop, and had his seat at Repton, the capital of Mercia, he wrought zealously and with great success, though of his special acts we have no information. He died shortly after (A.D. 655) among the Middle-Angles, "in the country called Feppingum," and was buried there, being succeeded by Cellach, another Scot. (For the notice of Diuma, the chief authority is Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. cc. 21-24; see also Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iv. 112-5, 121, Edinb. 1861; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 15, § 15; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 84-5; Hardwick, *Middle Age*, 10, 13-4; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 324; Churton, *Early English Hist.* 66; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 208-9; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 165.) Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 489 n. 46) places him among the monks of St. Columba, and notices the great variety in his festival, Ferrarius putting it on 16 Nov., Hugo Menard on 19 June, Dempster on 22 Feb., *Martyrol. Anglic.* on 19 July, and Camerarius on 1 Aug. [J. G.]

DIUS (1), the 31st bishop of Jerusalem, c. A.D. 190. He succeeded Narcissus when he had left Jerusalem and concealed himself in the deserts, on account of the slanderous charges brought against him. He held the see but a short time, and was followed by Germanion (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 10; Epiphani. *Haer.* 66, p. 637; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* tom. iii. p. 147.) [E. V.]

(2) Presbyter of Alexandria, martyred with bishop Peter, in the Diocletian persecution (Eus. *H. E.* viii. 13). [E. B. B.]

(3) Commemorated in the *Menology*, July 19, as a monk of Antioch, who founded a monastery at Constantinople, and when visited at the point of death by the patriarchs ATTICUS and ALEXANDER, A.D. 413-421, recovered for fifteen years. [E. B. B.]

DIVIANUS, DIVINIANUS, DIUUANUS, DIWANUS, missionary to Britain. [DUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

DIVINITY OF CHRIST. [CHRISTOLOGY.]

DIVITIANUS, ST., bishop of Soissons. The church of Soissons is said to have been founded by St. Sixtus, first bishop of Rheims, who constituted St. Sinicius as his coadjutor. To St. Sinicius succeeded his grandson Divitianus, of whose life there is no record further than has been already stated. He is thought to have died a confessor, and the Sammarthani state that his body was buried in the basilica of St. Crispin Major, or rather perhaps in the place where the basilica was afterwards built. That basilica and the abbey of the order of St. Benedict, vulgò St. Crispin the Great, are situate above the city of Soissons on the river Aisne. Divitianus lived about the beginning of the 4th century, and is commemorated on the 5th of October (A.A. *SS. Boll.* Oct. iii. 28; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 334; Flooardi *Historia*, Patrol. Lat. cxxxv.).

[D. R. J.]

DIZYAS. A church in Alexandria was dedicated to him (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69, p. 728).

[G. S.]

DOBAN—April 12. He is invoked in the Litany of Dunkeld among the confessors and monks, and said by Camerarius and Dempster to have been a companion of St. Bonifacius the apostle of Germany, but Camerarius calls St. Boniface, instead of Doban, 'Episcopus Trehe-tensis.' In Willibald's *Life of St. Boniface* he is called the fellow-soldier and chorepiscopus of St. Boniface, whom he aided in preaching, baptizing, &c., and who, when feeble with age, associated St. Doban with himself in the episcopate of the city of Trehet (Treves). Dempster places him in A.D. 751, which cannot be far from the truth, and on Dec. 23; Camerarius on April 12. (Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 220; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 129; Bishop Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, pp. lx. 224, 324; Canisius, *Thes. Mon. Eccl.* ii. 246.) [J. G.]

DOBDA (DUBHDA)—April 15. This saint is entered in the *Martyrologies of Donegal and Tallaght*, simply as Dubhda and Dubta, and there we have no further means of tracing his history. But there is one of the same name and race, and it may be the same person, who calls for our attention. In the *Life of St. Fergal* or Virgilius, bishop of Salzburg in Upper Austria, it is related that when St. Fergal became bishop, he concealed his own orders for two years, and had an Irish bishop with him to discharge all episcopal functions. (See FERGAL, for the probable explanation of the arrangement.) This Irish bishop is called Dobda, also Dobbagreus, and Dobbagreus, or Dobbán the Greek. He had probably been monastic bishop in the monastery of Salzburg, when St. Fergal was abbat, and received the name of "Greek" from a misinterpretation of the Irish "Dubhda-chrich," a name we find in the *Four Masters*, or of "Dubh-da-crich," that is, Dubh of the two countries, as he may have been called when he went to Germany. The Bollandists give the name of Dubta among the praetermissi of April 15. (Todd, *St. Patrick*, 64-7; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 19, § 12; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 340 n.; Ussher, *Syloge*, Ep. 16, wks. iv. 462; Mabillon, *Acta SS.* O. S. B. tom. iii. 331; Bolland. *Acta SS.* April. tom. ii. 367.)

Lanigan adds that, according to some accounts, Dobda was placed as bishop at Chiem (Chiempsee

in Upper Bavaria) by the Duke Otilo, and established there a school, which was frequented by a great number of students, but as this must have taken place before A.D. 748, and St. Fergal was appointed bishop of Salzburg in A.D. 756, he questions whether this was done at least by Otilo.

[J. G.]

DOCETAE. (The word is written *δοκίται* by the oldest authorities, Clem. Alex. and Hippolytus, followed by later writers in such a way as to shew that the itacism was not introduced by transcribers, but existed from the first.) The tenet that Christ's body was not real flesh and blood, but merely a phantom body, was held in some of the earliest heretical sects and was common to a great many of them; but the use of the name **DOCETAE** as the common appellation of those who held it does not appear to be earlier than Theodoret, who speaks (*Ep.* 82, iv. 1142) of "Marcion Valentinus Manes and the other Docetae." We consider this doctrine under the title **DOCE TISM**; in this article we confine ourselves to the name **Docetae** regarded as the recognised appellation of a separate sect. Very numerous as are the heretical teachers to whom the name **Docetae**, as we understand it, may be correctly applied, the use of the name as the distinctive title of a sect is very rare. Epiphanius, Philaster, and their followers, though they seem to have delighted in multiplying the names of heretical sects, have not the name **Docetae** in any of their lists. Yet there was at the end of the second century a sect which had assumed this name. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 17, p. 900) classifying the names of heretical sects according as they were derived from those of their founders or otherwise, mentions as one of the sects called from their peculiar dogmas, that of the **Docetae**. Elsewhere (*Strom.* iii. 13, 552) he calls **JULIUS CASSIANUS** the founder of Docetism (*ὁ τῆς δοκίσεως ἐξάρχων*), and as the *thing* Docetism was certainly more ancient than Cassianus it would seem that we are to understand that it was the *name* Docetism which Cassianus first adopted to denote the characteristic doctrine of his sect. Serapion, bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 12) mentions the **Docetae**, and states that there was in use among them a gospel called that of Peter, containing passages which favoured their erroneous opinions. Clement bears testimony to the use by Cassian of a gospel different from our four, but gives the name of the "Gospel according to the Egyptians," to one which contained the passages quoted by Cassian. The fullest account of the **Docetae** of the second century is in the *Refutation of Hippolytus* (viii. 8, 262; x. 16, 324). The difference deserves to be remarked that whereas Serapion describes them as "those whom we call **Docetae**," Hippolytus twice mentions that these sectaries gave this name to themselves. It is remarkable that Hippolytus gives no indication that he knew on what grounds they assumed this appellation. He himself sarcastically derives it from the beam (*δοκός*) in the eye of these false teachers unconscious of their blindness. In the account of Hippolytus no prominence is given to their doctrine concerning our Lord's body, and that doctrine, as

he expounds it, is not, in our sense of the word, docetic. These are the grounds on which we have separated the articles **DOCETAE** and **DOCE TISM**; not thinking ourselves entitled to assume that it was their doctrine concerning the Lord's body from which these heretics derived a name which may be explained by more than one other hypothesis. But whatever the name **Dokesis** may have meant in the intention of those who used it as the distinctive title of their doctrine, the consequence was drawn from it by the orthodox that it imputed unreality to our Lord's person and work; and so the name seems to have conveyed the same idea in the controversies of the second century as at the present day. (Irenaeus IV. xxxiii. 5, 271; V. i. 2, 292; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 17, 558.) We proceed now with the account which Hippolytus gives of the system of those whom he calls **Docetae**. The question suggests itself whether the docetic author whom he abstracts may not be Julius Cassianus; but as far as the scanty materials for comparison enable us to form a judgment, our answer is in the negative; the docetic author of Hippolytus being more mystical than the Cassianus of Clement, and certainly not a person from whom a sober work on chronology might be expected. We are inclined to pronounce the **Docetist** of Hippolytus to be a comparatively late writer (that is to say, who wrote about the beginning of the last quarter of the second century), who combines elements from more than one earlier system: but there is always some uncertainty when, in the absence of external evidence, we attempt to make a history of the growth of any of the Gnostic systems, or to assign their relative priority. The docetic writer in his account of the origin of the universe reminds us first of the system of Basilides as described by Hippolytus. That system commences with a non-existent God, who deposits the seed of the world: in the docetic system the God who is the first principle of all existence though not actually non-existent, is described as infinitesimally small, and is himself the seed of the fig-tree, diminutive in size, but containing within it infinite potentialities. The mention of the fig-tree suggests to the writer various scripture allusions, to the tree which furnished the leaves wherewith our first parents clad themselves, to the tree which our Lord cursed, to the tree to which the keeper of the vineyard came three times, vainly seeking for fruit. He goes on to expound that the seed when it began to develope itself necessarily did so in three forms, stem, leaves and fruit; and so he teaches that the next stage in the progress of the universe was the production of three aeons who served as the principles of further growth; but these aeons are not, as the illustration would suggest, beings different in their character and properties. They are said to differ from each other in nothing but position; that which was nearest the primal seed Deity having the greatest productive power, the second having less, the third, as most removed, having least of all. The comparison of the growth of the universe to that of a tree is to be found also in the system of Simon (*Hipp. Ref.* vi. 9, p. 164). The doctrine which the **Docetist** grounds on it as to the triplicity which reigns through nature is to be found also in the system of the **Naassenes** (*Ref.*

v. 6, p. 95), that of the Peratae (v. 12, 124) and other kindred systems. But the closest contact in this respect is with that of those whom Hippolytus calls Sithians; and it seems on other grounds likely that the book which Hippolytus describes under the name of the paraphrase of Seth was used and esteemed by the docetic author. At least there is common to the two an argument on which two persons could not have hit independently—viz. the doctrine of triplicity just mentioned is proved from the fact that Moses (Deut. v. 22) mentions three "words of God," darkness, gloom, and tempest (σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα), and "he added no more," that is to say, according to the Docetist, God added not to the three aeons. We consider that the docetic system as here compared with the related systems has marks of posteriority. In the Ophite systems the threefold division has its explanation in the theories of the systems themselves. It expresses the result of a philosophic speculation, which discovers in man or in nature, three elements distinct in character (such for instance as the νοερόν, ψυχικόν and χολικόν), and refers their origin to three unlike principles. But it is quite arbitrary that the mutually resembling aeons of the docetic system should be exactly three: for anything in the system itself they might as well have been ten or thirty, and the number three seems to have been adopted from previously current theories. To proceed with the docetic theory; the three aeons go on to develop themselves and arrive at perfection. Perfection consists in the number ten, and so the three aeons become thirty. Further, that which, as nearest the primal Deity, had the greatest productive power, the "immeasurable one," measured himself ten times in greatness, so becoming a hundred; the second, "the incomprehensible," comprehended himself sixfold, thus becoming sixty; while the third or external aeon being removed to an infinite distance by the growth of his brethren, considered himself in thought three times, and thus becoming thirty, bound himself as an eternal^a bond of union. No title is given to the third aeon, but analogy would lead us to conjecture his title to be some such name as Anennoetus, a name which we find with Acataleptus (Irenaeus, I. xi. 5, 56) in the terminology of one of the Valentinian systems. Although in the preceding we have a set of thirty aeons divided into three tens, yet later on (p. 268) we have the quite inconsistent Valentinian division into a more excellent ogdoad an intermediate decad and a lower dodecad. In fact, in this docetic system of aeons, all like each other, little stress is laid on their number, and presently we find their development proceeding to an infinity of bisexual aeons. The writer goes on to lay a foundation for his Christology by teaching that the aeons being all in harmony and union, coalesced into a single aeon in the midst, and there begat of one virgin a joint offspring, the Saviour of all; and this offspring is described as having a right to the title Monogenes, and as being coequal in power with the fig-seed, that is to say with the primal Deity, in every respect save that he was begotten, the latter unbegotten. In other words

the docetic writer agreed with the orthodox in making the Saviour equal with God. It has been already remarked that this docetic system is clearly post-Valentinian, and the account of the birth of the joint offspring of the aeons completely agrees with the Valentinian account of the birth of the joint fruit of the Pleroma (Irenaeus, I. ii. 6, 12); see Irenaeus's account of the controversy on this point among the Valentinians (I. xii. 4, 58). Except that in the docetic system the harmony of the aeons does not contrast with any preceding discord.

The account of the development of the universe as thus far given has found no place for the material world. The aeons whose genesis has been related, are objects not of sense but of intelligence (ἡ νοητὴ φύσις). We refer to the article Gnosticism for a discussion of the theories concerning a supersensible world common to several Gnostic sects, merely remarking here that in order to understand such speculations it is necessary to know what account the system of philosophy which the speculators received gave concerning the meaning of general terms; what answer, for instance, it gave to the question what is the relation between that which is denoted by the word man or animal and the actually existing Socrates or Diogenes. In this docetic system the origin of the material world is ascribed to the action on the underlying darkness of the kingdom of light, and especially of its outside member, the third aeon. The light sends forth innumerable ideas of various living creatures; these being caught by the chaos beneath give it form and assume consistence, and so are the cause of all that has come into being here. It was in order to check the dragging down into the darkness of the forms (χαρακτῆρες) of light that the third aeon, knowing the power of the darkness and the simple and bountiful nature of light, placed the firmament to separate between the light and darkness, and "He called the light which was above the firmament day, and the darkness He called night." But not only had the innumerable ideas of the third aeon been caught by the darkness, but the figure of the third aeon himself similarly impressed, had given origin to the "Great Archon" (a name found also in the Basilidian system); that which in the aeon had been pure light becoming in the archon fire. It is to be noted that in the Clementine Homilies light and fire are always opposed in the same manner as good and evil. This fiery god is He who spoke to Moses from the bush (Σάρας), by which it is explained we are to understand the dark air, the medium through which the ideas of light had passed downwards, and through which all sounds and savours are still transmitted. This fiery god is the Demiurge who made the world, as Moses has told; and up to our Saviour's coming he had ill-used the characters of light detained in the darkness, causing a continual wandering of souls. For the souls (ψυχαι) are the ideas which had cooled^b down in the darkness (ἀποψυγεῖσαι), and

^a The word αἰώνιος seems to be used more than once with designed ambiguity.

^b This derivation is given in Plato's Cratylus, and is also mentioned by Aristotle, *De Anima*, I. 2, 34. Origen entertained the same idea of the soul having cooled down from the heat of a previous existence (*De Princ.* II. 8, 3), for which notion he is censured by Epiphanius. (*Haer.* 64, 5, 528, and *Ep. ad Joann. Hier.* II. 314.)

these souls are constrained to abide in the darkness wandering from body to body under the guardianship of the Demiurge. In scripture proof of this are quoted, Job ii. 9, LXX, and Matt. xi. 14. This transmigration continued till the Saviour's Incarnation, since when faith is preached for the remission of sins. The Saviour desiring to liberate these prisoned souls, and knowing that the aeons could not abide the sight of Him who was the fulness of all the aeons, contracted himself into a small body. Just as the light of vision contracted under the eyelids goes forth as far as the stars of heaven and returns under the eyelids when it wills; and though thus going everywhere and traversing all things is invisible to us who see only the outward organs of vision; so the only begotten Son contracted himself and arraying himself after the form of each of the aeons [compare the account given of the descent of our Lord in the Ascent of ISAAH], passed into this lower world unseen, unknown, and not believed on. And in order that he might array himself here in the outer darkness also, that is to say in flesh, an angel who accompanied him from above made the annunciation to Mary, as it is written in the gospels. And from this point the docetic story of the Saviour's earthly life, which ought to be compared with the Basilidian story (*Ref. vii. 27, 243*), goes on in full conformity with the gospels. But it adds that our Lord at His baptism received in the water a form and impress of the body born of the Virgin. [It is probable that we are here not to understand Mary, but that the reference is to the birth from the Virgin mentioned in the earlier part of this myth.] The Saviour received this body in order that when the Archon had condemned to death the flesh which was his own formation, the Saviour's soul having stripped off the fleshly body and having left it nailed to the cross, triumphing thereby over principalities and powers, might yet not be found naked, being arrayed in the body received at the baptism. Thus we find that the Docetism of this system applied only to our Lord's resurrection body. It was admitted that during His earthly life He had a body of flesh, but it was denied that this body of flesh was exalted to heaven. And so Hippolytus tells of the system of Basilides (*v. 27, 244*), that it represented the Saviour's work to be the making separation between elements previously mingled together, His own bodily part given back to the formlessness whence it had sprung, and the higher elements of His nature returning to the regions whence they had taken their origin. With this should be compared the doctrine of the Sethites (*v. 21*; see also Irenaeus, I. xxx. 13, 112); and that of Apelles (*Hipp. vii. 38, 260*). There does not seem any ground for asserting that the doctrine of Casianus was more docetic than that which has been described, or that however low his views concerning matter, he denied that the Saviour temporarily inhabited a body of flesh.

It remains to mention one other point of the docetic doctrine which seems intended as the foundation of a theory of conciliation of different sects. It was taught that the Saviour had arrayed himself in the ideas of each of the thirty aeons, appearing in one of each, each of the thirty years he was on earth. Now the prisoned souls whom

he came to liberate included ideas from each of the thirty aeons; each of these souls then recognises in Jesus a kindred nature in which the only begotten had arrayed himself. But these forms are different; and this is why so many sects emulously seek Jesus, for He is indeed related to all, but each believes that that is the only one who is related to themselves; Him they recognise as a brother and deem all the rest as bastards. And those who derive their nature from the lower aeons cannot see the Saviour's ideas which are above them; but those who spring from the highest aeons, the middle decad or the most excellent ogdoad, whence these Gnostics claimed to derive their own descent, know the entire Jesus, and are the only ones who, as being from above, are perfect, all the rest having but partial knowledge. It seems a mark of lateness, that whereas the older Gnostics divided mankind into three classes, corresponding no doubt to the unconverted world, ordinary Christians, and the instructed Gnostics, this theory recognises a subdivision of each of these classes into a variety of sects.

Möller (*Kosmologie*, 334), who gives a full account of these Docetae, and Lipsius (*Gnosticismus* in Ersch and Gruber, 290) consider that the name Docetae is to be accounted for by this theory concerning the different seeming aspects of Jesus to different souls. But this appears to us very doubtful, though we have not confidence to put forward any other conjecture as better: such, for instance, as that the theory represented the whole material world as seeming compared with the supersensible realities. The fact is that the attention of Hippolytus does not seem to have been caught by that part of the theory on which the name is founded, and so he has not supplied us with information to justify any positive assertion on this point. [G. S.]

DOCETISM, the doctrine that our blessed Lord had a body like ours, only in appearance, not in reality. The rise of this notion was very early. St. Jerome scarcely exaggerates when he says (*Adv. Lucif. 23*) that "while the apostles were still surviving, while Christ's blood was still fresh in Judaea, the Lord's body was asserted to be but a phantasm." Not to speak of New Testament passages, such as Eph. ii. 9, Heb. ii. 14, which have been used in confutation of this assertion, but which do not bear clear marks of having been written with a controversial purpose, it appears from 1 John iv. 2, 2 John 7, that at the time when these epistles were written there were teachers stigmatised by the writer as prompted by the spirit of anti-christ, who denied that Jesus Christ had come *in the flesh*, a form of expression implying that these teachers maintained a Docetic theory. As soon as Christianity included among its disciples men of culture who sought to frame for themselves a theory of the universe, combining what they were willing to adopt from the gospel with the philosophy in which they had been brought up, one of the questions to which they first addressed themselves was that of the origin of evil. And the solution which found most favour with men of this class was that evil resulted from the inherent fault of matter; and they represented the deliverance of men's souls from the dominion of matter as the great work which

the Saviour came to accomplish. They found it then impossible to believe that the Saviour could be himself under the dominion of that evil from which he came to deliver men, and they therefore rejected the church's doctrine of a real union of the divine and human natures in the person of our Lord. But it is remarkable, as shewing how generally a belief in our Lord's pre-existence and superhuman nature was regarded as an essential part of Christianity, that it was on the doctrine of his perfect humanity that the main assaults were made, the opinion that he was mere man holding a very subordinate place in Gnostic teaching. This is said to have been the doctrine of the Ebionites, a sect which did not extend beyond the limits of Judaism; but with two exceptions, or perhaps even only one, all the sects known as Gnostic ascribed to the Saviour a superhuman nature, some however separating the personality of that nature from his human personality, others reducing our Lord's earthly part to mere appearance. The exceptions are JUSTINUS, who is only known to us from the account of his system given by Hippolytus at the end of his fifth book, and who of all the Gnostics teaches the lowest doctrine concerning our Lord. With him Jesus is but an ordinary shepherd-boy until at the age of twelve he receives and obeys the message of an angel; and even then it is not stated that any higher nature was communicated to him. Among the Gnostics described by Irenaeus, the only one who is said to have held that our Lord was a man like others, is CARPOCRATES. It is even doubtful whether we are not to understand in a technical sense the statement that he taught that "power" from the Father had descended on our Lord; that is to say, whether it was not his doctrine that one of the heavenly powers had united itself to the man Jesus. Teaching of this kind is unequivocally attributed to CERINTHUS, whose other doctrines, as reported by Irenaeus, have great resemblance to those of Carpocrates. It is possibly on account of this resemblance of doctrine that Irenaeus, followed in this respect by later heresiologists, places Cerinthus out of chronological order next after Carpocrates. Cerinthus is said to have rejected the doctrine of the miraculous conception, and to have taught that Jesus was, according to the ordinary course of human birth, the son of Joseph and Mary; that he differed from other men only as being unusually righteous and wise; that on his baptism Christ had descended on him in the form of a dove; that he had been thereby enabled to preach the supreme God and to work miracles; that before his crucifixion Christ withdrew himself, leaving Jesus to suffer and to rise again, while Christ, as being a spiritual being, remained impassible. It is in opposition to the theory which makes our Lord's claim to be Christ date, not from his birth, but from some later period, that Irenaeus (iii. 16) uses the argument, shewing his belief in the inspiration of the gospels, that Matthew might have said, "the birth of Jesus was in this wise," but that the Holy Spirit, foreseeing and guarding against the depravation of the truth said by Matthew "the birth of Christ was on this wise," Baur (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 258) makes Docetism common to all the Gnostics, holding that the theory which has just been described is in a

certain sense Docetic; inasmuch as while holding Jesus to be a real man, visibly active in the work of redemption, it teaches that this is but deceptive appearance, the work being actually performed by a distinct personality, Christ. But it is more usual and more natural to use the word Docetism only with reference to those other theories which refuse to acknowledge the true manhood of the Redeemer. For example, we are told (Irenaeus, i. 23) that, according to the system of SIMON, the Redeemer (who, however, is not Jesus,* but Simon himself) "had appeared among men as man, though he was not a man, and was thought to have suffered in Judaea, though he did not suffer." According to the system of SATURNINUS (Irenaeus, i. 24), the Saviour was without birth, without body, and without figure, and appeared a man in phantasm, not in truth. And according to BASILIDES, as reported by Irenaeus (i. 24), Christ or Nous is not distinguished from Jesus, but is said to be an incorporeal power, who transfigured himself as he willed; that he appeared on earth as man and worked miracles, but that he did not suffer; that it was Simon of Cyrene, who, being transfigured into the form of Jesus, was crucified, while Jesus himself, in the form of Simon standing by, laughed at his persecutors, and then, incapable of being held by them, ascended up to Him who had sent him, invisible to them all. The Docetism here described is in several places strenuously combated in the Ignatian Epistles in their Greek form. It suffices to refer to two of the strongest passages (*Ad Trall.* 9, 10, and *Ad Smyrn.* 2). In these the writer emphasises the statements that our Lord was truly born, did eat and drink, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified, and truly rose from the dead; and he expressly declares that these statements were made in contradiction of the doctrine of certain unbelievers, or rather atheists, who asserted his sufferings to be but seeming. This polemic is absent from the Syriac Ignatius, and an argument has hence been derived against the genuineness of the Greek form. But in order to make the argument valid, there ought to be proof that the rise of Docetism was probably later than the age of Ignatius, whereas the probability seems to be quite the other way. Without entering into controversy as to the date of John's Epistles, or of the activity of Simon, Saturninus holds such a place in all heretical lists, that he must be referred to the very beginning of the 2nd century, and as he taught in Antioch, he may very possibly have been encountered by Ignatius. Polycarp also in his Epistle (7) uses the words of St. John's Epistle (iv. 3) in such a way as to shew that Docetism was in his time troublesome.

In the forms of Docetism thus far described, there is no evidence that there was involved any more subtle theory than that the senses of the spectators of our Lord's earthly life were deceived just in the same way as in the Book of Tobit (xii. 19) Raphael is made to say, "All these days I did appear unto you, but I did neither eat

* Perhaps it is not correct to say "not Jesus," for Simon held a theory of the transmigration of souls, and may have claimed to be identical with Jesus. If this were so, however, he must have been later than the Simon of the Acts.

nor drink, but ye did see a vision." The Docetism of VALENTINUS was exhibited in a more artificial theory. According to him (Irenaeus, i. 7) our Lord's nature was fourfold: (1) He had a *ψυχή* or animal soul; (2) he had a *πνεῦμα* or spiritual principle derived from Achamoth; (3) he had a body, but not a material body, but a heavenly one, formed according to a special dispensation with unspeakable art, so as to be visible and tangible and capable of suffering. This body, according to the report of Irenaeus, was psychical, that is to say, framed of the same substance as the animal soul; but Hippolytus (vi. 35) states that this was only the doctrine of the Italian school of Valentinians, and that there was an Eastern school which held that the body was spiritual. In either case the body came from heaven, and was not formed from the substance of the Virgin; she was but the channel through which it was conveyed into the world (*καθάπερ ἔδωρ διὰ σωλήνος*); (4) the pre-existent Saviour descended on him in the form of a dove at his baptism. When our Lord was brought before Pilate, this Saviour as being incapable of suffering withdrew his power; and the spiritual part which was also impassible was likewise dismissed;^b the animal soul and the wonderfully contrived body alone remaining to suffer, and to exhibit on the cross on earth a representation of what had previously taken place on the heavenly Stauros. It thus appears that Valentinus was only partially docetic. He conceded to Jesus the possession of a real body capable of really affecting the senses; but he held that that body was made of a different substance from ours, and also that it was peculiar in its relation to sustenance by earthly nutriment (Letter to Agathopus, *ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.* iii. 7, 451). Irenaeus, on the other hand (v. 1, 2, and more fully iii. 22), insists that the Valentinian doctrine did not practically differ from pure Docetism; for that if our Lord had not taken substance of flesh in the womb of the Virgin he could not have been the real man who suffered hunger and thirst and weariness, who wept at the grave of Lazarus, who sweat drops of blood, from whose wounded side came forth blood and water.

The Docetism of MARCION differed from that of preceding Gnostics. With them the great stumbling-block had been the sufferings of Christ, and accordingly it is the reality of Christ's passion and death that their antagonists were most solicitous to establish. Marcion, on the contrary, was quite willing to acknowledge the proof of our Lord's love exhibited in his sufferings and death, but it was repulsive to him to own his human birth, which according to his view would have made our Lord the debtor and the subject of the Creator of the world. Accordingly, while Basilides had admitted a real birth of the man Jesus, Valentinus at least a seeming birth in which the body elsewhere prepared was ushered into the world, Marcion would own no birth at all, and began his gospel with the sudden announcement that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Christ^c came down

(by which we are to understand came down from heaven) to Capernaum, a city of Galilee (Tert. *adv. Marc.* iv. 7). And he appealed to the question "who is my mother?" as proving that Jesus had refused to own a human birth. His interpretation of Luke xxiv. 39 is worth quoting: "A spirit has not flesh and bones, and you see that I have them only in such wise as a spirit has them" (Tert. *adv. Marc.* iv. 43). On this subject, in addition to the books of Tertullian entitled against Marcion, his tract *de Carne Christi* ought to be consulted. Marcion's disciple Apelles so far modified his master's doctrine that he was willing to own that Jesus had a solid body, but denied that there had been a birth in which he had assumed it (Tert. *de C. C.* 6); and he held that of this body our Lord made only a temporary use, and that when he had shewn it to his disciples after his resurrection he gave it back to the elements from which he had received it (Hipp. *Ref.* vii. 38, 260). Something of this kind seems to have been also the view of the sect known as DOCETAE.

The fourth book of the dialogue against the Marcionites [ADAMANTIUS] (Origen, i. 853) contains a polemic against Docetism which is represented as defended by Marinus the disciple of BARDESANES, who adopts the Valentinian notion that our Lord had come *διὰ Μαρίας*, not *ἐκ Μαρίας*, and who maintains that his earthly body was only such as the angels had temporarily assumed who ate and drank with Abraham. One argument used on the orthodox side ought not to be passed over, because it is common to several of the Fathers, and because the form of words in which each has expressed himself has been much discussed in the interests of modern controversy. It occurs here in the form "If Christ were without flesh and blood, of what sort of flesh and blood are the bread and wine, the images (*εἰκόνας*) with which he commanded that the memorial of him should be made?" (compare Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* 7; Irenaeus, iv. 18, v. 2; Tertullian, *adv. Marcion.* iv. 40). Of later heretics, the most considerable who maintained a docetic theory are the Manichaeans. In the controversy with them the orthodox had exactly the same points to establish as in the controversy with Marcion, viz. that Christ had come into the world, not merely as sent by the Father, but as really born of the Virgin; that he was truly incarnate, and did not assume the form of a body merely as did the angels whose appearances have been recorded; that he was circumcised, baptized, tempted; that his death was a real one, as was necessary in order that his resurrection also should be real (see in particular the disputation between Augustine and Faustus). With regard to the disputes in the 6th century concerning our Lord's body, see JULIAN OF HALICARNASSUS, CORRUPTICOLAE, PHANTASIATAE. It is well known that Mahomet also adopted the docetic account of our Lord's crucifixion.

Besides formal heresies which have been tainted with Docetism, the same imputation has been cast on more than one of the Fathers. The charge seems to be groundless in the case of Barnabas (7); but it is very strongly brought

^b Neander (*Church History*, ii. 91) asserts that it was held that this was done in the words, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit;" but we cannot find that he has authority for this detail.

^c There is a well-recommended various reading,

"Deum" instead of "eum"; but Epiphanius (*Haer.* 42, p. 312) would scarcely have passed this over in silence had he found it in his Marcion.

by Photius (*Bibl.* 109) against the hypotyposes of Clement of Alexandria. This book has not survived, but there is no doubt from his extant writings that Clement ascribed to our Lord a real body. He held, however (*Strom.* vi. 9, 775), that as it would be ridiculous to suppose that that body which was maintained by the Divine power needed food or drink for its support, we must believe that our Lord only partook of them for the sake of those with whom he lived, lest they should deem, as some afterwards did, that his body was not real. In a fragment, probably from the lost Hypotyposes preserved in a Latin translation (p. 1009), he quotes from "the traditions" that when St. John handled the body of our Lord the flesh offered no resistance, but yielded place to the disciple's hand. Redepennyng contends (*Origenes*, i. 444) that we are to understand this, not as describing the permanent condition of the Lord's body, but as what took place on a single occasion, probably at an appearance after the resurrection. And his conclusion (ii. 391) is that Clement's doctrine deviated from that subsequently recognised as orthodox, not in respect of our Lord's body, the reality of which he acknowledged, but in holding that this body was directly united to the divine logos without the intervention of a human soul capable of feeling pain or suffering. In the place last referred to will be found a discussion how far Origen is chargeable with Docetism, on which may also be consulted Huet's *Origeniana*, ii. Qu. iii. 10, 11.

The traditions referred to by Clement have been identified with the contents of a work of Leucius Charinus, purporting to relate travels of the apostles, of which an account is given by Photius (*Bibl.* 114), and from which extracts are also quoted in the acts of the second council of Nicaea (*Actio* v.) In this work, which Grabe seems to have correctly regarded as Marcionite, it was taught that the Son was not man, but only seemed to be so; that he shewed himself to his disciples sometimes young, sometimes old; sometimes a child, sometimes an old man; sometimes great, sometimes small; sometimes so great as to touch the heavens with his head; that his footsteps left no trace; and that he was not really crucified, but, according to Photius, another person in his place. The account given in the Nicene extracts of a vision seen by St. John on the mount of Olives, at the time of the crucifixion, teaches that the form crucified was not really our Lord, but does not suggest that it was any other person. [G. S.]

DOCHDWY, Welsh saint of the 6th century. He accompanied Cadfan to Bardsey, where he was ordained a bishop. He does not appear to have been appointed to any particular see, but is recorded to have administered the diocese of Llandaff during the absence of Teilo at Bardsey. He is perhaps the founder of two churches in Glamorganshire, named Llandocho, or Llandochoa, or Llandough. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 220.) [C. H.]

DOCHONNA is only another form of Dachonna and Mochonna, and frequently interchanged with them [**DACHONNA**, and **MOCHONNA**]. Among others of this name, the *Mart. Doneg.* has Dochonna, son of Odhran, Feb. 17. In the *Life of St. Attracta*, or Athracht (Aug. 11), given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 279, c. 7), a saint called Da-

chonna was employed by St. Conall, brother of St. Attracta, to try and prevail upon her not to build a monastery, as she intended, near St. Conall's [CONALL (3)]. The church belonging to this Dachonna or Dochonna is said by Colgan (*ib.* 281 n. 12) to be now a parish church in the diocese of Clonfert, named from him, and not far from Kill-conaill. If he was a brother or even a contemporary of St. Attracta, he belongs to the 6th century. [J. G.]

DOCTRINA ADDAEL, [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 31.]

DOCTRINA APOSTOLORUM. [ACTS OF APOSTLES, p. 21.]

DOCUS. [CADOC.]

DOCWINUS (CUNGARUS, CYNGAR), Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of a monastery named Docunnus in the diocese of Llandaff, but the situation of which is at present unknown, though its abbats ranked with those of Llan-carfarn and Lantwit, and all three of them exercised great influence in the diocese. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 183 and Index.) [C. H.]

DODDO (DODO), a duke of Mercia, who flourished in the reigns of the Mercian kings Ethelred, Coenred, and Ethelbald. In conjunction with his brother Oddo, another duke of Mercia, he is stated to have founded the monastery of Tewkesbury, A.D. 715. They built it on their own estate near the Severn, where the hermit Theokus resided, after whom it was named Tewkesbury, endowing it with the manor of Stanwey, with its members, and other smaller possessions; but only four or five monks inhabited it at that early period, and the authority states that they observed the rule of St. Benedict. These Mercian dukes were also great benefactors to Pershore abbey, where they are said to have been buried, and Doddo is said to have lived in the monastic habit. They had a brother Almaric, or Amalric, buried at Deerhurst, in a little chapel over against the priory gate, which had once formed part of a royal palace, but was converted by Doddo into a church, and consecrated (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. 53). The authority for this account is a Cotton MS. called *Chronica de Tewkesburie*, which is printed in *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 59, and of which a translation appears in Atkyns, *Hist. of Gloucestershire*, ed. 1768, 331, ed. 1712, 725. [C. H.]

DODO, abbat of St. Genulfus of Bourges. He obtained privilege and immunity from tribute both from Pepin and from Charles the Bald in the fourth year of his reign. He was succeeded by Mainardus, about the year 850. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 145, 146.) [D. R. J.]

(2) Called also Odo, abbat of St. Martial at Limousin. He lived during the middle of the 9th century. Charles the Bald called a council of the archbishops and princes of Aquitaine, at which Ainardus, superior of the monastery of St. Martial, and the canons of that church, prostrated themselves before Charles on his throne, and petitioned that a habit might be given them so that they might become regular monks. The king granted their petition, overcoming by gifts the opposition of Stodilus, bishop of Limousin. The monks were unwilling to appoint one of

themselves for their abbat, and chose Dodo, who had been abbat of St. Savinus, Poitiers. After two years' rule at St. Martial's, Dodo returned to the monastery of St. Savinus, and in 853 was present at the synod of Soissons. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 555.) [D. R. J.]

DODO (3) 21st bishop of Toul, enriched his church with many possessions, the names of which are now unknown, and dedicated the church of St. Martin. He died in the beginning of the 8th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 965.) [D. R. J.]

(4) Mercian duke. [DODDO.]

(5). [DIDO.]

(6) Abbat of the monastery of St. Denis, Paris, in the reign of Clotarius, father of Dagobert I., in the early part of the 7th century (*Gall. Christ.* vii. 338). [D. R. J.]

(7) 14th bishop of Beauvais. In most catalogues of the bishops of Beauvais, Dodo is placed between Radingus and Ercambertus, as if he had been bishop in the reign of king Chilperic II. But as he in conjunction with the abbat Ebrulfus (who was a contemporary of queen Fredegundis) restored the abbey of St. Lucian, he must have held his see under Chilperic I., and preceded Marinus, who was bishop in the year 640 (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 695). [D. R. J.]

DODOLINUS, ST., bishop of Vienne, called also St. Dodolenus, Landolenus, Dolinus, and Landalenus, and possibly even St. Bobolinus I. An additional difficulty is that Landolenus is certainly the same as Syndulphus. Can all these names mean one man? The synod of Châlons-sur-Saône was held under Clovis II., but it is uncertain in what year, though it is supposed by Sirmondus to have been in 650 or 658. To that synod Landalenus (*i.e.* Dodolinus), bishop of the church of Vienne, subscribed second. In an ancient document on the antiquities of Vienne, he is said to have been made Pontifex Viennae, "Leone vel Leontio Romanis imperante, et Theoderico Francis, ac Sergio Papa." This would bring him down to about the year 688, leaving out of the reckoning Leontius, who began to reign some years after the death of king Theoderic. Dodolinus died, and is commemorated on the 1st of April. (*AA. SS. Boll.* April, i. p. 30; Ado, *Vienn. Chronicon*, *Patrol. Lat.* cxliii.; *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 33; *Decretum Burgundofaronis Meldensis Episcopi*; Labbe, *Concilia* V. ann. 636.) [D. R. J.]

DOGED, DOGED FRENHIN, *i.e.* Doged the king, Welsh saint of the 6th century, founder of the church of Llanddoged in Denbighshire. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 209.) [C. H.]

DOGFAEL, Welsh saint of the 6th century, founder of four Pembrokeshire churches, St. Dogmael in Cemmaes, St. Dogwel in Pebidiog, Monachlog Dhu, and Melinau; as well as patron of Llanddogwel, subject to Llanrhyddlad, in Anglesey. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 211.) [C. H.]

DOGFAN, Welsh saint of the 5th century, slain by the pagan Saxons at Merthyr Dogfan in Dyfed or Pembrokeshire, where a church was consecrated to his memory, the particular situation of which is at present unknown. He was

also the patron saint and founder of Llanrhaiadr ym Mochnant in Denbighshire; commemorated on July 13. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 145.) [C. H.]

DOGMAEL (TEGWELL), patron saint of an abbey in Pembrokeshire, died c. A.D. 500; commemorated on June 14. (*Acta SS.* June ii. 957; Cressy, *Ch. Hist. of Brit.* x. 21.) [C. H.]

DOKIE. In Forfarshire, in the parish of Monifieth, is Chapel Dokie. It probably takes its name from St. Murdoch, who has a chapel some miles northward at Inverkeillor (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 325, 416-7; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scotl.* ii. 446; Jervise, *Epitaphs*, i. 318-19). [J. G.]

DOLGAN AB GILDAS, a saint of the college of Cattwg Ddoeth at Llancarvan, in the 6th century. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 257.) [C. H.]

DOLGAR, Welsh saint of the 6th century, daughter of Gildas ab Caw. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 258.) [C. H.]

DOLICHIANUS or **DULICHIANUS**, succeeded Valens as 29th bishop of Jerusalem. His exact date is unknown, but he may be placed in the last quarter of the 2nd century. He was followed by Narcissus (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. v. c. 12; *Chronicon*, a° 2199; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 66, p. 637; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii. p. 147). [E. V.]

DOMHAINGEN, bishop of Tuaim Muscraighe, April 29. By O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 113) he is called "son of Fionnluigh, (and) brother of Brenainn, son of Fionnluigh, who was of the race of Ciarr, son of Fergus, son of Ros, son of Rudhraighe" [BRENDAN (2)]. In the *Life of St. Carthage Mochuda*, from which Colgan quotes in his *Memoir of St. Gobbán* (Mar. 17), St. Carthage is said to have built a church in Muskerry, in Munster, and to have placed there St. Domhaingen with twelve disciples, among whom were the three sons of Nasca or Nescainn—Gobbán, Straphán, and Laseran; while these afterwards founded monasteries for themselves, St. Domhaingen continued to reside at Tuaim-Muscraighe, which Lanigan believes to be the same as Tome, a place marked as in Muskerry in Smith's map of the county of Cork (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 631; Lanigan, *Éccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 14, § 15). There is a Domhaingen mentioned by Colgan (*ib.* 305, c. 3) as a cousin of St. Etchen (Feb. 11), but if this be the same person, he must have been much younger than St. Etchen to be a disciple of St. Carthage Mochuda, who was born A.D. 570, while St. Etchen of Clonfad ordained St. Columba about A.D. 550. They are, however, probably not the same, and the bishop of Tuaim-Muscraighe flourished in the beginning of the 7th century. [J. G.]

DOMHANGORT (DOMANGART, DONARD). (1) Son of Eochaidh, bishop, of Rath-muirbuilg and Slieve Donard, March 24. He is sometimes called Dominicus, and is on this account to be distinguished from Domhnog, Modomnocus, or Dominicus (Feb. 13). [DOMHNOG.] He was son of Eochaidh, son of Muiredhach Muinderg (red-necked), king of Ulster, and of the race of Fiatach Finn, monarch of Erin, and of the seed

of Heremon. His mother was Derevilla or Derinill, surnamed Cethuir Chicheach, that is, of the four paps, or, more probably, of the four provinces; through her he was brother of St. Mura (Mar. 12) of Fathain (now Fahan, in Enishowen), and others (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 85; Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* 154, 236). Eochaidh appears to have done his utmost to thwart the teachers of the Christian faith, and is said to have even put two virgins to death, but his pious queen tried to make amends, and both Joceline and Evinus in their *Lives of St. Patrick* (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 94, c. 130, 114 n.¹³¹, 161, cc. 64-5, 187 n.⁹⁴) relate how she besought mercy for her unborn infant, and how St. Patrick was the means of imparting the blessing which conveyed, not an earthly, but a heavenly sceptre, to her son, who was named Domhangort, or by contraction Donard. But this story connecting him with the age of St. Patrick is extremely doubtful, and is simply impossible, if St. Domhangort was brother of St. Mura who flourished in the first half of the 7th century; O'Clery's date of A.D. 506 for his death is unquestionably wrong in any view of the matter, and he could not have flourished at the end of the 5th century as Colgan (*Acta SS.* p. 327 n.^{*}) imagines. The beginning of the 7th century is more likely to have been the time when he lived, though it is uncertain, but in this case he could not have been grandson of Muiredhach Muinderg, who died A.D. 479. He was founder and patron of two churches; one was called Rath-Murhbuil in Dalriada (properly Dalaradia), at the foot of Sliabh Slainge, which was afterwards called Slieve Donard from this saint, and the other was on the top of the mountain at a long distance from all human dwellings. The former was afterwards called Rath and Machaire-Ratha, and is now Maghera, a parish in the barony of Upper Iveagh, co. Down, and situated on Dundrum Bay, where also we find the ancient Murhbuil in Murlough, a townland in Maghera parish (Reeves, *Ecol. Antiq.* 27-8, 154-5); at this church his bell called *Ghunan* was long preserved, and also one of his shoes in a reliquary of gold and silver. Of the latter church there are still remains, and a very interesting account of them was given by Harris (*Down*, 121) in the last century. Of the time of his death we have no knowledge. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Mart. 24, tom. iii. 481) give a memoir from the *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* and from that by Joceline, but their conclusion is that his cultus is certain and everything else uncertain; while his relationship to St. Mura "non ita liquidum, ut sit extra suspicionem falsitatis." (Lanigan, ii. c. 14, § 5; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 742 sq.; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Top. Hib.* Dist. iii. c. 2; Reeves, *Ecol. Ant.* 207-8; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 104; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 137-39; O'Hart, *Irish Pedigrees*, 188 n.) [J. G.]

DOMHANGORT (2) Besides the foregoing, there was another Domhangort in Ireland, who was son of Saran, and brother of St. Domhnog, Dominicus, or Modomnocus (Feb. 13 and May 18); he must have flourished with his brother about the end of the 5th century (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 326, c. 1, 327 n.⁴; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 14, § 5). [J. G.]

DOMHNOG, son of Saran, of Tiprat-fachtna, in the west of Osraighe, Feb. 13, May 18. On

the former day Colgan (*Acta SS.* 326-7) gives a memoir, *Mart. Doneg.* has the feast of Modhomhnog, and *Mart. Tall.* that of Modimoc; at the latter *Mart. Tall.* has the feast of Modomnoc, and *Mart. Doneg.* that of Domhnog. Modomhnoc is simply the honorific form of Domhnog, and means 'My Domhnog.' He is also known by the latinised forms of Dominicus, and Dominic of Ossory. Colgan has collected the acts attributed to the saint, and from him we learn that he was son of Saran, son of Tighernach, of the race of Eoghan, son of Niall. For a stricter life and greater perfection he left Ireland, and was under St. David at Menevia, where he progressed so favourably in learning and piety, and especially in the virtue of obedience, that he became St. David's greatest favourite, and was miraculously saved from death by St. David, as we read in the *Life of St. David*. But that for which he is best known, is the transporting of bees from Menevia to Ireland. To attest the fact of his taking bees to Ireland Colgan quotes several authorities, such as St. Aengus the Culdee, and Peter Lombard of Armagh, yet he does not contend for more than the introduction of a better breed by St. Domhnog, and, perhaps, a more careful system of culture. But, according to the legend, the bees swarmed about the vessel as he was leaving Wales, and after two ineffectual attempts to depart without them, he had to sail to Ireland with this strange convoy, and this is made the first introduction of bees into Ireland. Llann-beachaire, that is, the church of the bee-man, where St. Molaga (Jan. 20) of Tulach-min was venerated, and which is identified by Joyce with "the ruined church and cemetery in Bremlere, a little north of Balbriggan, now nameless, but which, in the *Reg. Alani* of the see of Dublin, is called Lambeeher," is said to have received its name from a swarm of St. Domhnog's bees, which St. Molaga placed there. St. Domhnog settled at a place called Tiprad-fachtna, in Ossory, near the river Suir (now Tibberaghny or Tipperaghny, in the barony of Iverk, co. Kilkenny). As a disciple of St. David he must have lived at the end of the 6th century; he was very greatly venerated in Ossory, and had a double dedication. (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 14, § 5, iii. c. 18, § 3; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Top. Hib.* Dist. i. c. 5; Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, ii. 291-2, Feb. 13; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, ii. 179, Feb. 13; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 73; Bolland, *Acta SS.* Feb. tom. ii. 673, at Feb. 13; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 189, 3rd ed.)

[J. G.]

DOMINAE. In the parish of Barr, in Ayrshire, there is a chapel called Kirk Dominae, probably the church of Our Lady (*New Stat. Acc. Scot. Ayrshire*, 409; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 324).

[J. G.]

DOMINIC of Ossory. [DOMHNOS.]

DOMINICA, wife of the emperor Valens, suffered from dreadful dreams the night her husband had imprisoned Basil the Great (*Socr.* iv. 21).

[E. B. B.]

DOMINICUS (1), ST., bishop of Cambrai. He acted as vicar to St. Vedastus for the churches of Arras and Cambrai, and succeeded him in his see, about A.D. 540. (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 4.)

[D. R. J.]

DOMINICUS (2), bishop of Carthage, sent an epistle by bishops Donatus and Quodvultdeus, deacon Victor, and notary Agilegius to congratulate Gregory the Great on his election (Greg. *Ep.* ii. 47, p. 610, vol. iii. 586). Gregory afterwards congratulated him on his zeal against the heretics, but reproved him for his too great severity in stripping of their episcopal dignity and estates those who were negligent in seeking them out (*Epp.* v. 5, p. 731; vi. 19; viii. 33; xii. 1 are to the same). [E. B. B.]

(3) Bishop of Civita Vecchia, A.D. 601 (Greg. *Magn. Ep.* i. 13, p. 499). [E. B. B.]

(4), 11th bishop of Carpentras, ruled his diocese from the year 640 to 645, and was succeeded by Licerius (*Gall. Christ.* i. 898). [D. R. J.]

(5) 16th bishop of Amiens, was present at the translation of St. Lambert, A.D. 721 (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 1156). [D. R. J.]

(6) Seventh bishop of Sion (Sedunum), occurs in the catalogue of Agaunum (St. Maurice) towards the year 516, in succession to St. Protasius I. (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 735.) [D. R. J.]

DOMINIUS, third bishop of Geneva, lived in the first half of the 5th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 378.) [D. R. J.]

DOMITIANUS (1) A.D. 81–96. This emperor, though placed by Lactantius (*de Mort. Persecut.* c. 3) and others in the lists of the persecutors of the church, can hardly be considered as having made any systematic effort to crush Christianity as such. Through the greater part of the empire the disciples of Christ seem to have been unmolested. The traces of persecution, such as they are, seem rather to belong to his general policy of suspicion and cruelty. Indirectly they have the interest of shewing in what way the new religion was attracting notice and to what extent it was spreading.

1. What Suetonius relates (*Domit.* c. 12) as affecting the Jews of Rome must indirectly, probably chiefly, have involved the Christians. Some, he says, who led a "Jewish life," neglected to register themselves as Jews, and so evaded the payment of the tax which, after the destruction of Jerusalem, had been imposed on all Jews throughout the empire, in lieu of the *didrachma* which they had formerly contributed to the Temple. Others again, though Jews by birth, tried to conceal their origin. They were dragged before the procurator and examined, that it might be seen whether they were or were not circumcised. It is obvious that the first class may have included many converts from Heathenism to Christianity, whose mode of life was popularly identified with that of the Jews; and that the latter may have embraced others, who being converts from Judaism, no longer thought themselves bound to register their names as belonging to a religion which they had renounced.

2. Vespasian, before his death, had given orders (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 12) that inquiry should be made for all who claimed to be descendants of the house of David, seeking in this way to cut off all who might on the strength of that claim incite the Jews to a fresh revolt. The fears of Domitian led him to continue the search, and

Hegesippus (in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 19, 20) records one striking incident connected with it. The *delatores* whom the emperor's policy called into activity, found out the grandchildren of Judas the brother of the Lord, gave information to Evocatus, the prefect of Judaea, and they were taken by him to Rome and brought before the emperor's presence. They acknowledged, on being questioned, that they were of the kingly line, but when required to give an account of their possessions, declared that they had but 9000 denarii between them, and that not in cash, but in land which they tilled with their own hands, and on which they paid the legal dues. They stated further that the only kingdom they looked for was one spiritual and angelic, to be manifested at the end of the world. The emperor, Hegesippus goes on to say, thought them beneath his notice, released them, and allowed them to go back to Judaea, and put a stop to the persecution against the church which he had begun. In the mouth of such a writer the persecution of which he speaks was probably that caused by the very inquiry of which they had all but been the victims. The Judæan followers of the Christ, whom they habitually spoke of as of the seed of David, would inevitably come under the suspicion which was restlessly on the watch against any appeal to the hopes of the conquered population.

3. Towards the close of Domitian's reign we find the record of a domestic tragedy, which reminds us in part of the case of Pomponia Graecina [CLAUDIUS], and which there is good reason for connecting with the progress of Christianity. The emperor had a cousin of the name of Flavius Clemens, whom at one time he held in high favour. He gave him his niece Flavia Domitilla in marriage, changed the names of his sons to Vespasian and Domitian, and designated them as heirs to the empire. Finally he nominated him as his colleague in the consulship. Suddenly, almost within the year of his consulship, he put him to death. His wife was banished to Pandataria, his daughter, bearing the same name as her mother, to Pontia. It would seem as if revenge for these acts of tyranny had no small share in bringing about the emperor's death. Among the conspirators who were concerned in his assassination the most prominent was an agent and freedman of the banished widow of Clemens, of the name of Stephanus. So far we have the story as told by Suetonius (*Domit.* cc. 15 and 17). It remains to see on what grounds church writers like Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 18) claim the three members of the Flavian house as among the first illustrious martyrs of royal rank. (1) Flavius Clemens himself is described by Suetonius (*l. c.*) as "contemptissimæ inertiae." One who sought to lead a Christian life would naturally be so described by men of his own rank and by the outer world, just as Tertullian complains that the Christians of his time were stigmatised, when other charges failed, as "infructuosi negotiis" (*Apol.* c. 42). (2) The specific charge against Clemens and the two Domitillæ is reported by Dio Cassius (lxvii. 14) and Xiphilinus (p. 766) to have been that of atheism. The same accusation, the latter adds, was brought against many others who shewed a bias towards Jewish customs. This again agrees with the general feeling of the Roman world

towards the Christians at a later period, and may fairly be looked on as the first instance of what was afterwards so common. (3) The evidence of later tradition comes in to confirm these inferences. Jerome tells us (*Ep.* 27) how Paula visited the island of Pontia, on her way to Jerusalem, as already an object of reverence, and saw the three cells in which Domitilla and her two eunuchs Achilleus and Nereus had lived during their exile. They were said to have returned to Rome and suffered martyrdom under Trajan. A church on the Coelian Hill at Rome dedicated to St. Clement, in which a tablet was discovered in 1725 to the memory of Flavius Clemens, martyr, and described by Cardinal Albani (*T. Flavii Clementis Viri Consularis et Martyris Tumulus illustratus*, 1727) seems from the fact just mentioned to have commemorated the consul and not the writer of that name. Even the name of Clement of Alexandria, Titus Flavius Clemens, may fairly be regarded as an indication of the honour in which the martyr's memory was held. On the whole, everything seems to indicate that the received tradition is true, and that the Christian church was almost on the point, even before the close of the 1st century, of furnishing a successor to the imperial throne.

4. With the reign of Domitian is also connected the legend of St. John's presence at Rome, and of his being thrown, before the Porta Latina, at the command of the emperor, into a caldron of boiling oil, and then banished to Patmos. Tertullian (*de Praescript.* c. 36) is the first writer who mentions it. If we were to attach any historical value to the narrative, it would probably connect itself rather with the story told by Hegesippus than with the tale of Clemens and Domitilla. The apostle, as known to have been the chosen friend of the Son of David, may have been pointed out by the *delatores* of Ephesus as the descendants of Judas were in Judaea. Tertullian, in speaking elsewhere (*Apol.* c. 5) of Domitian's conduct towards the church, describes him as only attempting a persecution, and then, thinking better of it, himself recalling those whom he had condemned to exile. In other accounts (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20) the decree of recall was connected with the accession of Nerva. [E. H. P.]

DOMITIANUS (2), ST., a doubtful bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, supposed to have lived in the 4th century, and commemorated on the 9th of August. (*AA. SS. Boll.* Aug. ii. p. 413.) Gams (*Series Episc.* p. 534) mentions him under the year 344. [D. R. J.]

(3) A prefect, assassinated by orders of the Caesar Gallus, for which crime the prince himself was punished by Constantius, A.D. 354 (Greg. Nyss. *Con. Eunom.* lib. i., Pat. Gr. xlv. 263 A.). [E. B. B.]

(4) An offender whom Basil the Great entreats duke Andronicus to pardon (Bas. *Ep.* 112). [E. B. B.]

(5) The 'oeconomus' of the church of Constantinople. Chrysostom, hearing of his want of funds to supply the necessities of the widows and orphans after his deposition, wrote to his intimate friend Valentinus, requesting him to supply him (Chrysost. *Epist.* 217). He visited Rome in Chrysostom's behalf, A.D. 405, and communicated to Innocent the vindictive

judicial proceedings against Olympias, Pentadia, and others of Chrysostom's friends (Pallad. 28). [E. V.]

DOMITIANUS (6) Quaestor, wrote to Helladius of Tarsus and to Theodoret, publishing a certain law obtained by John of Antioch, and entreating them to re-enter into communion with that patriarch (Labbe, *Conc.* iii. 829, 859). [E. B. B.]

(7) One to whom Nilus writes (*Ep.* ii. 233) to point out how the Holy Communion presupposes the Resurrection of the Lord. [E. B. B.]

(8) ST., abbat of the monastery of Bebrou, or St. Rambert de Joux or St. Rambert-le-Joux (St. Ragnebertus Jurensis), in the diocese of Lyon. Period, 4th or 5th century. Commemorated on the 1st of July. The first mention of him is by Ado, archbishop of Vienne (A.D. 875), in his *Martyrologium*. The legend preserved in the ancient MSS. of the monastery is full of inaccuracies and anachronisms. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 254; Ado Vienn. *Martyrolog.* p. 295; *Patrol. Lat.* cxliii.; *AA. SS. Boll.* July, i. pp. 46-55.) [D. R. J.]

(9) Bishop, by whom Leo writes to Marcian, Aug. 17, A.D. 458 (Leo, *Ep.* 133). [E. B. B.]

(10) I. Seventh bishop of Geneva, about the year 470. In the church of St. Victor, which was built in Cevennes in the 5th century, by queen Sedelenba, the eldest daughter of Chilperic, the following inscription was discovered: "Acta sunt haec regnante Domitiano episcopo Genevensi, quo tempore etiam castrum Solodurense episcopatu Genevensi subditum erat," whence it has been supposed, but without sufficient reason, that Domitian ruled his diocese in the time of Sedelenba, who in the year 486 was driven into exile by Gundebaldus. The best authorities apply to Domitian I. an earlier date than the time of queen Sedelenba, and place him amongst the first bishops of the diocese of Geneva. (Fredegarius Scholasticus, *Chron.* c. 22, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi.; *Rev. Gallic. Script.* ii. 398; *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 379, and xii. 777.) [D. R. J.]

(11) Bishop of Cologne, was the seventh in succession, coming between Simonius and Charentinus. He subscribed to the council of Auvergne, which was held in the year 535: "Domitianus in Christi nomine episcopus ecclesiae Coloniensis consensit et subscripsi." In some codices, as Jacobus Sigmundus tells us, the reading is, "Episcopus de Colonia." In the Pithoean codex we read, "Episcopus Ecclesiae Tungrorum," from which Le Cointe infers that Domitian ought not to be reckoned amongst the bishops of Cologne; but against this we have the superior authority of the Codex Fossatensis and others. The name of Domitian is also to be found in the synodic epistle written to king Theodebert. (*Gall. Chr.* iii. 624.) [D. R. J.]

(12) 12th bishop of Angers, was present at the third council of Paris in the year 557. In the acts of that council, a Domitianus is mentioned without reference to his see, and he is thought to have been bishop of Angers. About the year 563 he subscribed to the epistle written conjointly by the bishops of the province of Tours, "about paying tithes, reconciliation with enemies, and dissolving incestuous marriages." Domitianus is also reckoned amongst the bishops who sat in the second council of Tours, A.D. 567, after which,

it seems, he subscribed to the letter of Eufro-nius to Radegundis, the wife of king Clotharius. In the year 568 he was present at the consecra-tion of the church of Nantes, a fact referred to by Fortunatus in the following couplet:—

Domitianus, item Victorius, ambo columnae,
Spes in utrisque manens pro regionis ope.

Domitianus was held in great esteem by Fortu-natus, who was never tired of singing his praises. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 548; Claudius Menardus in *Pepto Andegavensi*; Rivetius, *Hist. Franciae Litter.* iii. 280.) [D. R. J.]

DOMITIANUS (13) ST., bishop of Maes-tricht, was born of a good family in Gaul about the middle of the 6th century, and is com-memorated on the 7th May. He succeeded St. Eucharius in the bishopric, but it is not known in what year. He was very zealous in preaching, in almsgiving, and in converting the pagans, of whom there were many in his diocese. He took an active part in the general council of Orleans for the suppression of Arianism, and distin-guished himself above all the other bishops by his eloquence, on which account he was elected by them to the special work of resisting heresy. He was also present and subscribed at the synod of Clermont in the reign of Thudbertus, king of Austrasia, A.D. 535.

Among the tales associated with his name, occurs the legend how in the neighbourhood of Huy in his time there was a certain well which was said to be infested by a dragon, in conse-quence of which many people were afflicted with dreadful diseases, and beasts and cattle drinking thereof died. At the request of the people Domitian went to the well, and having said a prayer exorcised the dragon, who immediately descended from the well into the depths of the earth and never more appeared. The saint then struck his pastoral staff into the ground, and thereby miraculously produced a fresh spring of pure water, which cured all kinds of diseases.

In the council of Orleans, which was held in the 38th year of the reign of Childebert (A.D. 547 or 549), Domitian subscribed 15th in order. He died on the 7th May, and was buried in the church of St. Mary of Huy. (Migne, *Encycl. Théolog.* xl. 767; *AA. SS. Boll.* May, ii. 146.) [D. R. J.]

DOMITIANUS (14) ANCYRANUS bp. of Ancyra and metropolitan, one of the Acephali, and an eager advocate of Origenism. He was an intimate friend of Theodore Ascidas, who, though made bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea, usually resided at Constantinople, and aided him in his intrigues to secure the favour of Justinian for their party. He was the author of a treatise *On the Origenian Controversy* addressed to pope Vigilius, A.D. 545, quoted by Facondus in his *Defence of the Three Chapters* (lib. i. c. 2; lib. iv. c. 4; Migne, lxvii. 532, 627), in which he frankly states that the Origenists had adopted the device of raising a controversy about "the Three Chapters" in order to divert public atten-tion from their own dogmas (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 523). [E. V.]

(15) Bishop of Melitene and metropolitan of Roman Armenia, born of Christian parents of wealth and rank, near of kin to the emperor Maurice in the time of Justin II. (c. A.D. 564),

was well taught in sacred and profane literature, took a pious and faithful wife, was soon left a widower, and gave himself to virtue and the fear of God, and gained so high a character, that he was not only made bishop, but by his fame drew Chosru Parviz, king of Persia, to love him, and brought him into allegiance to the emperor Maurice. For the Persian wrote to the Roman: "If you send Domitian, and he carry me along with him, I am not only your friend, but your slave." This mission was A.D. 589 or 590. His fellow envoys were Narses and Gregory of Antioch. All obstacles to the alliance were smoothed over, but Chosroes was not converted. As Gre-gory the Great says, in congratulating Domitian, A.D. 593 (*Ep.* iii. 67), "An Ethiopian comes black out of the bath, but the bathman gets his pay." Domitian had sent Gregory for his con-solation an allegorical interpretation of the story of Dinah, which was not Gregory's own, and is congratulated for finding time amid his states-manship and missionary labours for the study of Scripture. He must have been a main supporter of the orthodox doctrine in the controversies with Eutychianism, then rife in the East. Eulo-gius, patriarch of Alexandria, dedicates to him his books against Severus and Timotheus (Photius, *Cod.* 225). He is probably the same as the Domi-tian reproved, along with Peter and Elpidius, by Gregory in A.D. 596 for crying out, "This is the day that the Lord hath made" at the appointment of Cyriacus to the see of Constantinople (*Greg. Ep.* vii. 7, p. 854, vol. iii. 860; in *Ep.* v. 15, for Datian some copies have Domitian). When Mau-rice fell ill, he made a will appointing Domitian to be tutor to his sons, which was discovered in the first year of Heraclius (Theophyl. Sim. viii. 11). But Domitian died at Constantinople Jan. 10 or 11, A.D. 502, and his funeral in the church of the Holy Apostles was attended by all the senate. His relics were afterwards transferred to his own eastern see, and there said to work miracles. (*Men. Basil.* Jan. 10; Theoph. p. 410, 438; Evagrius, vi. 16-18; Theophyl. Sim. iv. 14; Ceillier, xi. 494, 590.) [E. B. V.]

DOMITILLA FLAVIA, the niece of the emperor Domitian, married to her cousin Flavius Clemens (CLEMENS FLAVIUS), who, with her hus-band, was condemned on a charge variously re-presented as "atheism" and "Judaizing" (Sueton. *Domit.* c. 18; Dio Cassius, lxxvii. 14). Clement suffered capital punishment, and she was banished, A.D. 96, to the island of Pandateria, where, ac-cording to Jerome (ad Eustoch. *Epist.* 86), she remained many years in exile. Jerome states that he himself had seen the cells in which she dragged out her existence, and praises Paula for taking the voyage thither "to behold the monument of so noble a confessor." Domitilla's place of banishment, however, according to Jerome, was Pontia, not Pandateria. The acts of martyrdom of Nereus and Achilleus also bring before us a Domitilla, of whom they were the "cubicularii" or "grooms of the bed-chamber," also banished to Pontia. This Domitilla is represented as being the virgin daughter of Plautilla, an assumed sister of Flavius Clemens, and therefore the niece of the other Domitilla, who with her mother is asserted to have been baptized by St. Peter. Eusebius also, quoting from the heathen historian Brutius, agrees with

the above "Acts" in making Domitilla the niece, not the wife, of Clemens, and the place of her banishment Pontia, not Pandateria (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 18; *Chron.* p. 382 (Mai), sub anno 95). Hence many writers, including Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* ii. 124 ff.), and Imhoff (*Domitianus*, p. 116), make two Domitillas, aunt and niece, both banished for the faith to a Mediterranean island. The improbability of this is great, and we may safely affirm with Lightfoot (*Philippians*, p. 22, note 1), that "it can hardly be doubtful that one and the same person is intended in these notices. Pontia and Pandateria are neighbouring islands, and the different accounts of her relationship may be explained very easily by the carelessness of Eusebius or some early transcriber." Tillemont allows that the "Acts of Nereus and Achilleus" are a manifest forgery, probably of a Manichean origin, containing only a germ of truth. All he ventures to assert of these supposed martyrs is that they were beheaded at Terracina, and buried on the Ardeatine Way, where one of the earliest of the Roman Christian burial vaults, or catacombs, evidently from its construction and decoration belonging to the imperial times, still exists, under the joint appellation of "Coemiterium Domitillae" and "Coemiterium Nerei et Achillis" (Northcote, *Roma Sotterranea*, p. 69 sq.). The primitive date of this tradition is proved by the cemetery having been restored by John I., A.D. 525 (Anastas. p. 89), and by the fact of Gregory the Great having delivered a Homily on the festival of SS. Nereus and Achilleus in the Basilica bearing their name (*Homil. in Evangel.* 28).

[E. V.]

DOMITIUS (1) professor of rhetoric at Clermont, whom Sidonius (*Poem.* 18, p. 1271) invites to his country house at Avitae, describing his tennis court.

[E. B. B.]

(2), ST., Confessor. Lived before the middle of the 8th century, and is commemorated on October 23. He was an ecclesiastic of unknown degree, who lived near Amiens. By one writer he is called presbyter and canon. By others he is thought to have been only a deacon. No one except Molanus calls him a bishop. He resigned his preferment, whatever it was, and turned hermit. In his time lived St. Ulphia, virgin, whom at her earnest request Domitius adopted as his spiritual daughter, he being very old at the time, and she quite young. He was accustomed to resort every night for prayer to the church of St. Mary, where the monastery of St. Acheolus subsequently arose, and to return to his cell at six in the morning. His relics, together with those of SS. Firminius and Ulphia, were translated in 1279 to the cathedral church of Amiens, and placed under the high altar (*AA. SS. Boll.* Oct. x. 143; Migne, *Encycl. Théolog.* xl. 753).

[D. R. J.]

DOMNEVA (Sim. Dun. *G. R. A.* in M. H. B. 648), queen. [EORMENBURGA.]

[C. H.]

DOMNINA. [CLAUDIUS (4).]

(2) A lady of Antioch, who at the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution fled to Edessa with her daughters, Berenice and Prosdocia, but her husband came with soldiers to fetch her back. On the road the ladies seized an opportunity to

drown themselves; dreading the outrages that might await them. The fact is recorded by Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 12); but he does not give their names. For our knowledge of these we are indebted to a sermon of Chrysostom on their festival, within twenty days of the festival of the Cross (Chrys. t. 1, *Hom.* 51). Both these fathers highly applaud the deed. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, i. 26) supposes it must have been justified by special revelation.

This Domnina is not known to the *Menology*, but only the martyr of Anazarbus in Cilicia, under Lysias (see CLAUDIUS (4) and ASTERIUS) in the beginning of the Diocletian persecution; commemorated Oct. 12, and a hermitess of Cyra Feb. 28. The latter was contemporary with Theodoret, who wrote her life, and assures us she never spoke without tears. (Theodor. *Hist. Rel.* p. 814; Ceillier, x. 64.) [E. B. B.]

DOMINUS (1) Martyr at Thessalonica under Galerius, who was building a palace in that town, and was affronted to find that there could still be an avowed Christian in his immediate neighbourhood. When Dominus confessed, he bade them cut his mouth with scourges, and, as he persisted, he commanded them to take him outside the city, break his legs, and leave him. In that state he lingered on for seven days without food, giving thanks to the last (*Men. Basil.* Oct. 1). [E. B. B.]

(2) Martyr, brought before Maximin at Caesarea, Nov. 5, A.D. 307, with Theotimus, Timotheus, Philotheus, Dorotheus, Carterius, Silvanus, and others. Eusebius tells us that he had shone in many other confessions, and was well known throughout Palestine for his great freedom of speech at such times, and that he alone on that day was condemned to the flames. See PAMPHILUS. (Eus. *Mart. Palaest.* vii.) [E. B. B.]

(3), ST., bishop of Digne, lived in the 4th century, and is commemorated on the 13th February. He came with St. Marcellinus, or Marcellus, and Vincentius from Africa to preach the gospel in Gaul. Dominus and Vincentius were co-disciples, and they first went with their master Marcellinus to Rome when St. Eusebius was pope and Constantine emperor, about the year 310. When after they had been with him for some time in Alpine Gaul, Marcellinus sent them on a mission together, telling them that they were to go like the disciples of old, who went in pairs, and that although absent in body, he would be with them in spirit. Dominus settled at Digne, which was at that time given up to idolatry. Here, though he at first met with some opposition, his labours were crowned with signal success, for the people forsook their idols in crowds, and as many as five hundred were baptized in one day.

After a time he was enabled to build a church in honour of the blessed Virgin, and then Marcellinus came and consecrated him bishop. Meanwhile the church in the East was beginning to suffer from the Arian heresy, and the council of Nicaea was held. But Dominus kept his flock uncontaminated by the new heresy. At length, when he felt that he was about to depart, he appointed Vincentius his successor, and died on the 13th February, in the reign of Constantine.

During their mission Dominus and Vincentius

traversed the greater part of the Maritime Alps. (AA. SS. *Boll.* Feb. ii. pp. 660-61. Petrus Gassendus, *In Ecclesiam Diniensem*, quoted in *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1109.) [D. R. J.]

DOMNINUS (4), bishop of Marcanopolis, in the province of Moesia Inferior, circ. A.D. 360. He interested himself, together with the Arian bishop Valens, for the recall of Eunomius, the opponent of Basil of Caesarea. (Philostorg. ix. viii.; *Patrol. Graec.* lxxv. 575; Ceillier, vi. 261.) [W. M. S.]

(5) Bishop of Gratianopolis (Grenoble), attended the council of Aquileia, and joined in the condemnation of Palladius and Secundianus (Ambrose, iii. 821-843). He is also known as St. Dominus (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 219; Labbe, *Concil.* t. iii. col. 999.) [J. L. D.]

(6) A young man of the 4th-5th century, of noble birth, in answer to whom Nilus of Sinai wrote a very long letter on temptations and the means of surmounting them. (Nilus, *Epist.* lib. iii. 43, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxix. 407; Ceillier, viii. 220.) [W. M. S.]

(7) Presbyter of the 4th-5th century, to whom Nilus of Sinai wrote three letters on toleration, patience, and prayer. He appears to have been a man of hasty, ardent, and contemptuous disposition. (S. Nil. *Epist.* iii. 144, 145, 146, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxix. 449.) [W. M. S.]

(8) Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, who was consecrated by Praylius, bishop of Jerusalem, though a "digamus." (Theodoret, *Epist.* 110; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* tom. iii. col. 567.) [E. V.]

(9) and **CYRIACUS**, the deacons appointed to summon the bishops to the sessions of the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 381.) [E. B. B.]

(10), **ST.**, 22nd bishop of Vienne, succeeded St. Julian, according to Ado and others, towards the middle of the 6th century; the precise year is not stated. His name, however, does not occur in the acts of any council. In the chronicle of Ado, referred to above, he is said to have distinguished himself as much in divine as in secular arts; to have been a lover of the poor, a redeemer of captives, and most upright in his life. His learning and manners made him very popular among the clergy of Vienne. According to the Martyrology of Ado he was commemorated on the 3rd November. Flavius Lacanius, an illustrious man, built a chapel in honour of him and a tomb with a poetical epitaph under the following heading: "Dominus papa, in nomine Christi pauper episcopus." The word "papa" is perhaps worthy of note, as customary in the 6th century. We may compare the common use amongst bishops of the phrase "Your Holiness," in addressing each other (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 23; Le Blant, *Inscript. Christ.* ii. 56; Adonis *Martyrologium*, *Patrol. Lat.* cxxiii. 9.) [D. R. J.]

DOMNIO, a presbyter of Rome towards the end of the 4th century, to whom Jerome sent his notes on the twelve Minor Prophets, which no longer exist, accompanied by an introductory letter. (Hieron. *Ep. ad Pammachum*, p. 243.) There exists a second letter from Jerome to

Domnio, in answer to a letter in which Domnio had asked him to reply to certain criticisms on Jerome's book against Jovinian. The letter of Domnio shews that the critic was a young monk. Jerome treats him with great contempt. (Hieron. *Ep. ad Domn.* p. 244.) In A.D. 394 Domnio received at Rome Paulinus, presbyter of Barcelona, afterwards bishop of Nola. (Paulin. *Ep.* 3 and 5, *Patrol. Lat.* lxi.) Paulinus, in a letter to Alypius, gives him the title of Father. Domnio was canonised, and is celebrated on Dec. 28. (Migne, *Encycl. Theolog.* xl. 771; Ceillier, vii. 603, viii. 52; August. *Epistolar.* Classis, i. 29; *Patrol. Lat.* xxxiii. 100.) [W. M. S.]

DOMNITIUS, a friend to whom Sidonius describes when king Sigismer, on his way to wed the daughter of the king of the Visigoths, made his entry into the city, where he himself then was (Sidon. *Ep.* iv. 20.) [E. B. B.]

DOMNOLENUS, ST., confessor, Auxerre. Is commemorated on October 21, but there is no certainty as to who he was or when he lived. He is supposed to have been the Domnolenus whom St. Vigilius mentions in his will—"Do ad unam cappam villam Leodebarde meas portiones, quas de Sperio et Domnoleno presbytero habere videor"—in which case he must have lived towards the end of the 7th century, as St. Vigilius died about 685.

(2) Galfredus Vosiensis wrote in 1184:—In the church of St. Gregory (Limosin), near the monastery of St. Andrew, is seen the tomb of St. Domnolenus, concerning whom nothing is known except the report that he was prince of Limosin, and his festival is on July 1. His body was translated outside the city in 1534.

St. Domnolenus of Auxerre, however, and his namesake of Limosin are thought to be two distinct persons. The former is commonly known as St. Andelain, the latter as St. Dampnolet, St. Anolet, St. Tonnolein, St. Ounoulé (AA. SS. *Boll.* Oct. ix. p. 324; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 432, ii. 539.) [D. R. J.]

DOMNOLUS (1), ST., 10th bishop of Le Mans, brother of St. Audoinus bishop of Angers. "In the time of king Clothaire," says Gregory of Tours, "he was abbat of the monastery of St. Laurence at Paris. During the life of king Chilbert the elder, he had been signally faithful to Chlothaire, often concealing his spies; accordingly, when Clothaire was king, he looked out for him a bishopric. When the bishop of Avignon died, Clothaire thought that see would suit him. But Domnolus, hearing of this, repaired to the church of St. Martin, where Clothaire had come to say his prayers, and after spending the whole night in watching, persuaded the attendants of the king to suggest that he did not wish to be banished from his sight like a captive; let not the king suffer his simplicity to be taxed by sophistical senators and philosophical judges at Avignon; the place would be for his abasement, not for his honour. The king agreed. So when Innocens, bishop of Le Mans died, he appointed Domnolus to that see." This must have been in 559 or 560, as Gregory says that Domnolus died in the 7th year of king Chilbert, which was the 21st of Chilperic and Gunthramn, or A.D. 581, after an episcopate of

22 years. This passage of Gregory has been rejected by Le Cointe (ad ann. 545) and by Papebrochius; but their objections have been sufficiently met by Bouquet.

The acts of Domnolus state that he was returning from Rome, when elected by the people and clergy of Le Mans. The first mention of his episcopate is apparently in 566, in a charter falsely attributed to the abbat Gallus; and in the same year in another charter by which St. Germain is thought by some to grant a privilege to the abbey of St. Cross; by others it is rejected. In 567 he was present at the second council of Tours.

His virtues soon acquired him the reputation of one of the greatest prelates of his age. His friends were the most illustrious of his order, among them St. Germain of Paris. Part of the night he passed in prayer, and during his meals he read books which placed before him the religious ideal. His faith in his creed was so great that he could not officiate at the Eucharist without shedding tears. To the poor he disbursed enormous sums; he founded the abbey of St. Vincent du Mans, finished that of St. George, and founded a monastery and a hospital between Beaugé and La Sarthe.

In his old age he desired to nominate a successor, and proposed abbat Theodulph, but the choice was not accepted, and fell upon Baldé-gisile, mayor of the palace to Chilperic.

Domnolus died shortly after, Dec. 1, 581. His body was interred, at his desire, in the abbey of St. Vincent. His relics were kept there till 1793; but his head was at the church of Chaume-en-Brie, where his feast was celebrated under the name of St. Dôme. His days are May 16 and Dec. 1. His will exists, and is given in vol. lxxii. of the *Latin Patrology*, p. 629. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 345; Le Cointe, ad ann. 545; *AA. SS. Bolland.* May, iii. p. 603; Migne, *Encycl. Théol.* xl. 771.) [W. M. S.]

DOMNOLUS (2), ST., bishop and confessor, Vienne. He was the twenty-ninth archbishop of Vienne, lived in the beginning of the 7th century, the period assigned to him being 617, and is commemorated on June 16. In the time of the emperor Phocas and Clovis king of the Franks, he afforded great assistance to Gregory the Great in the conversion of Britain. He succeeded St. Desiderius, and was succeeded by St. Aetherius. St. Domnolus displayed much zeal in redeeming Christian captives. He also distinguished himself by his bold defence of St. Rusticula, abbess of the monastery of St. Caesarius at Arles, who had been condemned and imprisoned on false charges. St. Domnolus went to the king and told him he was sinning against God in having unjustly condemned a servant of Christ. The king and queen listened to him with great reverence, and ordered the prisoner to be released. (*AA. SS. Boll.*, June, iii. p. 145; *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 29.) [D. R. J.]

(3) 12th bishop of Mâcon. At the beginning of his episcopate his city is said to have been besieged by the Arabs. Le Cointe says that he was bishop in 732, and may have lived till the time of king Pippin, from which prince, who was then mayor of the palace, he obtained for his church of Mâcon a charter,

A.D. 743, dated January 1, in the 2nd year of his rule. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 1043.)

[D. R. J.]

DOMNULUS (1), imperial quaestor, a pious man, accustomed to retire to the monasteries of the Jura, is informed by Sidonius (*Ep.* iv. 25) of a provincial council held for the election of a bishop of Châlons, at which Patientius bishop of Lyons presided, and as the popular vote was equally divided, joined with Euphronius in appointing a certain John, who had been a reader from childhood, then archdeacon, then presbyter, to the vacant see. [E. B. B.]

(2) Placed by Honoratus, bishop of Mar-seilles, with Salvius (or Silvius) and Eusebius as a doctor of the church in the 7th century, celebrated by his excellent writings. Nothing of his work remains. (Honoratus, *Vita Hil.* cap. xi.; *Patrol. Lat.* l. p. 1232; Ceillier, viii. 452.)

[W. M. S.]

DOMNUS (1) succeeded Theoctistus as bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, A.D. 257 or 258 (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 14).

[E. V.]

(2) I. Bishop of Antioch, appointed by the council that assembled at Antioch A.D. 269 to consider the heretical teaching of Paul of Samosata, on the condemnation and deposition of that infamous man. Domnus was the son of Paul's predecessor, Demetrianus. He was appointed by the sole authority of the council, without any reference to the clergy and people, the assembled bishops evidently fearing that if the power of choice were allowed them Paul would be re-elected (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 30). Paul, relying on the support of Zenobia, retained possession for two years of the episcopal residence and the church connected with it. The orthodox section appealed against this usurpation to Aurelianus after he had conquered Zenobia and taken Antioch, A.D. 272. The emperor decided that the right of occupation should belong to the party which was in communion with the bishops of Italy and the see of Rome. This decision was enforced by the civil powers, and Paul was compelled to leave the palace in disgrace (Euseb. *H. E.* u. s.). The episcopate of Domnus was not a long one. It is variously reckoned at five or three years, according as the *terminus a quo* is the deposition of Paul in A.D. 269, or his expulsion from the episcopal residence A.D. 272. Domnus died A.D. 274, and was succeeded by Timaeus (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* tom. iv. p. 302; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. i. p. 193, Clark's translation; Neale, *Patriarch. of Antioch*, pp. 52-57).

[E. V.]

(3) One of the forty-three solitaries who in the 4th century lived at Raithu, not far from Sinai, in separate caverns, under the rule of the abbat Paul. About A.D. 373 they were attacked by the Blemmyes. One of them hid himself, and after the retreat of the enemy discovered Domnus, Andreas, and Orion still alive. But Domnus died shortly of his wounds. They are celebrated on January 14. (Ceillier, iv. 285; *Ex Actis Graecis Combefisii*, ed. Paris, A.D. 1660, pag. 95, etc.; *AA. SS. Bolland.* Januarius, i. ad diem xiv. p. 966.)

[W. M. S.]

(4) II. Bishop of Antioch, the second of that name, the friend of Theodoret. He was

nephew of John, bishop of Antioch, and was brought up under Euthymius, the famous anchorite of Palestine. He was ordained deacon by Juvenal of Jerusalem, on his visit to the Laura for the purpose of consecrating the church of the community in A.D. 429. Two years afterwards, on learning that his uncle, the bishop of Antioch, had become entangled in the meshes of the Nestorian heresy, he besought Euthymius to allow him to go and extricate him. Euthymius, with a clear insight into the weakness of the young man's character, counselled him to remain where he was; telling him that God could take care of his uncle without him; that solitude was safer for him than the world; that if he persisted in his design it would not turn out to his ultimate advantage; that he might not improbably succeed to his uncle's dignity, but would become the victim of clever and unprincipled men, who would avail themselves of his simplicity, and then accomplish his ruin. But the old man's sage counsels were thrown away. Domnus left the Laura without even saying farewell to Euthymius, whose predictions were only too truly fulfilled (*Vita S. Euthymii*, cc. 42, 56, 57). He obtained such popularity at Antioch that on the death of his uncle, A.D. 441, he was appointed his successor, and at once took rank as the chief bishop of the Eastern world. In A.D. 445, Domnus summoned a synod of the Syrian bishops to settle the question of the deposition of Athanasius of Perrha, which had remained for some time open, in consequence of his refusal to appear before the assemblies to which he had been summoned to answer the charges against him. Athanasius was condemned in default, his deposition was confirmed, and Sabinianus was consecrated in his room. In A.D. 447 he consecrated Irenaeus to the see of Tyre, although he had been twice married (Theodoret, *Epist.* 110; Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iii. col. 1275). Theodosius having commanded that the appointment of Irenaeus should be annulled, both as a *digamus* and as a favourer of the Nestorian heresy, Domnus, notwithstanding all Theodoret's remonstrances, shewed the weakness of his character by yielding to the imperial will (Theodoret, *u. s.*; *Epist.* 80). We next find him taking a leading part in the question of the orthodoxy of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, destined to become so notorious. Having visited Hierapolis for the purpose of enthroning the new bishop Stephen, two of the priests of Edessa, Cyrus and Eulogius, took the opportunity of presenting accusations against their bishop, who was charged with promulgating Nestorian doctrines (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iv. col. 658). Domnus summoned a council to take cognizance of these charges, which met at Antioch, in A.D. 448, and decided in favour of Ibas, and deposed his accusers (Labbe, tom. iv. col. 639 sq.). Domnus's sentence, though revoked by Flavian, to whom the deposed presbyters appealed, was confirmed by the three episcopal commissioners, to whom he and the emperor Theodosius had committed the matter, who arranged a concordat between the parties. Domnus was one of the earliest impeachers of the orthodoxy of Eutyches, in a synodical letter to Theodosius, about A.D. 447 (Facundus, lib. viii. c. 5; lib. xii. c. 5). When it became evident that Eutyches's demand to have the charges against him heard by a general council would

be granted, through the all-powerful influence of the eunuch Chrysaphius, Domnus wrote to apprise Theodoret of it. Theodoret replied by warning Domnus of the dangers to the church he apprehended from such a synod, and counselling him as to the measures he should take to prevent his being crushed by the faction of Dioscorus, and being forced as president of the assembly (a position which as the premier bishop of the East he could not fail to occupy) to give his sanction to the anathematisms of Cyril (Theod. *Epist.* 112). The advice he gave that Domnus should be very careful what bishops he brought with him to the proposed council, and should select none but those whose strength of character and zeal for the truth could be depended upon, was rendered nugatory by the dominant secular influence. The council, infamous as "the Council of Robbers," or the *Latrocinium*, held at Ephesus, Aug. 8, A.D. 449, was packed with the grossest unfairness, and its proceedings were characterised by tumult and violence. In virtue of an imperial rescript Domnus found himself deprived of his presidential seat, which was occupied by Dioscorus, the Roman legate took the second place, while by a reversal of the recognised order of the sees, precedence over the patriarch of Antioch was given to Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavian of Constantinople being degraded to the fifth place (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iv. col. 115, p. 251). The weakness of Domnus's character soon made itself evident. Cowed by the dictatorial spirit of Dioscorus, and unnerved by the outrageous violence of Barsumas and his band of brutal monks, he consented to revoke his former condemnation of Eutyches, and gave his voice for his restoration to the dignity of presbyter and abbat (Labbe, *ib.* col. 258). This cowardly act of submission was followed by a still baser proof of weakness, the condemnation of the venerable Flavian (*ib.* col. 306). Dioscorus, having thus by sheer intimidation obtained his ends, revenged himself for their former opposition to his wishes, upon those whose cowardice had made them the instruments of his nefarious designs, and proceeded to mete out to them the same measure they had dealt to Flavian. Domnus was the last to be deposed. The charges alleged against him were his reported approval of a Nestorian sermon preached before him at Antioch by Theodoret on the death of Cyril (Mercator, tom. i. p. 276), and some expressions in letters written by him to Dioscorus condemning the perplexed and obscure character of Cyril's anathematisms (Liberatus, c. 11, p. 74). Indisposition, the fruit of self-condemnation and the loss of all self-respect, kept Domnus away from the synod that day, and he was condemned to deposition and banishment in his absence. The remainder of his days appear to have been spent by Domnus in endeavouring to atone for his fatal weakness, by a complete retirement from the public scenes for which he had proved so little fitted. He was the only one of the bishops then deposed and banished who was not reinstated after the council of Chalcedon. At that council Maximus, his successor in the see of Antioch, obtained permission to assign Domnus a pension from the revenues of the church, the sum being left to his discretion (Labbe, *ib.* col. 681; append. col. 770). Finally, on his recall from exile Domnus

returned to the monastic home of his youth, and ended his days in the Laura which his master St. Euthymius had rendered so celebrated, where in A.D. 452, according to Theophanes, he afforded a refuge to the bishop by whom he had been ordained, Juvenal of Jerusalem, when driven from his see by the usurper Theodosius (Theophanes, p. 92).

[E. V.]

DOMNUS (5) Bishop of Apamea, a member of the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. iv. p. 373), who, leaving before its conclusion, had his signature to its acts affixed by Mellitus of Larissa (*ib.* col. 787). The 87th letter of Theodoret is addressed to him, complaining of his silence in his time of trial, when so many calumnies were heaped upon him by his enemies from Osrhoene. Towards the middle of the 6th century Domnus's name was erased from the diptychs by Peter, an heretical successor (Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. p. 912).

[E. V.]

(6) III. Bishop of Antioch, the third of the name, succeeded Ephraim in A.D. 546. He was a Thracian by birth, and had presided over an almshouse at Lychnis in Illyricum. Having visited Constantinople on business, he had an interview with Justinian, who was so much charmed with him that he at once nominated him to the vacant see of Antioch. He was present at the oecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 553 (Labbe, *Concil.* tom. v. p. 416, 419 sq.). He occupied the see 14 years, and was succeeded in A.D. 461 by Anastasius Sinaita. (*Vita Sim. Stylit. Jun. No. 76*; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. f. 734.)

[E. V.]

(7) Bishop of Elne (episc. Helenensis—Helena, Helna, and Elna). The Sammarthani say that he ruled the church of Elne before the year 568, and he is supposed to have been the first bishop of that diocese. He was distinguished for the sanctity of his life, the candour of his manners, his profound knowledge of Holy Scripture, and his uncompromising hostility to heresy. In an ancient chronicle occurs the following notice of him: "Domnus Helenensis ecclesiae episcopus, clarus habetur." (*Gallia, Christ.* vi. 1031; Joann. Biclairens. *Chronicon, Patrol. Lat.* lxxii. 860.)

[D. R. J.]

(8) Or **DONUS**, bishop of Messana, in the 7th century. Pope Gregory the Great, in sending him the pallium, tells him only to use it at the times at which his predecessor had used it, and to add to the external ornament the practice of virtue. In another letter pope Gregory forbids him to exact any money for the burial of the dead. (Greg. *Epistolae*, lib. vi. num. 9; lib. viii. num. 3, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvii. 798, 896; Ceillier, xi. 504, 510.)

[W. M. S.]

(9) Pope. [DONUS.]

(10) Forty-first bishop of Avignon, lived in the time of pope Gregory II. and king Chilperic II. In an ancient codex he is described as elected by the people and clergy to succeed St. Veredemius when abbat of St. Peter and St. Paul; he was an illustrious prelate who ruled the church with signal success, and gave an example of good life. It is not known on what day or in what year he died, but the year 743 is mentioned as the most probable. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 870.)

[D. R. J.]

DOMO or **DROMO**, twenty-ninth abbat of Chartres, succeeded Deodatus in the 7th century (*Gall. Christ.* viii. 1101.)

[D. R. J.]

DONA, Welsh saint of the 7th century, founder of Llandona church in Anglesey; commemorated on Nov. 1. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 302.)

[C. H.]

DONADEUS, 12th bishop of Gap, known from the synod of Narbonne, held in the year 788 under the presidency of Daniel the metropolitan. There was also present at that council Elifantus, archbishop of Arles, who was accompanied by many bishops, amongst whom was Donadeus. (*Gall. Christ.* ed. 1870, t. i. p. 458.)

[D. R. J.]

DONALD (**DONEVALDUS**), July 15. St. Donald or Donevaldus, and his nine daughters are commemorated by *Kal. Brev. Aberdon.* Adam King, and Dempster on July 15, and by Camerarius on July 12. St. Donald and his daughters are said by local tradition to have led a religious life in the glen of Ogilvie, in Forfarshire, where they are still remembered as 'The Nine Maidens,' and their dedications are found throughout Forfarshire [MAZOTA]. (Dempster *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 208; Camerarius, *d. Scot. Fort.* 163; Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 157; Boethius, *Hist. Scot.* lib. ix. c. 25 Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scot. Saints*, 157, 205, 324. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jul. tom. iv. 60) give a memoir of St. Donald and his daughters at July 10, and place them, as the Scotch authorities do, under king Eugenius VII. in the 8th century.

[J. G.]

DONANUS (*Acta SS.* April, ii. 487), Irish saint. [DONNAN.]

[C. H.]

DONARD. [DOMHANGORT.]

DONATA (Carthaginian refugee?). Christian at Rome, Cyp. *Ep.* 22. See MACARIUS.

[E. W. B.]

DONATDEUS, deacon in Numidia A.D. 602, deposed by his bishop Victor, appealed to Gregory the Great. (*Conc.* v. 1612; Ceillier, xi. 910.)

[E. B. B.]

DONATIANUS (1), ST., martyr, Nantes. The date assigned to this saint by the Bollandists is 299, and he is commemorated on the 24th of May.

SS. Donatianus and Rogatianus were two brothers of good family at Nantes. Diocletian and Maximian, when they were persecuting the Christians at Rome, sent letters to the Roman governor in Gaul, who is thought to have been Rictiovarus, commanding him to set up images of Jupiter or Apollo in his province, and to compel all the people to worship them. Donatianus and Rogatianus not only refused to comply with the injunctions as to pagan worship, but were accused of making Christian converts, in consequence of which they were arrested and taken before the Roman governor. Donatianus was considered the most important, and was examined first. As they refused to retract, they were first tortured and then ordered to be beheaded, which sentence was carried out, although the executioner, before beheading them, first pierced their throats with his lance. Their bodies were buried at the place of their martyrdom, near Nantes.

In the reign of Constantine an oratory was raised over their tomb, and towards the end of the 5th century a church. Their relics were subsequently translated to the cathedral of Nantes.

(*AA. SS.* May, v. 279; *Petr. de Natal. Catal. SS.* v. 37; *Baillet, Vies des Saints*; *Migne, Encycl. Théolog.* xl. 775; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. 760.)

[D. R. J.]

DONATIANUS (2) Bishop of Claudii Forum, at the council of Rome A.D. 313. (*Labbe, Conc.* i. 1404.)

[E. B. B.]

(3) **ST.**, bishop and confessor, cir. 346 (*Gams, Series Episc.* p. 532), of Châlons-sur-Saône, commemorated on the 7th of August. His name appears among those appended to the council of Cologne, A.D. 346. (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 861.)

[D. R. J.]

(4) African catechumen, imprisoned with **LUCIUS** A.D. 359, and after having been baptized in prison, instantly expired. (*Ruinart*, 233; *Ceillier*, ii. 388.)

[E. B. B.]

(5) **ST.**, bishop of Rheims, A.D. 360-390, commonly called **St. Donas**. He was by birth a Roman, his father's name being **Cornelius**, his mother's **Lucina**. He succeeded **St. Maternianus**, and was succeeded, according to *Baillet*, by **Viventius**. He is either the 7th or 9th bishop. Nothing is known of this saint, but he became very celebrated by the translation of his relics in the 9th century, first to **Turnholt** or **Turholt**, then to **Bruges**, where they were placed in the church of the Virgin, which afterwards took the name of **St. Donatian**. He thus became the patron saint of **Bruges**, and tutelary saint of the maritime coast. He is commemorated, first on the 14th October, which is his principal festival, and then on the days of his translations, viz. 6th January, the 24th May, and the 30th August.

(*AA. SS.* Oct. vi. pp. 487-515; *Baillet, Vies des Saints*, iii. 215; *Surius, Vit. SS.*; *J. Molanus, Recapitulatio SS. Belgii*; *Richard et Giraud, Bibl. Sac.*; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 5.)

[D. R. J.]

(6) Bishop, at the fourth council of Carthage, A.D. 398. He subscribes as **Donatianus Talabrigensis primæ sedis**, and signs second, after **Aurelius** bishop of Carthage. (*Labbe, Conc.* ii. 119.)

(7) Bishop of **Telepte**, the metropolis and *prima sedes* of the province of **Byzacena**, in Africa. He presided at the council at **Telepte** held A.D. 418. The only thing for which this council is known is the reading of a decretal letter from pope **Siricius** for the decision of a local dispute, an illustration of the deference felt in the African Church for the bishop of Rome. (*Labbe, Conc.* ii. 1577.)

[C. H.]

(8) Missionary to Britain. [**DUVIANUS**.]

DONATILLA, martyred with **Maxima** and **Secunda** at **Tuburbum**, in the province of **Byzacena**, July 30, A.D. 304, mentioned in the martyrdom of **Crispina**. (*Ruinart, Act. Sinc.* Mart. 450.)

[E. B. B.]

DONATISM. The Donatists were the first Christians who separated from the church on the ground of discipline. The church had hitherto been rent and torn by heresies, such as Gnosticism and Manichæism, which had affected doctrines: but the schism of the Dona-

tists was due to objections to the discipline of the church, and became the parent and pattern of all schisms due to a similar cause. It is important to remember that Donatism was not heresy, as the word is ordinarily understood. All heretics are, in one sense, schismatics, but all schismatics are not heretics; and the Donatists themselves protested, with justice, against being considered heretics.

There was much in the religious atmosphere of the time, much in the peculiar locality (North Africa), which helps to explain the origin and development of this schism. The North African loved 'subjectivity,' as opposed to 'objectivity,' and he found it exemplified in a Tertullian, and reduced to a system in Montanism: he was a born mystic rather than a practical apostle, and he turned to Novatianism—that protest against the church which thought well to enfold within its pale believers and unbelievers, good and bad—as his refuge: he resented what he called the assumption of **St. Cyprian**, and he threw in his lot with **Feliceissimus** or **Novatus** in that contest which has been described as the first protest of Presbyterianism against Episcopalianism. These were the precursors and predecessors of Donatism. Montanism, Novatianism, and this primitive Presbyterianism were storm signals full of omen of the coming crash, and North Africa was the land which seemed to attract into its bosom as its natural home the lightning-flash of destruction.

The principles underlying the intentions of these separatist bodies were principles which command respect. No one can blame systems which theoretically aim at the presentation and preservation among men of a church "without spot or wrinkle," an immaculate clergy, and a laity purified and strengthened by discipline; but the theory was not fulfilled in practice. The history of the Donatist schism adds another proof to the oft-proven fact that, whenever and wherever such principles are enforced in a rigid unbending manner by men who degrade enthusiasm into fanaticism, and distort Scripture language and church rule, the result is disastrous. Doctrine, as well as discipline, is discredited, unity is at an end, and the peace of the church is broken into fragments.

Mensurius was bishop of Carthage during and after the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303). In common with his fellow-Christians, he had been required by the consul **Anulinus** to give up any copies of the Holy Scriptures in his possession. He had answered by hiding them in a safe place, and passing off heretical works in their stead. When the "pious fraud" was made known to the consul, the latter declined to take further action. **Mensurius'** step was open to censure and criticism, and there were not wanting those who applauded the rebuke administered by one **Secundus** of **Tigisis**—"I am a Christian and a bishop, but no 'traitor.'" The act was, however, venial to many in comparison with what followed later. **Mensurius** felt it his duty to check the growing and inordinate reverence for martyrdom. He saw clearly enough that there were too many would-be martyrs whose character would not bear close scrutiny. The cells were full of debtors unable to meet their creditors, of fanatics, of lazy loafers who were fed by indolent devotees, and **Mensurius**

with his archdeacon Caecilian, did his best to discountenance the mistaken reverence with which good but mistaken Christians regarded these undeserving men. This course of action naturally brought him into great odium with those who did not like to be told that they were mistaken, or that they should be careful how they applied their principles. To them martyrdom was the becoming conclusion of the Christian life; the subjective theory was everything, and mistakes in practice were of little account. If a man was in a martyr's cell, that and that alone was enough to make it incumbent upon them to ignore his personal shortcomings. A curious paper exists entitled, *Fragments from the Martyr-history of the Holy Davitus, etc., and other African Martyrs*, which, as written by a Donatist—though of later date than the time in question, and probably spurious—is interesting as giving the extreme conceptions current. In this paper, Mensurius and Caecilian are personally denounced, and their disapprobation is exaggerated into most frightful cruelty; while the virtues and sufferings of the martyrs are profusely dwelt upon, and even power to forgive sins is attributed to them.

During the lifetime of Mensurius the storm was brewing. It fairly broke out when Caecilian (see under the name) succeeded him (A.D. 311). That appointment was felt to be a blow to all who magnified martyrdom, and superstitiously revered martyrs' relics: it was rightly considered a rebuke to a purely theoretical and subjective conception of the church's discipline. But though personal pique and spiritual pride had much to do with the opposition raised to Caecilian, his opponents rested their principal objection on the fact that he had been ordained by a 'traditor,' Felix.

Before briefly considering this objection, it may well be remarked that the charge was, in some respects, a strange one to be made by Caecilian's chief opponent, Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, for documents exist which prove that Secundus himself was a traditor, in spite of his boast to Mensurius. At a synod held at Cirta (A.D. 305) under the presidency of Secundus, for the purpose of electing and ordaining a bishop, the fact became evident that not one present could claim to be free from traditorship. One had thrown the gospels into the fire, another had offered incense to the gods, a third had delivered up small papers but kept his codices. A charge of murder was brought against bishop Purpurius: the members of the synod turned to him. In an agony of fury he broke out: "Do you wish," he cried to Secundus, "to frighten me, as you have frightened others? Not only have I killed, but I do kill all who thwart me. Take care not to provoke me too much, or I shall have to declare what you did when the curator demanded of you to deliver up the Scriptures." The terror of all was great, and the suggestion, that as God had not punished them they should not punish each other, made at an earlier period of the meeting, was adopted as the best escape from their difficulty. The decision of Secundus that each must account to God ('vos scitis et Deus') was greeted with the unanimous answer, "Thanks be to God!" One, Silvanus, was chosen and consecrated, a man who was afterwards (A.D. 320) proved by a judicial process, conducted by the consul Zenophilus, to have been

"a traditor and a thief." (See these documents in Ribbeck and Deutsch.)

These were the men who denounced the traditorship of Felix of Aptunga, and proceeded to elect Majorinus as successor to Mensurius. The day that Majorinus was consecrated, the irrevocable step was taken which transformed opposition into schism. From that date Donatism, as it was afterwards called, had a separate and schismatical existence. The personal character of these men must not, however, be permitted to obscure the importance of the question connected with Felix. The traditorship of the prelate of Aptunga was asserted so loudly at the time, and so frequently by the Donatists afterwards, that it is satisfactory to know that the whole matter was carefully sifted. A great principle was at stake. The opinion widely prevailed at the time, and was always a leading tenet with the Donatists, that the validity of all sacerdotal acts depended on the subjective character of the persons who performed them. Any sacerdotal act performed by an excommunicated person was considered invalid, and a 'traditor' was, to a Donatist, as good as excommunicate. Hence, when the supporters of Caecilian and of Majorinus appealed to Constantine, the emperor at once subjected the alleged traditorship of Felix to a thorough examination (A.D. 313). The point was decided in favour of Felix, his character was cleared, and consequently the ordination of Caecilian was declared valid. But nowhere was the subject more exhaustively discussed than before the consul Aelianus, who, at the bidding of Constantine, gave the Donatists, disgusted with the previous decision of the council at Rome, an opportunity (A.D. 314), at Carthage, of proving their charge against Felix. Claudius Saurianus (or Saturninus), the curator of the republic, who happened to be in Felix's city at the time of the persecution, a local magistrate, Alfius Caecilianus, and others gave such evidence that the finding of the tribunal was unanimous. "Felicem religiosum episcopum liberum esse ab exustione instrumentorum deificorum manifestum est, cum nemo in eum aliquid probare potuerit quod religiosissimas scripturas tradiderit vel exusserit."

Bishop Majorinus died in A.D. 315, but from the first he had been a leader of little consequence to his followers. They had called themselves, for convenience' sake, the party of Majorinus; but after his death, if not before, they took that name—Donatists—by which they are best known in ecclesiastical history. There were two bishops named Donatus; the first of Casae Nigrae, who took up the mantle of Secundus of Tigisis, and who, before Caecilian's elevation, had shewn his schismatical tendencies; the second, the successor of Majorinus and surnamed "the Great." It is difficult, and perhaps unnecessary, to decide from which of these two the sect took its name. The censure passed upon Donatus of Casae Nigrae by the synod of Rome under Melchades for his iteration of baptism and reordination of apostate bishops, was—it is true—a censure passed by adversaries: nevertheless, it may have been sufficient to induce so strict and idealistic a body as the Donatists to prefer tracing their name to one greater than his Numidian brother.

Donatus the Great succeeded Majorinus A.D.

315 as bishop of Carthage; and in him the various converging points of personal hostility to Mensurius and Caecilian, of irritation against the decisions of Rome and Arles (*see* under CAECILIAN), of Aelianus and Constantine, seemed first to centre, and thence again to issue in a more defiant attitude against both Church and State. The dissentients to Caecilian had, consistently enough, refused to his church the title of the Church of God, and appropriated that distinction to themselves. The Caecilianist clergy were condemned for their league with a traitor and their acts repudiated as invalid; hence those who followed Majorinus were rebaptized. But Constantine's edict (A.D. 316) took away from them their churches, and the heavy hand of Ursacius deprived them of their lives. The sectarians wanted a man bold enough to denounce the imperial power and to infuse vigour into their strife against the Caecilianists; and they found that man in Donatus.

This man was neither "the angel" his followers called him, nor "the fiend" his opponents described him. He was a man of unquestionable ability, eloquence and thoroughness—the Cyprian of his party, as St. Augustine called him; but also hard and unloving to foe, proud and overbearing to friend. Optatus and St. Augustine were justified in comparing with the proud "prince of Tyre" (Ezek. xxviii. 2) the man who in his lifetime permitted his followers to swear by his name and by his grey hairs, and could ask of the menial bishops, "What do you say to *my* party?" and who, after his death, was described by Donatists at the conference of Carthage as the miracle-worker, "the pride of the church of Carthage, the man with the reputation of a martyr."

When the soldiers of Ursacius appeared in North Africa Donatus was ready to resist them, and his courage infected the timid people and their prelates. His name became the rallying-point for every man who had real or imaginary grievances against existing ecclesiastical, civil, and social powers: and amongst those whom he attracted were the Circumcellions. "They were a class of men," says St. Augustine, "who followed no kind of useful occupation: they held their own lives in fanatical contempt, and thought no death too cruel for those who differed from them; they wandered about from place to place, chiefly in the country districts, and haunted the cells of the peasants for the purpose of obtaining food. Hence they were called 'Circumcelliones.'" It is charitable to consider many of these men and women affected by religious madness. They were the Camisards and Covenanters of Africa. The better class of Donatists turned away in horror from fanatics who imbrued their hands with the blood of the innocent as well as of the guilty; but the offer of partisanship having been once made and accepted, it was impossible to withdraw it altogether. Donatus, Parmenian, Petilian, and Cresconius were forced, in turn, to palliate as much as they could the actions of those allies who preferred to be called not Circumcellions but Agonistici, Champions of Christ, and who rushed into the battle with "Deo laudes" as their war-cry, and with a weapon dubbed "Israelite" as their war-club.

Constantine soon found that Donatism was not

to be put down by the sword. In A.D. 317, Ursacius received his instructions to hold his hand, and Caecilian was exhorted to treat his opponents kindly, and leave vengeance to God. The emperor's letter was a mixture of truth and sarcasm: "All schisms," he wrote, "are from the devil: and these Separatists proceed from him. What good can you expect from those who are the adversaries of God and the enemies of the holy church? Such men must split off from the church, and attach themselves to the devil. Surely we act most wisely, if we leave to them what they have wrenched from us. By patience and kindness we may hope to gain them. Let us leave vengeance to God. I rejoice to think that you meet their brutality with gentleness and good temper. As I understand that these men have destroyed a church in Constantine, I have ordered my finance-minister to build you a new one. God grant that these mistaken Separatists may at last see their error and turn to the one true God!" It was not a letter calculated to soothe the Donatists. They presently replied to the emperor that he must distinctly understand that they would have nothing to do with his "fool of a bishop" (*i.e.* Caecilian), and that he might do his worst. With this mutual contempt and recrimination matters ended for the time. Constantine during the remainder of his life ignored the Donatists; and they held on their own way, increasing largely in point of numbers in their own districts—in A.D. 330 they held a synod, which was attended by 270 bishops—and establishing a few insignificant stations elsewhere.

Constans, the son of Constantine, succeeded to his father's North-African possessions; and, at first, endeavoured to conciliate the Donatists by kindness. He published (A.D. 340) an edict requiring the Donatists to return to the church, urging that "unity must now exist, because Christ was a lover of unity," and instructed his commissioners Ursacius (probably a different man to the Ursacius already mentioned) and Leontius to distribute money, as alms, in the Donatist as well as in the Catholic churches. The Donatist spurned it as gold offered by the devil to seduce men from their faith. The sword of persecution was then unsheathed to deprive the Donatists of their churches; and the victims who fell became martyrs to the survivors, and their graves the platforms from which to preach resistance. In A.D. 345 a second attempt to win submission was commanded and undertaken by Gregorius. He travelled through the province, offering not only alms but valuable church plate to all who would accept the imperial invitation. This roused Donatus; he issued circular letters through all the provinces, forbidding the acceptance of any presents; and, not content with that, wrote to Gregorius in a style which was simply scurrilous. Two years later (A.D. 347), a third commission, composed of Paul, Macarius, and Taurinus, entered the country. They came to Donatus himself, with their gold in their hands, and to explain their object. The bishop listened impatiently, and at length broke out: "What has the emperor to do with the church?" They were words which meant much at the time, but have meant more since. For they are words which have expressed the principle that Church and State are to be

for ever distinct from, and independent of, each other; and that principle has found its supporters alike in the ranks of Presbyterianism and Ultramontaniam.

The language of Donatus was repeated right and left, and from every Donatistic pulpit preachers proclaimed the duty of separation from a church "which committed fornication with the princes of this world," and whose prelates were mere tools of an emperor who employed miserable hypocrites to spread his nets. Such furious obloquy served to madden the fanatics, even though it brought upon them furious persecution. The Circumcellions rose, and frightful bloodshed followed. These 'Christian champions' traversed the country, subverting everything. Slaves and debtors were brothers, to be welcomed with open arms; masters and creditors were tyrants, to be speedily brought to their senses. When resisted, the Circumcellion struck his victim to the earth, or gloated over his death-agonies; when summoned to resist, he attacked with the fury inspired by fanaticism the foe pointed out to him, and died doing battle for his church and discipline. Their excesses were so great, that even Donatus and his brother-bishops, who had started them in their mad career, were forced to appeal to Taurinus to check them. The Circumcellions kissed the hands which betrayed them, and turned their fury upon themselves. They hated life for themselves as well as in others: they longed only for martyrdom, as they understood it. The pagan temples were invaded that death might be found from the sword of some infuriated idolater: the courts of justice were entered, and the frightened judge compelled to order their instant execution; travellers were stopped in their journeys, and threatened with instant death if they did not slay the suppliants at their feet. Days, hours, and places were named that an admiring crowd might witness these unhappy, mistaken, men cast themselves headlong from some rock into the graves which their posterity would reverence as those of the martyrs.

Macarius did not think it necessary or possible to discriminate between the more moderate Donatist and the extreme Circumcellionist. With an iron hand he crushed both. Donatus himself was banished, and died in exile.

The church was triumphant. Optatus saluted Constans as the servant of God who had been privileged to restore unity, husbands to wives, children to parents, brother to brother; but there were many who regretted that unity had been won at such a price. When Donatists afterwards called Christians 'Macarians,' in scornful allusion to the persecutor of their sect, it was characteristic of St. Augustine to reply: "Yes, we are Macarians, for that name means 'blessed,' and Who is more blessed than Christ to Whom we belong?" but it was both natural in him and worthy of him to go on and add, "Don't let me call one another names. Don't cast at me the times of Macarius, and I won't remind you of the madness of the Circumcellions. Let us, as far as possible, work together, because we are all orphans."

It was probably soon after the cessation of the persecution that Gratus, Caecilian's successor, summoned a synod at Carthage, which established, among other points, two conclusions of great

value in matters of discipline:—(1) the non-iteration of baptism, when it had been duly administered in the name of the Trinity; (2) the necessary restrictions to be placed on reverence for martyrs, and on the assignment of that title to persons deserving it.

In A.D. 361 Julian became emperor. His edict "recalled all the bishops and clergy who had been banished in the reign of Constantius, and granted equal freedom to all parties of the Christian church." The Donatists were not included in this act. Two of their bishops, Rogatian and Pontus, waited on the emperor. They saluted him as the one man from whom they could expect justice, and they left his presence with full permission to return to their country. The act of mercy was just, but the Donatists had found it convenient to forget their watchword: "What has the emperor to do with the church?" The return of the sectaries was marked by acts of violence and murder. As soon as they obtained possession of their churches they treated them as places which had been profaned. They washed the walls and altars, tore the vestments to pieces, threw the holy vessels outside and the sacred elements to the dogs. Their next step was to introduce again and enforce their own rigorous discipline. Apostates were received only after the most humiliating penance, laymen were re-baptized, and clerics re-ordained. For two years Donatism was in the ascendant, and the church bearing the cross. One who had hid him all the elements of a Separatist sat upon the imperial throne, and schism basked in the imperial sunshine. But the cry which went up from the dying Julian's lips (A.D. 363), "Galilaee! Thou hast conquered," was also the cry which told the Donatist that his day of triumph had ended.

Donatus had died in exile. He was succeeded by Parmenian, perhaps the ablest and least prejudiced of the Donatist episcopacy. A foreigner by birth, and actually ignorant of many of the saddest and cruellest episodes of Donatist history, he entered upon his duties at Carthage from the passionate views which marked so many of his followers, and disposed to rate at a slight value much that to them was of great importance. His literary merit was great, and excited the admiration of Optatus bishop of Milevi and of St. Augustine, to both of whom the Christian church owes a statement of the current Donatist opinions. The theological disputations, for example, which took place between Optatus and Parmenian, are preserved in the great work of the former, and there is every reason to believe that Parmenian's opinions are honestly given. Optatus was a man of unquestioned piety, dialectical skill, and orthodoxy; perfectly indifferent to the threats of the Circumcellion, or to the temptations of bribery and corruption; he was animated by an earnest wish for the restoration of unity, provided it could be obtained without the sacrifice of principle; and few can read his arguments without the conviction that he was seeking as much common ground as possible before he states unhesitatingly where he and his opponent must part. If the usual tone of kindness and courtesy is occasionally forgotten, if the title "brother" given to Parmenian is replaced by "Antichrist" when Donatus is mentioned, if cool argumentative reasoning is sometimes

dropped for defiant passionate utterance, the difference is intelligible in a character full of both charity and zeal, and is explained by St. Augustine's remark: "Optatus is a second Ambrose of Milan."

A slight sketch of the passage of arms between these two men will be of interest. There were two points about which, theoretically, both were agreed: (1) That there was only one Church; and (2) that in that one Church there was only one baptism, and this not to be repeated. But disagreement began directly the theory upon these points was debated from the Catholic or Donatist point of view. "A church," said the Donatist, "in which traitors both existed and dispensed the sacraments was no church, and baptism administered by traitors was no baptism. Where, then, was the pure church? with the Catholic or Donatist? how far was the validity of the sacraments dependent upon the purity of the church and the personal character of those who dispensed them? These were old questions coming forward, but to be discussed between Optatus and Parmenian as they had never been discussed before.

Parmenian argues successively upon baptism, the unity of the church, the case of traitors, the acts of the imperial commissioners Paul and Macarius, unction, and the dispensation of the sacraments by and to sinners; and Optatus deals with these burning questions not exactly in the same order, but in an order which is for his purpose more logical. He first discusses the question of traitors and separatists, then the unity of the church, then the commissioners, then the case of sinners, then baptism, and lastly deals with the prejudices and errors of the Donatists.

Optatus prefaces his remarks upon traitors by a few words full of conciliatory power, and expressive of a truth which should never be forgotten in any discussion between Churchman and Nonconformist. "Remember," he says to Parmenian, "you Donatists have, in common with ourselves, the true sacraments." There was no such question between them as:—what is to be the attitude of the church towards heretics? The Donatists were not heretics, they were schismatics; and schism, however much to be regretted, was very far short of heresy. "Heresy is not only without truth, but has abandoned the truth it once knew; schism is like a child, which has indeed separated itself in its disobedience and hatred from the mother church, but it does not wish to do anything new or anything different from what it has learnt from its mother." Optatus then gives at length the whole history of the Donatist schism; however painful to Parmenian to know the facts, know them he must, that once known he might see how unjustifiable and self-condemnatory the acts of his predecessors had been. This history need not be repeated here. It was hoped that as Parmenian examined it, he would see two things: (1) not only that Caecilian and Felix were not traitors, and that consequently the church to which they belonged was the one true and pure church; but (2) that among the Donatists were traitors and those ordained by traitors, and that consequently the Donatists were schismatics, as well as inconsistent with their asserted principles when they appealed to the emperor.

Parmenian and Optatus had one grand tenet in common. They were neither of them men who could assert or approve the independency of religious bodies, and the existence of many churches. They both held fast to one visible church, the one body with its many members; and then they asked themselves the question: Where is the one church? Optatus answered with the Catholics, "who connect the holiness of the church with the presence of God's word and sacraments, unchangeable as God Himself," who consider the church "Catholic" or "universal" (Pss. ii. 8, lxxii. 8); whose members include "heathen and all people" (Ps. xvi. 1-3); which has received "gifts," and amongst these a knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity (and other doctrines), "an unbroken succession of bishops from the time of St. Peter," and "a priesthood independent of the worthiness of the individuals." Parmenian definitely asserted the opposite to this. He insisted most strenuously upon personal worthiness. Such insistence probably proceeded then, as it frequently does still, from a confusion between "holiness" and "justification," between the "holiness" of the church as the church, and the "justification" of the individual as an individual; but it was most firmly held; and consequently so long as men were not what the Donatist asserted that they ought to be, so long they were not to be considered members of the one church; the church which retained them was not the church, but a body engaged in compassing land and sea to make men twofold more the children of hell, or staining itself with the blood of the saints. The one true church was to be found where the saints were, in that quarter of Africa where the Donatists lived. Parmenian either did not know, or had forgotten the fanaticism of the Circumcellions and the excesses perpetrated by those whom he called "saints." Optatus was obliged to remind him of this; and then he asked how a church could be called holy which applauded such personal worthiness as theirs.

This question of the personal holiness of men comes up again in the sections about sinners; but, like the question of the relations between Church and State (discussed by Optatus in the section in which he considers the conduct of the commissioners), the subject does not receive the ample treatment which it received when St. Augustine took it up. As Optatus examined it, the question took the form: "Suppose that a priest be a sinner (a wicked man), what then?" but his answer was not so much an answer to that question as a defence of the position, "If you Donatists refuse our administration of the sacraments because you consider our priests wicked men, then must you also reject your own, for your wickedness is much greater." Few cared then, any more than now, for that kind of argument; and, in fact, Optatus had supplied himself already with a far healthier and holier solution of the question when he had suggested "let us leave to God to say—who is a sinner. One Father has begotten us all, one Redeemer has saved us, one church has given us birth through the sacraments. We pray for you because we love to do so; you also pray for us, even though you wish it not, whenever you say the Lord's prayer; unless, indeed, you pray then, O my Father, which art in heaven. Give me, my

daily bread, Forgive me my trespasses.' Ah! there is one band which encircles us all, and nothing can rend it asunder."

The question of baptism was debated more as it affected re-baptism than as a new doctrine. Parmenian and Optatus both agreed in acknowledging one baptism, as they agreed in acknowledging one God, one Christ, one faith; but Parmenian insisted that there was a true and false baptism; to which Optatus replied that such a distinction was unnecessary: a false baptism, were such a thing possible, would be no baptism: "There is but one baptism, and that depends neither upon place nor person, but upon the Trinity. It is not man, but the Trinity, who give us baptism." In this he again rejected the Donatist opinion that the personal worthiness of him who administered baptism must enter into the question. The Donatist asked, "How can a man, who has nothing to give, give anything?" or to express it differently, "How can a sinful man, who has no goodness in him, give so great a blessing as the blessing of the sacrament of baptism?" and the question was answered then, as now; the sacraments are of themselves holy, and owe no element of holiness to man. If man gave this holiness and blessing, then would God be the giver of nothing. St. Paul once rejoiced that he had baptized but a few, lest any should say that he had baptized in his own name (1 Cor. i. 15). Another Donatist formula was equally specious and equally indefensible: "In baptism (of sinners) we must attach far more weight to the personal character of him who administers than to that of him who receives the sacrament." Optatus replied that the essential part of baptism was that it should be administered in the name of the Trinity; and then shewed, from such instances as the faith of the woman of Canaan (St. Matt. xv. 28), and that of the woman with the issue (ditto, ix. 20), that Christ, by putting Himself the giver, as it were, in the background, assigned the foremost position to the faith of the recipient.

The "errors and prejudices" treated in the following section are, amongst others, the Donatist treatment of those persons, especially young females, who had taken "vows," their manner of proselytising; their bigotry; their cruelty to their fellow-creatures; and their treatment of the churches. It was perhaps this last point which, exhibiting more than any other the intense bitterness of the Donatist faction, drew from Optatus the remark which expresses the struggle to forgive what he cannot forget: "When you destroyed the altars, should you not have remembered the blessings which you and others had once received at those very altars?"

An appendix to these sections, dealing with points better discussed by St. Augustine, closes the work of Optatus. The actual result was at the time little or none; but the student of church history must ever be grateful to the man who has written for him the first chapter of sectarianism, and at the same time taught him to frame his answer to sectarian arguments upon that highest and most unsectarian of all grounds, "We are brethren."

The existence of Donatism was now threatened by the usual consequences of a "house divided against itself." "As Donatus," says St. Augustine, "sought to divide Christ, so was Donatus divided

by the divisions which arose daily amongst his own followers." Rogatists and Maximianists, or individuals like Tichonius, arose to contest or moderate the views and opinions of the founders of the sect. Something must be said of these.

Rogatus was bishop of Cartennae in Mauritania about A.D. 370. The exact nature of the difference between the Rogatists and the Donatists it is hardly possible to tell; perhaps it was in some degree connected with the definition of the Catholic Church; at any rate, the Rogatists declined to allow that title to the Donatists, but appropriated it to themselves. They appear to have been marked by one element of humanity, in that they discouraged and repudiated the Circumcellions.

In point of date, Tichonius (c. A.D. 380) may be placed between the Rogatists and Maximianists. His history is the history of one who, "when a Donatist, wrote against the Donatists in a manner perfectly irrefutable, and yet was of so strange a disposition (*absurdisissimi cordis*) as to refuse to leave them entirely" (Augustine). He was an African, deeply interested in church matters, learned in the Scriptures, and familiar with the historical events of his time. He has left some "rules" on the interpretation of Scripture, which St. Augustine has praised (*De Doctrina Christiana*, iii. 30-37), and which exhibit his points of contact with Catholic doctrines and of difference from Donatist opinions. Thus, in his first rule, dealing with "the Lord and His Body" the church, his assertion that the church has for its mission, extension throughout the whole world and gathering all people into its bosom, is in direct opposition to the exclusiveness which the Donatist affirmed should be a characteristic feature in the church as a whole and in the individual members which formed the church. So, again, in his second rule, Tichonius spoke of the One Body (the church), as having two parts, those who tended to make the church what Christ would have it (Ephes. v. 27), and those who to all appearance members of the church do yet but draw near to Christ with their lips only and not with their hearts also; a mode of speech utterly incompatible with Donatist statements. Tichonius had, in fact, read the practice and the history of the Donatists with eyes unblinded by prejudice. He did not hesitate to tell them that their theory and their attitude towards the church was in plain words this: "what we will, is holy." He proved to them that their assumption of personal holiness was a farce, by reminding them of a certain synod held at Carthage when 270 of their bishops, after a session of 78 days, had come to the conclusion to hold communion with traitors if they refused to be re-baptized! Parmenian was roused by this attack, and wrote to Tichonius; not, however, meeting his arguments, but blaming him for tergiversation, warning him against the consequences, and exhorting him to cleave to those who had left the traitor-church and had suffered persecution in behalf of the truth. The letter had no effect, and Tichonius was excommunicated. He had gone too far. In his seventh rule he had maintained that only at the last day would the separation of the good and the wicked in the church take place. It was the church's doctrine; why could he not go farther, and take the logical step of joining the church? History

does not give the answer. Tichonius had said and held strongly that the church had done many disgraceful things since the time of Caecilian; but according to his own shewing, this need not have kept him from joining it. Yet for some reason he preferred to remain aloof from the Catholic whom he had avenged, and the Donatist who had excommunicated him. He found with neither what he wanted, and died an isolated eclectic.

The fiercest blow hitherto given to Donatism was, however, given by the Maximianist schism. Parmenian died A.D. 392, and was succeeded by Primian. Primian, for some unexplained cause, felt himself obliged to impose penance on one of his deacons, named Maximian; the deacon protested, and was excommunicated. There was pride at work on the one side, and Lucilla-like intrigue (*see* CAECILIANUS) on the other. Maximian appealed to some neighbouring bishops, who took up his cause and respectfully solicited Primian to give them a hearing or to meet them. Primian declined. In A.D. 393 the malcontent bishops assembled in synod at Cabarsussis to the number of more than 100: they summoned Primian before them; and, on his again refusing to notice them, they recited his misdeeds in an elaborate document, excommunicated him, and elected Maximian, procuring his consecration at Carthage. The Donatists of Carthage were now divided into Primianists and Maximianists, and that body had, in its turn, to experience the misery of altar set up against altar. "God," says St. Augustine, "was repaying to them the measure they had paid to Caecilian." Primian and his party were, however, much the stronger. The bishops of Numidia and Mauritania to the number of 310 sided with him; and at the council of Bagai (A.D. 394), presided over by Primian himself, Maximian, his ordainers and coadjutors were reviled in the strongest language, the first-named was excommunicated, and the latter commanded to repent and return to the Primianist party before a certain date. The Maximianists shewed little disposition to acquiesce in this decision, and persecution began. Maximian's church was levelled to the ground, and his house handed over to a heathen priest. The proconsul Seranus was asked to assist in carrying out the judgment of the council on the refractory. The followers of Maximian were hunted from place to place, and the treatment of the aged and beloved bishop of Membresa, Salvius, was scandalous and cruel beyond measure. The misery which ensued brought back, however, but a few Maximianists to the main body; the majority held aloof and struggled on as martyrs; re-baptizing and re-ordinating those who came over to them. Donatism had received a mortal wound from which, to a certain extent, it never recovered.

The action of the Catholic Church and the State during this period further combined in checking the extension of Donatism. Many Donatists, priests as well as laymen, had become disgusted with party squabbles and cruel excesses; and they turned their eyes to the church. They were met with kindness and forgiving love. In A.D. 393 a council met at Hippo under the presidency of Aurelius, bishop of Carthage. The first object of the council was to revive such necessary church discipline as had fallen into disuse, and thereby purify thoroughly that body

to which they might next proceed to invite dissentients to return. The measures passed which concerned the Donatists were liberal in spirit and intention. In confirmation of a decision passed at the synod of Capua (A.D. 391), and which recited that "the repetition of baptism or of ordination, and the translation of bishops was not permitted"; the council of Hippo (1) allowed the returning Donatist clergy to retain their clerical position and functions, if they had not re-baptized, and if they brought their congregations with them; and (2) approved of the proposition that the children of Donatists, even if they had received Donatist baptism, should not be excluded from the service of the altar. The line adopted by the council was not only the most generous, but also the most conciliatory.

The action of the State had been more or less incisive according as political events had directed imperial attention to Donatists or removed it from them. Valentinian's edict (A.D. 373) deposing any clerical person who re-baptized, and Gratian's successive decrees—the first (A.D. 375) commanding the surrender of their churches; the second (A.D. 377) issued to the Donatist, Flavian, the imperial representative in Africa, enjoining further the confiscation of houses used by them; the third (A.D. 378) commanding the expulsion from Rome of one Claudian, who had gone there to propagate Donatist opinions—produced a good deal of misery; but the political disquiet connected with the murder of Gratian (A.D. 383), the wars between Maximus and Theodosius, the deposition of Maximus and restoration of Valentinian (A.D. 388) made it impossible to enforce these or similar injunctions, and for the time the Donatists enjoyed a comparative freedom from interference. In A.D. 392 Theodosius issued his laws against heretics generally, in which he fined all who performed priestly functions. This was not directed against the Donatists particularly, and was probably not enforced against them previous to the death of Theodosius (A.D. 395). That event was followed by Gildo's usurpation of power in Africa, and his alliance with one of the cruellest of the Donatist bishops, Optatus of Thamugas. The ravages committed by these men were only stayed by Honorius' victory over Gildo (A.D. 398); and Theodosius' penalty was enforced by Seranus against Optatus and his followers. The Circumcellions had also, during Gildo's temporary prosperity, begun again their fanatical ravages; and an edict of Honorius (A.D. 398) decreeing the punishment of death to all who dared to violate churches and maltreat the clergy, was evidently directed against them.

Yet, in spite of these checks, the condition of the Donatist body was better than that of the Catholic Church. The greater part of Africa was Donatist, and the church lay crushed and oppressed. As the end of the fourth century drew near, it seemed almost as if the place of the ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic church would be taken by the new usurping sect. At this juncture the good providence of God raised up the man, St. Augustine, whose piety and ability shielded then and since the true church of Christ.

The life and works of St. Augustine are discussed elsewhere (*see* under the name); in this article the relation of both to Donatism is all that need be considered, and that briefly. But

it must never be forgotten how much this man's previous life prepared him for the line he took as regards Donatism. He was for many years a Separatist; not only did he, as a Manichaean, take up the Separatist's cry, "my church is the only pure and true church," but he was compelled to learn the tendencies and consequences of Separatism. No one, humanly speaking, but the man nursed, bred, and living in an atmosphere vitiated by Manichaeism, Pelagianism, and Donatism could have been competent to understand, analyse, and describe the poisonous nature of the air others were compelled to breathe. He who could say of his early belief: "I had nothing certain, nothing fast when I thought of Thee (O God): an empty phantasy and mine error—that was my God," was the fitting as well as the chosen vessel, led by the mercy of God from "rioting and wantonness, strife and envying," himself to find, and help others to find, in God's word and Christ's Catholic Church, the "putting on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. xiii. 13), which was and is the only solution of his and man's harassing doubts.

In A.D. 391 St. Augustine came to Hippo, and the popular vote at once pointed him out as the future successor of the aged Valerius. In A.D. 395 he was consecrated coadjutor bishop. Hippo was a hot-bed of Donatism; fanaticism carrying its pettiness so far as to prohibit the Donatist making bread for the Catholic. In a letter (*Ep.* 33) to Proculus the Donatist bishop of Hippo, St. Augustine pathetically asks, "What has Christ done to us, that we rend His members asunder? Consider how sad a division reigns in Christian households and families. Husband and wife, who—in their married life—know no division, separate themselves at the altar of Christ! Children live with their parents in the same dwelling, but that dwelling is not also God's dwelling." St. Augustine, full of zeal, threw himself at once into the thick of the fight. His sermons attracted Donatists as well as Catholics; and the sectarians not only called him names, but threatened his life. He was the preacher before the already-mentioned council of Hippo (A.D. 393), and his sermon was afterwards enlarged into the work, *De Fide et Symbolo*. What share, if any, he took in drawing up the decision of the council it is impossible to tell now; but it was in that year that he wrote his *Abecedarium*. This was a metrical composition, divided into verses corresponding with the number of letters in the alphabet, in which the history and mistakes of Donatism were recited, and the attitude of Catholics towards Donatists depicted. Just as Gregory of Nazianzum met by popular songs the doctrinal errors of Apollinarius, so did St. Augustine by a similar device place in the hands of unlearned and simple men a true statement of the difference between Catholicism and Donatism. Two verses will describe the general cast of the whole. St. Augustine speaks of the Donatists as breaking asunder the net (the church, St. Matt. xiii. 43), and gives their character:—

"Homines multum superbi, qui justos se dicunt esse,
Sic fecerunt scissuram, et altare contra altare.
Diabolo se tradiderunt, cum pugnant de traditione,
Et crimen quod commiserunt, in alios volunt transferre:
Ipsi tradiderunt libros, et nos audent accusare.
Ut pejus committunt scelus, quam commiserunt et ante."

Again, he alleges the example of Christ and His treatment of Judas in defence of the practice of the Catholics as opposed to that of the Donatists:—

"Hunc inter bonos ferebat, hunc misit et predicare,
Malus servus praedicabat, sed Christus erat in fide.
Quia qui iudice credebant, non curabant de praecone.
Quando dedit sanctam coenam, nec tunc illum ex-
clusit inde,
Sed nobis exemplum datum est malos fratres tolerare,
Et quando non possunt excludi, solo separentur
corde."

In his correspondence, whether with bishops or laymen, and in his conferences with leading Donatists, the features characteristic of these verses may be continually noticed: there is always the fearless exposure of the fault, and the loving effort to point out the remedy.

Among the letters of this period, that to Honoratus (*Ep.* 49) gives that view of the church as an external, visible, and organically constituted church proper to it as the church of all people, which was so frequently pressed by him in later stages of the controversy; and those to Genuerius, afterwards consul of Numidia, are models of letters which a "spiritual father" would write to a layman tempted by Donatist proselytisers to abandon the faith of the church.

St. Augustine's sermons, letters, conferences, and hymns, led naturally to those more elaborate works by which his fame in this dispute is established: and it will be convenient to refer to some of these here, though to do so is somewhat to anticipate the dates at which they were actually written.

(a) "Three Books against Petilian's Letter." Petilian was the Donatist bishop of Cirta, who, upon his elevation to the see, had written a pastoral letter against the Catholic Church. Originally an advocate and a very able man, he appears to have become a Donatist somewhat against his will; but having once joined the sect he became one of the most thorough supporters of their views; and flattered by their applause, assigned to himself the title of Paraclete. Petilian's letter had a great reputation amongst the Donatists, but it was very difficult to obtain a copy. It appears to have been a fact that not only did the Donatists do their best to conceal from the Catholics what they wrote; but, in St. Augustine's case, they were especially careful to prevent his seeing them, so much did they dread his eloquence and logic. St. Augustine, while at Cirta, procured a copy of the first part of Petilian's letter, and (circa A.D. 398) wrote his "First Book" against it. Petilian's positions, summarily stated, were these: Catholics blame us for re-baptizing; but inasmuch as we hold that the working of baptism depends on the character of the baptizer, and that, for example, baptism by a traitor is not true baptism, therefore we baptize again those who come to us. We consider ourselves the true church because we have suffered persecution. Our inconsistency as regards the Maximianists is to be excused as an act of kindness on the part of the strong towards the weak. Petilian expressed these views in passionate and defamatory language. St. Augustine's reply was thorough. It is couched in a vein in which loving regret at

the prejudice of his opponent is at times relieved by a happy irony; and the sadness with which he reads the Donatist conclusions often gives place to a rallying good humour as he marks the absurdities by which those conclusions are reached. The quondam-advocate had met his match in the quondam-professor: and the Donatist was taught by the Catholic that saintly "charity" was the only weapon to use in theological dispute. Briefly, St. Augustine shews his readers that if (as Petilian had admitted) there were bad men in the Donatist body, then baptism administered by them must be open to objection; baptism, in fact, never could be valid according to them unless they were unerringly convinced of the personal holiness of the baptizer, and of that not man, but God alone, could be the judge. In practice, moreover, they were not consistent with their theory about what constituted the true church. The Donatists had persecuted the Maximianists; therefore the Maximianists and not the Donatists deserved the name of "true church." Lastly, if Donatists asked to be excused for their conduct to Maximianists, why could they not go a step further, and extend their wish to forgive and forget to that Catholic Church which was only too willing to love and receive them?

Somewhere about A.D. 401, the second part of Petilian's letter came into St. Augustine's hands. It was, in substance, an elaboration of the points stated previously, and was written in the same tone. Traitors were the doubles of a Judas Iscariot, as unclean as he was, as bereft of the grace of baptism, and their administration of baptism consequently impure and false. The so-called Catholic Church was not the true church, but the church of Separatists; not Jesus Christ, but Judas Iscariot had died for Catholics. Donatists had put on Jesus Christ, but the church had put on Judas Iscariot: Donatists were in the "narrow" way, Catholics in the "broad." The constraint put by Catholics on the kings of the earth, or the appeals made to them had originated in a party spirit. These kings had been taught lies, and prevented becoming true Christians. They, the Donatists, however, found it better to trust in the Lord than to put any confidence in princes. Petilian concluded by exhorting his people: "Come out from among them (the Catholics), come to the church of the people of God, and flee the traitors, lest ye perish together with them." St. Augustine begins his "Second Book" by remarking that he feels it necessary to answer this part of the letter for the benefit of his people, though it contains few fresh arguments. Baptism, he reminds them, does not obtain its power from man, but from Christ: no man, not even the most immaculate, can make another immaculate, for he is not God. The citation of such cases as that of Judas Iscariot is altogether beyond the question. Christ, by permitting Judas's presence at the Last Supper, evidently meant men to understand that the impurity of one affected that one alone, and did not reflect upon the purity of the others. As regards the church, if, according to the Scripture, the whole world belongs to the church, and the church, like a city set on a hill cannot be hid, then how can the Donatists say that Catholics are but a part of the church when the Catholic Church extends throughout the whole world?

Or how can the Donatists say that they are *the* church when they are limited to a little corner of the world, and very few know of their existence? Lastly, St. Augustine deals with the relations between Church and State, the right of the church to employ force, and the case of true and false martyrdom as it arose in consequence of the employment of force. It was easy to shew from Old Testament examples how much and variously God had permitted the kings of the earth (the State) to affect His people: and not less easy to shew that the Donatists, by their appeals to Constantine and Julian, did not hesitate to avail themselves of imperial (or State) interference whenever it suited them. Again, the action of Jesus Christ in purifying the temple with His scourge, furnished St. Augustine with a proof that the church might and should, where necessary, use force. Combining these precedents, St. Augustine affirmed that where the Church and State could thus work together for the furtherance of what was good and the restriction of what was bad, there they were justified in their co-operation, and even in employing force. There was a time indeed, when St. Augustine had thought differently; but experience had long shewn him that nothing but the strong arm of ecclesiastical and civil law could secure obedience from those who were sectarians first and Christians next, or who rated fanaticism higher than citizenship. In the same spirit, he readily granted the title of martyr to those who deserved it, but he denied it to those who had sought it by means of suicide, or as the result of fanatical madness.

Petilian, in the meantime, had been requested to examine and answer St. Augustine's "First Book." He did so, and his reply elicited St. Augustine's "Third Book." Petilian's reply consisted chiefly in abuse: he abused not only the Catholic Church generally, but St. Augustine personally. The bishop's skill in argument was simply "lying;" his previous life as a Manichaean was raked up; his consecration as a bishop called in question; his cloisters, and the monks who occupied them, denounced as immoral. Petilian cleared up a few sentences in his pastoral letter which might have been better expressed, but substantially maintained his previous opinions. St. Augustine put the abuse on one side: in simple touching language he confessed that he repented every day the faults and follies of his life when a Manichaean; and then he asked his readers to study Petilian's letter for themselves: they would see that Petilian had misquoted Scripture, had misstated historical facts, and had not met one of his (St. Augustine's) arguments. He stated again, as if never tiring of stating the truth, his two fundamental propositions as regarded baptism and the church: (a) The former is, so far as validity is concerned, quite independent of the baptizer: (b) The latter is that field the world, whose harvest is not in Africa, whose end is not the age of Donatus. "We cannot separate ourselves, while in the body, from the wicked; but we must use all the greater diligence in heart and will to separate ourselves from their mode of life. It is our duty to recognise this, and not to imperil love by passionate division, or disserve unity by pride. Let us be diligent to hold the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: for he who gathers outside this

unity, gathers not with Christ; and he who gathers not with Christ, destroys.

(b) "Against Parmenian's letter." The controversy between this Donatist bishop and Optatus of Milevi, and his letter to Tichonius have been already mentioned. Parmenian had died since, but the influence of his name and the effects of his letter were still sufficiently great to make St. Augustine feel it his duty to consider it controversially. This he did about A.D. 405. The especial aim of Parmenian had been to expose and denounce as sinful, the commixture of believers and unbelievers in the church. St. Augustine, for his part, considers and answers in the negative the question: "In the unity and communion of the same sacraments do the evil contaminate the good?" His treatise consists of three books, the first of which is occupied in refuting historically the numerous mis-statements made by Parmenian, and in giving a correct if short summary of the origin and progress of Donatism. The second and third books discuss scripturally the theological differences between the Catholics and their opponents.

Parmenian, says Ribbeck (to whom students are indebted for an exhaustive analysis of this and St. Augustine's other letters, etc. referring to Donatism), like all Separatists, laid stress upon the letter rather than upon the spirit of Holy Scripture. He attached greater importance to external than to internal marks of separation between the church and the world: and from his peculiar mode of interpreting texts which referred to holiness, Parmenian inferred that men could not know for certain whether there were in the church good Christians or not. Donatus, he said, had asserted with justice: "Through our separation have the tares been separated from the wheat; and the tares are in the church." Amongst his own party, Parmenian continued, were not only no unbelievers, but "we (are they who) are no longer sinners and need no repentance, we have no impure, false, priests; my colleagues have no stain and are guilty of no impiety." Parmenian urged, with greater development than his predecessors, and with copious quotation from Scripture, the usual opinion, "any blessing connected with the ministerial office and the sacraments depends upon the personal character of the priests;" even going so far as to render Almighty God powerless, by asserting that He could not work when His agent was an unbelieving priest or bishop.

St. Augustine, in his second book, points out how faulty was Parmenian's interpretation of the texts concerning the church, and then throws his strength into the affirmation of the position; "the sacrament is independent of the person of the dispenser; we must separate the person and his act." He urges, on scriptural grounds, that the worthiness of the ministerial office is quite independent of the person of him who exercises it. We may, and should, heartily regret when one ordained to any holy function is wicked or unbelieving, but those defects do not alter what he does as God's minister; above all earthly priests, subject to human infirmities, we have one great High Priest Who alone does all. He, and not bishop or priest, sitteth at the right hand of God and ever maketh intercession for us: He, and not they, is the propitiation for our

sins. The wicked and unbelieving priest harms himself only: the sacrament remains the sacrament whether conferred by traitor or faithful priest: no man can give, and no man can take away, God's promises.

In his third book, St. Augustine discusses at length the text 1 Cor. v. 13, which Parmenian specially urged in defence of the line of action adopted by himself and his party: and points out from the language used and the context, that it was not a question of putting away what was evil (*malum*), but evil men (*ut homo malus auferatur ex hominibus bonis*), a matter which was best left to church discipline and kind loving treatment, such as that employed by St. Cyprian. And then he asked; Were there no evil men among the Donatists? Let them but consult their own history; perhaps that would teach them not to consider themselves righteous and despise others. While true and good men sighed and lamented over the wickedness they saw around them, they yet trusted to God's promises. It was best to hold fast to these promises, and not sever themselves from each other, even though they (the Catholics) did not cast out the wicked from among them.

(c) On Baptism. St. Augustine had announced in his second book against Parmenian his intention of writing at greater length on this subject. This he now did, in a work which discusses in seven books three principal points:—(a) What is the baptism of the Separatists? Is it valid or not? (b) Can the Donatists cite, with justice, the practice of St. Cyprian as a precedent in their favour? (c) What did the council of Carthage, under St. Cyprian, decide about heretical baptism?

With reference to the baptism of Separatists, St. Augustine defends the opinion that it was valid, and for the same reasons as he had elsewhere alleged, viz. that the sacrament was not to be considered as dependent upon persons or upon the church, but upon the word of the Lord. But he then goes on to assert that baptism would be of little profit to wicked men, and to Separatists as such, because they had lost by sin the grace which they had received. He and the Donatists agreed that regeneration took place in baptism, but for Donatists to abide in their schism was indicative of want of love; and where there was no love, there there was no forgiveness of sins. Baptism would only be profitable to Separatists for the forgiveness of sins, when they returned to the unity of the church.

St. Cyprian's actions and the council of Carthage are then discussed, and St. Augustine proves that the Donatist practice was anything but similar to that followed by the bishops of that council. St. Cyprian, while he gave as his own opinion—an opinion confirmed by the council—that heretics who came to the church should be baptized with the baptism of the church, distinctly allowed to his brother-bishops the power to think and act differently. Many of his colleagues did think and act differently; but St. Cyprian neither separated himself from them nor they from him. Had the Donatists behaved in a similar manner, their sect would never have existed.

In the course of his remarks, St. Augustine's views about the church are very forcibly stated.

While he laid down the fundamental maxim that the word of God, as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, was sufficient for all guidance on this subject, he did not refuse to Apostolic tradition, a healthy and agreeable, though inferior, influence. In his estimate of the church, external organic unity and episcopal succession were of the highest importance. "Unity or oneness is the first and most necessary predicate of the church," and by "unity" he meant Catholic communion. Proceeding upon the principle "ubi Spiritus, ibi ecclesia," he maintained that when Christ breathed upon His disciples, these disciples represented the church, and He spake to them as to the church. Consequently it followed that the Lord having given His salvation to the church, outside the church there was no salvation. Heretics and schismatics must come within the church and receive peace and that love which is a peculiar gift of Catholic peace and unity. The peace of the church remitted sin, and wilful alienation from that peace was the retention of sin. This peace was, indeed, only in the good who strove to live a life of godliness, and was not to be found in the wicked whether baptized or not, whether in the church or outside it. St. Augustine admitted, and with deep sorrow, that in the church were tares as well as wheat, and outside of it wheat as well as tares; but he looked forward to the time when this, so difficult now, would be made clear, and God would know them that were His. His was a higher and holier view than that which he combated: "we Donatists have no wicked persons amongst us, and in the church there are no children of God!" and it is a view which is supported and expanded in another treatise "on the unity of the church," which there is every reason to believe St. Augustine's.

These works of St. Augustine and his active interference in all matters connected with the Donatist schism, produced naturally great effect. Men like Petilian were silenced; priests, laymen, and even whole communities came back to the church. The time had arrived for Church and State to unite in protecting the Catholics from the still dominant Donatists, and for the church to take such steps as should secure to her flocks properly-qualified pastors. Twice in the year A.D. 401 did a council meet at Carthage to consider this latter point. Donatist enticement or persecution had reduced so much the number of the Catholic clergy, that in many churches there were no deacons, and therefore no future means for supplying the higher offices as they fell vacant. The decisions of the council at Hippo had imposed restrictions upon Donatist clergy exercising, when they returned to the church, their office as clergymen. Appeal was therefore now made to pope Anastasius to remove these restrictions, and the appeal was allowed. St. Augustine set the example of receiving Donatist-ordained deacons, though he appears to have declined to receive again—in an official capacity—those who had previously passed from the church to the sectarians.

These measures, though accompanied by loving words of greeting, roused the Donatists. They were still the majority and as powerful as persistent. Not only did they open their arms to men, clergy and laity, who came to them from the

church fretting under the discipline which the revived Catholic strictness had imposed upon them for the laxity of their lives, but they called to their aid the brutal fanaticism of the Circumcellions. Once again fire and the sword levelled churches and destroyed altars. The furious madness of these men directed itself principally against apostate Donatists and the Catholic clergy. St. Augustine was threatened, tracked, and surrounded: Catholic priests were stopped in the road, and the choice offered them: "Promise to preach no more, or prepare for ill-treatment." Moderate-minded men among the Donatists looked on in horror, but were powerless to check the barbarity their brothers had roused. The Catholics, before appealing to the State for aid, made an attempt (A.D. 403) to come to an understanding with the Donatists by means of a conference. The Donatist bishop, Primian, repelled their advances with insult: "The sons of the martyrs and the brood of traitors can never meet," and forbade his colleagues to do what would make them participate in the sins of the Catholics. Attempts were also made by individuals like St. Augustine and Possidius to confer with leading Donatist bishops, but they were equally unsuccessful. At last things had reached such a pass that a council at Carthage (A.D. 404) determined to appeal to Honorius to enforce the laws of Theodosius against the Donatists, and restrict the excesses of the Circumcellions. But before the deputation reached the emperor, his anger appears to have been kindled by the accounts which his own officers transmitted to him. The cruelty of the Donatists to two Catholic bishops, Servus and Maximinian of Bagai, made him little disposed to accept the milder, gentler measures, proposed by the council of Carthage; and in A.D. 405 he issued an edict, fining those who had inflicted the ill-usage, and threatening the Donatist bishops and clergy with banishment. In the same year imperial laws forbade re-baptism, condemned the Donatists as heretics, confiscated their meeting-houses and the goods of those who re-baptized, excluded them from testamentary inheritance, and proclaimed to all "that the one and true Catholic faith of Almighty God was to be received."

These and similar imperial edicts brought to the church many who had been wavering. The Catholics received them with love and forgiveness; and in some cities, as in Carthage, union between Catholics and Donatists was openly asserted and celebrated. But these same edicts also exasperated still further the more extreme Donatists. St. Augustine's own city, Hippo, and its neighbourhood suffered fearfully from the Circumcellions. In A.D. 409 St. Augustine complained bitterly (*Ep.* 111) of their plundering and ravages, their revengeful acts and cruelties to the Catholic bishops and laity. Letters to Donatist bishops or to imperial commissioners were, however, of little practical use when the men to whom they referred would slay themselves if balked of their prey, or cast themselves into the flames of the fire they themselves had kindled. They heard of Stilicho's death (A.D. 408). Rightly or wrongly they had looked upon him as the originator of the stern decrees lately issued against them, and they hailed the news by joining hands with the heathen, and slaying,

ill-using, or putting to flight the hated Catholic bishops. Fresh deputations went to Rome; St. Augustine wrote letters to the chief minister, Olympius; and fresh edicts to proconsul and prefect enforcing previous laws, fines, and punishments were sent to Africa.

It was about this time that St. Augustine issued those other works which throw so much light on the Donatist controversy; and to which reference, however brief, must here be made.

(a) "On the One Baptism." This, written between A.D. 406 and 411, was an answer to a tract of Petilian's bearing the same title. Petilian had maintained that amongst Donatists alone was "the one baptism" to be found, and believed his opinion confirmed by the fact that the Catholics did not re-baptize those who went over to them. Then followed the usual recrimination against the baptism of the church, the defence of re-baptism, and an exhortation to his readers to leave the corrupt church and join the Donatists. St. Augustine's answer was framed on the same lines as those of his greater treatises. The perversity of Separatism and the dignity of the sacrament are emphatically pressed; and the necessity of distinguishing between the sacrament and him who administered it as emphatically repeated. He reminded the reader of St. Cyprian's communion with those from whom he differed strongly, and urged that as the example to be followed in preference to schism. He recommended him to bring before Christians that spiritual and internal separation within the church, always possible between the good and the bad, which would be more productive of good results than exhortations to leave and rend asunder the visible church of Christ.

(b) "Against Cresconius." Cresconius was a layman, who wrote in answer to St. Augustine's "First Book against Petilian," but the work did not come into St. Augustine's hands till some time after it was written. In A.D. 409 St. Augustine's answer was issued. It consists of four books, of which the first three deal specially with Cresconius's arguments, and the fourth enters at length into the history of the Maximianist separation.

Cresconius modified some of Petilian's affirmations about the personal holiness of the baptizer; but he held, as strongly as his predecessor, that the working of baptism was dependent upon the baptizer's character. The views of absolute sinlessness asserted by some modern Perfectionists find their earliest shape in the teaching of the Donatists as illustrated by Cresconius: and he even makes the less presumptuous teaching of the church on this point an item of accusation. The Catholics allowed that they were sinners; therefore, urged Cresconius, they wrongly permitted to themselves the right to baptize; and he quoted the baptism by St. Peter of men already baptized with Moses' baptism in defence of the Donatist habit of re-baptizing. Cresconius treated with ridicule St. Augustine's view that, in the church, believers were not contaminated by unbelievers: in his opinion the church had committed a great sin in not condemning sinners, and was—for that reason—abiding in schism. He warned St. Augustine to come out of such a church, and not make himself partaker with its sin. Cresconius objected to his party being

called Donatists: "Not Donatus, but Christ was their founder. They were not heretics; it was not heresy but schism which separated them and the Catholic Church; and it was not they who were living in schism but the Catholics, who thereby had lost church and baptism: they (the Donatists) had remained in the perfect and Catholic Church. In the Donatist communion every member was both a believer and holy, but among the Catholics every member was both an unbeliever and unholy."

St. Augustine, in his reply, abides by his former views as regards baptism. Baptism was a sacrament, let who will administer it, Donatist or other: but it was not now so much a question in what body or party baptism was found, as what blessing followed baptism, what profit was made of baptism. Baptism, by itself, would not take a man to heaven. St. Peter's example, above cited, was not to the point: neither St. Peter nor any of the Apostles re-baptized heretics. The fearlessness with which Cresconius and his party could affirm "we are not sinners" pained, and almost frightened St. Augustine: "I do not know," he said, "whether any one can really be found to say this. It exhibits such great and heretical pride. I can hardly conceive it possible for any man to permit such a thought to possess him, so full of blindness is such arrogance." St. Augustine's remarks about the church are full of beauty, and are descriptive of what the church is, rather than an answer to the strongly-coloured antagonism of Cresconius: "The Church is the holy Body of Christ. In it alone is the Holy Spirit; and therefore love can only be his who is in the church. It is not, however, every member of the church who has received the Holy Ghost, but only he who is truly bound to the members of the church. This church is visible, and known to all. It is the city set on a hill, which cannot be hid. Through His Church Christ reigns from one sea to another and to the ends of the earth. The church is the seed of Abraham, multiplied fourfold, like to the stars of heaven and to the sand on the sea-shore in multitude; and through which all families of the earth are blessed. The church grows and cannot perish, even though wicked men are mixed in it with the good; for this mixture does not make the church lose its character. When there are wicked men in the church, men who are spiritually dead, I must not, for that reason, separate myself from those who are living members of the church. It is not men who have founded the church. Men exist and are in the church, like good wheat if they are good, or like weeds if they are bad. I must try to improve these bad men so far as I can, and if I cannot improve them, I must bear with them. The Apostles took no part in the thefts of which Judas was guilty, though to all appearance they belonged to the same company, listened to the same Master, and received the same sacraments. They were his companions in one sense, but separated from him by dissimilarity of spirit."

St. Augustine had been at one time disposed to allow such a distinction as Cresconius had maintained between heretics and schismatics; but he seems now to have come to the conclusion that practically there was very little difference. While he assented to Cresconius's definition:

"Heresy is the characteristic of those who depart from the faith of the church, schism is that of those who hold the same faith as the church;" he pressed it to its logical conclusion, and pointed out that to re-baptize a person already baptized was heresy, and that therefore they who practised it were heretics rather than schismatics. Theirs was a heresy indeed, which would be pardoned if they returned to the church, and St. Augustine exhorted the Donatists to do this.

In this letter St. Augustine again defends the position that under certain circumstances persecution is justifiable. State and Church had united in taking measures to suppress Donatism; and these measures, when enforced by imperial agents, had involved misery, oppression, and persecution, however much the church might have desired them to have been carried out in the loving spirit of a mother, wishful only to recall her disobedient children. His arguments are the usual ones on this subject, clearly and forcibly put; but also leaving the impression, as such arguments always do, that the man who puts them forward has ceased to be, in that respect, generous and large-hearted, and has become narrow-minded and the half-unwilling apologist of a system he secretly despises. What, in fact, St. Augustine defends in this letter, was so much in contrast to his usual way both of speaking of and acting towards Donatists, that—whether inspired by this letter or not—a bishop named Vincentius wrote to him, asking him if it was indeed true that he had changed his hitherto friendly attitude into one of hostility. St. Augustine's reply was a letter (*Ep. 93*) which may be summed up in the quotation he made from St. Luke (xiv. 23): "It is written: Compel them to come in." Little did he forebode to what fearful results his now celebrated maxim would afterwards lead. It was one thing to call for the interference of the State when Donatist pride and brutality defied civil laws; it was another to permit to ecclesiastical powers a similar interference when a man's religious convictions were under consideration. St. Augustine's own previous remark to Petilian, "I would have no man compelled to believe against his will," exhibited a truer appreciation of the noble maxim attributed (rightly or wrongly) to him: "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas."

The invasion of Rome by Alaric king of the Goths took place A.D. 408, and the rumour got abroad that the Donatists of Africa were ready to give the invader their support. The emperor Honorius was induced, chiefly by political considerations but partly also by his own kindness of heart, to rescind his extreme decrees against heathen and schismatic. In A.D. 410, however, a deputation of four bishops from Carthage waited upon him to bring once more to his notice their complaints against the Donatists. The deputation was charged to petition for a conference in which Catholic and Donatist might meet under imperial presidency, and discuss their differences. The Donatists themselves seem either then or a little later to have expressed a desire for such a conference, and in October, A.D. 410, the proconsul of Africa, Marcellinus, received instructions from Honorius to make all necessary preparations within a time not exceeding six months from

that date, and to act as president at the debates. Marcellinus, a soldier, an under-secretary of State, and a well-informed man, was in many ways fitted for this post. He began by issuing an edict (Jan., A.D. 411) inviting Catholic and Donatist bishops to meet in June at Carthage and elect representatives, promising to all concerned safe-conduct to and fro, and suspending for the time all processes against Donatists.

Both parties entered eagerly and readily into the scheme: 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist bishops came to Carthage in May; and Marcellinus issued another edict indicating the order of proceedings. The baths of Gargilian, a convenient place in the middle of the city, was selected as the place of debate, and June 1 as the date. Each party was to be represented by seven disputants, to whom alone was granted the permission to speak, and by seven assistants who might act as counsellors to the speakers. The court officials and four clerical notaries, assisted by four bishops from each side, were to take down the proceedings, which would be countersigned by the president and the members of the conference. Each speaker would also be required to sign his name to the report of any speech made by him. The conference would last three days, and the second day would be occupied in affirming and subscribing the protocols, which would then be sealed by the president and the eight assistant-bishops.

The Donatist bishops, on receiving this edict, protested especially against that part of it which required the signature of the speaker to his speech, and then elected their seven representatives, Primian, Petilian, Emeritus, Protasius, Montanus, Gaudentius, and Adeodatus, to whom they committed "the cause of God's congregation, and appointed them their defenders against the traditors and persecutors." The Catholic bishops, after sending two letters to Marcellinus—in the first of which they assented to everything in his edict, and in the second, regretted the protest of the Donatists—elected as their representatives, Aurelius, Alypius, Augustine, Vincentius, Fortunatus, Fortunatian, and Possidius: and placed in their hands a document which gave a short sketch of the history of the schism, and added a defence of their view of the church, its sacraments and attitude to unbelievers, in substance, a summary of the arguments of St. Augustine.

These documents were countersigned by all the bishops of each party.

The first day of the conference (June 1) ended in no results. The whole time was occupied in verifying the identity of the bishops who had signed; and the dishonesty of the one party, and the irritation of the other augured ill for any practical conclusions. The second day (June 3) was equally wasted, difficulties being made about signing the proceedings of the first day; and the session was adjourned to June 8. On that day, after much dispute, in which president, Catholic, and Donatist all joined, as to what was the precise or what should be the first point debated, matters were at last brought to a crisis by St. Augustine. He proposed an alternative: either to go into the matter historically, if it was the wish of those present to consider their differences as a historical question, or to discuss it Scripturally if it was their wish to

examine what and which was the true church: and the president ordered the recital of the acts from the State archives which bore upon the subject. This point was only attained after many attempts on the part of the Donatists to create delay ("quanta agantur ut nihil agatur," says St. Augustine); and before it could be fairly discussed two interruptions took place.

The one was caused by Petilian's personalities. Turning upon St. Augustine, who was then taking the lead of his party, he asked, "Who ordained you a bishop?" This was to revive an old scandal, and an insult to revive it; and for some moments the interruption was so great that the president was forced to interfere. At last for the sake of peace, he requested that Petilian's question might be answered. "It is superfluous to do so," replied St. Augustine, "yet answer I will;" and in simple but nervous language, he narrated all the events connected with his ordination, and shattered to atoms the charge of immorality implied in Petilian's question. "We must cease these personalities," urged the president. "Then let us leave out of court Caecilian's case," replied Emeritus. "The life of a pastor must be blameless. Whether this is the case with the Catholics or not is easily proved; let this explanation which we have written of our separation from the church be read." This was the second interruption. A document was handed in, which had emanated not from the entire Donatist party, but from the seven representatives.

Objection being taken to this, Emeritus explained that the paper being based on Holy Scripture, the attestation of all the bishops was not considered necessary; and at St. Augustine's especial request it was handed to a Donatist to read. This document, though containing nothing absolutely new, was of the greatest importance; had it been presented sooner, all the previous waste of time and exhibition of temper might have been avoided. The paper, after some prefatory remarks, objected to the Catholic belief that, according to Holy Scripture, the church must contain to the end of time good and bad mixed together. This belief was fatal to their own conception, which they supported by Scripture, that the church must be pure and without spot. The Donatists objected also to the examples drawn from the times of the prophets as inapplicable to their own day, and refused their assent to the Catholic appreciation of the case of Judas Iscariot, and to the Catholic interpretation of special texts (e.g. St. Matt. xiii. 24, etc.; Rom. i. 18, 23). They maintained the necessity of separating themselves entirely from sinners, defended their apparent inconsistency, in this respect, towards the Maximianists, and asserted themselves persecuted by the Catholics and by those kings and consuls who had been swayed by Catholic misrepresentation.

The conference listened to this paper respectfully and without interruption. St. Augustine rose to reply to it. After expressing his sincere regret that it had not been produced sooner, he proceeded to deal with its two main propositions; (a) The testimony of Holy Scripture to what was the church; (b) The accusation brought by the Donatists against the church. His speech, so far as it is recorded, was a defence of the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, and based upon the

same line of reasoning as that with which his already quoted works have made the reader familiar. He was interrupted frequently by the Donatists; and he had to appeal not only to them to extend to him that courteous silence which the Catholics had awarded to the reading of their paper, but also to the president to secure him a fair hearing.

The president at length closed these interruptions and this portion of the debate, by insisting upon the consideration of the question: What were the original causes of the schism? By dint of perseverance, he procured the reading of those acts, which familiarised him at once with the events coupled with the names of Caecilian, Felix of Aptunga, Majorinus, Melchades, etc. He was then in a position to give his judgment. The deputies, at his request, left the hall while the judgment was considered and written down. On their return that judgment was read to them. The official acts and the testimony of Holy Scripture were taken to have proved respectively the unsoundness of the accusations against Caecilian, and of the view that one man, through the sinfulness of another, became therefore a partaker in that other's guilt. "I therefore," said Marcellinus, "warn all men . . . to hinder the assembling of Donatists in towns and villages, and to restore the churches to the Catholics. Every bishop of the community of Donatus must, on his return to his home, return to the one true church, or at least not impede the faithful execution of the law. If they have Circumcellions about them, and do not restrain and repress the excesses of these men, they shall be deprived of their places in the state."

Marcellinus was strictly within the terms of his appointment when he thus assumed the attitude of a judge rather than that of the president of a debate; and the conduct of the Donatists throughout it will fairly explain his assumption of the former character. Their unreasonableness, quibbling, personalities, and pride, estranged from them a man who, at the opening of the conference, had no other wish than to be impartial, but who at the close of it felt that summary proceedings could alone secure peace and order.

The conference had been carefully followed, and its results anxiously awaited, by thousands. It will be readily conceived that the historical facts and the Scripture arguments thereat adduced came to many Donatists with all the novelty and power of convincing truth, while they angered and irritated many who could not deny them. These last, among whom were the principal bishops, smarting at their defeat, reviled Marcellinus and appealed to the emperor. The reply came (A.D. 412), terse and stern, and classed them as heretics. It bade them return to the church, fined them in various sums according to their rank and station, and in the event of contumacy confiscated their houses and goods.

This edict was followed by the usual consequences. Many Donatists obeyed it, others scorned it. Whole communities, as at Cirta, bishops and laymen everywhere, returned to the church; some glad to do so, their convictions having radically changed since the conference; others, induced by baser views of expediency and comfort. The Circumcellions, on the other

hand, broke out afresh. They fired churches and destroyed houses. They cast into the flames those Scriptures which had been found to tell against them, and cruelly maltreated and even murdered those ecclesiastics who expounded them. The less violent proclaimed with a sneer that the chests of the church and the imperial coffers were enriched with the gold of the Separatists, and pointed to the death of Marcellinus (A.D. 413) as a divine judgment upon their unrighteous judge. But that death, mysterious still to the historian and divine, and regretted by both emperor and St. Augustine, brought no relief to the Donatist. In A.D. 414 a yet sterner decree than the former announced that all Donatist church-buildings were to become the property of the Catholic Church, and all Donatist clergy to be suspended and banished. Fines were doubled; confiscation and banishment stared the Separatists in the face; their testimony in courts of law was disallowed; their social condition was degraded to the lowest; nothing but the penalty of death was wanting to their cup of bitterness. To St. Augustine, as much as to any one, did they owe their immunity from this last extreme. He could not himself push his "Compel them to come in" to its last and bitterest conclusion; and he strove, and successfully, as with Marcellinus, to prevent others from imbruing their hands with the blood of mistaken fanatics.

The church, to its credit be it recorded, strove by kindness and gentleness to make the pain of defeat less bitter to its foes, while it did not neglect to avail itself of the new advantages resulting from victory. As the Catholic bishops returned to their homes they spread everywhere the knowledge of what had happened, and in the following Lent publicly proclaimed it in their churches. Short summaries of the conference, of its acts, and of the judgment, were prepared and circulated, one being by St. Augustine himself. These were intended principally for Catholics; others, as St. Augustine's "*ad Donatistas post collectionem*," were addressed to the Sectarians who might be swayed by the one-sided reports circulated by Donatist bishops respecting the conference, or by their slanderous abuse of Marcellinus and the Catholics.

In A.D. 418 a council was held at Carthage, at which certain resolutions were passed regulating the order of proceedings, when Donatist bishops, clergy, and congregations came back to the church. Nothing could prove more clearly to what a large extent this had taken place. The church was no longer suppliant, but triumphant; and the change is observable not only in these resolutions, but in some letters and acts of St. Augustine which belong to this period, and which may be said to be his last words on the great Donatist controversy.

His work, *De Correctione Donatistarum*, is addressed to a soldier, Bonifacius, and is written in a style and language almost military in its stern enforcement of discipline. Bonifacius had asked him to tell him the difference between the Arians and Donatists. The juxtaposition of these names and their temporary alliance was due to political far more than to any other considerations; the Goths being Arians, and like the Donatist, opponents of the Church Catholic. St. Augustine, after answering the question of Boni-

facius, went on to speak of Donatists as "rebels against the unity of the church of Christ." The conference at Carthage and the emperor had laid down laws. When men disobeyed those laws, as did some of the Donatists, they disobeyed laws which were passed in the service of truth, and they deserved punishment (Dan. iii. 29). The church was therefore justified in enforcing those laws, though she would do this without that shedding of blood which marked the Circumcellion. The church would enforce them in a loving spirit; for the Lord had commanded His disciples to compel the resisting to come to the marriage-feast, and that marriage-feast was the unity of the Body of Christ. The church was that Body; so long as a man lived, God, in His goodness, would bring him to repentance, and lead him to that church which was the temple of the Holy Ghost; but outside that Body, the church, the Holy Ghost gave no man life.

The same strong statement recurs in his exhortation to Emeritus the Donatist, bishop of Caesarea. The majority of Emeritus' congregation had returned to the church. St. Augustine pleaded with the bishop: "Outside the church you may have everything except salvation. You may have Offices, Sacraments, Liturgy, Gospel, belief, and preaching, in the name of the Trinity; but you can only find salvation in the Catholic Church."

The last letters of St. Augustine were addressed to a Donatist bishop, Gaudentius. Marcellinus had been succeeded by Dulcitius, who endeavoured to carry out the strong laws against the Donatists with all possible mildness, and specially interested himself in restraining the fanaticism of the Circumcellions. Unfortunately, some words of his were taken to mean that he would punish them with death unless they returned to the church. Gaudentius and his congregation assembled themselves in their church, determined to set fire to it and perish in the flames. Dulcitius contrived to stop this by a letter to Gaudentius, who in two letters defended his proposed action and the views of his party. Dulcitius, in despair at what he should do with such people, appealed to St. Augustine. As soon as he could find time, St. Augustine answered Gaudentius's arguments. His work, *contra Gaudentium*, in two books, goes once more over the old ground, in addition to exposing the folly and crime of suicide. The views of the church on baptism, the worthiness of ministers, discipline, and compulsory powers are stated as honestly and as emphatically as before; and they are closed with one of those loving sentences which take the sting out of reproofs both fierce and dogmatic.

Donatism had now lived its life. No new champions appeared to defend it, and no St. Augustines were needed to expose it. Once again only did the schism lift up its head. Towards the end of the 6th century there was a momentary revival of energy and proselytism; but popes such as Leo and Gregory the Great and imperial laws were irresistible. The movement at once died out. The Donatists lingered on till the invasion of Africa by the Mahomedans swept them away or merged them into some other schismatical body.

The following works should be consulted:—Optatus, ed. *Alba Spinaeus*, Par. 1631, or ed.

Dupin, *Antw.* 1702; S. Augustini *Opera*, vol. vii. Par. ed. 1635; Vogel, 'Donatisten' in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.*; Hefele, do. in Wetzser's *Kirchenlexicon*; Neander, *Church History*, iii. 258, etc. ed. Bohn; Niedner, *Lehrbuch d. Christlichen Kirchengeschichte*, 324; Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, i. 175, etc.; Hagenbach, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 547; Ribbeck, *Donatus und Augustinus*, 1858; Deutsch (M.), *Drei Actenstücke zur Geschichte der Donatismus*, Berlin, 1875.

[J. M. F.]

DONATULUS, African bishop. Cyp. *Ep.* 56. [AHIMNIUS.] Bishop of Capsa (P. Byzac.), suffr. 69 Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. No doubt then it was for his consecration that the five bishops had met.

[E. W. B.]

DONATUS (1) African bishop, Cyp. *Ep.* 57, *Ep.* 70, in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bapt.* i.; *Sentt. Epp.* in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 3, *de Bapt.* No. 55. bishop of Cybaliana (in Prov. Proc. (?) *Morcelli*).

(2) *Alus* in *Epp.* 57 and 70.

(3) Presbyter of Carthage, and one of the party who pressed Cyprian to relax the rule as to readmitting the lapsed, but could not induce him to decide apart from the presbytery and laity (*Ep.* 14). With him were FORTUNATUS, NOVATUS, GORDIUS. These were four of the five presbyters who originally opposed the election of Cyprian. See PRIVATUS. (Cf. Neander, i. 312.) There can be no question about Novatus being one of the first five if we weigh the emphatic words of *Ep.* 52, ii. 13.)

(4) Immediate predecessor of Cyprian in the see of Carthage, condemned Privatus of Lambaese of heresy in council of ninety bishops, as is commonly stated. The words perhaps more exactly mean that Privatus was condemned at such a council, and that Donatus, as well as Fabian, bishop of Rome, gave letters condemnatory of him (Cyp. *Ep.* 59, xiii.).

(5) The friend and fellow-convert to whom Cyprian addressed his first treatise *De Gratiâ Dei*. He was possibly a rhetorician also.

(6) Mart. Carth. A.D. 250. [ARISTO.]

[E. W. B.]

(7) the Great, bishop of Carthage. [DONATISM.]

(8) Bishop of Casae Nigrae. [DONATISM.]

(9). [SECUNDUS.] [E. B. B.]

(10) Bishop of Arezzo about A.D. 350; martyr in 362. (Gams, *Series Episc.* 741; Gregory the Great, *Dial.* i. 7; *Ep.* xiv. 7, 13; v. *Acta SS.* Aug. 7.) [E. B. B.]

(11), **AHLIUS**. A celebrated grammarian, who taught Jerome rhetoric (Hieron. ad ann. 358; *Patrol. Lat.* xxvii. 687). Smaragdus, abbat of St. Michael-on-the-Meuse (A.D. 819), has a commentary on Donatus in the form of a grammar; of this there are two MSS. in the library at Corbia. (*Patrol. Lat.* cii. 10; Honorius, lib. iv. *De Script. Eccles.* cap. vi.; *Patrol. Lat.* clxxii. 230.) Remigius, monk of St. Germain d'Auxerre, also has a commentary on Donatus (*Patrol. Lat.* cxxxi. 49; Ceillier, iv. 325, xii. 256, 759). Lindemann has edited the treatises of Donatus as one book:—(1) "De literis, syllabis, pedibus et tonis"; (2) "De octo partibus orationis," "De barbarismo," "De soloeismo," "De coeteris

vitiis," "De metaplasmo," "De schoematibus," "De tropis." These works were widely spread in the schools of the middle ages, so that the name Donat became proverbial, and synonymous with any kind of lesson. Bishop Peocke entitled one of his works *The Donat* (introduction) into *Christian Religion*; and another the *Follower to the Donat*. An old French proverb says, "Les diables estoient encore à leur Donat" (the devils were still at their rudiments). (See Warburton, *Hist. Engl. Poetry*, sect. viii.)

Besides the *Ars Grammatica*, we have Introductions (Enarrationes) and Scholia on five of the six plays of Terence. Some think that these are collected from his pupils' notes. The notes on Virgil, cited by Servius from a Donatus, are probably by Tiberius Claudius Donatus.

In the early days of printing a prodigious number of editions of the *Ars Grammatica* were printed. They have given rise to more discussions amongst bibliographers than any other book except Holy Scripture. (Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*.) [W. M. S.]

DONATUS (12), son of Ninus, and Primus son of Januarius, two Catholic deacons, whose murder by Donatists is related by Optatus (*De Schism. Donat.* ii. cap. 18, *Patrol. Lat.* xi. 970; Ceillier, v. 115.) [W. M. S.]

(13) ST., bishop of Euroea in the province of Vetus Epirus, circ. A.D. 387; his life was translated into Latin by Anastasius, the librarian, who died circ. A.D. 888. Sozomenus gives us a legend of the slaughter of a dragon by Donatus, and also of a copious spring of water which was granted to his prayers. He says that a splendid church was built over his remains. (Sozom. vii. 26, *Patrol. Græc.* lxxvii. 1498; *AA. SS. Boland.* Aprilis, iii. ad diem 30; Ceillier, xx. 715.) [W. M. S.]

(14) A deacon of the church of Carthage, circ. A.D. 393. One of the charges brought at the council of Cabarsussis in that year against Primianus, Donatist bishop of Carthage, was that he had engaged certain presbyters in a conspiracy against the deacon Maximianus, and against the deacons Rogatianus, Donatus, and Sargamius. (Augustin. *Enarr. in Psal.* xxxvi. 2, *Patrol. Lat.* xxxvi. 378; Ceillier, iv. 658.) [W. M. S.]

(15) A bishop of Tysedis in Numidia, in the 4th century, violently deprived of his see by the Donatist bishop Felix, although he had led an irreproachable life, and was 70 years old; this account is given by Optatus. (*De Schism. Donat.* ii. 19, *Patrol. Lat.* xi. 973; Ceillier, v. 115.) [W. M. S.]

(16) Donatist bishop of Bagaia in the 4th century, who, according to Optatus, excited the Circumcellions against Paulus and Macarius, who had been sent by the emperor Constans to procure reunion of the schism. (Optat. *Contr. Donat.* iii. 1, *Patrol. Lat.* xi. 989; Ceillier, v. 116, 117.) [W. M. S.]

(17) Proconsul of Africa, addressed in A.D. 408 by Augustine of Hippo. The law of the emperor Honorius against Donatists and Jews was designated in particular to Donatus the proconsul; Augustine therefore wrote asking him to let the Donatists know that the laws against them were in force, but to be merciful in the execution of them, and not to put any to

death, however violent they had been against the church; both on other grounds, and because ecclesiastics would not bring complaints before him if the result was likely to be the capital punishment of those whom they accused. About A.D. 410 Augustine again addresses Donatus, on his retirement from office. Donatus had filled his place with great honour and perfect probity; Augustine exhorts him to humility and true greatness. (Aug. *Epp.* 100, 112, *Patrol. Lat.* xxxiii. 366, 427; Ceillier, ix. 17, 104, and 110.) [W. M. S.]

DONATUS (18) Presbyter of the Donatist sect, arrested for Donatism about A.D. 416; would not use the mule provided for him, but dashed himself to the ground and injured himself severely. Augustine writes to remonstrate with him (*Ep.* 173 [204]; Migne, ii. 753). [E. B. B.]

(19) Bishop of Nicopolis, metropolis of the province Vetus Epirus (circ. A.D. 425-433, etc.) He is addressed by Cyril of Alexandria in A.D. 433, on the subject of the negotiations for peace between the Egyptian and Syrian parties at the council of Ephesus. Cyril thinks it necessary to send details, for fear of false reports. He also sends copies of the letter he had written to the Oriental party, and of the reply he had received. (Cyril, *Ep.* 155, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 250; Ceillier, viii. 295.) [W. M. S.]

(20) ST., was twenty-fifth bishop of Avignon, and lived about the middle of the 5th century. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 863.) [D. R. J.]

(21) VICTOR, RUSTICUS, and PAR-DALUS, the four African bishops at the council convened at Rome, March 14, A.D. 487, to consider the treatment of those who had fallen in the Vandal persecutions (Ceillier, x. 720). [E. B. B.]

(22) Addressed by FULGENTIUS. He was a young man, who, after having applied himself to classical studies, devoted his time to religious reading. Finding himself in the company of Arians, he did not know what to say to their argument that the Father is greater than the Son. So he wrote to Fulgentius, and the reply is preserved. (Fulgent. *Ep.* 8, *ad Donat.* p. 197, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxv. 360; Ceillier, xi. 32.) [W. M. S.]

(23) ST., hermit, near Sisteron in Provence, died about the year 535, and is commemorated on the 19th August. He was a native of Orleans, and was distinguished in his childhood for the brightness of his intellect. He had read the whole of the Bible, Old and New Testaments, before he was ten years old, and the bishop was so pleased with him that he dedicated him to the diaconate when he was only twelve. He subsequently turned hermit, as it is said, in Mount Jura. His legends relate to serpents, demons, and a terrible dragon. (*AA. SS. Boll.* Aug. iii. p. 735; Ado, *Martyrolog.* p. 333, *Patrol. Lat.* cxxiii.; Usuard, *Martyrolog.* p. 377, *Patrol. Lat.* cxxiii.) [D. R. J.]

(24) ST., bishop of Besançon, was born in 592 or 594, and died in 651. He is commemorated on the 7th of August. According to the contemporary record of abbat Jonas, he was the son of Waldeleus, who was duke of a part of Burgundy bordering on the Jura. Flavia, the

mother of the saint, is said to have been barren, and to have gone with her husband to St. Columbanus, then abbat of Luxeuil, to ask him to pray that they might have a child. St. Columbanus promised to comply with their request on condition that they promised that if his prayer should be answered they would dedicate the child to the service of God. This they willingly promised, and in due time a son was born to them. The mother immediately sent the child from their home at Besançon to St. Columbanus at Luxeuil, and he at once baptized it under the name of Donatus, as being a gift of heaven. The abbat then sent it back to its mother to be nursed, and when it was old enough it was again entrusted to him to be educated for the holy office for which it was destined. St. Donatus became a monk in the monastery at Luxeuil under St. Columbanus, and about the year 624 he was consecrated bishop of Besançon. In 625 he was present at the council of Rheims, over which Sonnatius presided, and in 646 at the council of Châlons-sur-Saône. St. Donatus founded the monastery of St. Paul (Palatius) at Besançon, for "regular canons," and placed it under the Rule of St. Benedict and of St. Columbanus of Luxeuil. His mother Flavia, after the death of her husband, also founded a monastery for women, called St. Joussan, which was placed under the Rule of St. Caesarius, and she herself, together with her daughter, retired into it. St. Donatus may, however, be looked upon as the actual, though not the nominal founder of St. Joussan as well as of St. Paul's. He was buried in his own monastery, and his mother in hers. In his life, as given by the Bollandists, it is stated that he died after the year 656, but most French writers give 651 as the date of his death. (*AA. SS. Boll.* Aug. ii. p. 197; Mabillon, *AA. SS. V. St. Ben.* ii. 14; *Gall. Christ.* xv. 15; *Histoire Littéraire de la France.* iii. 570; Jonas Monachus Eluonensis, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxvii.; Floardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii., *Patrol. Lat.* cxxv.) [D. R. J.]

DONATUS (25), probably the latinised form of the Irish Donagh, is the name of two saints who belonged to Ireland by birth, were foreign bishops, and are often confounded, though there must have been nearly two centuries between them: the one was St. Donatus, bishop of Lupia, and brother of St. Cathaldus, in the 7th century [CATHALDUS], and the other, St. Donatus, bishop of Fiesole in Tuscany, in the ninth. Both were commemorated on Oct. 22. The former accompanied his brother St. Cathaldus to Italy, where St. Donatus became the first bishop of Lupia or Aletium, now Leece, in Naples, and the two brothers are said to have lived together as hermits for some time, near a small town, now called San Cataldo. In his usual way Dempster credits him with the authorship of two books, which no other one ever heard of. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 547, c. 11, 556 n. 13; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 16, wks. vi. 308; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 212-3; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 18, § 11; Kelly, *Cal. Ir. SS.* 88. For the bishop of Fiesole, in the middle of the 9th century, see Colgan, *ib.* 236, in the *Life of St. Brigida*, sister of St. Andrew, the deacon of Fiesole; Lanigan, *ib.* iii. c. 21, § 4.) [J. G.]

(26) Abbat of Hy. [DUNCHADH.]

DONATUS (27), patriarch of Grado, A.D. 717—circ. 730. Addressed by pope Gregory II. in a letter which warns him of the encroachments on his prerogatives made by Serenus patriarch of Aquileia. (Greg. II. Pap. *Epist.* xvi., *Patrol. Lat.* lxxxix. 527; Ceillier, xii. 25.) [W. M. S.]

DONDAN, of Little Berneray, is one of the saints of the Lewes, mentioned by Martin (*West. Isles*, 27). It is probably the same name as Donan and DONNAN (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 468). [J. G.]

DONIDIUS, born at Ebreuil, a little town in Auvergne. He resided at Arverna (Clermont) as a cleric, and was a man of note. He was a friend of Sidonius, who, in a letter addressed to him about A.D. 471, tells him that pious books, such as Augustine and Prudentius, are proper for women, while Varro and Horace belong to men. (Sidon. *Ep.* ii. 9.) Sidonius afterwards requests Hypatius to let this Donidius buy back the other half of his patrimony at Ebreuil (*ib.* iii. 5). [E. B. B.]

DONNAN. The fullest and most accurate account of the saints of this name is to be found in Dr. Reeves's *Adamnan*, 303-9, with immediate reference to St. Donnan of Egg, and his companions in martyrdom. But in his treatment of them he accepts as a fact, without discussing it as a matter worthy of dispute, that St. Donnan, the patron of Auchterless, was the same as Donnan of Egg, and not a saint of the 12th century. In the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Apr. tom. ii. 483, 491), there are two notices of St. Donnanus, and both on April 17. On the former page is an account of St. Donnan and his fifty-two companions, who were slain on the Scotch island Egg, about A.D. 600; and on the latter is an account of St. Donnan, abbat in Scotia, who lived under king Machabius, "anno 640, imo 1046, aut circiter," and by Camerarius is called "Abbas Tanglandiae," A.D. 1044, and by Dempster is identified with St. Donnan of Auchterless, and said to have lived or died A.D. 640. It is evident that the Bollandists wish to separate the two, and are willing to rectify imagined errors in authorities, in order to make the patron of Auchterless the special friend and favourite of king Duncan. But there is so much confusion in the chronology, and the authorities quoted for the separation are so weak, that it seems best to regard the saints as in reality only one. Dempster in his *Menolog. Scotic.* (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 197) gives a double dedication, "April 17 Donani abbatis patroni in Auchterles, cufus baculus circulatoris euilibet languori medebatur. April 18. In Buchania Donani ejusdem abbatis elevatio."

(1) Abbat of Egg, April 17. (Donanus, *Acta SS.* Boll. Ap. ii. 487.) Like so many others in the 6th and 7th centuries, this saint came over from Ireland to evangelise the West of Scotland; he was younger than St. Columba and probably followed him, as he is not found in the list of his companions. According to the *Felire of Aengus*, he went to St. Columba to make him his "soul's friend" or spiritual director, but St. Columba declined, on the plea that he could not be "soul's friend" to the heirs

of red martyrdom, that is, to St. Donan and his companions. And this fate came to them in their own monastery on the island of Egg. It is said to have been on Easter day, A.D. 617, that the bloody deed was consummated, when the queen or female chief of the island sent her agents, who, according to some accounts, are called the pirates, to murder the saint and his fifty-one companions for their settlement on her property: mass was begun when the murderers arrived, apparently on Easter Eve, and on the request being made to the queen's agents to wait till mass was ended, they did not molest the saints for the time, but so soon as the Holy Mysteries were celebrated, the whole company of monks was put to the sword. St. Donnan had many dedications in the west and north of Scotland, and one at Auchterless, in the north-east, where his bacul or pastoral staff was preserved up to the time of the Reformation, and was used for curing diseases. (Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 324-26, 467; J. H. Burton, *Hist. Scot.* i. 277-78; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 207; Innes, *Orig. Par.* passim; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 227, Edinb. 1861; *Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 105; *View Dioc. Mart. Aberd.* 505-6; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 132.)

DONNAN (2) Son of Liath and priest of Inis-aingin, in Loch Ribh, Jan. 7. This St. Donnan was nephew and disciple of St. Senan (Mar. 8), and successor of St. Ciaran (Sept. 9) of Clonmacnoise, at his monastery of Inis-aingin, now Howe Island, in Loch Ree, on the Shannon. St. Ciaran is said, in his life, to have left St. Donnan "the island, and also his gospel and its true bearer, i.e. Maelodhrain" (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 9). In the *Life of St. Senan*, given by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 535, c. 35), a story is related of St. Donnan's working a miracle, by the instructions of St. Senan his uncle, on two boys who were drowned. His chief feast was Jan. 7, but he was also commemorated on April 29 and Aug. 11. From his contemporaries we must infer that he flourished about the middle of the 6th century. (Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi., *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 548; Reeves, *Adamnan*, pp. xl. 303; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 191, A.D. 548, 535, c. 35, 540 n. 23, 542, c. 2; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 99.)

(3) Deacon, Aug. 11. He was son of Beoadh, and brother of St. Ciaran (Sept. 9) of Clonmacnoise [CIARAN (5)]: he was at Cluain along with his brother (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 217, 243; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 303). [J. G.]

DONNELL. There was probably an ecclesiastic of this name in the west of Scotland, who has given his name to Kildonnell in Kilchousland, in the present parish of Glassary, Argyleshire, but the person himself is unknown (Innes, *Orig. Par.* ii. 19; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 327). [J. G.]

DONUM GRATIAE. [BAPTISM.]

DONUS, bishop of Messana. [DOMNUS.]

DONUS or **DOMNUS**, pope, was elected successor to Adeodatus in August, 676, and consecrated on the 2nd of November of that year. Of his life and actions little is known, except that he was by birth a Roman, and that he com-

pled certain ecclesiastical buildings in Rome. He died and was buried in St. Peter's on the 11th of April, 678. For the chronology, see Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum*. [T. R. B.]

DORBENE FODA (the Tall), A., Oct. 28. O'Clery (in *Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 287) calls him son of Altaire, of the race of Conall Gulban, and abbat of Ia Coluimcille; Colgan (*Tr. Thaum.* 480, col. 2) gives a more extended genealogy, in which Dorbene is sixth from Conall Gulban, but this is, probably, by omitting one or two links. The *Annals of Ulster* (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 73 and note) have at A.D. 712 "Dorbein Kathedram Iae obtinuit, et quinque mensibus peractis in Primatu, V. Kal. Novembris die sabbati obiit," but the true year is A.D. 713, as in 713 the Sunday letter was A, and Oct. 28 was on "die sabbati" or Saturday; this is also the year given by Tighernach and the *Four Masters*. How he was abbat at Iona that year is not easily explained, unless we suppose that as St. Dunchadh was elected abbat, possibly tanist or coadjutor abbat, in A.D. 707, during the life of abbat Conamhail, so St. Dorbene may in the same way have been chosen during the primacy of St. Dunchadh, and again St. Faelchu, two years after this, and two years before St. Dunchadh's death; or else we must suppose that after St. Adamnan's death there was a schism in the monastery for some years, which is, in itself, improbable, and has no authority in the annals [DUNCHADH] (Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. clxxii.; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. c. 19, § 4; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scot.* i. 114; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 326). At the close of St. Adamnan's *Life of St. Columba* there is the colophon, "whoever readeth these books on the virtues of St. Columba, let him pray to the Lord for me Dorbene, that after death I may possess everlasting life." There is every reason to believe that this Dorbene the scribe is the same as Dorbene the Tall, who outlived St. Adamnan by nine years, and was the writer of the MS. which is now called Codex A of St. Adamnan's *Vita S. Columbae*, and is preserved in the public library of Schaffhausen, having formerly belonged to Reichenau (Reeves, *Adamnan*, pp. xiii.-xv. 242, n. k; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* p. 372 n. k). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Oct. 28, tom. xii. 623-5) give a sylloge upon this abbat of Hy, and a list of the different abbats, placing Dorbene in A.D. 713. [J. G.]

DORMITANTES. [NYCTAGES.]

DOROTHEA. Virgin, martyred with Theophilus the Advocate, and two other women, Christa and Callista, at Caesarea, in Cappadocia. Some doubt is entertained about these names, as they occur in no Greek menology or martyrology; but they are found in ancient Roman accounts; and details are given by the monk Usuard, the bishop Ado, and Rabanus. They are celebrated on the 6th of February. Baronius, Bollandus and Tillemont agree in placing the death of Dorothea in the persecution of Diocletian.

Dorothea was a young girl of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, famed so widely for Christian piety that when the governor Fabricius, Sapricius, or Apricius arrived at that place he had her brought before him and tortured. Unable to persuade her to marry, he sent her to Christa and Cal-

lista, with orders that they should induce her to give up her faith. She converted them; whereupon the governor put Christa and Callista to death in a boiling caldron.

Dorothea was again tortured, and shewed her joy for the martyrdom of Christa and Callista, and for her own sufferings. The governor, insulted and enraged, ordered her head to be cut off.

On her way to the place of execution, an advocate named Theophilus laughingly asked her to send him some apples and roses from the paradise of her heavenly bridegroom. The legend states that these were miraculously conveyed to him, although Cappadocia was covered at the time with snow. Theophilus was converted, tortured, and decapitated.

Dorothea's body is said to have been taken to Rome, and preserved in the church which bears her name, across the Tiber. On her festival there is a ceremony of blessing roses and apples. (Migne, *Dict. Hagiographique*, i. 779; Bollandus, *Acta Sanct.* Februar. i. p. 771; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 497 (Paris, 1702). [W. M. S.]

DOROTHEUS (1), ST., was the first abbat of Lyons, under bishops Aelius, Faustinus, and Verus, in the 3rd century (*Gall. Christ. iv.* 222). [D. R. J.]

(2) Bishop of Tyre, placed by Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 803) after Methodius the martyr, at the close of the 3rd century. Theophanes (41, p. 19) records his sufferings for the faith under Diocletian and Licinius, reporting that he was banished, and returning at the cessation of the persecution, was again driven into exile to Odysopolis on the accession of Julian, at the hands of whose officers he suffered death, at the age of 107. The whole story rests on late evidence, and has been overthrown by Tillemont (vol. v. p. 657, note 8) and Cave (*Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 163), who have shewn the inconsistencies of the account, and called attention to the improbability of its having been passed over in silence by both Eusebius and Jerome, if true. Theophanes says that Dorotheus wrote much on ecclesiastical history. A spurious tract on the twelve apostles and seventy disciples, attributed to him, is given by Cave (*u. s.*) and in the *Bibl. Patr.* Lugd. 1677, vol. iii. See also appendix to *Chronicon Paschale*, ii. 120, Bonn edition. [E. V.]

(3) A presbyter of Antioch, ordained by Cyril of Antioch (Hieron. *Chron.*) c. A.D. 290, who with his contemporary, Lucian, may be regarded as the progenitor of the sound and healthy school of scriptural hermeneutics, which distinguished the interpreters of Antioch from those of Alexandria. Eusebius speaks of him with high commendation, as distinguished by a pure taste and sound learning, of a wide and liberal education, well acquainted not only with the Hebrew scriptures, which Eusebius says he had heard him expounding in the church at Antioch, with moderation (*μετρίως*), but also with classical literature. He was a congenital eunuch, which commended him to the notice of the emperor Constantine, who placed him at the head of the purple-dye-house at Tyre (Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 32; Neander, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 528, Clark's trans.; Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 247, Clark's trans.) [E. V.]

DOROTHEUS (4), a deacon of the church of Antioch, attached to the communion of Meletius, who in A.D. 371 was the bearer of two letters from Basil to Athanasius, entreating him to use his influence with the Western church to interpose to heal the schism of the church of Antioch, by inducing all orthodox Christians to unite with Meletius and his adherents, and of Athanasius's reply (Basil, *Epist.* 48, 50, 52). At the close of the same year Basil again despatched Dorotheus to Athanasius, with letters to pope Damasus and the Western bishops, entreating him to aid him with his counsels and his prayers, and strengthen his cause by deputing some of his clergy to accompany him (*ib.* 52). He spent the winter in Italy, in fruitless negotiations, and returned in 372 to Athanasius and Basil, with letters from Damasus bearing witness to the community of their faith, but offering no effectual help (*ib.* 61, 62, 273). Basil then sent him to Meletius before Easter, with the request that he would draw up more urgent letters to the Western bishops, which were sent to Rome, not by Dorotheus, but by Sabinus (*ib.*). Tillemont distinguishes him from the subject of the next article. [E. V.]

(5) A presbyter deputed by Basil and the orthodox Eastern bishops in A.D. 373 to carry their application for assistance to Rome and the Western bishops. He is highly commended by Basil for his zeal for the faith, his knowledge, intelligence, and skill in managing difficult business (Basil, *Epist.* 321, 342). To give additional weight to his mission, it was arranged that Gregory Nyssen should accompany him, and Basil advised him to defer starting till the spring of A.D. 374, and go by sea, to avoid the perils to be dreaded from the open or concealed enemies who would beset the land route (*Epist.* 250). We are ignorant of the further details. Dorotheus returned in 375, reporting very little success (*Epist.* 10). He was again despatched to Rome by Basil three years later, with no better results. In an interview with Damasus and Peter of Alexandria, his indignation was roused by hearing his master's beloved friends, Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata, ranked among the Arian heretics, and he appears to have expressed himself with an intemperate warmth, for which Basil apologises in a letter to Peter, A.D. 378 (*Epist.* 321). [E. V.]

(6) (or **THEODORUS**, Soz. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 37), an Arian bishop of Antioch during the Melitian schism, in succession to Euzoius, A.D. 376. He had previously been bishop of the metropolitan see of Heraclea in Thrace, and was instrumental, through his influence with Valens, in placing his friend Demophilus in the then suffragan see of Constantinople (Philostorg. *H. E.* lib. ix. c. 10). He was translated from Heraclea to Antioch on the death of Euzoius (Soz. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 37; Socr. *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 35; v. c. 3). In consequence of the decree of Theodosius, A.D. 381, prohibiting Arian religious assemblies in cities, he left Antioch, and returned to his native country of Thrace (Philostorg. *H. E.* lib. ix. c. 19); but he was in Antioch again in A.D. 386, when the Arians of Constantinople invited him to become their bishop, in the place of Marinus, who had been chosen on the death of Demophilus (Socr. *H. E.*

lib. v. c. 12, 23; Soz. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 14, 17), but who held unorthodox views, according to the Arian standard, on the paternity of God, which he held to be eternal, in opposition to Dorotheus and the main body of the Arians, who regarded it as coeval with the existence of the Son. A schism was thus formed among the Arians at Constantinople, Dorotheus and his followers retaining possession of the buildings. [E. V.]

DOROTHEUS (7), bishop of Martianopolis in Moesia Secunda, and metropolitan. He was a zealous supporter of the doctrines of Nestorius, and a determined enemy of the title *θεοτόκος*. Preaching in Constantinople not long before the council of Ephesus, he uttered the dictum that "if anyone asserted that Mary was the mother of God he was anathema" (*Epistol. Cyrill.* apud Baluz. *Concil.* col. 402). He attended the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he naturally took part with the Easterns against Cyril, signing the remonstrance against commencing the council before the arrival of John of Antioch (Baluz. 697), and the appeal to the emperor against the tyranny of the dominant party (*ib.* 701). He joined also in the documents warning the clergy and people of Hierapolis, and of Constantinople, against the errors of Cyril, and announcing Cyril's excommunication (*ib.* 706, 725). It is needless to say that Dorotheus was himself deposed and excommunicated in his turn by Cyril and his friends. This deposition being confirmed by the imperial power he was ordered by Maximinian's synod at Constantinople to be ejected from his city and his throne. His influence, however, with his people was so great, that they refused to receive his successor, Secundianus, and drove him from the city (*Epist. Dorothei ad Cyrill.* Baluz. 750), whereupon he was banished by the emperor to Caesarea in Cappadocia. Two letters of his to John of Antioch are preserved in the *Synodicon* (Nos. 78, 115; Baluz. 781, 816), expressing first the anxiety he felt at Paul's setting out to Egypt, and then his distress at hearing that terms had been come to with Cyril, and a third (No. 187; Baluz. 840) to Alexander of Hierapolis and Theodoret, proposing a joint appeal to the emperor. [E. V.]

(8) Abbat of a convent of nuns in the town of Athribia in Egypt. Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia (circ. A.D. 431), relates that Dorotheus, who succeeded Elias in this post, shut himself up in the highest story of the house, where none could enter nor in any way intrude upon his solitude; and that through a window, which opened on the convent, and which he could close at pleasure, he spoke to the nuns and kept peace amongst them. (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxiii. 1136, § 735. Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* cap. 36; Ceillier, vii. 489.) [W. M. S.]

(9) A monk of Alexandria, c. 502, was the author of a lengthy work in defence of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, entitled *Tragoedia Prophetica*, which was put into the hands of the emperor Anastasius by his brother's wife Magna, in the hope of weaning him from the Eutychian heresy. But he treated the book with contempt, and banished the author to the Oasis (Theophan. *Chronogr.* ann. 502, p. 131; Cave *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 492). [E. V.]

DOROTHEUS (10) Bishop of Thessalonica (A.D. 515–520). He wrote on April 28, A.D. 515, to pope Hormisdas, urging him to labour for the peace of the church. He testifies respect for the see of Rome, and wishes to see the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches everywhere condemned. The pope in reply praises his zeal, and exhorts him to the same labours for peace.

But in the spring of A.D. 517 we find Dorotheus in the character of a Eutychian schismatic, endeavouring to exercise over the province of Thessalonica the rights which belonged to that metropolis when in communion with the Catholic church. In particular he persecuted John bishop of Nicopolis, employing the secular arm, and persuading the emperor Anastasius to countenance his faction. Complaints were brought to pope Hormisdas, who pointed out to him that he might regain his rights if he rejoined the Catholic church; at the same time the papal legates Ennodius and Peregrinus were to bring the affair before the emperor, if bishop Dorotheus should persist. The emperor Anastasius refused the message of the legates, tried to corrupt them, and wrote a letter to the pope saying that he could suffer insults, but not commands. (July 11, 517.)

The death of the emperor Anastasius almost exactly a year afterwards altered the balance against the Eutychians. Justin I., the Thracian, wrote on his accession to the pope, expressing his own wish and that of the principal Eastern bishops for the restoration of peace between East and West. Hormisdas, with the advice of king Theodoric, sends a third legation to Constantinople, Germanus, bishop of Capua, John a bishop, Blandus a presbyter, and others. When these men had done their business at Constantinople, Hormisdas wrote to them to inquire personally into the doings of the Eutychians at Thessalonica, and to cite bishop Dorotheus and his abettor Aristides the presbyter to Rome, that they might give account of their faith and receive resolution of their doubts. Two days before the arrival of the legates, Dorotheus baptized more than 2000 people, and distributed the eucharistic bread in large baskets, so that multitudes could keep it by them. On their arrival, the populace of Thessalonica, excited, as the legates thought, by Dorotheus, fell upon them, and killed John, a catholic, who had received them in his house. News of these outrages arriving at Constantinople, the emperor Justin promised to summon Dorotheus before him. The pope wrote to his legates, saying that they must see Dorotheus deposed, and take care that Aristides should not be his successor.

Dorotheus was cited before the emperor at Heraclea; he appealed to Rome, but the emperor thought it unadvisable to send him there, as his accusers would not be present. He was suddenly sent away from Heraclea, and the pope's legates, bishop John and the presbyter Epiphanius, who had remained at Thessalonica in his absence, wrote in alarm to the remaining legates who were at Constantinople lest Dorotheus and others should re-establish themselves in their sees by liberal use of money, of which they had abundant supply.

Dorotheus was now obliged by the emperor to send deputies to Rome to satisfy the pope. He accordingly wrote an agreeable letter, saying

that he had exposed his life in defence of bishop John, when the populace had fallen upon him. Pope Hormisdas wrote back, saying that the crime was known to all the world, and required clearer defence: he remitted its examination to the patriarch of Constantinople. (Hormisd. *Epp.* Patrol. Lat. lxiii. pp. 371, 372, 408, 445, 446, 452, 468, 473, 481, 499, etc.; Ceillier, x. 616, 618, 619, 625, 626, 628, 632, 633.)

[W. M. S.]

DOROTHEUS (11), or **DROCTOVAEUS**, a monk of great virtue, appointed by Germanus bishop of Paris (circ. A.D. 576) abbat of the monastery of St. Cross, sometimes called St. Vincent, afterwards St. Germain-des-Prés, attached to a church built by king Childbert in A.D. 559. Dorotheus had been disciple to Germanus when abbat of St. Symphorien d'Autun. He was canonised, and is celebrated on May 26. (*Gallia Christiana*, vii. 419; Aimoinus Monachus, ii. 36, iii. 16, 56; Fortunat. Pictav. *Miscell.* ix. carm. 2; Greg. Turon. Appendix, § 1370; *Patrol.* Lat. lxi. 1188; Ceillier, xi. 307.) [W. M. S.]

(12) Archimandrite, at the beginning of the 7th century. *Twenty-four Discourses* and *Eight Letters* bearing the name of Dorotheus are to be found in Gatland, xii. 369; and thence reprinted in the 88th volume of the *Patrologia Graeca*, coll. 1611–1846. An account of the MS. sources as well as of previous editions is given by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* xi. 103, ed. Harles.

It has been disputed what Dorotheus is the author of these writings. Palladius in his *Historia Lausiaca* mentions two archimandrites Dorotheus who lived in the 4th century. (Pallad. *Hist. Lausiaca*, Patrol. Lat. lxxiii. 709, 710, 735, 767, 943, 985.)

A third archimandrite of the name was disciple of John the Prophet, who had himself been disciple of Barsanuphius, near Gaza in Palestine, circ. A.D. 540–550. This Dorotheus quitted the monastery of the abbat Seridus, and built one for himself and his followers. He was an adherent of Severus, one of the chiefs of the Eutychians. (Evag. iv. 33.)

A fourth is mentioned by Allatius; he was called the "Younger," because he lived towards the beginning of the 11th century. This last lived with 1000 monks under his rule, the ordinary monastic life. The third also lived in common with his followers. The first two were really eremites, living in separate cells.

An anonymous Greek writer, who gives the prologue to the *Twenty-four Discourses*, asserts that they are by one of the two earlier archimandrites, arguing that their doctrine is too sound for them to have been by Dorotheus the Severian. But as they are written for monks living in common, they could not be written by an eremite. They cannot on the other hand be as late as the 11th century. It is more probable therefore to refer them to Dorotheus the Severian.

The following are the subjects of some of the *Twenty-four Discourses*:—1. Self-renunciation; 2. Humility; 3. Conscience; 4. The fear of God (in this he says he had lived in the monastery of abbat Seridus). 5. (In this he calls himself the disciple of abbat John.) 15. The Lenten fast of eight weeks; 17. On the government of monasteries; 18. Charge of monastic

temporalities; 22 and 23. Certain hymns of Gregory of Nazianzum. The *Eight Letters* of Dorotheus are addressed to different monks in circumstances of temptation or affliction. (*Patrol. Graec.* lxxxviii. col. 1611–1846; Ceillier, xi. 695.) [W. M. S.]

DOROTHEUS (13), the deacon addressed in the 5th letter ascribed to **DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE**. [E. B. B.]

DORULF, bishop, attests a charter of Offa A.D. 777, marked spurious or doubtful by Kemble (*C. D.* No. 130). [C. H.]

DORUS, bishop of Beneventum, A.D. 447 or 8, to 450. Pope Leo the Great writes to reprimand him for setting at the head of his presbyters Episcarpus, newly-ordained. Episcarpus ought to have remained last until another ordination. Two of the senior presbyters had basely complied, but another named Paul complained to the pope. The pope entrusted the execution of his orders to a bishop named Julius. (*Leo Mag. Epist.* xix., *Patrol. Lat.* liv. p. 709; Ceillier, x. 210.) [W. M. S.]

DORYMEDON, a convert of Trophimus, martyred with him at Synnada under Probus, Sept. 19. (*Men. Basil.*) [E. B. B.]

DOSITHEUS (1). The earliest ecclesiastical writers attest the existence of a sect of Dositheans, which, though it never spread far outside the district of Samaria, seems to have had some considerable duration in that quarter. It is rather to be counted a Jewish sect than a Christian heresy, for Dositheus was regarded rather as a rival than as a disciple of our Lord, but trustworthy information as to his history and his doctrines is very scanty. The name, but nothing more than the name, of himself and his sect occurs in Hegesippus's list of heresies, preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 22). He is there placed next after Simon and Cleobius. The earliest detailed account of him is given in the Clementine writings, and this deserves the more attention, as it is not unlikely that their account of this Samaritan teacher was derived from the treatise on heresies of Justin Martyr. The Recognitions (ii. 8) and Homilies (ii. 24) agree in making Simon Magus a disciple of Dositheus, and the Recognitions would lead us to suppose that Dositheus was clearly the elder. They represent him as already recognised as the prophet like unto Moses, whom Jehovah was to raise up; when Simon with difficulty and entreaty obtained, on the occurrence of a vacancy, election into the number of his thirty disciples. The account of the Homilies is that Simon and Dositheus were fellow disciples of John the Baptist, to whom in several places the author shews hostility. As our Lord, the Sun, had twelve apostles, so John, the Moon, had thirty disciples, or even more accurately answering to the number of days in a lunation, 29½, for one of them was a woman. On John's death Simon was absent studying magic in Egypt, and so Dositheus was put over his head into the chief place, an arrangement in which

Simon on his return thought it prudent to acquiesce. Origen, who was acquainted with the Recognitions, probably had in his mind the story of the thirty disciples of Dositheus, when he says in one place (*contra Celsum*, vi. 11), that he doubts whether there were then thirty Dositheans in the world, and (*ib.* i. 57) that he doubts if there were then thirty Simonians. Recognitions and Homilies agree in stating that Simon after his enrolment among the disciples of Dositheus, by his disparagement among his fellow disciples of their master's pretensions provoked Dositheus to smite him with a staff, which through Simon's magical art passed through his body as if it had been smoke. Dositheus in amazement thereat, and conscious that he himself was not the Standing one as he pretended to be, inquired if Simon claimed that dignity for himself, and, being answered in the affirmative, resigned his chief place to him and became his worshipper. Soon after he died. Elsewhere (i. 54) the Recognitions represent Dositheus as the founder of the sect of the Sadducees, a sect which according to their account had its commencement only in the days of John the Baptist.

Next in order of the early witnesses to the activity of Dositheus is Hippolytus, who, as we learn from Photius (*Cod.* 121), commenced his shorter treatise on heresies with a section on the Dositheans. We gather the contents of this treatise from the use made of it by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 13), Philaster (4), and Pseudo-Tertullian, and it is to be remarked that the opening sentence of the latter, which relates to the Dositheans, is almost exactly reproduced by St. Jerome (*adv. Luciferianos*, iv. 304). It would appear that the first section of the work of Hippolytus contained a brief notice of pre-Christian sects, the foremost place being given to the Dositheans. Hippolytus seems to have adopted the account of the Recognitions that the sect of the Sadducees had its root in the teaching of Dositheus, and to have also charged Dositheus with rejecting the inspiration of the prophets. A statement that Dositheus was a Jew by birth was understood by Epiphanius to mean that he had deserted from the Jews to the Samaritans, a change which Epiphanius attributes to disappointed ambition. Origen mentions Dositheus in several places (*cont. Celsum ut supra*, tract 27 in *Matt.* vol. iii. 851; in *Luc.* iii. 962; in *Johann.* iv., vol. iv. p. 237; *De Princ.* iv. 1–17); but it is only in the last two passages that he makes any statement, which clearly shews that he had sources of information independent of the Clementine Recognitions; viz. in the commentary on John he speaks of books ascribed to Dositheus as being then current among his disciples, and of a popular belief among them that their master had not really died; and in *De Princ.* he asserts that Dositheus expounded *Exod.* xvi. 29, so as to teach that persons were bound to remain to the end of the sabbath as they found themselves at the beginning of it; if sitting, sitting to the end; if lying, lying. Epiphanius, who may have read Dosithean books, adds, from his personal investigations, to the details which he found in Hippolytus. He describes the sect as one still existing in his own time, the members of which observed the sabbath, circumcision, and other Jewish ordinances, abstained from animal food,

* Ritschl derives from the ἀναρτήσαι of this prophecy an explanation of the title ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν claimed by Dositheus and Simon; but this does not seem satisfactory.

and many of them from sexual intercourse either altogether, or at least after having had children; but the reading here is uncertain. They are said to have admitted the resurrection of the body, the denial of which doctrine is represented as an addition made by the Sadducees to the original teaching of Dositheus. Epiphanius adds a story that Dositheus retired to a cave, and there, under a show of piety, practised such abstinence from food and drink as to bring his life to a voluntary end. This story appears, in a slightly different shape, in a Samaritan chronicle, of which an account is given by Abraham Ecchellensis ad *Hebed Jesu, Catal. lib. Chald.* p. 162, Rom. 1653, the story there being that it was the measures taken by the Samaritan high-priest against the new sect, measures especially prompted because of their use of a book of the law falsified by Dositheus (there called Dousis), which compelled Dositheus to fly to a mountain, where he died from want of food in the cave in which he had concealed himself. The notes of Ecchellensis are not given in Assemani's republication of *Hebed Jesu (Bibl. Or. iii.)*. This account is taken from Mosheim (*v. infra*), and from De Sacy's *Chrestomathie Arabe*, i. 337.

Finally, it appears that the sect of Dositheans long continued to maintain a local existence. In *Hebed Jesu's* catalogue of Chaldee books (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. 42) we read that Theophilus of Persia, who was later than the council of Ephesus, wrote against Dositheus. And Photius (*Cod.* 230) reports that he read among the works of Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, who died A.D. 608, one entitled *Definition against the Samaritans*, the argument of which is that the people of Samaria being divided in opinion as to the meaning of the prediction of a "prophet like unto Moses," some holding that it was fulfilled in Joshua, others that the predicted prophet was Dosthes or Dositheus, Eulogius held a synod there (in the 7th year of Marcianus according to the MSS.; if we correct this to the 7th year of Maurice, it gives A.D. 588), and taught them the divinity of our Lord. And though this account raises a suspicion that we have here a rhetorical exercise, and not an account of a real fact, yet the independent notices of the continued existence of the sect make it not incredible that Eulogius may have encountered it. Mosheim conjectures that he may have been commissioned by the emperor to settle the dispute between parties who would not voluntarily have submitted to his arbitration. This writer, who appears to have really used Dosithean books, reports that Dositheus exhibited particular hostility to the patriarch Judah, and it is intelligible that if he claimed to be himself the prophet who was to come, he would be anxious to exclude the belief that that prophet must be of the tribe of Judah. The form Dosthes given by Eulogius for his name is a closer approach than Dositheus to the Hebrew Dosthai, which it probably really represents. Drusius (*de Sectis Hebraeorum*, iii. 4, 6) and Lightfoot (*Disquis. Chorograph. in Johann. iv.*) give proof that this was according to Jewish tradition the name of one of the priests who was sent (2 Kings xvii. 27) to teach the manner of the God of the land, and that the same name was borne by other Samaritans more or less distinguished.

There seems no ground for Reland's conjecture

(*De Samaritanis*, v.) that Dositheus was the author of the Samaritan book of Joshua, since published by Juynboll, Leyden, 1848. Juynboll, p. 113, quotes the testimony of an Arabic writer, Aboulfatah, given more fully (De Sacy, p. 335), shewing that the sect was still in existence in the 14th century. This writer places Dositheus in the time of John Hyrcanus, that is to say, more than a hundred years before Christ. Jost (*Gesch. des Judenthums*, i. 66) refers to Beer (*Buch der Jubilien*) as giving evidence that the sect left traces in Abyssinia.

Several critics who have wished to accept all the statements of the above-mentioned authorities, and who have felt the difficulty of making the founder of the sect of the Sadducees contemporary with John the Baptist, have adopted the solution that there must have been two Dositheis, both founders of Samaritan sects. But we may safely say that there was but one sect of Dositheans, and that there is no evidence that any ancient writer believed that it had at different times two heads bearing the same name. Considering that the sect claimed to have been more than a century old when our earliest informants tried to get information about its founder, we need not be surprised if the stories which they collected contain many things legendary, and which do not harmonise well together. It seems likely that the Dositheans were a Jewish or Samaritan ascetic sect, something akin to the Essenes, existing from before our Lord's time, and that the stories connecting their founder with Simon Magus and with John the Baptist may be dismissed as merely mythical. The fullest and ablest dissertation on the Dositheans is that by Mosheim (*Institutiones Historiae Christianae majores*, 1739, i. 376). [G. S.]

The Samaritans possess two Arabic chronicles, the "Book of Joshua" (12th or 13th c. A.D.), and the Chronicle of Aboulfatah (14th c.). (Cf. Petermann, s. n. *Samaria*, pp. 377, 387 seq. in Herzog, *R. E.*) The latter (*v. S. de Sacy, Chrest. Arab.* i. 344 seq.) speaks of a Samaritan sect—the Dostan or "Friends"—which assumed independence probably about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; but the manner in which Aboulfatah confuses names and periods renders it difficult to state this with certainty. They differed from their fellow-countrymen and co-religionists in rejecting the festivals established by law or tradition. They carried to excess rules restricting the use of certain kinds of food, and adapted to the purification of man, woman, and habitation. They rejected the use of the formula **ברוך אלהינו לעולם** and the Jewish and Samaritan pronunciation of יהוה, adopting in its stead the pronunciation אלהים. They claimed to be the possessors of a book of Moses in which it was written that men used to honour the name of God in the land of Zawila, before the institution of worship on the Mount Gerizim. They put aside the astronomical tables, and counted thirty days to every month; adopting, moreover, the Jewish and not the Samaritan mode of reckoning the Pentecost. They observed the Sabbath with great strictness, preparing the food for their cattle on the Friday, and permitting nothing to

be eaten or drunk on that day out of vessels which would require cleansing, such as vessels of glass or metal. At their head was one Zara, who was expelled from the Jewish synagogue for immorality. He assumed the title of Imam, and composed a work for his followers (cf. Herzfeld, ii. 601-603).

Still later, according to Aboulfatah is to be placed the origin of another sect whose founder is known by the name of Dusis (or Dositheus), and of Arabian descent. Dusis had been convicted of immorality, but was spared from death on his pledging himself to go to Nablous and cause division among the Samaritans by founding a sect. The Chronicle recounts at length how, to produce this result, Dusis ingratiated himself with a devout and learned sheik of the Samaritans. He watched his opportunity, and accused his benefactor of unchastity. Presently he fled for his life, found refuge with the widow Amentu, read and wrote; and then, beaten and foiled, concealed himself in a cave, died of hunger, and was eaten by dogs. Dusis left his writings with the widow, charging her to let no man read them till he had previously undergone the purification of the bath. In course of time a band of seven pursuers, headed by Levi the wise and devout son of the high priest's brother, came to Amentu. The widow shewed the papers and named the conditions. One of the seven plunged into the pool, and as he stepped forth he cried, "I believe in Thee Jehovah and in Dusis Thy servant." Levi's sword cut him down. A second, a third, a seventh followed. The same cry was followed by the same death. Levi stood alone. "I must disprove this," he said, and plunged into the bath. As he rose the same words sprang from his lips: "Woe be to us if we deny Dusis the Prophet of God." The precious writings were examined and found to contain a number of alterations in the Thorah more numerous than those made by Esra. Levi returned to Nablous and explained away the failure of his mission. The day of the Passover came round and the duty of reader fell to Levi. As he read Exod. xii. 21-22 he altered the word *אֲזִכָּר* (E.V. "hysop") into *עֶזְרָה*. He was corrected, but persisted. "The right word," he expostulated, "is 'ז' as God hath spoken by His prophet Dusis. Ye are all guilty of death because ye have altered the festivals, falsified the great name of Jehovah, and persecuted the second prophet of God promised at the Mount of Sinai. Woe to you because ye reject Dusis and follow him not." The speech was listened to with horror. "Kill him," shouted the high priest; and the place where he fell is still called the "Hill of Levi's grave." Levi's adherents dispersed in confusion, but gradually collected again in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. They retained the writings of Dusis, and bade all who would read them prepare for so solemn an act by fasting seven days and seven nights. They kept their festivals on the Sabbaths only, and the Sabbaths themselves in the strictest manner. On the death of one of their members they girded the body with a girdle, placed a staff in his hand, and shoes on his feet; they believed that a man was no sooner laid in the grave than he arose and went to Paradise. A comparison of these accounts will shew that Aboulfatah did not associate the fol-

lowers of Dusis with the Dostan previously described.

The question now arises: is it altogether impossible to extract from these traditions the features they have in common, and shape the historical Dositheus? If the MSS. lying in the St. Petersburg library, not indeed lost to sight but sealed to criticism, were available (cf. *Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch.* xix. 603, xxi. 169) the task would be easier. It is, moreover, hardly advisable to appeal too strongly to the "Book of Jubilees" as a work of the Dosithean sect. (Beer, *Das Buch d. Jubiläen*, p. 58 seq.; cf. agst. Beer, Dillmann, *Zeitschr. d. D. M. G.* xi. 161; Largen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, p. 90, 1866.) Nevertheless certain broad outlines are clear, and may serve as guiding marks to critical deductions. The Dositheans of the fathers and the Dostan of the chronicler are but two forms of the same name, and this tempted Epiphanius to borrow tenets from the latter and ascribe them to the former. His history of Dositheus has so much in common with that given by Aboulfatah of Dusis, that the same facts or the same traditions may be assumed to have served as the common base of their narratives. Dusis may thus be brought down to a later period than that assigned to him by the chronicler, and made to synchronise with the Dositheus of Origen. He lived in the first or at the latest in the second century of the Christian era. The religious schism shadowed forth in the whole history is one natural to a time when men's minds were strongly agitated and divisions frequent: it is distinguished only by what gives to it its own peculiar application to the people amongst whom it worked. Dositheus appears as the Messiah: he rests his claims upon his identification of himself with the prophet foretold by Moses; rejected by the Jews he turns to the Samaritans. He is not the founder of a Christian sect, but simply a Pseudo-Messiah who accepts or rejects whatever in the Jewish or Samaritan systems opposes or suits his scheme. He is followed by thirty men, a number corresponding to the thirty days he has allotted to each month in his calendar. His own title, "Hestōs," is an assertion of the durability of the fixed invariable month; "Helena," the title of the month (Luna) he has intercalated, as it is that of the one female pupil who adheres to him (Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. d. wissenschaftl. Theologie*, xi. 371 seq., 1868). He meets with but little success, and dies the death of a starved recluse.

The fabulous additions of the Arabian writers in later centuries may be set aside (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. seiner Secten*, i. 65), but the sect still existed in the 6th century. The Dositheans and Samaritans were then engaged as of old in disputing over the interpretation of Deut. xviii. In a synod presided over by Eulogius (A.D. 588) the arguments of both sides were listened to with patience: judgment was given, no doubt to the satisfaction of all concerned, in the following form:—not these disputants were in the right, but they only who affirmed Jesus to have been the prophet foretold (Photius, *Bibl.* § 230, vol. ii. 285, ed. Bekker).

In addition to the works mentioned in the preceding paragraphs the following may be found useful:—Juynboll, *Chron. Samar.* 112-114; Grimm (Jos.), *Die Samariter*, 113-125; Noack,

"Simon d. Magier," in *Psyche, Zeitschr. f. d. Kenntniss d. menschl. Seelen- u. Geistesleben*, iii. 257-325, Leipzig, 1860; Beer, *Gesch. Lehr. u. Mein. aller religiösen Secten der Juden*; Möller, art. "Simon Magnus," p. 392, in Herzog's *R. E.*; Lipsius, do., in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*.

[J. M. F.]

DOSITHEUS (2) according to *Praedestinatus* (i. 41), a bishop of Seleucia who confuted Sabellianism. It is possible the subject of the next article is intended, though this notice relates to an earlier period, and *Praedestinatus* is capable of inventing a name quite at random.

[G. S.]

(3) II., elected and consecrated bishop of Seleucia Pieria, who, not proving acceptable to the people of the place, was translated by Alexander, bishop of Antioch, to Tarsus, c. A.D. 415. (*Socr. H. E. lib. vii. c. 36*; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* tom. ii. col. 778.)

[E. V.]

DOTTO, abbat, commemorated April 9. Camerarius is followed by Butler in giving an account of St. Dotto, abbat in the Orkneys, after whom one of the islands is called. Camerarius represents him as living after churches and monasteries in Orkney were dedicated to St. Brendan, and yet as dying in A.D. 502. We cannot be surprised that the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* April, tom. i. p. 810) doubt his existence. (Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 128, April 9; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, iv. 121, April 9; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 326.)

[J. G.]

DOULACH, Irish saint. [DIULECH.]

DOXARIANS, or Aposchists, a sect spoken of by John of Damascus. The majority of them, he says, rejected baptism and communion; others paid no honour to crosses or images, and, considering themselves no less worthy than anybody else, would have neither presbyters nor bishops. It has been supposed that by this sect John meant the Paulicians. (Joh. Damasc. *de Haeres.*; *Patrol. Graec.* xciv.; Ceillier, xii. 70.)

[W. M. S.]

DRACILIANUS, governor of Palestine, ordered by Constantine to build the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem (in place of the temple of Venus that had stood there) under the directions of the patriarch Macarius (Theodoret, *Hist.* i. 16).

[E. B. B.]

DRACONTIUS, BLOSSIUS AEMILIUS, a Latin poet who flourished about 425, in the reign of the younger Theodosius. Early tradition describes him as a Spanish presbyter, the author of a *Hexaëmeron* in heroic verse. This poem was first published in 515 lines, along with the *Genesis* of Claudius Marius Victor at Paris, 8vo, 1560, and was variously edited in this form until 1619. In 1619 an enlarged edition was published by Sirmond, from a MS. in the royal library of Paris, together with the *Opuscula* of Eugenius of Toledo, who flourished two centuries after Dracontius. This prelate, somewhere between the years 642-672, revised the *Hexaëmeron* for Chindasuindus, king of the Spanish Goths. In a letter which is extant (Sirmond's works, Ven. 1728, vol. ii. p. 890), addressed to this prince upon the conclu-

sion of his task, he says that his work had not been confined to revision and supplement, but that, finding certain errors in the poem, he had also removed what he deemed superfluous. Extraneous authority for this story is to be found in Ildefonsus (*Script. Eccles.* ch. xiv.). The *Hexaëmeron* was thus extended to 634 lines, in which shape it was edited by Sirmond. From the same MS. he also published an elegiac fragment, which he describes as an elegy addressed to Theodosius II., in which the author implores forgiveness of God for certain errors in his greater work, and excuses himself to the emperor for having neglected to celebrate his victories. This version of the poems of Dracontius was adhered to until 1791, when Arevali published a new 4to edition at Rome, based upon the discovery of two new MSS. in the library of the Vatican. The first of these was found to contain a poem in three books, entitled '*Aurelii Augustini de Deo*,' the 116th line of which answered to the commencement of the *Hexaëmeron* of Dracontius, which occupied the remainder of the first book. Although the MS. was not of great antiquity, it appeared from the frequent lacunae to have been transcribed from one of much older date, of which several words and letters had perished. It can hardly be doubted that, although this poem is inscribed with another name, it is the original work from which the *Hexaëmeron* was extracted. The latter bears the marks of being a mere fragment, both from its abrupt commencement, without any statement of the argument,

"Prima dies lux est terris, mors una tenebris,"

which in the Vatican MS. reads

"Prima dies nam lucis erat," &c.,

as well as from its closing lines, in which the author, who is manifestly in some distressing situation, prays the Deity for relief:

"Ut valeam memorare tuas hoc carmine laudes
Quas potero"—(i. 747).

But, in fact, the connexion of the several parts of the poem, *De Deo*, and the similarity of sentiment, and phraseology throughout it, furnish incontestable evidence of its being the work of one hand, and it is next to impossible that those writers who speak of the *Hexaëmeron* as being the work of Dracontius, one of whom, St. Isidore, quotes a line of this poem (*Etym.* lib. xii. c. 2), should have been mistaken. St. Augustine, moreover, held the allegorical interpretation of the six days of creation, which view is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the present work.

The other MS. discovered by Arevali was found to contain the elegy of Dracontius in 158 couplets, whereas that published by Sirmond consisted only of 99. It has no title prefixed, but at the end of the poem, in the same hand as the text, are added the words, "Explicit Satisfactio Dracontii ad Guthamndum regem Guandalorum dum esset in vinculis." Sirmond was thus seen to be mistaken in his conjecture, that the elegy was addressed to Theodosius; nor was the newly discovered portion of the poem found to support his idea that it was written as an apology for the longer work. In both poems as now edited, the author describes himself as languishing in prison on account of some grave fault he had committed (*Satisfactio*, 49, 283, 311; *De Deo*, iii. 576, ff. 602, 648), and the language

of the elegy implies that this fault consisted not only in having neglected to celebrate the triumphs of some prince whom he calls "dominus," but in having also bestowed praise upon some enemy of his master (*Satisf.* 19, 93, 105). The poet's object seems to be to appease the anger of this prince, and to obtain his release from prison. Apart from the note above quoted, it is evident from (*Satisf.* l. 30)

"Ut qui facta ducum possem narrare meorum
Nominis *Asdingui* bella triumphigera,"

compared with Dio Cass. lxxi. and Jornand. *de Reb. Get.* c. 22, that some Vandal prince is alluded to. There remains the question of identification. The Vatican MS. gives "Guth-amundum," which is corrupt. We know, however, from history that about the year 425 Guntharic, the brother of Genserich, and his Vandals crossed from Gallicia into Baetica, the supposed home of Dracontius (*Idacius, Olymp.* 299). This prince's name is variously written Guntharic, Guntharic, Guntharius, Gunthericus; and Arevali conjectures with much plausibility that in using the plural 'duces' Dracontius refers to Guntharic and his brother, Genserich, who together succeeded their father Godigisidus; and that by 'dominus' he intends the former of the two. This view is supported by comparing certain lines of the elegy (211-214), which imply that, whoever was the prince addressed, his arms had been crowned with success in Africa through the instrumentality of others, and that he himself was not a warlike character, with Procopius's description of Guntharic (*Hist. Vand.* lib. i.) as being of inactive habits, while Genserich, on the other hand, is represented as versed in the arts of war. Whether or no, at the time the poet wrote, Guntharic was as unworthy of his panegyric as he afterwards became (*Idac.* ad ann. 428; *Isidor. Reg. Goth. et Vand.* 131); it is certain that the names of both Genserich and Guntharic were subsequently held in abomination by the Goths, and it is not improbable that the respectful sentiments of Dracontius towards a Vandal prince may have led to the mutilation of his poems even before Eugenius laid his hand upon them. The only other Vandal prince to whom the note appended to the Vatican MS. can refer is Guntamund, the great-grandson of Genserich, who reigned at Carthage 484-496; but the warlike character of this prince, as depicted by Procopius (*Hist. Vand.* lib. i.), is hardly in keeping with the allusions of the elegy (*Satisf.* 211, ff.). Moreover, St. Columban, at the beginning of the 6th century, mentions Dracontius's poems "inter vetera," which would scarcely have been the case had he flourished as late as 484.

A fresh contribution has recently (1873) been made to the recovery of the works of Dracontius by the publication of a MS. long since (1827) described in a catalogue of Cataldus Jannellius as existing in the Museo Borbonico, at Naples. (*Dracontii Carmina Minora plurima inedita ex codice Neapolitano*, edidit Fridericus de Duhn, Lipsiae, Teubner: 1873, 16mo.) From this MS. we derive for the first time the full name of the author; in it are contained the following poems in heroic verse:—(1) *Hylas*, with a trochaic preface addressed to one Felicianus, styled 'Grammaticus.' (2) *Heroulis verba cum videret Hydrae serpentis capita pululare post caedes*. (3) *Controversia de statua viri fortis, quam dixit in Gargilianis*

Thermis Blossius Aemilius Dracontius vir clarissimus, et togatus fori proconsulis almae Karthaginis apud proconsulem Pacidegium, the subject of which is a curious case of conscience. (4) *Epithalamium in fratribus dictum*. (5) *Epithalamium Joannis et Vitulae*. (6) *Raptus Helenae*, previously edited by Cardinal Mai at Rome. (7) *Deliberatio Achillis an corpus Hectoris vendat*. (8) *Medea*. The similarity of style between these poems and the two which have been already discussed is sufficient in itself to prove the identity of authorship; but confirmatory evidence is furnished by the second *Epithalamium* (118-136), in which the writer describes his captive condition in similar terms to those employed in the *De Deo* and the *Satisfactio*. Although there is nothing in the newly discovered poems of Dracontius which directly contradicts the tradition of his Spanish origin, it will be seen that the title of (3) connects him immediately with Carthage. It is hardly likely that he should have returned to mythological subjects after writing the *De Deo*; hence it is probable that we have in these effusions the essays of his youth.

One other question remains. On the supposition that Dracontius was a Spaniard carried prisoner into Africa by some Vandal prince, how are we to account for the discovery in Italy of the original MSS. of his poems? To this question no certain answer can be given, but the ingenious conjecture of Arevali is worth mention. Sidonius, in his *Excusatorium ad Felicem* (l. 9), commends three poets who had been companions of his own and of his friend's father in their youth. The name of the third poet is not mentioned, but he is thus alluded to:

"Baetim qui patrium semel relinquens
Undosae petiit sitim Ravennae,"

and a statue is said to have been erected to him in the Forum of Trajan. Sirmond, without much reason, supposes this poet to have been Merobaudes: Arevali suggests that it was Dracontius, who, if he regained the freedom for which he pleads in his elegy, may not improbably have migrated to the north of Italy to seek the "secura quies" for which he prays (*De Deo*, iii. 64). This idea derives some confirmation from the fact that St. Columban, the founder of the monastery of Bobbio, had read the poem of Dracontius in its entirety, for in his own poem addressed to Hunaldus (255, ff.) he borrows certain lines from it. Moreover, Raphael of Volaterra speaking of the same monastery (*Comment.* lib. iv. p. 140), says that in the year 1491, among other works was discovered *Dracontii varium opus*, and that this MS. was carried to Rome by his "municeps," Thomas Phaëdrus. Whether the *varium opus* was the MS. now in the library at Naples, or whether it still lies hid in some corner of the Vatican, must be left for the determination of future investigators.

With regard to the merits of Dracontius as a poet, critics, as usual, differ. Isidore praises the style of that portion of the *De Deo* with which he was acquainted for its lucidity (*Script. Eccles.* c. 24), a merit which is conspicuously absent from this poem, and from all the works of Dracontius. There is, however, considerable vigour in his expression, and traces of his classical erudition are by no means wanting even in his sacred poem.

The full text of the *De Deo* and the *Satisfactio* was first published by Cardinal Arevali, Rom. 4to. 1791, whose edition is reproduced in vol. ix. of Migne's *Patrologia*. The earlier version of the *Hexaëmeron* first appeared in Paris, 8vo, 1560. The most important edition is that of Weitzius, Franc. 8vo, 1610. The Eugénian version was first published by J. Sirmond, Paris, 8vo, 1619. The *Carmina Minora* are edited in the Teubner series, Lipsiæ, 16mo, 1873.

[E. M. Y.]

DRACONTIUS (2) A bishop to whom Athanasius addresses a letter (vol. i. p. 63; edit. Montfaucon).

[E. M. Y.]

(3) A bishop deposed at the council of Constantinople (Socrat. ii. 42; Sozom. iv. 24).

[E. M. Y.]

DRAUCIUS, fourth bishop of Therouanne, succeeded St. Audomar, who died probably, about A.D. 667. (*Gall. Christ.* x. 1530; Gams, *Series Episc.*)

[D. R. J.]

DRAUSIUS, ST. (DRAUTIUS or DRAUSCIO), 22nd bishop of Soissons, and confessor, was born in the reign of Clotharius or of Dagobert, and is commemorated on the 5th of March. His parents were of noble rank, his father's name being Lendomar, his mother's Rachildis. She is said to have been a very holy woman, and to have abstained from wine from the time of the conception of her son. Drausius was much beloved as a boy by the bishop St. Ansarius, whose pupil he was, and he served under his successor Battolenus or Bettolenus, as archdeacon. The Sammarthani say that he was made bishop in 654 at the age of thirty. He founded two monasteries, one for monks, the other for nuns, the latter at the instigation and with the help of Ebroinus, mayor of the palace to the king of the Franks and his wife Leutrudis, Aetheria being appointed abbess. The dates of his various subscriptions are 658, 660, 663 and 666; he died in 667. He was buried in the church of the nunnery. (*AA. SS. Boll. March*, i. p. 404; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 338; Drausii Suession. *Charta, Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1183.)

[D. R. J.]

DREGMO, a pious man near Hagulstad (Hexham), who, according to a legendary account in Simeon of Durham (*Gest. Reg. Ang.* in M. H. B. 665), had a vision of bishop Alchmund directing his bones to be removed to within the church.

[C. H.]

DRITHELM (Gaimar, *Estonie*, v. 1554, in M. H. B. 783), visionary. [**DRYTHELM.**]

[C. H.]

DROCTIGISILUS, fifteenth bishop of Soissons, towards the end of the 6th century. He is thus referred to by Gregory of Tours, lib. ix. cap. 37: "In the 14th year of king Chilbert, A.D. 589, there was at Soissons Droctigisilus, who four years later lost his senses through too much drinking. So they say. Many of the citizens, however, asserted that this calamity befell him by the bad practices of his archdeacon, whom he had degraded: and that this madness afflicted him most within the walls of the city; when he was abroad he was better. When king Chilbert came to Soissons, and Droctigisilus was more sane, he was not allowed to enter the city on account of the presence of the king. Now although he was voracious of food, and an immoderate wine-bibber, nobody ever accused

him of adultery. Next year a council of bishops was held at Sourci, and he was allowed to enter his see." (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 336.)

[D. R. J.]

DROCTOALDUS, ST., fourteenth bishop of Auxerre, succeeded St. Optatus, and died in the month of November about A.D. 532. (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 66.)

[D. R. J.]

DROSERIUS, the Valentinian interlocutor in the dialogue against the Marcionites (Sect. iv.).

[ADAMANTIUS (2).]

[G. S.]

DROSIS, a young virgin burnt for the faith, probably at Antioch. There is a homily on her festival, by Chrysostom (ii. 688), who descants on the miracles performed by her relics.

[E. B. B.]

DROSTAN, Dec. 14. According to the Scotch legend given by Fordun (*Scotichron.* iii. c. 38), and *Brev. of Aberd.* (pars hyem. fol. xix.) St. Drostan belonged to the blood royal of Scotia (Ireland), being son of Fyn Wennem, daughter or grand-daughter of Aedan, king of Scotia (Ireland) by Conanrodus, the king of Demetrius's son. According to the legend in the *Brev. of Aberdeen*, he was son of Cosgrach, of the royal family of the Scoti, and having shewn an early disposition towards learning and piety, was given in charge to his uncle St. Columba (June 9) by whom he was instructed till he received the monastic habit at Dalquhongale (Holywood). He became abbat there, and afterwards went north to Glenesk, Forfarshire, where he built a church, led an eremitic life, wrought some miracles, and died. His greatest foundation was that at Deer, Aberdeenshire, as we read in the first memorandum in the *Book of Deer*, the most ancient document of Scotland extant. (This MS. dating, it is supposed, from the close of the 9th century, belongs to the Univ. Library, Cambridge, and has been published by the Spalding Club, Scotland, 1869, with a learned preface by John Stuart, LL.D.) According to it, St. Columba and St. Drostan came first to Aberdeen on the coast, and then to Deer in the interior, and having received lands from the Mormaer of the country, founded at the latter a famous monastery, which received the name of Deer or Deer from the tears shed by St. Drostan at the departure of St. Columba. He has many dedications, for the most part in the north and north-east of Scotland. To be a contemporary of St. Columba he must have flourished at the end of the 6th century. His feast is Dec. 14, though not uniformly, and his name assumes the forms of Drustan, Dunstan, Dustan, Throstan, and the honorific form of Modrustus. The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* July 11, tom. iii. 190-91) give a memoir culled from Camerarius and other Scotch authorities, and say he flourished about A.D. 600. (*Book of Deer*, passim; Joan. Major, *de Gest. Scot.* lib. ii. c. 7, p. 68; Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 146, 163; Boethius, *Hist. Scot.* lib. ix. 171; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 206; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 163, July 11, forming the Bollandists' authority for placing St. Drostan on that day; Innes, *Scotland in the Middle Ages*, 321-25; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 80-1, Edinb. 1861; *Ant. Sh. Aberd. and B. ii.* 409-12; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 35 n. b; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 326-27; *Scot. Mag.* new ser. ii. 579-81.)

[J. G.]

DRUCTEGANGUS (1), third abbat of Gorzia, a monastery founded A.D. 749 by Chrodegangus bishop of Metz within his diocese. He succeeded Gundelardus and was followed by Theutmarus, dying A.D. 769 (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 875). The name Druetegangus occurs among the numerous variations of that of Chrodegangus (*ibid.* 705). [C. H.]

(2) Eighth abbat of Jumièges in Normandy. He is occasionally confounded with the abbat of Gorzia and also with Chrodegangus, bishop of Metz. When pope Stephen III. (A.D. 753) first applied to Pippin, the latter sent an abbat Rodigandus to assure him of his good will, and subsequently two other envoys, bishop Rodigangus and duke Autcharius, to conduct the pope into France. This is the statement of Mabillon, who identifies bishop Rodigangus with Chrodegangus bishop of Metz, and the abbat Rodigandus with Druetegangus abbat of Jumièges, thus in part differing from Le Cointe, who considered the abbat to have been Druetegangus abbat of Gorzia. Le Cointe also notices that some have confounded Druetegangus the abbat with Chrodegangus the bishop. That there should have been two abbats Druetegangus contemporary in Gaul, and contemporary with bishop Chrodegangus, to say nothing of the variations in all their names, has made great confusion. Mabillon's reason for preferring the abbat of Jumièges to the abbat of Gorzia for Pippin's first envoy rests on a point of chronology. The monastery of Gorzia, founded by bishop Chrodegangus A.D. 749, was, he considers, scarcely finished in 753, and if not finished, then without an abbat. But there are certainly examples of abbats being appointed to a fraternity, Ceolfrid for instance, at the time of the founding of their monasteries. (Le Cointe, *Ann. Eccl. Franc.* t. v. pp. 415, 416; Mabill. *Ann. Ord. Bened.* ii. 145, 146, 162.) [C. H.]

DRUIGEN—March 6. She was one of the daughters of Leinin, son of Gannchu, of the race of Aengus, son of Mogh Nuadhat: she thus was sister of SS. Brigida, Luigen, Luicell, Macha, and Riomhtach, the daughters of Leinin, and with them was at the church of Cill-Inghen-Leinin (now Killiney), in Ui-Briuin-Cualann, "a territory," as is said by O'Donovan (*Four Mast.* 340 n. 2), "comprising the greater part of the barony of Rathdown, in the present county of Dublin, and some of the north of the county of Wicklow." (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 69; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 104, c. 2, and *Tr. Thaum.* 612, col. 2; Joyce, *Irish Names of Places*, 303, 545, 3rd ed.) [J. G.]

DRYOTHELM, DRYTHELM (DRITHELM), a paterfamilias dwelling at Incuneningum (supposed to be Cuningham, *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 260, and Stevenson, note on Bed. *H. E.* v. 12), who is related by Bede to have died in the beginning of the night, and to have revived at dawn. While separate from the body he had visions of purgatory, gehenna, the place of imperfect happiness, and the vicinity of the celestial kingdom. He afterwards took up his abode in a cell by the monastery of Mailros, where he lived in great austerity, and where he related his visions to the monk and priest Haemgils, and to king Aldfrid. The story, to which Bede devotes a whole chapter (*H. E.* v. 12) has an

interest, as illustrating the popular belief of the period on those subjects, as well as exemplifying the homiletic side of Bede's History. There immediately follows it, by way of contrast, the case of king Coenred and the impenitent officer. [COENRED.] His death is recorded in the *Saxon Chronicle* (A.D. 693). He is also mentioned in Gaimar (*Estorie*, v. 1554, M. H. B. 783). [C. H.]

DUACH. [DUBHTHACH.]

DUALISM. [MANICHAISM; GNOSTICISM.]

DUBHAN (1), Priest, Nov. 11. O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 305) says he was of the Lagenians, and brother of Daman (Feb. 12), of Cluain-foda [DAMAN], and is further of opinion that this is the same Dubhán who went alone with Moling (June 17) to ask for the remission of the Borumha. By Colgan (*Acta SS.* 626, col. 1), he is given among the sons of Mella, brothers of St. Daman, and nephews of St. Coemgen (June 3), but as St. Coemgen died A.D. 617 (618), and St. Moling, A.D. 696 (697), there is some difficulty in supposing the contemporary of the latter to have been sister's son of the former, who died in extreme old age (*Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. ii. 558-59).

(2), the Pilgrim, at Rinn Dubhain, Feb. 11. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 314) has a short memoir of St. Duban, confessor, at Feb. 11: his father was Bracan or Brychan of Brycheiniog, the Welsh chief, and his mother Din or Digna, daughter of the Anglo-Saxon king. He was born in Britain, but after arriving at manhood, he accompanied his brothers, SS. Canoc, Mogoroc, Caeman, Dabheog or Mobeog, &c., to Ireland, where following the teaching and example of St. Patrick and his disciples, they became perfect in virtue, and were put each over a monastery. St. Dubhan's monastery was called Rinn-Dubhain-aillithir (the promontory of Dubhan, the pilgrim), now identified with Hook Point, co. Wexford: he is said to have been brother of Gladusa, the mother of St. Cadoc (Jan. 24). But Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 8, n. 197) throws a doubt on the whole story, or at least on so much of it as makes Duban one of the sons of Bracan, and brother of Canoc, and he is not mentioned in Rees's *Account of Brychan of Brecknock*. But scarcely two of the lists extant of Brychan's family agree in the names and number. [CANOC, and DABHEOG.] Colgan says he flourished about A.D. 492, but his date is uncertain. (*Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. ii. 559 n.; *Journ. Kilk. Arch. Soc.* 1 ser. iii. 194-99; Rees, *Cambro-Brit. SS.* 602 sq. 605 n.) [J. G.]

DUBHDA. Irish saint. [DOBDA.]

DUBHDALETHE (1), of Armagh. There were three of this name abbats or archbishops of Armagh, two in the 10th and 11th centuries, and one in the 8th. This last was Dubhdalethe, son of Sinach, who succeeded, apparently with difficulty, on the deposition or resignation of Foendelach, A.D. 771, and is said by the *Four Masters*, A.D. 778 (recte 783) to have taken part in the promulgation of St. Patrick's law at Cruachain, now Rathcroghan, near Belagunagare, co. Roscommon. The *Four Masters* and *Ann. Ult.* give his death in A.D. 792, which Ware

corrects into 793, but Lanigan gives him a rule of fifteen years, and says he died in 786 (Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 20, § 6; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 385, 399, 403; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 116; Stuart, *Armagh*, 95. [J. G.]

DUBHDALETHE (2), Dubhdalethe na Graifne (of the Writing), was abbat of Cill-scire, now Kilskeery, co. Meath, and died in the year 750 (*Ann. Tigh.*). O'Donovan is of opinion that this is the Dubhdalethe whose writings are referred to in the *Annals of Ulster* at A.D. 962 and 1021, but the opinion of O'Connor and Ware seems preferable in regarding the writer as Dubhdalethe, son of Maelmuire, bishop of Armagh, who died A.D. 1065. (*Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 348 n. 3, 349; O'Connor, *Epist. Nuncupat.* 16, 103, *Prolegomena*, ii. 133, and *Ann. Ulst.* 290, 313; Ware, *Bps.* 49, 50; Stuart, *Armagh*, 124; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 784 n. 6.) [J. G.]

DUBHLITIR, abbat of Finghlaisi-Cainnigh, near Ath-Clath (now Finglass, in the barony of Castleknock, near Dublin), May 15. *Mart. Doneg.* and *Four Mast.* give his obit in A.D. 791, but O'Donovan says it is really A.D. 796: Finglass has Cainnigh attached to it, as it was first the monastery of St. Cainneoc or Cainnech (May 15). [J. G.]

DUBHTHACH [DUACH] (1) Son of Dubhan, son of Maeluidhir, Feb. 5. He was of the race of Conall Gulban. When Cormac, bishop of Armagh, died A.D. 497, he was succeeded by Dubhthach or Duach, who is also called "of Druim-dhearbh," which Lanigan suggests and O'Donovan accepts as probably Derver, in the county of Louth. He is honoured as "the venerable Duach, the famous archbishop of St. Patrick's see," and his death took place in the year 513. After two of the name of Alidus had ruled, another Dubhthach or Duach, of the family of Colla-Uais, was bishop from A.D. 536 to A.D. 548. Little however is known of the history of either of them. (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 293, col. 2, 480, n. 10, and *Acta SS.* 62, c. 7, n. 10, 190-1; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 437 and Ind. Chron. A.D. 497, 513; Stuart, *Armagh*, 91-2; Ware, *Bps.* 37-8; *Four Mast.* by O'Donovan, i. 168, n. m, 169; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 8, § 14, ii. c. 10, §§ 1, 13.)

(2) Oct. 7. O'Clery (in *Mart. Doneg.* 269) thinks that "this is he whom Moling mentions as having gone with himself to seek a remission of the Borumha from Finnachta, king of Erin" [MOLING].

(3) Mac Ui Lugair. When St. Patrick had come to Tara and was preaching before king Leogaire, we are told that the only one who rose on the saint's approach and respectfully saluted him was Dubhthach, the king's poet, who was the first to embrace the Christian faith in that place; and as Joceline says, "being baptized and confirmed in the faith, he turned his poetry, which in the flower and prime of his studies he employed in praise of false gods, to a much better use; changing his mind and style, he composed more elegant poems in praise of the Almighty Creator and His holy preachers." This was Dubhthach Mac Ui Lugair, descended from Cormac Caech, son of Cucorb, in Leinster. His name occupies a large space in ancient Irish hagiology as being himself a famous poet, and also the ancestor of

many well-known saints. He was the teacher of St. Fiacc (Oct. 12) of Sletty, and recommended him to St. Patrick for the episcopate [FIACC]. In the compilation of the Seanchus Mor, which is said to have been carried on under the auspices of St. Patrick, St. Dubhthach was one of the nine appointed to revise the ancient laws, and we have no good reason to question the probability of his being engaged in a work of this character. Colgan says he had in his possession some of the poems of St. Dubhthach (*Tr. Thaum.* 8 n. 5): the *Poems of St. Dubhthach* are given, with translations and notes, in Shearman's *Loca Patriciana*, and they are also in O'Donovan's *Book of Rights*. His dates are uncertain, but his birth is placed after the year 370, his conversion in 433, and his death perhaps after 479. (See *Loca Patriciana*, by the Rev. J. F. Shearman, in *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Assoc. Ir.* 4 ser. vols. ii., iii., with Mr. R. R. Brash's papers in the same Journal, traversing several of Shearman's assertions; Ware, *Irish Writers*, 1; Ussher, *Ecol. Ant.* c. 17, wks. vi. 409-12, and Ind. Chron. A.D. 433; *Book of Rights*, by O'Donovan, pp. xxxv. 234 sq.; Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 7 n. 2, 8 n. 5, 44-5, c. 44, 126, c. 61; O'Reilly, *Irish Writers*, 26-8; O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. p. vii.; Lanigan, *Ecol. Hist. Ir.* i. c. 5, § 5, c. 6, § 5; Todd, *St. Patrick*, 130, 424, 446; O'Connor, *Epist. Nuncup.* 59, 101, 106, and *Prolegomena*, i. 89 sq. ii. 68.) [J. G.]

DUBRICIUS, DUBRIC (DIBRIC, DYFRIG), archbishop of Caerleon. This is one of the most distinguished names in the story of king Arthur as related by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Arthur makes him archbishop of the city of Legions (*Galf. Mon. Hist.* viii. 12); he crowns king Arthur (ix. 1); makes an oration to the British army prior to the battle of Badon (ix. 4); and is the director of all the ecclesiastical pomp of the court. He was the grandson of Brychan king of Brecknockshire, and two localities, rather vaguely described as the banks of the Gwain near Fishguard and the banks of the Wye in Herefordshire, are claimed for his birthplace. Rees considers the weight of evidence in favour of the latter for the following reasons. In the district of Erchenfield, in the county of Hereford, are a church (Whitchurch) and two chapels (Ballingham and Hentland, subject to Lugwardine) dedicated to Dubricius, and all of them near the Wye. At Henllan (*i.e.* Old-church, now Hentland) he is said to have founded a college, and to have remained seven years before removing to Mochros much further up the Wye, supposed to be the present Moccas. In corroboration of this tradition there were lately remaining, says Rees, on a farm called Lanfrother in Hentland traces of former importance. This author further suggests whether St. Devereux, seven miles to the west of Hereford, might not be a Norman rendering of Dubricius. Rees grants, in support of Ussher, that he may have been appointed bishop of Llandaff about A.D. 470, and that he was raised by Ambrosius Aurelius, the brother of Uther and uncle of Arthur, to the archbishopric of Caerleon on the death of Tremounos or Tremorius, A.D. 490. It does not appear that Wales was in this age divided into dioceses, or that there were any established bishops' sees. The only exception was Caerleon, from the importance which the Roman occupation had given to

that town. The jurisdiction of its archbishop, according to the rule observable in other parts of the empire, would be co-extensive with the Roman province of Britannia Secunda, and his suffragans were so many chorepiscopi, without any settled places of residence. The influence of Dubricius and the liberality of Meurig ab Tewdrig king of Glamorgan, were the means of making the see of Llandaff permanent; whence Dubricius is said to have been its first bishop. It appears, however, that after his promotion to the archbishopric of Caerleon he still retained the bishopric of Llandaff, where he mostly resided, and from which he is called archbishop of Llandaff; but that the title belonged rather to Caerleon is clear from the circumstance that upon his resignation David became archbishop of Caerleon and Teilo bishop of Llandaff. Dubricius is distinguished as the founder of colleges; and besides those on the banks of the Wye already mentioned he founded, or concurred in founding, the collegiate monasteries of Llancaivan, Caergorworn, and Caerleon. In his time the Pelagian heresy, which had been once suppressed by St. Germanus, had increased again to such a degree as to require extraordinary efforts for its eradication, and a synod of the whole clergy of Wales was convened at Brei in Cardiganshire. The distinction earned by David on that occasion gave Dubricius an excuse for laying down his office, and being worn with years and longing for retirement he withdrew to a monastery in the island of Enlli or Bardsey, where he died. Rees, who puts the chronology of Dubricius and David early, gives A.D. 522 for the date. He was buried in the island, where his remains lay undisturbed till A.D. 1120, when they were removed by Urban bishop of Llandaff and interred with great pomp in the new cathedral which had been rebuilt a short time before from the foundations. His death was commemorated on Nov. 4, and his translation on May 29. The bones of the saint were with great difficulty discovered at Bardsey, and the oldest writings had to be searched in order to help out the inquiry, as recorded in the *Liber Landavensis* (ed. Rees, 1840, p. 329). From this circumstance Rees argues that for six centuries the body of the great archbishop Caerleon, whose reputation for sanctity was almost equal to that of St. David, lay unenshrined, and that therefore the Britons of the primitive church, in whatever esteem they may have held the memory of their holy men, could not have worshipped their relics. Such in the main is Rees's account of Dubricius (*Essay on the Welsh Saints*, 171-193). Of ancient materials an anonymous *Vita* in Wharton (*Angl. Sac.* ii. 667) is important as having been evidently compiled from earlier sources before the fables of Geoffrey of Monmouth appeared. Benedict of Gloucester wrote his *Vita* (*Angl. Sac.* ii. 656) after Geoffrey. Capgrave has also a *Life* (*N. L. A. f. 87*). For others see Hardy, *Des. Cat.* i. 40-44. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 146, 147, should be consulted on Dubricius's Llandaff bishopric, and on his connexion with Archenfield or Erchenfield; likewise Stubbs (*Registrum*, 154, 155) for the early and legendary successions to Llandaff and Caerleon. See also Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* Works, t. v. 510; Chron. Index, sub ann. 490, 512, 520-522.

In regard to the period of Dubricius, authori-

ties differ within limits similar to those assigned to St. David. The *Annales Cambriae* under A.D. 612 give the obit of Conthigirnus and bishop Dibric, whom the editors of the *Monumenta*, with an "ut videtur," name bishops Kentigern and Dubricius (M. H. B. 831). The *Liber Landavensis* also (80) gives this date, and it is adopted in Haddan and Stubbs (i. 146). Hardy (*Des. Cat.* i. 41) refers to Alford's *Annales*, A.D. 436, ss. 2, 3, 4, for some critical remarks on the probable chronology of the life of Dubricius.

[C. H.]

DUD, abbat, attesting a grant of land to Glastonbury Abbey, A.D. 744, marked spurious or doubtful (Kemble, *C. D. No.* 92; Birch, *Fasti Monast.* 63). An epistle of Boniface (editorial date A.D. 736) is addressed dilecto filio Dudde, begging him to send some treatises on St. Paul's epistles, using the language of a father and an old friend. (*Ep. No.* 41, ed. Würdtwein, also No. 41 in Migne, *Patrol.* vol. 89, p. 740.) [C. H.]

DUDD, the eleventh bishop of Winchester. If he is rightly placed in the lists his date falls between 781 and 785, but nothing else is known of him. (Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Angl.* p. 8; Wharton, *Ang. Sac.* i. 195.) [S.]

DUILECH (DOULACH), of Clochar, commemorated Nov. 17. He was son of Amalgadh, son of Sinell, of the race of Conmac, son of Fergus, son of Ross, son of Rudhraighe, &c. He lived at a place called Clochar-Duiligh, near Swords, in the barony of Coolock and district of Fingall, near Dublin. In the martyrologies he is called bishop and confessor, but beyond his connexion with Clochar beside Dublin, and his leaving his name at the ancient church of St. Doolagh in Dublin, and perhaps at St. Tullan's chapel, in the parish of Kilrane, and barony of Forth, county Wexford, nothing is known of him. (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 129; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 598, c. 3, col. 2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 22 n. 62; Reeves, *Church of St. Duilech*, pass.; *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, pp. xlii. lxxx. 71, sq. 179.) [J. G.]

DUINSECH, virgin, on Loch Cuan, in Uladh (Ulster), Aug. 5. This saint has given its name to Dunsy Island, in Loch Cuan, now Strangford Lough; there is also Dunsy Rock near it. On Dunsy Island there are no ecclesiastical ruins, but the human bones indicate that on it had been a cemetery, and that the place was sacred, probably in honour of St. Duinsech, whose history however is unknown. (Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 186, 379.) [J. G.]

DULAS, said to be a prefect of Cilicia, deposed from office for his Christianity and most horribly tortured to death under the procurator Maximus, June 15. (*Men. Basil.*) [E. B. B.]

DULCIDIUS, ST., 3rd bishop of Agen, in the province of Bordeaux, and confessor, successor to St. Phoebadus, called also DULGITIUS, DULCIUS, DULCISSIMUS, DULCEDIUS, ST. DOUX, ST. DOULCET or DOUGIS. The reader is cautioned by the Bollandists that he is to be distinguished from Dulcidius of Tolosa. He was probably bishop in the beginning of the 5th century, and is commemorated on the 17th of October. Though said to be of royal blood (of the Franks), he was so attracted by the fame of Phoebadus, bishop

of Agen, that he gave up all his worldly prospects and went there in order to become his disciple. The bishop taught him theology, and ordained him deacon.

He was very zealous in defence of the Catholic faith and in opposing all kinds of heresy, especially Arianism; and he was so good to the poor that he kept nothing for himself. He died at a good old age, and his relics were afterwards translated to Chamberet, in the diocese of Limosin. (*AA. SS. Boll.* Oct. viii. pp. 50-53; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 897.) [D. R. J.]

DULCIDIUS (2) I., 18th bishop of le Puy en Velay (Anicium, afterwards Podium Vellavorum). Dulcidius is scarcely known except from the acts of St. Agripanus, whose relics he translated from Viviers to le Puy, where they were placed in the subterranean oratory of St. Stephen whence they were afterwards translated to the church which Dulcidius had built at the foot of Rupes-Cornelia, called after the martyr in question. He succeeded St. Agripanus in the bishopric, and was succeeded by Higericus, according to Le Cointe, in the year 705. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 691; Deschamps, *Dictionnaire de Géographie*, p. 1363.) [D. R. J.]

DULCITIUS (1). [IRENE.]

(2) Tribune and notary, charged with executing the imperial decrees against the Donatists, c. A.D. 420, to whom Augustine writes (*Ep.* 204 (61)), blaming him for proclaiming that "they were to be given up to the death they deserved," as the punishment of death was not decreed against them, and for being slightly too courteous to a Donatist bishop, but generally praising him, summing up very briefly his own former arguments against the Donatists on the nature of martyrdom, of liberty of conscience, &c.; claiming to mourn over their suicides as David over Absalom, and trying to refute the justification of suicide, which they attempted to find in the example of Razius, in the book of Maccabees (cf. *Aug. Retract.* ii. 59). [DONATISTS; GAUDENTIUS.] [E. B. B.]

(3) The notary, among the legates of pope Leo at the synod of Ephesus in 449 (Ceillier, x. 174). [E. B. B.]

(4) 10th bishop of Toul. Nothing is known of Dulcitus except his name, and the order in which he stands amongst the other bishops of that diocese, which he ruled between the years 532 and 549, though not during the whole of that time. (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 962.) [D. R. J.]

DULIANI, a sect of Arians, so called from their using the word *δουλος* to describe the relation of the Son to the Father (Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* iv. 4). [G. S.]

DULICHIANUS. [DOLICHIANUS.]

DUN, DUNNUS, the eleventh bishop of Rochester; consecrated, according to the A. S. Chronicle, in 741 (*M. H. B.* p. 329). He took part in the council of Clovesho in 747 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 362). If the charter mentioning his successor Eardulf, under the date 747 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 96) be genuine, he must have died the same year. A charter of Ethelbert of Kent in 732, granting land at Liminae to

"abba presbyter Dun," may belong to the same person (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 77). [S.]

DUNAAS = DSU NOVAS. [See under CHOSROES NUSHIRVAN.]

DUNANUS, DUNIANUS, DUMANUS, DUMIANUS, missionary to Britain. [DUNIANUS.]

DUNCHADH, son of Cennfaeladh, abbat of Hy, May 25. He was grandson of Maelcobha, of the race of Conall Gulban, and closely related to the preceding and contemporaneous kings of Ireland. His name was latinised as Donatus, and he is first known as abbat of Kill-lochuir, or Kill-clochuir, on the east coast of South Ulster, where in Colgan's time he was annually honoured as the patron of the place and of sailors; Lanigan (*Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 19, n. 48) thinks the place must be what is now called Killough in the county of Down. He then became abbat of Hy, first, according to the *Annals of Ulster*, in A.D. 706 (707), probably as coadjutor to Conamhail, and then as his successor, when he is said to have ruled for seven years, A.D. 710-717; but this can only be by supposing either that a schism had occurred in the brotherhood, as Dorbene is said to have been elected to the chair in A.D. 713, dying the same year, and Faelcu in A.D. 716, who survived and succeeded Dunchadh; or, as is much more probable, that these were elected as Tanist abbats or coadjutors on account of Dunchadh's age or infirmity (see O'Connor's important notes, in his *Rer. Hib. Script.* iv. 72, n. 1, 78 n. 3, and DORBENE FODA). *Mart. Doneg.* (by Todd and Reeves, 139) says he was ten years in the abbacy, a statement which is true, if we include the time between his election and his entrance upon the full discharge of his abbatial duties at Conamhail's death. Camerarius may have felt the difficulty, and says that Duumchadus or Dunichadus (Mar. 24), abbat of Hoy, the most fertile island of saints, was over the monastery of Hoy for many years, not without the fame of sanctity and miracles. That for which his abbacy is most notable is the adoption, by the Columban monastery, of the Roman Easter and tonsure, under the influence of a Northumbrian priest named Egbert or Ecgerbert, according to Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* iii. c. 4). This was after they had clung to their own calculation for a hundred and fifty years, appealing to the authority of their founder, and had refused compliance even to St. Adamnan. Their last celebration according to the Scotie usage was at Easter, A.D. 715 [EGBERT]. The *Felire of Aengus* calls him "Duncad of cold lae," and in the *Litany of Dunkeld* he stands among the abbats as Dunichad. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 744-6, at March 24, which is sometimes marked as his festival, and *Tr. Thaum.* 480 n. 18, 499; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 379-80; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 19, § 4; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 15, wks. vi. 244-5, and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 717; Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. cc. 4, 27, v. c. 22; Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scott.* i. 113-14, 118; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 328; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, v. 378, May 25.) [J. G.]

DUNGAL was a not uncommon name among the Irish saints (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 257 n. 18), but the most famous person bearing this name was one in the beginning of the 9th century, who

called himself an exile from Ireland, "and was one of the most learned men of his time, an excellent theologian, poet, and scholar." We first find him living as a recluse in the monastery of St. Denis, A.D. 811, but soon after, he became a public teacher in France, and then in Italy. When the double eclipse of the sun happened, in the year 810, Charlemagne the emperor made special application to the Irish learned men in his kingdom for an explanation of the unusual occurrence, and in the following year Dungal provided a deeply learned treatise in reply. (O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scriptor.* iv. 140, 175, and *Prolegomena*, ii. 136.) We do not know the exact date of his going into Italy, or the occasion of his journey, but he was chief teacher in the school at Pavia, when Lothaire II., in his endeavour to revive learning in Italy, selected him to superintend the whole system of the universities in the eight principal cities of Italy, in A.D. 823; and when Claudius had been made bishop of Turin by Louis I. of France, in A.D. 821, and had declared open war with the use of crosses, images, and invocation to saints, Dungal came forward as one of the most learned apologists on their behalf, in a work entitled, *Responsa contra perversas Claudii Turonensis episcopi sententias*, in A.D. 827. All his works bear the marks of a deeply learned mind on all theological and scientific subjects. His treatise written for Charlemagne upon the solar eclipses, is given by D'Achery (*Spicileg.* tom. x.), and for his other works see the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, by the Benedictines, tom. iv. 'Dungal.' He probably spent his closing years in the Irish monastery of Bobbio, to which he left his large and valuable library, of which a catalogue is given by Muratori (*Antiq. Ital.* tom. iii. Diss. 43); a great part of this library is now in the Ambrosian library at Milan. (For Dungal and his time, see Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xlv.-xlviii.; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* cent. ix. ch. 1, § 7, ch. 3, § 17; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 20; Schröckh, *Kirchen-geschichte*, xxiii. 407-21; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scriptor.* iv. 175-76; Reeves, *Adamnan*, xxiii.; *Prim. Ch. Hist. Ir.* i. 394 sq.; Ware, *Irish Writers*, 17.) He is greatly praised by Muratori, Mabillon, Bellarmine, and others, for his solid learning, and he was valued both in France and Italy for his deep and varied acquirements.

[J. G.]

DUNNA, DUNNE. A nun to whom Ethelred, king of Mercia, gave land to found a monastery at Withington, which afterwards came to the cathedral of Worcester (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 82). [BUGGA.]

[S.]

DUNNIUS. Joceline, in his *Life of St. Patrick*, relates that St. Patrick built at Sabhall or Saul a famous monastery, which he gave in charge to one of his disciples, Dunnus, whom he made its abbat, and to it he often returned and stayed. This Dunnus is nowhere else mentioned, by this designation, but the general opinion seems to be that he is the saint who is venerated as Modune or Modunius on May 29, the *Mo* being prefixed "honoris et singularis observationis causa." (Colgan, *Tr. Thaum.* 72, c. 32, 100 n. 33, 265, col. 2; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 19, 222; Ussher, *Eccl. Ant.* c. 17, works, vi. 405-6.)

[J. G.]

DUNSTAN is spoken of by Leslaeus as an abbat in Scotland, in the reign of king Aidan (i.e. in the end of the 6th century), and a contemporary of other two learned men, Hebrædus and Convallus, or Divinius and Coganus (Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 146, 163). From this basis Dempster has a short memoir of St. Dunstan in his History, and in his *Men. Scot.* at Jan. 28, says he was abbat in Levinia (now Lennox), and confessor to the excellent king Aidan. Camerarius (June 18) and others commemorate him, while the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jan. 28, tom. ii. 807) place "Dunstanus, Abbas Scotus," among their *Prætermissi*. But Dunstan is in all likelihood only another form of Drostan, Drustan, Dustan [DROSTAN]. (O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, i. 468; Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* i. 207; Camerarius, *de Scot. Fort.* 159; Bp. Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints*, 191, 219.)

[J. G.]

DUNUUALD, a "minister" of Ethelbert, king of Kent (ob. A.D. 760). Being about to go to Rome ad limina apostolorum to take a sum of money as a present from his late royal master, he bestows his villa in case of death on the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, where Ethelbert was buried. This villa was a gift of the king to him, situated in the market by Queen-gate, Canterbury (ad Cuenegatum urbis Doruernis in foro) in the neighbourhood of the church. The document is dated A.D. 762, and is attested by archbishop Bregwin (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 109). The gate, in later times written Quenigate, and reckoned one of the minor gates of the city (more likely therefore to have been ancient), has long disappeared, but Somner identified its situation, as standing almost but not quite opposite the chief gate of St. Augustine's monastery. He considered it to have been named after queen Bertha, who might have frequently passed through it in going to St. Martin's church. "A remanent of British bricks laid and couched arch-wise at a place in the wall a little northward of the postern shews the very place." (Somner, *Antiqq. of Canterbury*, 1703, p. 16, where also a reference to Dunwald's vill.)

[C. H.]

DURDAN, Welsh saint of 6th century, companion of Cadfan, settled in Bardsey, and reckoned one of the presiding saints of that island. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 224.)

[C. H.]

DURIOTORUS, 6th bishop of Rennes, is said to have subscribed, through his procurator Bertulfus, to the acts of the first council of Châlons, about the middle of the 7th century. (*Gall. Christ.* xiv. 741.)

[D. R. J.]

DUTHERIUS, third bishop of Nicaea in the south of France, said (Gams, *Series Episc.* 588) to have been slain by the Vandals, A.D. 483 or 493. He lived about the end of the 5th century, but nothing is known of his life. (*Gall. Christ.* iii. p. 1273.)

[D. R. J.]

DUTHRACHT appears to be a name for male or female.

(1) Of Leamchoill, Oct. 25. O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 283) thinks she may be the same as Durach, daughter of Enna, son of Corbmac, who is of the race of Colla-dá-Chrioch. The same person is given by Colgan (*Acta SS.*

713, c. 4, n. ¹²) among the saints belonging to the family of the Oirghialla or Oriels, and of the race of Colla-da-Crioch, but is called "St. Dhracna, *alias* Dutracta, filia Endei," &c., and is said to be venerated on 29 (? 25) Oct. or 12 Nov.; on the latter day *Mart. Doneg.* has St. Duthracht, virgin, of Cill-muine.

DUTHRACHT (2), of Liathdruim, May 16. This Duthracht is thought by O'Clery (*Mart. Doneg.* by Todd and Reeves, 131) to be Durthacht, son of Trichem, of Caoin-druim, brother of Dichu (Apr. 29), son of Trichem, of Sabhall, who is of the race of Faitach Finn, monarch of Erin [DICHU]; O'Clery further states that it is at Teamhair he is (buried or venerated), and that Liath-druim and Drum-caoin are names of Teamhair (Tara). Colgan (*Acta SS.* 61, c. 2, 307, c. 2, and *Tr. Thaum.* 100 n. ³⁵) give lists of the sons of Trichem, and places Duthracht third, calling him bishop of Aendruim (Nendrum), but Lanigan (*Ecol. Hist. Ir. i. c. 7, n. ⁷⁴*) does not feel bound to give credit to Colgan's lists "of the pretended brothers of Dichu, St. Patrick's first convert." [J. G.]

DUUNCHADUS (Bede, *H. E.* v. 22). Abbat of Hy. [DUNCHADH.] [C. H.]

DUVANUS, said to have been sent by pope Eleutherius into Britain (*Galf. Mon. Hist.* iv. 19). [DERUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

DUVIANUS (1), said to have been sent by pope Eleutherius, on the application of king Lucius, as a missionary to Britain in company with Faganus. Both of them occur under many different forms, most of which, with the authorities for them, are given by Ussher, who prefers Duvianus or Dwywan and Faganus. The two missionaries, according to the *Iolo Manuscripts*, which call them Dyfan and Fagan, came to baptize the Cymri, the church of the former being Merthyr Dyfan in Morganwg. Other traditions connect them with Cornwall [DERWA], with the supposed see of Congresbury [DERUVIANUS, DIRUVIANUS], and with the supposed see of Winchester [DUVIANUS]. Matthew of Westminster relates that in A.D. 186 the two "beati antistites" returned to Rome and obtained papal confirmation for all their proceedings, after which they resumed their mission with numerous assistants, causing Britain soon to shine bright with the Christian faith. Their names and acts, he adds, are written in the book of Gildas, concerning the victory of Aurelius Ambrosius. See also Ussher, *Brit. Ecol. Ant.*, wks. ed. 1847, t. v. p. 75; E. Williams, *Iolo Manuscripts*, 495. The varieties of the name, some of which are obviously due to the common confusion of the letters u and n, are DAMIANUS, DERUVIANUS, DERUVINIANUS, DERVANUS, DERWA, DIMANUS, DIMIANUS, DINAN, DIUVANUS, DIVIANUS, DIVINIANUS, DIWANUS, DONATIANUS, DUMANUS, DUMIANUS, DUNANUS, DUNIANUS, DUUANUS, DUVANUS, DWYWAN, DYFAN, DYVAN. [C. H.]

(2) Said to have been appointed bishop of Winchester by king Arthur. (Bened. Claudioc. *de Vit. Dubric.* in Wharton, *Angl. Sac.* ii. 659.) [C. H.]

DWYFAEL, early Welsh saint of uncertain date, the son of Pryderi ab Dolor of Deira and Bernicia. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 307.) [C. H.]

DWYNWEN, female Welsh saint, of the 5th century, considered by Welsh bards the patron saint of lovers. She was the foundress of a church in Anglesey called Llanddwywnw or Llanddwyyn; commemorated January 25. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 151.) [C. H.]

DWYWAW, Welsh saint of the 6th century, brother of Derfell, patron saint of Llanddwywau, a chapel subject to Llanenddwyn in Merionethshire. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 221.) [C. H.]

DWYWE, wife of Dunawd or Dinothus abbat of Bangor, reckoned among the Welsh saints of the 6th century, but having no churches dedicated to her. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 207.) [C. H.]

DYFAN (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 81, 84), sent by Eleutherius to Britain. [DUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

DYFNAN, son of Brychan, Welsh saint of the 5th century, founder of Llandyfnan in Anglesey, where he was buried: three chapels were dedicated to him; commemorated April 23. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 142.) [C. H.]

DYFNIG, Welsh saint of the 6th century, one of those who accompanied Cadfan to Britain. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 224.) [C. H.]

DYFNOG, Welsh saint of the 7th century, probably the second saint of Dyfynog in Brecknockshire; which was originally founded by Cynog ab Brychan. Commemorated February 13. (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 295.) [C. H.]

DYFRIG (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 170), archbishop of Caerleon. [DUBRICIUS.] [C. H.]

DYMPNA. [DIMPNA.]

DYNAMIS [see POWER], in the system of Basilides as described by Irenaeus (i. 24), named together with Sophia as following Nous, Logos, and Phronesis in the series of emanations from the unborn Father. (See also Epiphanius, *Haer.* 24, p. 73; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 4.) [G. S.]

DYNAMIUS (1) bishop, Angoulême. Nothing is certainly known of the bishops of this diocese between St. Ausonius (A.D. 260), who was the first bishop, and Dynamius (A.D. 450). Nothing is known of Dynamius except what is stated in Gregory of Tours. Quoting a certain Paulinus, a presbyter, he describes Dynamius of Ecolisma among a list of "sacerdotes" who are "worthy of the Lord." A certain Dynamius subscribed to the synodical epistle sent in the year 451 by the bishops of Gaul to pope Leo I., and some writers think that he was the same person as the subject of this article. After Dynamius the bishopric was again vacant till about the year 500. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. p. 977; Gregor. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* lib. ii. cap. 13; *Patrol. Lat.* lxxi. 210; Leo Mag. *Epist.* xcix.; *Patrol. Lat.* liv. 966; Gams, *Series Episc.* p. 490.) [D. R. J.]

(2) Third bishop of Béziers (Biterra), flourished about the middle of the 5th century, according to *Gallia Christiana*, but his history is involved in much obscurity. Tillemont mentions him as possibly bishop of Béziers. His name is omitted by the Sammarthani. Both Tillemont and Quesnel seem to have formed their conjecture without any sound reason except

that a certain Dynamius, who contributed largely towards rebuilding the church of Narbonne, was bishop of the province of Narbonne, where the bishop of Béziers ranked next to the archbishop. (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 296; Tillemont, tom. xv.; *Hist. Eccles.* p. 405.) [D. R. J.]

DYNAMIUS (3), known by the title of PATRICIUS, from his rank as *patricius Galliarum*, was born of a noble family at Arles, in the middle of the 6th century. When only thirty, he was appointed governor of Marseilles, where he became infamous for his tyranny and avarice. He drove into exile Theodorus, the bishop of that city, and confiscated the revenues of that see. Later in life he became the subject of a conversion which transformed him into a trusted friend of Gregory the Great, and a magnificent benefactor to the church. Among Gregory's letters are two to him. In the first (*Epist.* lib. ii.; *Ind.* xi. *Ep.* 33) he thanks him for his faithful administration of the estates of the church of Rome in Gaul, and presents him with a cross containing some filings from St. Peter's chains and St. Lawrence's gridiron. The second (lib. v. *Ep.* 33) simply urges perseverance in prayer. He died A.D. 601, as we learn from a letter of Gregory's (lib. ix. *Epist.* 70) consoling his brother Aurelius on this event. His political compositions in early life are mentioned with commendation by Venantius Fortunatus (*Poem.* lib. vi. 11). We have from his pen two letters, given by Migne, and the biographies of St. Marius, abbat of Bevon, given in an abridged form by Mabillon (*Saec. Bened.* tom. i. p. 105; Bolland. *Act. Sc.* Jan. 27), and of St. Maximus, abbat of Lerins, and afterwards bishop of Riéz (Surius, Nov. 27). Both are given by Migne (*Patrolog.* tom. lxxx. pp. 24-40). The epitaph of Dynamius and his wife Eucheria are given by Duchesne (*Hist. France*, i. 519). (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 546.) [E. V.]

(4) Grandson of Dynamius Patricius, composed an epitaph for his grandfather by order of his father. (Duchesne, *Hist. France*, i. 518; Ceillier, xi. 401.) [W. M. S.]

(5) Thirteenth bishop of Avignon, is said to have been a priest at Marseilles before he was created bishop of Avignon, which diocese he ruled twenty-two years. He died A.D. 627. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 799.) [D. R. J.]

(6) Thirty-fifth bishop of Avignon, lived in the early part of the 7th century, when Sabinianus was pope, and Clotarius II. king. He was brought up at the court of king Sigibertus, by whom he was created patrician and prefect of a province. After the death of his wife, he vowed himself to God, entered the priesthood and served at Marseilles. On the recommendation of king Theodericus he was made bishop of Avignon, in which diocese he founded many churches and monasteries. He died in the twenty-third year of his episcopate, and was buried in the basilica of SS. Peter and Paul. His epitaph, which is contained in an ancient

codex, and quoted in *Gallia Christiana*, corresponds with these facts.

He must be a different person from DYNAMIUS PATRICIUS, author of the lives of St. Marius and St. Maximus, for that personage is said to have died in 601, whereas Dynamius, bishop of Avignon, was consecrated in 605. The two poems of Venantius Fortunatus (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxxviii. 229) are addressed to Dynamius Massiliensis, and must mean the bishop of Avignon. Dynamius Patricius is called by Gregory of Tours Dynamius Arelatensis. (*Patrol. Lat.* lxxi.; *Gall. Christ.* i. 867.) [D. J. R.]

DYSCOLIUS, 6th bishop of Rheims, about the year 346. Nothing is known of his life except that he is supposed by some to have been present in the year 346 at the council of Cologne, and in 347 at the council of Sardica, and to have died in the east during that visit, while others deny that there ever was such a person. The ancient catalogues of Rheims, however, testify that he existed as bishop of that diocese, and they are supported by Demochares, Marlotus, the Sammarthani, and others. (*Gall. Christ.* ix. p. 4.) [D. R. J.]

DYSIBOD (DISEN), July 8. He is said to have been a bishop in Ireland about A.D. 620, and by some styled bishop of Dublin; on account of the prevalent corruptions in faith and morals, he left Ireland and went forth as a missionary. After preaching some years through Germany, he settled in the diocese of Mentz, and built a monastery, which was the foundation of the present town of Disemburg, the ancient Mons Disibodi. There he was an episcopus regionalis, an abbot-bishop, without jurisdiction beyond his own monastery, and had under him a staff of twelve canons "ad numerum xii. apostolorum" (Todd, *St. Patrick*, 109-10; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 300); in the monastery, Lanigan says, the rule of St. Benedict was observed. He is said to have died in the eighty-first year of his age, on an eighth of July, and his life was written by the abbess Hildegardis, who died Sept. 17, A.D. 1180. The date of St. Disibod's death as usually given from Mar. Scotus, is A.D. 674. (Lanigan, *Eccles. Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 18, § 9; Mabillon, *Annal. Ben.* at A.D. 674; Ware, *Irish Writers*, 11; O'Connor, *Rer. Hib. Scriptor.* iv. 191; Leslaeus, *de Reb. Gest. Scot.* lib. iv. 154; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 375.) The *Vita Sti. Disibodi* is published by Surius (*Acta SS.* tom. iii. at Jul. 8) and by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* tom. ii. 581-99, the Life itself however occupying only pp. 588-97). Dempster (*Hist. Eccles. Scot.* i. 205) says he has seen a book written by him upon the *Proficiency of Monks in their solitary Estate*, but, like much else in Dempster, the authorship is doubtful. In *Men. Scot.* at June 8, he adds this, however, which may be perfectly true, that, while in Ireland, bishop Dysibod wrought hard at the overthrow of rites of unspeakable wickedness. [J. G.]

DYVAN (*Iolo Manuscripts* of E. Williams p. 495), missionary to Britain. [DUVIANUS.] [C. H.]

END OF VOL. I.

